

International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2015: Cognitive Pretest

Lenzner, Timo; Neuert, Cornelia; Otto, Wanda

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Lenzner, T., Neuert, C., & Otto, W. (2014). *International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2015: Cognitive Pretest*. (GESIS Project Reports, 2014/13). Mannheim: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften. <https://doi.org/10.17173/pretest89>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

gesis

Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

GESIS Project Reports

2014 | 13

International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2015

Cognitive Pretest
January 2014

*Timo Lenzner, Cornelia Neuert &
Wanda Otto*

GESIS Project Reports 2014|13

International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2015

**Cognitive Pretest
January 2014**

Timo Lenzner, Cornelia Neuert & Wanda Otto

GESIS Project Reports

GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften
Survey Design and Methodology
Postfach 12 21 55
68072 Mannheim

Phone: +49 (0) 621 1246 - 227 / - 225 / - 228

Fax: +49 (0) 621 1246 - 100

E-Mail: timo.lenzner@gesis.org / cornelia.neuert@gesis.org / wanda.otto@gesis.org

DOI: [10.17173/pretest89](https://doi.org/10.17173/pretest89)

Citation

Lenzner, T., Neuert, C.; Otto, W. (2014). International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2015. Cognitive Pretest. *GESIS Projektbericht*. Version: 1.0. GESIS – Pretestlabor. Text.
<http://doi.org/10.17173/pretest89>

Contents

	Page
1 Aims of the pretest.....	5
2 Sample.....	6
3 Methods.....	8
4 Results	9

1 Aims of the pretest

The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) is an international cooperation programme that conducts an annual joint survey on topics relevant to the social sciences. Since its foundation in 1984, the ISSP has grown to 48 member countries in 2013.

In order to prepare the ISSP survey 2015 in Germany and to check the translation of the questionnaire from English into German, selected parts of the questionnaire should be subjected to a cognitive (laboratory) pretest, revised on the basis of the test results and - where possible - improved.

For this purpose, the GESIS Pretest Laboratory was commissioned by the German ISSP project group to carry out the cognitive pretest. The contact person on the ISSP project group side was Dr. Evi Scholz.

2 Sample

Number of cognitive interviews: 15

Selection of target group: Quota sampling

Quota plan: Only people of full age and in employment.

Test persons were selected according to age (18 - 40 years; 41 years and older), education (Fachhochschule matriculation/accreditation; no Abitur) and sex.

Age	Education	Female	Male	Total
18 - 40	Less than university entrance qualification (Abitur)	2	2	4
18 - 40	University entrance qualification/ diploma	3	1	4
41 +	Less than university entrance qualification (Abitur)	2	2	4
41 +	University entrance qualification/ diploma	1	2	3
TOTAL		8	7	15

Key characteristics of the test persons:

Test person ID	Sex m= Male f= Female	Age in years	School-leaving certificate*	Working hours per week (including overtime)
01	f	24	B	08
02	f	36	C	40
03	m	34	B	47
04	m	35	C	40
05	f	31	G	44
06	f	34	G	50
07	f	25	G	38,5
08	m	25	G	60
09	f	51	E	24
10	f	62	B	60
11	m	56	C	45-50
12	m	46	C	40
13	f	51	G	35
14	m	41	G	60
15	m	50	F	50

- *Codes:
- A - Dropped out of school without a secondary school leaving certificate (Volksschulabschluss)
 - B - Secondary School Certificate (Volksschulabschluss, Hauptschulabschluss)
 - C - Intermediate level (Realschulabschluss, Mittlere Reife)
 - D - Polytechnic secondary school of the GDR with completion of the 8th or 9th class
 - E - Polytechnic secondary school of the GDR with completion of the 10th grade
 - F - Advanced technical college entrance qualification (Fachhochschulreife)
 - G - General or subject-related university entrance qualification (Abitur, Grammar school or EOS, also EOS with apprenticeship)

3 Methods

Field time:	09 January to 22 January 2014
Number of interviewers:	5
Pretests conducted in the lab (vide-recorded):	15
Procedure:	Use of an evaluation questionnaire
Used cognitive techniques:	Think Aloud, Comprehension Probing, General Probing, Specific Probing, Spontaneous requests.
Test person incentive:	30 Euro

4 Results

Question to be tested:

1. Haben Sie schon einmal für Ihre Familie auf Möglichkeiten zum beruflichen Weiterkommen verzichtet – oder würden Sie das gegebenenfalls tun?
 [Have you ever foregone opportunities to advance your career for your family – or would you do so if necessary?]

(Nur EIN Kreuz möglich!)
[Only ONE cross possible!]

Frequency distribution (N=15)

Ja	7
[Yes]	
Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, aber wahrscheinlich würde ich es tun	6
[No, not yet, but I probably would]	
Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, und wahrscheinlich würde ich es auch nicht tun	2
[No, not yet, and I probably wouldn't either]	
<i>Kann ich nicht sagen</i>	
<i>[Don't know]</i>	-

Cognitive techniques:

Think Aloud, General Probing, Specific Probing, Comprehension Probing.

Findings:

Seven test persons answered this question with "yes". Six of these respondents have correctly chosen this answer category, as they have already foregone opportunities for career advancement:

- *"I have refrained from longer absences in my company, e.g. in other cities. For longer absences I said "no", because family life is already very important to me."*¹ (TP 10)

¹ „Ich habe in meiner Firma auf längere Abwesenheiten, z.B. in anderen Städten verzichtet. Bei längeren Abwesenheiten habe ich gesagt „nein“, weil mir das Familienleben schon sehr wichtig ist.“ (TP 10)

- *"I have a daughter and that naturally meant that I had to give up professional advancement. Simply because of the smaller time commitment or also local restrictions."*² (TP 13)
- *"I have a chance to get a transfer, i.e. to continue my professional training, but because of my mother, who is handicapped, I gave up."*³ (TP 15)

Test person 04, however, answers with "Yes", although she has not yet given up: "I would definitely choose the family. I don't have one now, just my son. When I was on montage [...], I missed my son very much. I haven't had to give it up yet, but I would definitely do it for the family. (TP 04)

Six test subjects stated that they had not yet given up opportunities for career advancement for their families, but would probably do so. All of these respondents correctly interpret the answer category, for example:

- *"I wouldn't do it in general, but there are certain situations where I would do it and that's why I tick this box. It can always be that parents fall ill and you have to care for them and then you can no longer just see that you get on in your career. In extreme cases I would do it, but I would also not generally do without professional advancement."*⁴ (TP 05)
- *"I haven't done it yet, but I probably would. So if it were more important to the family that I not do it."*⁵ (TP 11)

Both test persons who have chosen the answer category "No, not yet, and I probably wouldn't do it" do not interpret this category in the intended sense. Test person 03 talks about having already worked in the family business and relates their answer behavior in this and the next question to this activity in the family business, although it emerged in the course of the interview that the test person has already changed jobs and professions several times in their previous lives. The respondent's understanding of the question 09 is contrary to the intended understanding: *"I wouldn't actually do that. In order to get on without the family, does that mean? So career is more important than family? No, I would not do that. Family is more important than career. No matter what your job is, even if it's your dream job."* (TP 09). So she ticked the "wrong" answer and should actually have ticked "No, ..., but I probably would".

With regard to the question itself, there are two further anomalies. Both test person 05 and test person 14 spontaneously state that they were thinking of their respective partners when they asked the question and that it was not clear from the question whether partnerships were included in the term "family".

Test subjects 06 and 08 (both high school graduates) point out that two questions are actually asked in one, namely whether one has already given up and whether one would do so if necessary. This means that one has to take more time and read the question several times before being able to answer

² „Ich habe eine Tochter und das bedeutete naturgemäß, dass ich auf berufliches Weiterkommen verzichten musste. Einfach aufgrund des geringeren zeitlichen Einsatzes oder auch örtlicher Beschränkungen.“ (TP 13)

³ „Ich habe eine Chance, mich versetzen zu lassen, also beruflich weiterbilden zu lassen, aufgrund meiner Mutter, die behindert ist, verzichtet.“ (TP 15)

⁴ „Ich würde es nicht generell tun, aber es gibt bestimmte Situationen, da würde ich es tun und deshalb kreuze ich das auch an. Es kann ja immer sein, dass Eltern erkranken und man die pflegen muss und da kann man natürlich dann nicht mehr nur gucken, dass man beruflich weiterkommt. Bei krasen Fällen würde ich es tun, aber ich würde auch nicht generell auf berufliches Weiterkommen verzichten.“ (TP 05)

⁵ „Bisher habe ich es nicht gemacht, aber wahrscheinlich würde ich es tun. Also wenn es für die Familie wichtiger wäre, dass ich darauf verzichte.“ (TP 11)

it. Respondents who do not do this may not grasp the complexity of the question and run the risk of choosing a (wrong) answer category prematurely.

In order to find out more about what the respondents understand by "career advancement", this was explicitly asked. The most frequent mentions related to career or professional advancement, followed by further training opportunities, as well as spatial and temporal flexibility, a higher salary or generally a more responsible job with or without management tasks.

Recommendations:

We recommend that the question be reworded in two ways. Firstly, it should be made clear whether the term "family" explicitly includes partnerships or not. If so, we recommend adding the phrase "or your partnership" to the question. On the other hand, it should be made clear that the question is not only directed into the future ("Would you possibly renounce?"), but also into the past ("Have you ever renounced?"). In order to avoid that respondents answer here exclusively with regard to their future intentions, we recommend one of two alternatives:

Alternative 1: The question could be divided into two separate questions, for example:

Question 1:

"Have you ever given up opportunities for your family (or partnership) to advance in your career?"

[„Haben Sie schon einmal für Ihre Familie (oder Ihre Partnerschaft) auf Möglichkeiten zum beruflichen Weiterkommen verzichtet?"]

Yes [Ja]

No [Nein]

If "no" was answered:

Question 2:

"If necessary, would you give up opportunities for professional advancement for your family (or your partnership)?"

[„Würden Sie gegebenenfalls für Ihre Familie (oder Ihre Partnerschaft) auf Möglichkeiten zum beruflichen Weiterkommen verzichten?"]

Yes, I probably would. [Ja, wahrscheinlich würde ich das tun]

No, I probably wouldn't do that. [Nein, wahrscheinlich würde ich das nicht tun]

Alternative 2: The behaviour intended in the future could be recorded by changing the response categories. A possible formulation of the question and the answer categories would be:

"Have you ever given up opportunities for professional advancement for your family (or partnership) - or would you do so if necessary?"

[„Haben Sie schon einmal für Ihre Familie (oder Ihre Partnerschaft) auf Möglichkeiten zum beruflichen Weiterkommen verzichtet – oder würden Sie das gegebenenfalls tun?"]

Yes, I have done that already and would probably do it again.

[Ja, das habe ich bereits getan und würde es wahrscheinlich wieder tun.]

Yes, I did that already, but I probably wouldn't do it again.

