Setting Up an Online Panel Representative of the General Population: The German Internet Panel

Annelies G. Blom\textsuperscript{1} \hspace{1cm} Christina Gathmann\textsuperscript{2} \hspace{1cm} Ulrich Krieger\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{1} University of Mannheim \\
\textsuperscript{2} University of Heidelberg, IZA and CESifo

Abstract
This paper looks into the processes and outcomes of setting-up and maintaining a probability-based longitudinal online survey, which is recruited face-to-face and representative of both the online and offline population aged 16 to 75 in Germany. This German Internet Panel (GIP) studies political and economic attitudes and reform preferences through bi-monthly longitudinal online interviews of individuals. The results presented here demonstrate that a carefully designed and implemented online panel can produce high-quality data at lower marginal costs than existing panels that operate solely in face-to-face mode. Analyses into the representativeness of the online sample showed no major coverage or nonresponse biases. Finally, including offline households in the panel is important as it improves the representation of the older and female segments of the population.
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1. Introduction

Inferential statistics teach us that to infer from a sample to the population we need a random probability sample. In online survey research, however, volunteer access panels, where respondents self-select into the sample, dominate the landscape. Such panels are attractive due to their low costs; yet, in recent years we have seen increasing debates about their quality in terms of representativeness and measurement error (e.g. Yeager et al. 2011). In this paper, we describe the design, sampling, recruitment and maintenance of a probability-based longitudinal online survey of the general population aged 16 to 75 living in private households, the German Internet Panel (GIP). Internationally, the GIP is one among very few online panels that are both based on a gross sample of the general population and include individuals who previously had no or limited access to the internet, i.e. who would not have been represented in any other online panel. To our knowledge, only two such academically-based online panels are currently operating, the LISS Panel in the Netherlands (www.lissdata.nl) and the ELIPSS panel in France (www.elipss.fr). Furthermore, GESIS is currently setting up such a new panel in Germany (www.gesis-panel.org) and KnowledgeNetworks in the US maintains a similar commercial panel (www.knowledgenetworks.com/knpanel).

Given the novelty of this mode of survey and its potential for the future of survey research, we would like to share key insights into the recruitment and maintenance of one of these probability-based offline-recruited online panels that include previously offline respondents. In the following sections, we describe how the sample for the GIP was drawn, how the recruitment was conducted, how sample members who were previously offline were included in the GIP and how, once recruited, the panel members are interviewed online and are kept motivated. All processes were pre-tested on a small-scale sample and optimized according to experiences from these pre-tests. Finally, we provide a first description of sample composition and potential biases.
2. Recruiting the GIP: Methodology and Results

2.1. Sampling

The GIP is based on a three-stage probability sample. In the first stage, we sampled 250 Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) situated in 208 local administrative units. The drawing of PSUs was stratified by state, governmental district and level of urbanicity.

During the second sampling stage interviewers listed 100 households along a random route with random starting point at each PSU. To prevent errors and interviewer cheating and to enable detailed checking of the listed addresses, every household along the pre-defined route was listed. For all sample points different interviewers conducted the listing and the actual interviewing at the sample points. The listing yielded a total of 25,000 households, which constituted the sampling frame in the third sampling stage.

To minimize clustering, 22 addresses per PSU were drawn at set intervals with a random start. The resulting gross sample consisted of 5,500 addresses, of which 622 were found to be ineligible during fieldwork (AAPOR 2011), such as vacant or commercial housing units.

2.2. Recruitment in two phases

Recruitment into the GIP online panel was conducted in two phases: a face-to-face interview phase and a phase of invitations to the online panel, including sending out initial invitation letters, reminder letters, and phone reminders to households in which nobody had registered online yet. Figure 1 illustrates the complex recruitment process.