[Ja, das habe ich bereits getan, aber würde es wahrscheinlich nicht wieder tun.]

No, not yet, but I probably would.

[Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, aber wahrscheinlich würde ich es tun.]

No, not yet, and I probably wouldn't do it again.

[Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, und wahrscheinlich würde ich es auch nicht tun.]

Question to be tested:

2. Haben Sie schon einmal für Ihre Familie eine berufliche Tätigkeit mit hoher Verantwortung aufgegeben – oder würden Sie das gegebenenfalls tun?
 [Have you ever given up a professional activity with high responsibility for your family – or would you do so if necessary?]

(Nur EIN Kreuz möglich!)
 [Only ONE cross possible!]

Frequency distribution (N = 15)

Ja	3
[Yes]	
Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, aber wahrscheinlich würde ich es tun	8
[No, not yet, but I probably would]	
Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, und wahrscheinlich würde ich es auch nicht tun	3
[No, not yet, and I probably wouldn't either]	
Kann ich nicht sagen	
[Don't know]	1

Cognitive techniques:

Think Aloud, General Probing, Specific Probing, Comprehension Probing.

Findings:

Slightly more than half of the test subjects (n = 8) decide to answer "No, not yet, but I probably would." Test subject 05 answers "I cannot say" and justifies this as follows: "*I haven't done it yet, because I haven't had that kind of job with a lot of responsibility. [...] The question says "give up" and I cannot say that. I also can't imagine that I'll ever get into such a high position.*"⁶ (TP 05). This test person indicates that he should actually check "No, [...] but probably I would". However, the term "give up" implies that one already has a job with high responsibility. On the other hand, a formulation with "give up" - analogous to question 1 - implies, due to the choice of words alone, that in addition to a position that one already holds, one does not even aspire to a position with high responsibility.

Of the three test persons who answered "yes" to this question, two persons (TP 08, TP 14) chose this answer category without having read the other answers at all. Both test persons change their answer to "No, [...] but would probably do so" in the course of the interview, i.e. in response to the test lead-

⁶ „Kann ich nicht sagen“ und begründet dies wie folgt: „*Habe ich noch nicht gemacht, weil ich noch gar nicht so eine Tätigkeit mit hoher Verantwortung hatte. [...] In der Frage heißt es ja „aufgeben“ und da kann ich das nicht sagen. Ich kann mir auch nicht vorstellen, dass ich mal in eine so hohe Position komme.*“ (TP 05).

er's question, since they have not yet been in the situation of having given up a job with a high level of responsibility:

- TP 08: *"Never had to do it, but I'm sure I would. I think about how important family is, very important, that's what comes first and before work."*

TL: *You haven't given it up yet, but would you do it?*

TP 08: *"No, I haven't had to do without it yet, so of course the answer would be wrong. Now I see it at second glance, I had not even read the remaining categories."*

TL: *At second glance they would tick something else?*

TP 08: *"Yes exactly, the second answer."⁷*

- *"I haven't done it yet, but I would."⁸ (TP 14, Answer: „yes“)*

When asked how easy or difficult it was for Test Person 08 to answer this question, she says she found it rather difficult *"because two things are asked at once. [...] "Have you ever" and "would you". So future and past."* (TP 08). This shows that the item formulation does not take into account the intuitive answering behavior of the respondents. Only test person 02 answers correctly with "yes", whereby she explains her answering behavior in the sense of "renounce" and not in the sense of "give up": *"I once had the opportunity to take over a company, to become self-employed. I gave up on that. For the reasons I've already mentioned [nursing care in the family]."⁹* (TP 02).

Of the eight test persons who answered "No, not yet, but I probably would", seven interpret the question in the intended sense, for example:

- *"Well, I haven't done that yet. But sure, I would if I had to. Basically, my principles are that I stand for family."¹⁰ (TP 04)*
- *"No, not yet. [...] If I were in a management position and my husband/child said you were rarely home, I would."¹¹ (TP 07)*
- *"If there was a need for care or serious changes in the family, and I would say I need more time for the family, then I would definitely do that."¹² (TP 10)*

⁷ TP 08: *„Musste ich nie machen, würde es aber bestimmt machen. Ich denke darüber nach, wie wichtig ist Familie, ja sehr wichtig, die steht im Vordergrund und vor der Arbeit.“*

TL: *Sie haben noch nicht darauf verzichtet, aber würden es tun?*

TP 08: *„Nein, ich musste noch nicht darauf verzichten, deshalb wäre die Antwort natürlich falsch. Jetzt sehe ich es auf den zweiten Blick, ich hatte die restlichen Kategorien gerade gar nicht gelesen.“*

TL: *Auf den zweiten Blick würden sie was anderes ankreuzen?*

TP 08: *„Ja genau, die zweite Antwort.“*

⁸ *„Getan habe ich es noch nicht, aber ich würde es tun.“ (TP 14, Antwort: „ja“)*

⁹ *„Ich hatte einmal die Möglichkeit eine Firma zu übernehmen, mich selbstständig zu machen. Darauf habe ich verzichtet. Aus den bereits genannten Gründen [Pflegefall in der Familie].“ (TP 02).*

¹⁰ *„Also das habe ich noch nicht gemacht. Aber klar, ich würde das tun, wenn es sein muss. Grundsätzlich sind meine Prinzipien, dass ich für die Familie stehe.“ (TP 04)*

¹¹ *„Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht. [...] Wenn ich mal in einer Führungsposition sein sollte und mein Mann/Kind würden sagen, du bist zu selten zu Hause, dann würde ich das tun.“ (TP 07)*

¹² *„Wenn es in der Familie einen Pflegefall oder gravierende Veränderungen gäbe, und ich würde sagen, ich brauche mehr Zeit für die Familie, dann würde ich das auf jeden Fall tun.“ (TP 10)*

- *"Probably I would do it because family comes first, no matter what it is. But I haven't been in that situation."*¹³ (TP 15)

Test person 03 thinks, as in question 1, of their professional activity in a family business and associates in this context with "professional activity with high responsibility" that one generally bears responsibility for every task one is given: *"Everyone bears responsibility. If I come into someone's garden and different things are to be done, then I bear the responsibility for getting them done"* (TP 03).

Two of the three test persons who state that they have not yet given up any activity with high responsibility and are unlikely to do so in the future understand the question correctly:

- *"I think I would only do it in an emergency at the very most, and I probably wouldn't do it either. If I already do this job with a high level of responsibility, then it will probably also be a job that I enjoy, that gives me something and therefore I would not want to give it up for me personally."*¹⁴ (TP 01)
- *"I have never had such a job with high responsibility before. Maybe I wouldn't do it, I guess it depends on the job. I think about the fact that you get offered a team leader position and decide not to take the job because you have less time for your family."*¹⁵ (TP 06)

Test subject 09 ticked this answer, as in question 1, although she was contrary to her attitude, as she interpreted the question in the opposite sense: *"No, I wouldn't do that either. For the same reasons as with the previous question. Family is more important than a job. Career is also important, but family is the first priority for me. I would never do that."*¹⁶ (TP 09).

With the exception of test person 03, who associates a certain degree of responsibility independent of the respective activity, all test persons understand a "professional activity with high responsibility"¹⁷ to be a leading position or a management position.

Recommendations:

We recommend that the question be reworded in the same way as Question 1 (i.e. Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 and a more specific definition of the term "family"). In addition, we recommend, depending on the interest in the findings, to use one of the two terms "give up" or "renounce" in this question. The term "give up" implies that one already has a professional activity with high responsibility (in

¹³ „Wahrscheinlich würde ich es tun, weil Familie geht vor, auf jeden Fall, egal was es ist. Aber ich war noch nicht in der Situation.“ (TP 15)

¹⁴ „Ich denke, ich würde es allerhöchstens nur im Ernstfall tun und wahrscheinlich würde ich es auch nicht tun. Wenn ich schon diese Tätigkeit mit hoher Verantwortung ausübe, dann wird es wahrscheinlich auch ein Beruf sein, der mir Spaß macht, der mir etwas gibt und deshalb würde ich den für mich persönlich nicht aufgeben wollen.“ (TP 01)

¹⁵ „Ich hatte bisher noch keine solche Tätigkeit mit hoher Verantwortung. Vielleicht würde ich es nicht tun, das kommt wohl auf die Tätigkeit an. Ich denke da jetzt daran, dass man z.B. eine Teamleiterstelle angeboten bekommt und sich entscheidet, die Stelle nicht anzunehmen, weil man dann weniger Zeit für die Familie hat.“ (TP 06)

¹⁶ „Nein, würde ich auch nicht machen. Aus den gleichen Gründen wie bei der vorherigen Frage. Familie ist wichtiger als ein Beruf. Beruf ist auch wichtig, aber Familie ist die erste Stelle bei mir. Würde ich nie machen.“ (TP 09).

¹⁷ Mit Ausnahme von Testperson 03, die ein gewisses Maß an Verantwortung unabhängig von der jeweiligen Tätigkeit assoziiert, verstehen alle Testpersonen unter einer „beruflichen Tätigkeit mit hoher Verantwortung“ eine leitende Position bzw. eine Führungsposition.

order to be able to give it up). The term "renounce", on the other hand, also implies that one might not even accept such an activity.

Alternative 1:

Frage 1:

"Have you ever given up (on) a professional activity with high responsibility for your family (or your partnership)?

[„Haben Sie schon einmal für Ihre Familie (oder Ihre Partnerschaft) (auf) eine berufliche Tätigkeit mit hoher Verantwortung aufgegeben (verzichtet)?"]

Yes [Ja]

No [Nein]

If "No" was answered:

Frage 2:

"If necessary, would you give up (renounce) a professional activity with high responsibility for your family (or your partnership)?

[„Würden Sie gegebenenfalls für Ihre Familie (oder Ihre Partnerschaft) (auf) eine berufliche Tätigkeit mit hoher Verantwortung aufgeben (verzichten)?"]

Yeah, I probably would.

[Ja, wahrscheinlich würde ich das tun]

No, I probably wouldn't do that.

[Nein, wahrscheinlich würde ich das nicht tun]

Alternative 2:

"Have you ever given up (on) a professional activity with high responsibility for your family (or your partnership) - or would you possibly do so?

[„Haben Sie schon einmal für Ihre Familie (oder Ihre Partnerschaft) (auf) eine berufliche Tätigkeit mit hoher Verantwortung aufgegeben (verzichtet) – oder würden Sie das gegebenenfalls tun?"]

Yes, I have done that already and would probably do it again.

[Ja, das habe ich bereits getan und würde es wahrscheinlich wieder tun.]

Yeah, I did that already, but probably wouldn't do it again.

[Ja, das habe ich bereits getan, aber würde es wahrscheinlich nicht wieder tun.]

No, not yet, but I probably would.

[Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, aber wahrscheinlich würde ich es tun.]

No, not yet, and I probably wouldn't either.

[Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, und wahrscheinlich würde ich es auch nicht tun.]

Question to be tested:

3. Haben Sie schon einmal, nur Ihres Familienlebens zuliebe, eine Berufstätigkeit beibehalten, die für Sie nicht befriedigend war – oder würden Sie das gegebenenfalls tun?
 [Have you ever, just for the sake of your family life, maintained a professional activity that was not satisfactory for you - or would you do so if necessary?]

(Nur EIN Kreuz möglich!)

[Only ONE cross possible!]

Frequency distribution (N = 15)

Ja	5
[Yes]	
Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, aber wahrscheinlich würde ich es tun	7
[No, not yet, but I probably would]	
Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, und wahrscheinlich würde ich es auch nicht tun	
[No, not yet, and I probably wouldn't either]	3
<i>Kann ich nicht sagen</i>	
<i>[Don't know]</i>	-

Cognitive techniques:

Think Aloud, General Probing, Specific Probing, Comprehension Probing.

Findings:

In this question, five people answered "Yes", seven people answered "No, not yet, but probably I would" and three people answered "No, not yet, and probably I would not".

Based on the spontaneous comments of the test persons and the final assessment of the difficulty of answering the question, it is noticeable that seven persons initially had difficulties in answering the question. The difficulty for the test persons in reading the question for the first time is that the question is either unclear to them (TP 03, TP 06, TP 11, TP 13) or the formulation is more complicated than in the previous questions (TP 07, TP 08, TP 15). Unclear because three test persons initially had problems with the wording "family life" and test person 13 could not find himself in the answer categories at first, because he could not answer the question "in principle for his previous professional life", but would have preferred to answer "yes, but not always". Obviously, subject 13 missed the introduction "Have you ever...". The other three test subjects, who were initially unsure of the question, comment as follows:

- *"What is meant by "for the sake of family life" and "satisfying?"*¹⁸ (TP 03)
- *"For me it is true that I have a family, but there is this distance [TP leads a weekend-marriage], so it is not so easy to answer."*¹⁹ (TP 06)
- *"You can understand a lot about "family life"."*²⁰ (TP 11)

The aspect of question complexity is pointed out by three test persons:

- *"But the question is asked in a complicated way, with the relative clause and then this and that."*²¹ (TP 07)
- *"Did I have to read it twice."*²² (TP 08)
- *"The question was a bit complicated at first. You have to read it carefully to understand it."*²³ (TP 15)

The five respondents who answered "Yes" have, in one way or another, already had a job that was unsatisfactory for them and correctly chose this answer category. When answering the question, two test persons (TP 01, TP 02) remember that they have refrained from taking up their chosen occupation for the sake of their parents and have instead taken up another occupation and temporarily retained it. Test subjects 04 and 10 think of their own families:

- *"I started to work as a butcher after the middle school leaving examination, which I actually finished quite well. All the know-how I had to acquire for the final exams was completely unnecessary. It was kind of disappointing. But my girlfriend and my child had to be looked after."*²⁴ (TP 04)
- *"My old company has been taken over by a new company and I had a very difficult position there, I was very bullied. I was the main earner at that time and I gritted my teeth. But at some point I said that it was no longer possible, we were talking about a severance package because it was no longer reasonable."*²⁵ (TP 10)

Test subject 13 states that at certain times, for the sake of the family, she maintained a professional activity that was not satisfactory without explaining the situation in detail.

The seven subjects who said "No, not yet, but I probably would." tend to explain their response behavior by saying that if it were financially necessary, they would also pursue an unsatisfactory activity - at

¹⁸ „Was ist mit dem „Familienleben zuliebe“ und „befriedigend“ gemeint?“ (TP 03)

¹⁹ „Bei mir ist es ja so, dass ich zwar Familie habe, aber da ist ja diese Distanz [TP führt eine Wochenend-Ehe], deswegen ist das nicht so ganz einfach zu beantworten.“ (TP 06)

²⁰ „Unter „Familienleben“ kann man viel verstehen.“ (TP 11)

²¹ „Die Frage ist aber kompliziert gestellt, mit dem Relativsatz und dann noch dies und jenes.“ (TP 07)

²² „Musste ich jetzt erst einmal zweimal lesen.“ (TP 08)

²³ „Die Fragestellung war zuerst ein bisschen kompliziert. Man muss es genau lesen um es zu verstehen.“ (TP 15)

²⁴ „Ich habe nach der mittleren Reife, die ich eigentlich ganz gut abgeschlossen habe, als Fleischer angefangen zu arbeiten. Das ganze Know-how, das ich mir für die Abschlussprüfung habe aneignen müssen, war völlig unnötig gewesen. Das war schon irgendwie enttäuschend. Aber meine Freundin und mein Kind mussten eben versorgt werden.“ (TP 04)

²⁵ „Meine alte Firma ist von einer neuen Firma übernommen worden und ich hatte dann dort einen sehr schwierigen Stand, ich bin sehr gemobbt worden. Ich war damals Hauptverdienerin und habe die Zähne zusammen gebissen. Aber irgendwann habe ich gesagt, es geht nicht mehr, wir reden über eine Abfindungssumme, weil es nicht mehr zumutbar war.“ (TP 10)

least temporarily. The three test persons who would probably not do so, attribute a high priority to their jobs or believe that the job must be fun in the long run, otherwise they would change jobs.

There is a relatively wide range of answers to the question of what the test persons understand by "*a job that is not satisfying*". In part, the respondents refer to the lack of intrinsic motivation aspects such as individual promotion/challenge, opportunities for promotion and further training, enjoyment of work/fulfilment, workload or senselessness of the job, in part to extrinsic aspects such as insufficient pay, poor working atmosphere / bullying, fear of losing their job or dissatisfaction with colleagues or superiors.

Recommendations:

We recommend a rewording of the question analogous to question 1 and question 2 (i.e. alternative 1 or alternative 2 as well as a more concrete definition of the term "family"). Since the wording "for the sake of your family life" causes unnecessary difficulties in answering the question, we recommend replacing it with the wording "your family or your partnership" - analogous to the two previous questions. Also analogous to the two previous questions, we recommend using the wording "professional activity".

Alternative 1:

Question 1:

"Have you ever maintained a professional activity for your family (or partnership) that was not satisfactory for you?"

[„Haben Sie schon einmal für Ihre Familie (oder Ihre Partnerschaft) eine berufliche Tätigkeit beibehalten, die für Sie nicht befriedigend war?“]

Yes [Ja]

No [Nein]

If "no" was answered:

Question 2:

"If necessary, would you maintain for your family (or partnership) a professional activity that is not satisfactory for you?"

[„Würden Sie gegebenenfalls für Ihre Familie (oder Ihre Partnerschaft) eine berufliche Tätigkeit beibehalten, die für Sie nicht befriedigend ist?“]

Yeah, I probably would

[Ja, wahrscheinlich würde ich das tun]

No, I probably wouldn't do that

[Nein, wahrscheinlich würde ich das nicht tun]

Alternative 2:

"Have you ever maintained a professional activity for your family (or partnership) that was not satisfactory for you - or would you do so if necessary?"

[„Haben Sie schon einmal für Ihre Familie (oder Ihre Partnerschaft) eine berufliche Tätigkeit beibehalten, die für Sie nicht befriedigend war – oder würden Sie das gegebenenfalls tun?“]

Yes, I have done that already and would probably do it again.

[Ja, das habe ich bereits getan und würde es wahrscheinlich wieder tun.]

Yes, I did that already, but I probably wouldn't do it again.

[Ja, das habe ich bereits getan, aber würde es wahrscheinlich nicht wieder tun.]

No, not yet, but I probably would.

[Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, aber wahrscheinlich würde ich es tun.]

No, not yet, and I probably wouldn't do it again.

[Nein, bis jetzt noch nicht, und wahrscheinlich würde ich es auch nicht tun.]

Question to be tested:

4. Welche der folgenden Aussagen trifft am ehesten auf Ihre üblichen Arbeitszeiten zu?
 [Which of the following statements best applies to your usual working hours?]

(Nur EIN Kreuz möglich!)
[Only ONE cross possible!]

Frequency distribution (N = 15)

Ich arbeite tagsüber bzw. in Frühschicht [I work during the day or early shift]	6
Ich arbeite abends bzw. in Spätschicht [I work evenings or late shifts]	2
Ich arbeite nachts bzw. in Nachtschicht [I work nights or night shifts]	1 (2) ²⁶
Ich arbeite nach wechselndem Zeitplan bzw. in Wechselschicht (z. B. abwechselnd Früh-, Spät- und Nachtschicht) [I work according to a changing schedule or in alternating shifts (e.g. alternating early, late and night shifts)]	2
Mein Arbeitstag ist zeitlich geteilt [My working day is divided in time]	1
Meine täglichen Arbeitszeiten ändern sich oft kurzfristig [My daily working hours often change at short notice]	3
<i>Kann ich nicht sagen</i> <i>[Don't know]</i>	-

Cognitive techniques:

Think Aloud, General Probing, Comprehension Probing.

Findings:

The test subjects are spread over all possible answer categories, with most of them stating "working during the day or early shift". Test person 02 cannot choose one of the answer categories because their working hours have changed from a late shift to a night shift. She therefore chooses the two answer categories "I work in the evening or late shift" and "I work at night or night shift".

²⁶ TP 02 selects "I work in the evening or late shift" as well as "I work at night or night shift", because he works from 17:30/18:00 to 2:00 at night and thus the late shift changes into a night shift.

Persons who have more than one job also have difficulties in choosing a single answer option. Test persons 07 and 10 solve this problem by only referring to their main job when answering. Subject 08 chooses "a split working day" for the same reason.

Three other respondents (TP 06, TP 12, TP 14) indicate that the answer categories are not mutually exclusive:

- *"The answer categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive, e.g. during the day and times often change at short notice."*²⁷ (TP 06)
- *"Well, I work rotating shifts. Ah, only one answer is possible. Yeah, it's a three-shift operation. Sometimes, if someone is absent, for example, my work changes at short notice. Then you have to step in."*²⁸ (TP 12)
- *"I am in the field, which means that my working hours often change at short notice. [...] But it must be said that I actually work during the day, sometimes I have to do my correspondence in the evening or at night. [...] Well, if I think about it and only have to make a cross, then I cannot say that."*²⁹ (TP 14)

In particular, the answer category "My daily working hours often change at short notice" is not perceived as a separate answer category for describing "normal working hours", but as an additional feature. This can be attributed to the fact that this answer category is interpreted by the respondents primarily as "short-term replacement" or "flexible working hours" (see below).

Three test persons (TP 05, TP 11, TP 13) stumbled at the formulation "I work during the day or early shift":

- *"Oh, "or," okay. I didn't notice that until I read, "I work the morning shift during the day."*³⁰ (TP 05)
- *"I work days, but not the early shift."*³¹ (TP 11)
- *"I work during the day, but not the early shift. The "or early shift" might be a bit confusing. Most people work during the day."*³² (TP 13)

In this question, a systematic investigation was carried out into what the test persons understand by "a working day divided into periods of time" and by "daily working hours that often change at short notice". In order to obtain more detailed information on the understanding of these terms, the test persons were also asked to explain their answers in more detail (general probing).