*Face-to-face recruitment.* All sampled addresses were approached by interviewers, who aimed to make contact with the household and conduct a short face-to-face interview with a household member. In total 135 interviewers worked on the GIP face-to-face recruitment. Interviewers were trained face-to-face by the survey agency and the GIP team in one of three one-day training sessions.
All sampled households received an advance letter addressed to the household or, if no household name was available, to “tenant”. The advance letter announced the face-to-face interview as part of the study “Gesellschaft im Wandel” (“Changing Society”). The letter was kept very short (Appendix A) and was accompanied by a one-page color-print with additional information (Appendix B) and a data protection leaflet (Appendix C). All materials identified the University of Mannheim as the sponsor of the survey. Letters were sent out approximately one week before interviewers started work in the PSU.

Figure 1: Recruitment into the GIP in two phases

Interviewers conducted short interviews at the household asking about the household composition (name and year of birth of each household member), general demographics, simple attitudinal questions and whether the household had a computer and broadband internet connection. At the end of the interview, the interviewer asked the respondent for permission to have the University of
Mannheim send letters with further information about the online study to all household members born in the years 1937-1996, i.e. aged approximately 16 to 75. Households with at least one household member within this age-band, but without broadband internet connection and/or a computer were informed that they were invited to participate in the online study and that, if they agreed, someone would call them in the next week to make an appointment to install internet and, if no suitable computer was available, a *BenPC*. Interviewers carried with them materials describing the online survey (Appendix E) to be used during this final phase of the interview. If the interviewer, due to an imminent refusal, saw no possibility of conducting a full interview at the household, they were allowed to conduct a short doorstep interview instead, asking only five key questions.

Overall, this phase of face-to-face recruitment yielded 2,121 full interviews resulting in a response rate of 43.4% (AAPOR RR1). In addition, 422 doorstep interviews were conducted. Including the doorstep interviews the response rate was 52.5% (AAPOR RR2). While internationally seen these response rates seem rather low, in the German survey climate, however, where large-scale social surveys such as the Socio Economic Panel (SOEP) and the General Social Survey (ALLBUS) typically achieve response rates of around 30% only, these rates can be considered high.

*Invitations to the online panel.* The list of household members eligible to become members of the online panel was processed weekly by the GIP team. Eligible persons, who had a computer and a broadband internet connection at home, were sent an invitation letter (Appendix F) to the online panel. This letter contained further information about the study together with a login name and a password. In addition, it contained a small card (credit-card-sized) with the login details and hotline numbers to be easily kept. Households without internet access and/or computer were also invited to the study and sent login details. Furthermore, they were informed that someone would call them to make an appointment to install internet and/or a *BenPC*. Households where a doorstep interview had been conducted received

---

All response rates presented in this paper were calculated using priority-coded final dispositions (Blom 2013).
an invitation to the online panel addressed to the household. Upon their first online registration these households were asked about the household composition and additional personal invitations were sent to the other eligible persons in the same household.

Within the 2,121 households where full face-to-face interviews had been conducted 3,775 eligible individuals were identified, an average of 1.78 eligible persons per household. For 3,119 (82.6%) eligible persons we got permission to send invitations to the online survey. This includes persons living in households without internet access and/or a computer. 1,578 eligible persons registered for the online panel (AAPOR RR1 41.8%). In addition, 25 persons from households that conducted a doorstep interview registered online (AAPOR RR4 3.3% assuming 1.78 eligible persons per household). Taking all recruitment stages together the overall response rate is 18.5%. In order to find out more about potential selectivities in the panel due to nonresponse, we conducted bias analyses which are summarized in section 2.5.

2.3. Offline households in the online panel

Equipping previously offline households with a BenPC and/or internet is a key aspect of the GIP to ensure representativeness of the collected data. As a consequence, we implemented several measures to encourage the recruitment of offline households. First, the online panel was not mentioned in the advance letter to prevent households with little computer and internet affinity to drop out from the start. Second, interviewers were especially trained to react to the concerns of offline households. They were equipped with materials about the BenPC (the most essential materials are found in Appendix D) to show to the respondents during the interview. Third, the installation of the BenPCs and/or routers was subcontracted to a company that employs computer engineers all over Germany. The computer engineers were trained via video and written materials pointing out the specific challenges of communicating technical aspects to clients with little or no prior experience with computers. Fourth, the local computer engineers made an appointment with the offline respondents and installed the equipment on-site. There they showed respondents how the equipment worked and how they could fill
in the bi-monthly questionnaires. Finally, a hotline at the survey organization forwards queries from these households to the IT company.