²⁷ „Die Antwortkategorien schließen sich nicht unbedingt gegenseitig aus, z.B. tagsüber und Zeiten ändern sich oft kurzfristig.“ (TP 06)

²⁸ „Also ich arbeite Wechselschicht. Ah, nur eine Antwort ist möglich. Ja, das ist ein Drei-Schicht-Betrieb. Manchmal, wenn z.B. jemand ausfällt, ändert sich meine Arbeit auch kurzfristig. Dann muss man eben einspringen.“ (TP 12)

²⁹ „Ich bin im Außendienst, d.h. dass meine Arbeitszeiten sich oft kurzfristig ändern. [...] Man muss aber dazu sagen, dass ich eigentlich tagsüber arbeite, manchmal muss ich dann meinen Schriftverkehr abends bzw. nachts erledigen. [...] Also, wenn ich darüber nachdenke und nur ein Kreuz machen soll, dann kann ich das nicht sagen.“ (TP 14)

³⁰ „Ach so „beziehungsweise“, ok. Das hatte ich erst übersehen und gelesen „Ich arbeite tagsüber in Frühschicht.“ (TP 05)

³¹ „Kann ich nicht sagen, nichts davon... Ich arbeite tagsüber, aber nicht in Frühschicht.“ (TP 11)

³² „Ich arbeite tagsüber, aber nicht in Frühschicht. [...] Das „bzw. in Frühschicht“ irritiert vielleicht ein bisschen. Die meisten arbeiten ja tagsüber.“ (TP 13)

By a "working day divided by time" nine test persons understand a working day that is interrupted by a longer (lunch) break:

- *"As it is common in the catering trade, for example, that you go to work in the morning, take a break and then work again in the evening."*³³ (TP 04)
- *"A few hours in the morning, a few hours in the afternoon. Divided during the day. Our cleaning crew, for example, they come for three hours in the morning and another three hours in the evening."*³⁴ (TP 09)
- *"This means that you work four hours in the morning and then another four hours in the late evening, for example. [...] Maybe in the nursing service, which has to be available in the morning for the needy/disabled and then again in the evening."*³⁵ (TP 11)

Two test persons (TP 08, TP 15) understand a "split working day" to mean that someone has two different jobs. Subject 08 was the only one to choose this answer category when answering the question:

- *"It comes from different jobs. I have to categorize. I'm in college once. That's a completely different work schedule, so it's during the day. And this coach thing I do, that's an evening job as a rule. [...] is temporally divided, because there are two jobs that run completely different."*³⁶ (TP 08)
- *"That I have two jobs, for example. A part-time job in the morning and another part-time job in the afternoon."*³⁷ (TP 15)

Two other test persons (TO 03, TP 13) can imagine both that one can pursue two different activities and that the working day is divided by a longer break:

- *"If someone has a child. That you work in the morning, come home at noon and then work another two or three hours in the evening. Or two jobs, cleaning in the morning and then mixing in the bar at night."*³⁸ (TP 03)
- *"This could mean, for example, that there is a longer lunch break. In some professions there are two or three hours for lunch. Or maybe two different jobs with two different employers."*³⁹ (TP 13)

³³ „Wie es z.B. in der Gastronomie üblich ist, dass man morgens arbeiten geht, eine Pause macht und dann abends wieder arbeitet.“ (TP 04)

³⁴ „Morgens ein paar Stunden, nachmittags ein paar Stunden. Am Tag geteilt. Unsere Putzkolonnen zum Beispiel, die kommen vormittags drei Stunden und gegen Abend noch einmal drei Stunden.“ (TP 09)

³⁵ „Das bedeutet, dass man vormittags vier Stunden arbeitet und dann in den späten Abendstunden nochmal vier Stunden, zum Beispiel. [...] Vielleicht im Pflegedienst, die morgens früh für Bedürftige/Behinderte zur Verfügung stehen müssen und dann eben abends wieder.“ (TP 11)

³⁶ „Das kommt durch verschiedene Jobs. Ich muss da kategorisieren. Ich bin einmal an der Uni. Das ist eine ganz andere Arbeitszeit, also am Tag. Und diese Trainersache (Fitnesstrainer) die ich ausübe, das ist ein Abendjob in der Regel. [...] ist zeitlich geteilt, weil es eben zwei Jobs sind, die völlig unterschiedlich ablaufen.“ (TP 08)

³⁷ „Dass ich beispielsweise zwei Jobs habe. Morgens einen Teilzeitjob und nachmittags noch einen Teilzeitjob.“ (TP 15)

³⁸ „Wenn jemand ein Kind hat. Dass man morgens arbeitet, mittags heimkommt und dann abends nochmal zwei bis drei Stunden arbeitet. Oder zwei Jobs, morgens geht man putzen und dann abends in die Bar mixen.“ (TP 03)

Test person 12 understands a "split work day" to mean that someone is on early duty and then comes on the same day to work the night shift, e.g. at the police or fire brigade.

One test person (TP 06) claims not to know what is meant by this: *"What is meant by "my working day is split"? [...] Hm, changing shifts, like with nurses? But that would be more like "alternating shifts", would that also be "divided by time"? I don't know."*⁴⁰ (TP 06)

With regard to the definition of **"working times that change at short notice"**, a very heterogeneous picture can be observed among the test persons:

One third of the test persons (TP 03, TP 08, TP 09, TP 10, TP 12) understand this to mean when one has to fill in for colleagues at short notice due to staff absence, e.g. due to illness, or when days have to be changed because of this:

- *"If you have to be flexible. Like me, when two or three people are absent, that you start a few hours earlier."*⁴¹ (TP 03)
- *"I also sometimes have that two days before they call if I can change a day. Or trade a shift. If a colleague is sick and I have to fill in. I work at the cash register."*⁴² (TP 09)
- *"This can be, for example, in the event of illness, when someone is absent, i.e. loss of personnel. If something changes in the company in the short term. In the bakery it often happens that a colleague is ill and then the situation changes in the short term."*⁴³ (TP 10)

Three test persons (TP 01, TP 02, TP 07) connect temporary or contract workers with it, who are requested or assigned shifts/companies as required. Test person 07 has chosen this answer option when answering the question.

- *"Temporary staff, where they say you have to work today and then you have to leave."*⁴⁴ (TP 01)
- *"Temporary employment agencies, where you are called in the evening and are told that today this company is on the night shift and tomorrow another company on the late shift."*⁴⁵ (TP 02)

³⁹ „Das könnte zum Beispiel bedeuten, dass es eine längere Mittagspause gibt. Das gibt es ja in manchen Berufen, dass es zwei bis drei Stunden Mittagspause gibt. Oder vielleicht zwei verschiedene Jobs bei zwei verschiedenen Arbeitgebern.“ (TP 13)

⁴⁰ : *„Was ist damit gemeint, „mein Arbeitstag ist zeitlich geteilt“? [...] Hm, wechselnde Schichten, wie bei Krankenschwestern? Aber das wäre eher „Wechselschicht“, ob das jetzt auch „zeitlich geteilt“ wäre? Keine Ahnung.“* (TP 06)

⁴¹ „Wenn man flexibel sein muss. Wie bei mir, wenn dann zwei, drei Leute ausfallen, dass man dann ein paar Stunden früher anfängt.“ (TP 03)

⁴² „Habe ich auch manchmal, dass zwei Tage vorher angerufen wird, ob ich einen Tag tauschen kann. Oder eine Schicht tauschen. Wenn eine Kollegin krank ist und ich einspringen muss. Ich arbeite an der Kasse.“ (TP 09)

⁴³ „Das kann z.B. sein bei Krankheit, wenn jemand ausfällt, also Personalausfall. Wenn sich kurzfristig in dem Betrieb etwas verändert. In der Bäckerei passiert das schon oft, dass es heißt die Kollegin ist krank und dann verändert sich das kurzfristig.“ (TP 10)

⁴⁴ „Bei Aushilfskräften, bei denen man sagt, du musst jetzt heute arbeiten und dann muss man schon losfahren.“ (TP 01)

⁴⁵ „Zeitarbeitsfirmen, da wird man abends angerufen und bekommt mitgeteilt, heute diese Firma in der Nachtschicht und morgen eine andere Firma in der Spätschicht.“ (TP 02)

- *"[...] At about 13 o'clock, you always have a forecast of how many call-off forces will be needed. And then they call you. Whether it's Monday, Wednesday and Friday, it can always change from week to week."*⁴⁶ (TP 07)

Another three test persons (TP 06, TP 14, TP 15) associate flexible working hours with "working hours that change at short notice". The test subjects 14 and 15 both work as sales representatives and state that this applies to their working times for this reason:

- *"Does this mean having flexible working hours?"*⁴⁷ (TP 06)
- *"I am in the field, which means that my working hours often change at short notice. [...] But it must be said that I actually work during the day, sometimes I have to do my correspondence in the evening or at night. [...] Well, if I think about it and only have to make a cross, then I cannot say that."*⁴⁸ (TP 14)
- *"I'm in the field. I'm flexible in my work, so I can manage my time."*⁴⁹ (TP 15)

Two test subjects (TP 05, TP 13) think of on-call duty, another of courier drivers (TP 11) and one test subject (TP 04) associates "working hours that change at short notice" with the time when the work is finally completed.

When asked how easy or difficult it was for them to answer this question, twelve subjects state that they found it "very easy" (8 TPs) or "rather easy" (4 TPs). Three people found the answer rather difficult, which they explain as follows:

- *"Because there are many answers, which are also quite similar."*⁵⁰ (TP 01)
- *"I found this a little difficult now because of my personal situation, because I had to consider which job I was referring to."*⁵¹ (TP 07)

Subject 14 felt torn between two possible answers ("My working hours often change at short notice" and "I work during the day or early shift"), which made it difficult for her to answer.

⁴⁶ „[...] So um 13 Uhr hat man immer eine Prognose, wie viele Abrufkräfte gebraucht werden. Und dann wird man angerufen. Ob das jetzt montags, mittwochs und freitags ist, das kann sich immer von Woche zu Woche ändern.“ (TP 07)

⁴⁷ „Ist damit gemeint, flexible Arbeitszeiten zu haben?“ (TP 06)

⁴⁸ „Ich bin im Außendienst, d.h. dass meine Arbeitszeiten sich oft kurzfristig ändern. [...] Man muss aber dazu sagen, dass ich eigentlich tagsüber arbeite, manchmal muss ich dann meinen Schriftverkehr abends bzw. nachts erledigen. [...] Also, wenn ich darüber nachdenke und nur ein Kreuz machen soll, dann kann ich das nicht sagen.“ (TP 14)

⁴⁹ „Ich bin im Außendienst tätig. Ich arbeite halt flexibel, kann mir meine Zeit einteilen.“ (TP 15)

⁵⁰ „Weil es viele Antworten sind, die auch recht ähnlich sind.“ (TP 01)

⁵¹ „Ich fand das wegen meiner persönlichen Situation jetzt etwas schwierig, weil ich überlegen musste, auf welchen Job ich mich beziehe.“ (TP 07)

Recommendations:

Question:

We recommend that the question be supplemented with instructions for the respondents. This should make it clear that people who have several professional activities should only refer to their main occupation. A possible formulation would be:

"Which of the following statements best applies to your normal working hours? If you currently have more than one job, please answer the question for your full-time job only."

[„Welche der folgenden Aussagen trifft am ehesten auf Ihre üblichen Arbeitszeiten zu? Falls Sie derzeit mehr als einer beruflichen Tätigkeit nachgehen, beantworten Sie die Frage bitte nur für Ihre hauptberufliche Tätigkeit.“]

Response Options:

We recommend that the answer category "My daily working hours change often short-term" in order to avoid this being understood as including 'flexible working hours'. It should also be explained what is meant by the category "My working day is split".

In addition, we recommend querying the working hours of shift workers separately from those of other employees in order to avoid the term "shift" being perceived too dominantly in the answer categories and thus leading to confusion. A possible alternative would be to add a question about shift work and then offer specific answer categories:

Question 1:

"Do you work in shifts?" (filter question)

[„Arbeiten Sie im Schichtdienst?" (Filterfrage)]

Yes [Ja]

No [Nein]

Question 2:

"Which of the following statements best applies to your normal working hours?"

[„Welche der folgenden Aussagen trifft am ehesten auf Ihre üblichen Arbeitszeiten zu?"]

Falls „Nein“ bei Frage 1:

I work during the day

[Ich arbeite tagsüber]

I work in the evenings

[Ich arbeite abends]

I work at night

[Ich arbeite nachts]

I work on a changing schedule

[Ich arbeite nach wechselndem Zeitplan]

My working day is divided

[Mein Arbeitstag ist zeitlich geteilt]

I usually get my daily working hours at short notice

[Ich bekomme meine täglichen Arbeits-

Falls „Ja“ bei Frage 1:

I work the early shift

[Ich arbeite in Frühschicht]

I work the late shift

[Ich arbeite in Spätschicht]

I work the night shift

[Ich arbeite in Nachtschicht]

I work alternating shifts (e.g. alternating early, late, and night shift)

[Ich arbeite in Wechselschicht (z. B. abwechselnd Früh-, Spät- und Nachtschicht)]

My working day is divided

[Mein Arbeitstag ist zeitlich geteilt]

I usually get my daily working hours at short notice

[Ich bekomme meine täglichen Arbeitszeiten

zeiten meist kurzfristig mitgeteilt.]

Don't know

[Kann ich nicht sagen]

meist kurzfristig mitgeteilt.]

Don't know

[Kann ich nicht sagen]

Question to be tested:

5. Inwieweit stimmen Sie den folgenden Aussagen zu oder nicht zu?
 [To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?]

(Bitte machen Sie in JEDER Zeile ein Kreuz!)
[Please make a cross in EVERY line!]

Frequency distribution (N = 15)

	Stimme voll und ganz zu [Strongly agree]	Stimme zu [Agree]	Weder noch [Neither nor]	Stimme nicht zu [Disagree]	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu [Strongly disagree]	Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]
a) Ich bin bereit, härter zu arbeiten als ich muss, um zum Erfolg meiner Firma/Organisation beizutragen. [I am willing to work harder than I have to in order to contribute to the success of my company/ organization.]	6	4	2	1	1	1
b) Ich bin stolz darauf, für meine Firma/Organisation zu arbeiten. [I am proud to work for my company/organization.]	4	7	2	-	-	2
c) Ich würde eine andere, besser bezahlte Stelle ablehnen, um bei meiner jetzigen Firma/Organisation zu bleiben. [I would refuse another, better paid job to stay with my current company/organization.]	1	4	-	4	3	3

Cognitive techniques:

General Probing, Specific Probing.

Findings:

One test person (TP 02) has difficulties in understanding the term "organization" in all three items of the question battery. According to her own statement, she does not interpret it as the equivalent of "company", but to the effect that she has to organize something herself in her work: "*I understand organization to mean that I help with the production process or the planning of the day. I don't know*

that now."⁵² Because of this difficulty in understanding, for all three items this test person answers "I can't say."

Another subject (TP 08) states that he currently has two jobs (research assistant at a university, fitness trainer) and that he has to choose one of the two jobs when answering these items. In order to answer consistently, the respondent thinks of her second job (fitness trainer) in all three statements, but could just as well have thought of her first job or alternately of one of the two jobs.

With regard to the battery of questions as a whole, it is also noticeable that a test person (TP 10) thinks of different activities in his previous professional life when answering the three statements and not only of his current job. When answering statements a) and b), this test person thinks of her previous job as an insurance agent, but when answering statement c), she thinks of her current job as a cleaner in a bakery. In addition, four test persons (TP 03, TP 04, TP 09, TP 13) state that they did not interpret the three statements uniformly, but sometimes thought of the profession they had learned and sometimes of the company or the job they were doing.

Item a): I am willing to work harder than I have to in order to contribute to the success of my company/organization.

Two thirds (n = 10) of the test persons agree or strongly agree with the statement.

Test person 05 spontaneously comments that it is unclear to her whether this item refers only to the company/organization she is currently working for or whether it is more a general attitude: *"I ask myself, is this about my company where I am currently working? Or, if I were to work for another company tomorrow, that I could now name my future company? I am just thinking about whether this is a general question. Am I generally willing to do these things for my company or is it a snapshot of the current company?"*⁵³ (TP 05). This respondent states that an explicit reference to the "current" company, as in item c), would clarify the intention of the question and facilitate the answer.

The spontaneous comments of test subject 08 and test subject 12 make it clear that item a) may be difficult for civil servants or employees in non-profit organizations to answer because these companies/organizations are not geared to maximize profits and it is therefore unclear how the success of the companies/organizations can be measured:

- *"So now I'm thinking more about my second job, not my main job at the university. Because working at the university doesn't really help anyone because it's just not a company. It's just a different organisational structure. With the other job, where profit is made, I'm willing to do it."*⁵⁴ (TP 08)
- *"That's hard to answer because I'm a civil servant."*⁵⁵ (TP 12)

⁵² „Organisation verstehe ich so, dass ich beim Ablauf der Produktion oder der Planung des Tages mit-helfe. Das weiß ich jetzt nicht.“ (TP 02)

⁵³ „Da frage ich mich, geht es um meine Firma, bei der ich aktuell bin? Oder, falls ich morgen für eine andere Firma arbeiten würde, dass ich dann jetzt meine zukünftige Firma meinen könnte? Ich über-lege gerade, ob das eine generelle Frage ist. Bin ich generell bereit für meine Firma diese Sachen zu tun oder ist es eine Momentaufnahme der aktuellen Firma?“ (TP 05).

⁵⁴ „Da denke ich jetzt eher wieder an meinen Zweitjob, nicht an meinen Hauptjob an der Uni. Weil an der Uni zu arbeiten, das bringt ja irgendwie niemandem etwas, weil es einfach keine Firma ist. Das ist einfach eine andere Organisationsstruktur. Bei dem anderen Job, wo Profit geschlagen wird, da bin ich gerne bereit dazu.“ (TP 08)

⁵⁵ „Das ist schwierig zu beantworten, da ich Beamter bin.“ (TP 12)

When asked whether the respondents thought about their company/organization, their job or their profession when answering the statement, nine respondents stated that they thought about their company/organization (as intended by the questionnaire developers). However, one of these nine test persons (TP 06, strongly agree) only referred "indirectly" to the success of the company/organization: *"As a scientist I work more for myself, but of course I contribute to the success of the organization. But first and foremost I work for myself. I'm willing to work harder to get my habilitation as soon as possible."* (TP 06)

Test person 14 (strongly disagree) thought of their current job when answering the statement, and test person 02 (don't know) - due to the misinterpretation of the term "organization" - thought of different activities in different companies.

The remaining four test subjects (TP 03, TP 04, TP 09, TP 13) ignored the subordinate clause "to contribute to the success of my company/organization" when answering the statement and only referred to whether they were generally willing or able to work harder than necessary (for whatever purpose) when answering the item:

- *"That always pays off once in a while. If I work a few overtime hours, that you can stay at home for a day."*⁵⁶ (TP 03)
- *"I have already worked as a meat cutter on the assembly line, sometimes 20 hour shifts. So I guess it can't get any worse than that. Well, I'm certainly willing to work harder."*⁵⁷ (TP 04)
- *"I can't work any harder. I'm in sales, there's a day and then there's a day. So I'm not under pressure to achieve certain goals. I don't have to generate mandatory sales."*⁵⁸ (TP 09)
- *"I am of the opinion that my work is of good quality and that I contribute enough. Therefore I would not want to work even harder. But I would not want to work less either. It's okay the way it is now."*⁵⁹ (TP 13)

Item b): I am proud to work for my company/organization.

The majority of the test persons (n = 11) agree or strongly agree with this statement. Two test persons (TP 09, TP 15) answer with "neither nor" and two other test persons answer with "Don't know" (TP 02, TP 14). Subject 02 justifies her "don't know" answer with difficulties in understanding the term "organization" (see general findings on question 5) and subject 14 states that she has problems with the answer scale in this statement: She can only "rather agree" and since this category is not offered, she chooses "Don't know."

⁵⁶ „Das zahlt sich auch immer einmal aus. Wenn ich mal ein paar Überstunden mache, dass man dann auch einmal einen Tag zu Hause bleiben kann.“ (TP 03)

⁵⁷ „Ich habe schon als Fleischzerleger am Fließband gearbeitet, das waren teilweise 20-Stunden-Schichten. Also schlimmer als das kann es wohl nicht werden. Also ich bin sicher bereit, härter zu arbeiten.“ (TP 04)

⁵⁸ „Ich kann gar nicht härter arbeiten. Ich bin im Verkauf, da gibt es mal so einen Tag und mal so einen. Also ich stehe da nicht unter dem Druck, dass ich bestimmte Ziele erreichen muss. Ich muss keinen vorgeschriebenen Umsatz erbringen.“ (TP 09)

⁵⁹ „Ich bin der Meinung, dass meine Arbeit qualitativ gut ist und ich genug beitrage. Daher würde ich nicht noch härter arbeiten wollen. Aber ich würde auch nicht weniger arbeiten wollen. Es ist in Ordnung wie es jetzt ist.“ (TP 13)

With the exception of test person 02, all test persons stated that they had thought of their company/organization when answering this statement. Four of these respondents (TP 09, TP 11, TP 13, TP 15) also note that the phrase "be proud" is too strong or somewhat exaggerated:

- *"I'm not really proud. I like the work, but pride is a bit over the top. I would just never leave there because I enjoy it. I like working there."*⁶⁰ (TP 09)
- *"The "pride" thing is always one of those things. We Germans have a problem with that. I like working for the company and I'm willing to do a bit more for it. That's why I "agree" and not "totally agree". That's too absolute for me."*⁶¹ (TP 11).
- *"Sometimes one is a little afraid to express such opinions, with "proud to work for this company". It's maybe a little American-inspired. But I can't say that I don't value my company, so I rather agree with that. Although I personally would not make such a statement right now."*⁶² (TP 13)
- *"There is no special "pride" in that for me."*⁶³ (TP 15)

Item c): I would turn down another, better paid job to stay with my current company/organization.

Three test persons (TP 02, TP 11, TP 14) answered with "Don't know" and justified their answer with the fact that it depends on the respective circumstances whether one would refuse such a position or not. Several factors (and not only payment) would play a role here: *"The statement is formulated too generally. There are certainly 1,000 other reasons why you would turn something down, and not just because the current company is so great. It depends on the individual case, the situation. For example, whether the head of the other company is good."*⁶⁴ (TP 14)

The remaining test persons agree (n = 5) and disagree (n = 7) with the statement in approximately equal parts. However, the questions of the test leaders made it clear that in this second group a total of three test persons (TP 03, TP 04, TP 09) had ticked off a "wrong" answer because of the negatively formulated item and the associated difficulty in expressing with the answer scale that they wanted to stay with the current company or felt comfortable with it, and actually wanted to answer "agree" instead of "disagree":

⁶⁰ „Stolz bin ich eigentlich nicht. Mir gefällt die Arbeit, aber stolz ist irgendwie übertrieben zu sagen. Ich würde halt nie weggehen dort, weil es mir Spaß macht. Ich arbeite gerne dort.“ (TP 09)

⁶¹ „Das mit dem „Stolz“ ist immer so eine Sache. Da haben wir Deutschen ja ein Problem damit. Ich arbeite gerne für die Firma und bin auch bereit ein bisschen mehr dafür zu machen. Deshalb „stimme ich zu“ und nicht „voll und ganz zu“. Das ist mir zu absolut.“ (TP 11)

⁶² „Man schreckt ja manchmal ein bisschen davor zurück, solche Meinungen zu äußern, mit „stolz darauf für diese Firma zu arbeiten“. Das ist vielleicht schon fast ein bisschen amerikanisch angehaucht. Aber ich kann jetzt auch nicht sagen, dass ich meine Firma nicht wertschätzen würde, insofern stimme ich da schon eher zu. Wobei ich persönlich jetzt nicht so eine Äußerung machen würde.“ (TP 13)

⁶³ „Ein besonderer „Stolz“ ist da für mich nicht dabei.“ (TP 15)

⁶⁴ „Die Aussage ist zu allgemein formuliert. Es gibt bestimmt 1.000 andere Gründe, warum man etwas ablehnt und nicht nur weil die momentane Firma so toll ist. Das hängt vom Einzelfall, der Situation ab. Beispielsweise ob der Chef der anderen Firma gut ist.“ (TP 14)

- *"I'm walking to work in five minutes. I enjoy my job. And then for 2 or 3 euros more a month, I wouldn't drive an hour or so."*⁶⁵ (TP 03, disagree)
- *"Well, actually, I don't agree with that (that I would switch). It's going well at the moment and a better paid job, that would be a new challenge again and why not keep something that's going well?"*⁶⁶ (TP 04, disagree)
- *"I don't know how I would like to work somewhere else, that's the problem. Maybe I would improve financially, but maybe not in terms of the way I interact with people at work. You have to consider that."*⁶⁷ (TP 09, disagree)

Two other test persons (TP 07, TP 08) stated that they had difficulties in answering the statement due to its negative formulation:

- *"No, I would stay with my company. "Reject"...? So I have to agree here, right? I agree to disagree? Yes, that's right."*⁶⁸ (TP 07)
- *"I had to read that statement twice. I would have simply formulated the statement differently. I would always phrase it positively, instead of "reject" then "accept". Like "I would accept another, better paid job to make more money or to have advantages over my current company."*⁶⁹ (TP 08)

With the exception of test person 02 and test person 04, all test persons state on request that they thought of their company or organization when answering the statement.

Recommendations:

Question: As with question 4, we recommend supplementing the question with an instruction for the respondents. This should make it clear that the focus of the statements is on the company/organization where one is currently employed and that people who have several professional activities should only refer to their main job. A possible formulation would be:

"The following statements are about the company/organization where you are currently employed. If you currently have more than one professional activity, please answer the statements only for your main professional activity.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"

⁶⁵ „Ich bin in fünf Minuten zu Fuß bei der Arbeit. Der Job macht mir Spaß. Und dann wegen 2 bis 3 Euro mehr im Monat würde ich nicht eine Stunde oder so durch die Gegend fahren.“ (TP 03, stimme nicht zu)

⁶⁶ „Also eigentlich stimme ich dem nicht zu (dass ich wechseln würde). Es läuft zurzeit gut und ein besser bezahlter Job, das wäre wieder eine neue Herausforderung und warum nicht etwas beibehalten, das gut läuft?“ (TP 04, stimme nicht zu)

⁶⁷ „Ich weiß nicht, wie mir die Arbeit woanders gefallen würde, das ist das Problem. Vielleicht würde ich mich finanziell verbessern, aber in Bezug auf den Umgang mit den Menschen bei der Arbeit vielleicht nicht. Das muss man bedenken.“ (TP 09, stimme nicht zu)

⁶⁸ „Nein, ich würde bei meiner Firma bleiben. „Ablehne“...? Also muss ich hier zustimmen, oder? Ich stimme zu, dass ich ablehne? Ja, so stimmt es.“ (TP 07)

⁶⁹ „Diese Aussage musste ich zweimal lesen. Ich hätte die Aussage einfach anders formuliert. Ich würde es immer positiv formulieren, statt „ablehnen“ dann „annehmen“. Also wie z.B. „Ich würde eine andere, besser bezahlte Stelle annehmen, um mehr Geld zu verdienen oder um Vorteile gegenüber meiner jetzigen Firma zu haben.“ (TP 08)

[„Bei den folgenden Aussagen geht es um die Firma/Organisation, bei der Sie momentan beschäftigt sind. Falls Sie derzeit mehr als einer beruflichen Tätigkeit nachgehen, beantworten Sie die Aussagen bitte nur für Ihre hauptberufliche Tätigkeit.

Inwieweit stimmen Sie den folgenden Aussagen zu oder nicht zu?“]

Item a): We recommend adding the word "current" to this statement (see item c) to make it clear that the statement refers to current and not former employment. We also suggest that the subordinate clause be placed at the beginning of the sentence to prevent it from being ignored when answering the item. A possible formulation would be:

"To contribute to the success of my current company/organization, I am willing to work harder than I normally have to."

[„Um zum Erfolg meiner jetzigen Firma/Organisation beizutragen, bin ich bereit, härter zu arbeiten als ich normalerweise muss.“]

Item b): Again, we recommend adding the word "current" to the statement to make it clear that the statement refers to current and not former employment:

"I am proud to work for my current company/organization."

[„Ich bin stolz darauf, für meine jetzige Firma/Organisation zu arbeiten.“]

Item c): We recommend avoiding the negative wording "reject" in this statement, as this causes difficulties in using the response scale. A possible reformulation would be:

"I would stay with my current company/organization, even if they offered me another, better-paid position."

[„Ich würde bei meiner jetzigen Firma/Organisation bleiben, auch wenn man mir eine andere, besser bezahlte Stelle anbieten würde.“]

Question to be tested:

6. Sind Sie jemals in den letzten fünf Jahren beruflich benachteiligt worden, z.B. bei einer Bewerbung oder in Bezug auf Bezahlung oder Beförderung?
 [Have you ever been professionally disadvantaged in the last five years, e.g. when applying for a job or in terms of pay or promotion?]

(Nur EIN Kreuz möglich!)

[Only ONE cross possible!]

Frequency distribution (N = 15)

Ja [Yes]	8
Nein [No]	7
<i>Kann ich nicht sagen</i> <i>[Don't know]</i>	-

Cognitive techniques:

Think Aloud, General Probing, Comprehension Probing.

Findings:

A total of eight of the 15 test persons state that they have already been disadvantaged in the last five years, the remaining seven state that this was not the case.

By occupational disadvantage the test persons understand⁷⁰:

- Disadvantage in terms of pay, i.e. less pay for the same work or no pay increases (9 mentions)
- Disadvantage in filling vacancies/promotion, lack of opportunities for promotion (a total of 7 mentions, whereby two test persons (TP 14, 15) attribute this explicitly to age)
- Discrimination in applications (4 mentions: two general nominations, one in relation to age and one in relation to a link between age and gender)
- Disadvantage in terms of work tasks/task distribution (3 mentions)
- Discrimination on personal grounds, such as lifestyle (1 mention)
- Mobbing/discrimination based on gender/sexual orientation (1 mention)
- Forced transfer (1 mention)

As far as the definitions of occupational disadvantage are concerned, it is by and large no difference whether the test persons have experienced this themselves or not. While test persons who claim not to have been disadvantaged at work remain general in their answers regarding the reasons for applica-

⁷⁰ Several entries per test person are possible.

tion and promotion, those who do so refer to their own situation (due to age or due to a mixture of age and gender).

Three respondents point out that it is difficult to assess whether they have been disadvantaged when applying for jobs:

- *"Actually, I can't say, because how would I know on an application But I just had it recently that I applied and I was told that there are only two applicants and I was told that I was more qualified and likeable. In the end the other young man got the job. In this case I could just imagine that I am female, over 30 and I don't have a child yet, so they think that she will get pregnant in no time. And something must have disadvantaged me in this case."*⁷¹ (TP 05)
- *"I would say yes. I was thinking about where I applied. It's just so hard to get turned down on an application. I think I would have brought the prerequisites with me, but unfortunately I got a rejection. Disadvantaged, I mean, people were looking to see who was suitable. But I think, maybe from the age, that might be."*⁷² (TP 10)
- *"That's totally subjective. When applying for a job, for example, there is no feedback/no honest answer at all due to the legal regulations, so I don't know whether I was actually disadvantaged."*⁷³ (TP 14)

A total of 14 test persons found the answer to the question "very easy" (6 TPs) or "e-her easy" (8 TPs). Test person 04 found the answer "rather difficult", as "occupational disadvantage" is a very emotional topic for them.

Recommendations:

Question: No changes recommended.

Response options: No changes recommended.

⁷¹ „Eigentlich kann ich es nicht sagen, denn woher soll ich das bei einer Bewerbung wissen. Aber ich hatte es gerade kürzlich, dass ich mich beworben hatte und es wurde mir gesagt, dass es nur zwei Bewerber gibt und mir wurde gesagt, ich wäre qualifizierter und sympathisch. Am Ende hat der andere junge Mann den Job bekommen. In diesem Fall konnte ich mir halt vorstellen, ich bin weiblich, über 30 und habe noch kein Kind, dass die denken, die wird ratzfatz schwanger. Und irgendetwas muss mich ja in diesem Fall benachteiligt haben.“ (TP 05)

⁷² „Ich würde sagen „ja“. Ich habe überlegt, wo ich mich beworben habe. Es ist halt sehr schwierig, wenn man von einer Bewerbung eine Absage bekommt. Ich denke, ich hätte die Voraussetzungen mitgebracht, aber ich habe leider eine Absage bekommen. Benachteiligt, ich meine die Leute haben ja geguckt, wer geeignet ist. Aber ich denke, vielleicht vom Alter her, das mag vielleicht sein.“ (TP 10)

⁷³ „Das ist ja absolut subjektiv. Bei Bewerbungen bspw. gibt es ja aufgrund der rechtlichen Regelungen gar kein Feedback/keine ehrliche Antwort, daher weiß ich ja gar nicht, ob ich tatsächlich benachteiligt wurde.“ (TP 14)

Question to be tested:

7. Was waren Ihrer Meinung nach die wichtigsten Gründe für die Benachteiligung?
[In your opinion, what were the main reasons for the discrimination?]

(Mehrere Nennungen sind möglich!)
[Several entries are possible!]

Frequency distribution (N = 8) ⁷⁴

	<i>Number of mentions</i>
Mein Alter [My age]	3
Meine nationale Herkunft, Abstammung oder Hautfarbe [My national origin, descent or skin colour]	-
Meine Staatsangehörigkeit [My nationality]	-
Mein Geschlecht [My sex]	3
Meine Religion [My religion]	-
Meine Behinderung [My disability]	-
Meine familiären Verpflichtungen [My family responsibilities]	2
Ganz persönliche Gründe [Very personal reasons]	1
Andere Gründe [Other reasons]	2
<i>Kann ich nicht sagen</i> <i>[Dont' know]</i>	1

⁷⁴ In the table, only those eight respondents who stated in question 6 that they had been professionally disadvantaged in the last five years are included. Respondents who stated that they had not been disadvantaged in the last five years were asked an alternative question so that we could obtain information from them about what they understood by the reasons "My family commitments" and "Very personal reasons". The alternative question was: "What do you think are the most important reasons for professional disadvantage?"

Cognitive techniques:

General Probing, Comprehension Probing, Specific Probing.

Findings:

The frequency distribution includes only those eight respondents who stated in the previous question 6 that they had been professionally disadvantaged in the last five years. In total, the eight test persons make 12 mentions, which are distributed over the test persons as follows

Five of the eight test persons give one reason each, among them age (TP 10, TP 15), gender (TP 02) and other reasons (TP 04). Test person 11 ticked "Don't know" and justified this by saying that they could not judge what the reason was in the end.

Three test persons state several reasons each: Test person 14 gives "personal reasons" and "other reasons" as reasons for discrimination. Test person 13 blames a combination of gender and family responsibilities and test person 05 blames a combination of age, gender and family responsibilities for the disadvantage.

Question 7 also systematically investigated what respondents understand by "family commitments", "very personal reasons" and "other reasons".

"Family responsibilities" include family care for 14 of the 15 respondents: five respondents think of childcare (TP 03, TP 06, TP 07, TP 11, TP 13), the other nine include childcare and care for other family members, such as sick parents or parents in need of care. Only test person 04 cannot imagine a situation in which one is disadvantaged due to family responsibilities.

Two female test persons have given "family obligations" as reasons for their disadvantage and explain this as follows:

- *"Either I want people to think I'm about to get pregnant. Or the parent, for example a mother with a small child and people think, "It could be that the child gets sick all the time or you have a child with a disability or a seriously ill parent."*⁷⁵ (TP 05)
- *"The two points (gender and family responsibilities) are often closely related. Women usually have to take on the lion's share of family obligations and are therefore more likely to reduce working hours and cannot progress in their careers as much as men. In addition, our hierarchical structure is often male-dominated and therefore the understanding of this is probably not quite as present. Male colleagues are therefore rather preferred."*⁷⁶ (TP 13)

In answering question 7, one respondent ticked "very personal reasons". The test person explains her answer as follows: *"Personal reasons, because the decision was made politically. This is sometimes*

⁷⁵ „Entweder, dass die Leute denken, ich werde bald schwanger. Oder die Erziehungsperson, z.B. eine Mutter mit kleinem Kind und da denken sich die Leute, es könnte sein, dass das Kind ständig krank wird oder man hat ein Kind mit einer Behinderung oder ein schwerkrankes Elternteil.“ (TP 05)

⁷⁶ „Die beiden Punkte (Geschlecht und familiäre Verpflichtungen) hängen ja oft stark zusammen. Die Frauen müssen ja meist den Löwenanteil der familiären Verpflichtungen übernehmen und damit auch eher Arbeitszeiten reduzieren und können beruflich nicht so voranschreiten wie Männer. Außerdem ist unsere Hierarchiestruktur ja doch oft männlich geprägt und daher ist das Verständnis dafür wohl nicht ganz so vorhanden. Männliche Kollegen werden dadurch eher bevorzugt.“ (TP 13)

also because one applicant has to observe a period of notice and the other is available immediately."⁷⁷ (TP 14).

Of the remaining 14 test persons, three test persons (TP 02, TP 06, TP 08) state that they do not know what is meant by this. The remaining subjects include inappropriate behavior (3 TPs), such as alcohol abuse (TP 11), illegal activities (TP 04) or simply negative behavior (TP 13); lack of sympathy (TP 01, TP 05, TP 12) or the relationship with work colleagues (argument, TP 03; relationship, TP 15). Once each time, time or physical restrictions at work (TP 09), illness (TP 07) or lack of qualifications (TP 10) are associated with "personal reasons".

In total, two test persons (TP 04, TP 14) ticked "other reasons" as the reason for discrimination. While respondent 14 understands "professional deficits", respondent 04 is not sure what the reasons for discrimination were: "I would tick 'other reasons'. This can range from rumors to my lifestyle."⁷⁸ (TP 04)

Seven of the eight test persons who received the original version of the question found the answer "rather easy" (3 TPs) or "very easy" (4 TPs). TP 04 found the answer "rather difficult" because they had not yet thought about it.

Empfehlung:

Question: No changes recommended.

Response Options: We recommend deleting the answer category "very personal reasons" and to offer an additional open field for the answer category "other reasons" ("other reasons, namely:"). This gives respondents the opportunity to give a reason that goes beyond the reasons given in the answer categories.

⁷⁷ „Persönliche Gründe, weil die Entscheidung politisch getroffen wurde. Das liegt auch manchmal daran, dass der eine Bewerber eine Kündigungsfrist einhalten muss und der andere gleich zur Verfügung steht.“ (TP 14).

⁷⁸ „Ich würde mal ‚andere Gründe‘ ankreuzen. Das kann von Gerüchten bis zu meinem Lebensstil gehen.“ (TP 04)

Question to be tested:

8. Inwieweit stimmen Sie den folgenden Aussagen zu oder nicht zu?
 [To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?]

(Bitte machen Sie in JEDER Zeile ein Kreuz!)
[Please make a cross in EVERY line!]

Frequency distribution (N = 15)

	Stimme voll und ganz zu [Strongly agree]	Stimme zu [Agree]	Weder noch [Neither nor]	Stimme nicht zu [Disagree]	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu [Strongly disagree]	Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]
a) Ich bin bereit, härter zu arbeiten als ich normalerweise muss, um die allerhöchsten Anforderungen an meinen Beruf zu erfüllen. [I am willing to work harder than I normally have to in order to meet the very highest demands of my profession.]	3	2	3	5	-	2
b) Ich bin stolz darauf, in meinem derzeitigen Beruf zu arbeiten. [I am proud to work in my current profession.]	5	6	2	2	-	-
c) Ich würde eine andere, besser bezahlte Stelle ablehnen, um in meinem Beruf zu bleiben. [I would turn down another, better-paid job to stay in my calling.]	2	3	1	5	3	1

Cognitive techniques:

General Probing, Specific Probing.

Findings:

A total of seven test persons (TP 02, TP 05, TP 08, TP 09, TP 11, TP 12, TP 14) explicitly note that question 8 is very similar to question 5, which has already been answered. For test subjects 05, 08, 09 and

12, the two sets of questionnaires "basically aim at the same thing" and they indicate that they could not distinguish between company/organization and profession:

- „It's kind of the same thing. For me, "for the organization" and "for my profession" are the same thing. So the position in general is combined in the firm."⁷⁹ (TP 08).
- „I see profession and company as the same thing. Now, I've answered this just like I answered the question before."⁸⁰ (TP 09)

The test persons 06 and 09 answer question 5 and question 8 completely identically. Four further test persons (TP 07, TP 08, TP 11, TP 12) state for item c) that they gave the same answer as for the corresponding item in question 5.

Furthermore, it is noticeable here too (as in question 5) that a total of seven test persons (TP 02, TP 03, TP 07, TP 08, TP 11, TP 12, TP 15) did not interpret the three statements uniformly, but sometimes thought of the profession they had learned and sometimes of the company or the job they were currently doing.

Item a): I am willing to work harder than I normally have to in order to meet the very highest demands of my profession.

In each case five test persons agree (or strongly agree) with the statement and disagree. Three test persons (TP 03, TP 04, TP 15) answer "neither nor" and two test persons "don't know" (TP 05, TP 08).

Three of the test persons who answer "neither nor" or "don't know" (TP 04, TP 05, TP 08) justify their answer by stating that it is unclear to them what the question is aimed at or what is meant by the "all-highest occupational requirements:

- "I don't understand the question. What does that mean?"⁸¹ (TP 04)
- "I'm already thinking about what that means. What exactly does that mean, "to meet the highest standards in my profession"? A pilot has to fly people or cargo from A to B and if he doesn't meet his highest requirements, he flies from Berlin to New York and then only to Madrid?"⁸² (TP 05)
- "I keep thinking about it because I don't really understand it. I'm just trying to combine "working harder than I normally have to." I should be able to meet the requirements anyway. I can't say that I do. I don't really understand the context."⁸³ (TP 08)

Test person 02 misunderstands the question and misinterprets the term "requirements" as an "order" or "work instruction": "If I don't do this, it's a refusal to work. So I have to do it." ⁸⁴(TP 02).

⁷⁹ „Das ist irgendwie das Gleiche. Für mich ist „für die Organisation" und „für meinen Beruf" das Gleiche. Also die Stelle generell ist kombiniert in der Firma." (TP 08)

⁸⁰ „Ich sehe Beruf und die Firma als das Gleiche an. Ich habe das jetzt genauso beantwortet wie die Frage vorhin." (TP 09)

⁸¹ „Die Frage verstehe ich nicht. Was ist denn damit gemeint?" (TP 04)

⁸² „Ich bin hier schon am überlegen, was damit gemeint ist. Was heißt denn genau, „um die allerhöchsten Anforderungen an meinen Beruf zu erfüllen"? Ein Pilot muss Menschen oder Fracht von A nach B fliegen und wenn er nicht seine allerhöchsten Anforderungen erfüllt, fliegt er dann statt von Berlin nach New York nur nach Madrid?" (TP 05)

⁸³ „Ich denke immer noch darüber nach, weil ich es irgendwie nicht richtig verstehe. Ich versuche gerade zu kombinieren, „härter zu arbeiten als ich normalerweise muss." Die Anforderungen sollte ich ja sowieso erfüllen. Kann ich nicht sagen. Ich verstehe den Zusammenhang nicht richtig." (TP 08)

Three test persons (TP 07, TP 11, TP 12) state that the formulation "highest" requirements is a little exaggerated, which is why they tend to tone down their answer and indicate that they agree with the statement to a lesser extent:

- „The "very highest"? (laughs). The "very highest" thing has a negative connotation for me here. It makes me think about the fact that you do that and then you drop dead because you have met the "very highest" requirements. I am definitely willing to work harder, but nobody can really meet the "highest" requirements."⁸⁵ (TP 07, disagree)
- „I find it a bit excessive to meet the "very highest" requirements of my profession. I wouldn't do that. "Neither" or "don't agree" wouldn't fit either. So I'm willing to work harder than I normally have to in order to meet the demands of my profession. But for the "very highest" requirements, I would not agree."⁸⁶ (TP 11, agree)
- „To meet the "very highest" requirements? So sometime is good, you can't do more than work."⁸⁷ (TP 12, disagree)

When asked whether the respondents had thought about their job, profession or company/organization when answering the statement, four respondents (TP 02, TP 07, TP11, TP 12) stated that they had thought about their company/organization. The remaining 11 test persons referred to their current activity or their learned occupation corresponding to their current activity when answering the item (as intended by the questionnaire developers). Only respondent 10 refers (erroneously) to their learned occupation when answering this item, which however does not correspond to their current activity.

Item b): I am proud to work in my current profession.

The majority of the test persons (n = 11) agree or strongly agree with this statement. Two test persons (TP 01, TP 09) answer with "neither nor" and two further test persons with "disagree" (TP 05, TP 10).

Test person 05 justifies her "disagree" answer with her rejection of the term "pride": *"I am happy to work in my company and do my job well and with pleasure. But proud? Pride is something I personally don't know that much about anyway. I would be proud if I did something more noble, e.g. animal rescuers, doctors, rescue services, they really do save people. Or development aid."*⁸⁸(TP 05).

⁸⁴ „Wenn ich das nicht mache, dann ist das ja Arbeitsverweigerung. Also muss ich das machen." (TP 02).

⁸⁵ „Die „allerhöchsten"? (lacht). Das mit dem „allerhöchsten", das hat hier etwas Negatives für mich. Da denke ich daran, dass man das macht und dann Tod umfällt, weil man die „allerhöchsten" Anforderungen erfüllt hat. Ich bin auf jeden Fall bereit, härter zu arbeiten, aber den „allerhöchsten)

⁸⁶ „Also das mit den „allerhöchsten" Anforderungen an meinen Beruf zu erfüllen finde ich ein bisschen überzogen. Das würde ich nicht machen. „Weder noch" oder „Stimme nicht zu" würde aber auch nicht passen. Also ich bin schon bereit härter zu arbeiten, als ich normalerweise muss, um die Anforderungen an meinen Beruf zu erfüllen. Aber um die „allerhöchsten" Anforderungen, da würde ich nicht zustimmen." (TP 11, stimme zu)

⁸⁷ „Um die „allerhöchsten" Anforderungen zu erfüllen? Also irgendwann ist auch mal gut, man kann nicht mehr als arbeiten." (TP 12, stimme nicht zu)

⁸⁸ „Ich bin froh in meiner Firma zu arbeiten und mache meine Arbeit auch gerne und gut. Aber stolz? Stolz ist eh etwas, das ich persönlich nicht so kenne. Stolz wäre ich darauf, wenn ich etwas Edleres machen würde, z.B. Tierretter, Arzt, Rettungsdienst, die retten wirklich Leute. Oder Entwicklungshilfe." (TP 05).

Three test persons (TP 02, TP 03, TP11) state that they thought of their company/organization and not of their current activity as intended when answering this statement. The remaining 12 test persons said that they were thinking about their current job or (identical) learned profession. Only test person 15 refers (erroneously) to their learned occupation when answering the item, which however does not correspond to their current activity.

Item c): I would turn down another, better paid job to stay in my profession.

The majority of the test persons (n = 8) disagree (strongly) with this statement. However, as with question 5, it became clear from the questions of the test directors that one test person (TP 13) had ticked a "wrong" answer due to the negatively formulated item and the associated difficulty in expressing with the answer scale that he/she would like to continue in his/her current job and actually wanted to answer "agree" instead of "disagree": *"I would not agree with this question (that I would change) because I actually like my job very much and would possibly perform it in another company. But I didn't want to do something else arbitrarily."*⁸⁹ (TP 13, disagree).

Test person 01 also states that due to the negative wording he had difficulties in answering the statement: *"I found it difficult to answer. I had to think about which answer I had to mark with a cross to say what I meant."*⁹⁰ (TP 01)

The test persons 02 ("Don't know") and 15 ("Neither nor") justify their answers, as (partly) already in question 5, by the fact that it depends on the respective circumstances whether one would refuse such a position or not. Several factors (and not only payment) would play a role here:

- *"That depends on what I'm offered. There's more than just money involved."*⁹¹ (TP 02)
- *"Money is not the decisive point for a change of job. There are several factors. Money is only one of them."*⁹² (TP 15)

Three respondents (TP 06, TP 13, TP 14) stated that they did not know whether the statement referred to the current occupation or the current job:

- *"Does 'profession' here mean the position, i.e. the job? Because you can have another job in the same profession? Here I asked myself whether one takes the better paid job but leaves the profession or whether one takes a better paid job but stays in the profession? That is unclear. I have now referred more to the second interpretation. I would like to do this job, if it were a completely different job now, I wouldn't do it, it's something else."*⁹³ (TP 06)

⁸⁹ „Da würde ich bei dieser Frage nicht zustimmen (dass ich wechseln würde), weil ich eigentlich meine Aufgabe sehr gern mag und die gegebenenfalls in einer anderen Firma ausüben würde. Aber ich wollte nicht etwas Beliebiges anderes machen.“ (TP 13, stimme nicht zu).

⁹⁰ „Die fand ich schwer zu beantworten. Ich musste überlegen, welche Antwort ich ankreuzen muss, um das auszusagen, was ich meine.“ (TP 01)

⁹¹ „Das hängt davon ab, was man mir anbietet. Da spielt mehr als nur Geld rein.“ (TP 02)

⁹² „Geld ist nicht der ausschlaggebende Punkt für einen Arbeitsplatzwechsel. Es gibt verschiedene Faktoren. Da ist Geld nur einer davon.“ (TP 15)

⁹³ „Ist mit „Beruf“ hier die Position, also die Stelle gemeint? Weil man kann ja eine andere Stelle im gleichen Beruf haben? Hier habe ich mich gefragt, ob man die besser bezahlte Stelle annimmt, aber aus dem Beruf weggeht oder ob man eine besser bezahlte Stelle annimmt, aber im Beruf bleibt? Das ist unklar. Ich habe es jetzt eher auf die zweite Interpretation bezogen. Ich möchte schon diesen Beruf ausüben, wenn es jetzt ein ganz anderer Beruf wäre, dann würde ich das nicht tun, das ist etwas anderes.“ (TP 06)

- *"I found the answer to statement c) rather difficult. What is meant by "another, better paid job" as opposed to "to stay in my job"? By "not staying in my job" I would now imagine, for example, a complete change of job. I wouldn't agree with this question, because I really like my job very much and would like to work in another company if necessary. But I didn't want to do something arbitrary."*⁹⁴ (TP 13)
- *"After all, this is about my job, not the position I'm holding right now?"*⁹⁵ (TP 14)

In answering this statement, a total of four test persons (TP 07, TP 08, TP 11, TP 12) again stated that they had thought about their company/organization and not about their current job as intended.

Recommendations:

Question: As with question 5, we recommend supplementing the question with an instruction for the respondents. On the one hand, this should make it clear that the focus of the statements is on the current professional activity, and on the other hand that persons who have several professional activities should only refer to their main professional activity. A possible formulation would be:

"The following statements are about their current professional activities. If you currently have more than one professional activity, please answer the statements only for your main professional activity.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"

[„Bei den folgenden Aussagen geht es um ihre derzeitige berufliche Tätigkeit. Falls Sie derzeit mehr als einer beruflichen Tätigkeit nachgehen, beantworten Sie die Aussagen bitte nur für Ihre hauptberufliche Tätigkeit.

Inwieweit stimmen Sie den folgenden Aussagen zu oder nicht zu?"]

Item a): We recommend adding the word "current" to this statement (see item b) to make it clear that the statement refers to current and not former employment. We also recommend that the word "highest" be softened somewhat and replaced by "highest". Furthermore, it should be made clearer what is meant by "demands on my profession". Finally, we propose to place the subordinate clause at the beginning of the sentence to prevent it from being ignored when answering the item (see battery of questions 5). A possible formulation would be:

"In order to perform my professional duties in the best possible way, I am willing to work harder than I normally have to."

[„Um meine beruflichen Aufgaben bestmöglich zu erfüllen, bin ich bereit, härter zu arbeiten als ich normalerweise muss.“]

Item b): No changes recommended.

⁹⁴ „Die Beantwortung der Aussage c) fand ich eher schwer. Was versteht man unter einer „anderen, besser bezahlten Stelle“ im Gegensatz zu „um in meinem Beruf zu bleiben“? Unter „nicht in meinem Beruf zu bleiben“ würde ich mir jetzt vorstellen, das Aufgabengebiet zum Beispiel komplett zu wechseln. Da würde ich bei dieser Frage nicht zustimmen, weil ich eigentlich meine Aufgabe sehr gern mag und die gegebenenfalls in einer anderen Firma ausüben würde. Aber ich wollte nicht etwas Beliebigeres anderes machen.“ (TP 13)

⁹⁵ „Hier geht es ja um meinen Beruf und nicht um die Stelle, die ich gerade inne habe?“ (TP 14)

Item c): We recommend avoiding the negative wording "reject" in this statement, as this causes difficulties in using the response scale. A possible reformulation would be:

"I would retain my current occupation even if I were offered another, better-paid position."

[„Ich würde meine derzeitige berufliche Tätigkeit beibehalten, auch wenn man mir eine andere, besser bezahlte Stelle anbieten würde.“]