Within the 2,121 households where full face-to-face interviews had been conducted 528 were identified as offline households (24.8%). In these 528 households 883 eligible sample members were identified of which 487 agreed to receive further information about the online panel and to be provided with the necessary equipment to participate. Ultimately, 128 previously offline respondents received equipment and registered for the online panel (AAPOR RR1 14.5%). Thus, the recruitment rate in offline households was considerably lower than in online households.

With respect to key socio-demographic characteristics age and gender are concerned our analyses show, however, that panel members from online and offline households significantly differ in terms of these characteristics. Their contribution to the representativeness of the panel is discussed below.

**2.4. Incentives during recruitment**

Since the GIP was the first study in Germany to recruit members for an online panel based on face-to-face fieldwork and a probability sample, the most effective incentive strategies had yet to be researched. Moreover, paying incentives unconditionally is uncommon in the German survey context but a widely accepted and well tested practice in other countries. As part of the survey design of the GIP we thus implemented two incentives experiments to investigate which strategy maximizes panel response.

The first incentives experiment was conducted during the face-to-face phase. Households where the listing of addresses had yielded one or several household names, i.e. where the advance letter could be addressed directly to the household, were allocated to one of two experimental conditions: a €5 unconditional cash incentive, i.e. the advance letter contained a €5-bill, or a €10 conditional cash incentive, i.e. the advance letter contained the information that they would receive €10 in cash, if they participated in the face-to-face interview. The value of the incentives was chosen such that the costs for
the GIP research team would be independent of the incentive, assuming a 50% response rate in the face-to-face interview (including doorstep interviews). We chose this experimental design because we wanted to allocate the available budget for incentives in a way that maximizes the response rate.

With an 8.9%-points difference, the unconditional incentives yielded a significantly higher response rate in the face-to-face household interviews \((t=5.14)\). While 50.8% of households with an unconditional incentive responded to the face-to-face recruitment interview, 41.9% of the conditionally incentivized households responded (AAPOR RR1, i.e. not counting doorstep interviews). Moreover and despite the time lag between face-to-face interviews and the invitations to the online interviews, this effect carries over to and is reinforced at individuals’ online registration for the panel. While 33.8% of eligible persons registered online when the household had been incentivized for the face-to-face interview with €5 unconditionally, 31.3% of eligible persons registered for the online interviews when incentivized with €10 conditionally \((t=2.06)\). Households where the name(s) of the inhabitant(s) was not identified during the listing received lower response rates than each of the two experimental groups. Households sampled during the second field phase were excluded from the analyses, since they all received the unconditional incentive.

In the second incentives experiment, we studied the effect of a €5 unconditional incentive in the first mail reminder versus no incentive on the individual-level registration rate to the online study. Given the special two-stage nature of the GIP, the effects of this second-stage incentive have not been empirically studied in the literature. However, given that a variety of studies has found that providing an incentive yields higher response rates than not providing any (e.g. Singer and Ye 2013), we expected a positive incentive effect at this second recruitment stage.

Our analyses showed that the €5 incentive in the reminder letter had a significant effect on the online registration rate. While 30.0% of the cases that received a reminder incentive registered online within 2 weeks of receiving the reminder letter, 13.7% of cases without incentive registered online within this time period \((t=7.27)\).
The two experiments were also crossed and their combined effect analyzed. The analysis is restricted to those persons that were part of the recruitment incentive experiment (N=3900), responded to the face-to-face interview, could be invited to the online panel and received a reminder letter. The sample sizes of the four experimental subgroups are displayed in Table 1.

**Table 1: The combined effect of two incentives experiments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>€ 5 unconditional</th>
<th></th>
<th>€ 10 conditional</th>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incentive n %</td>
<td>control n %</td>
<td>incentive n %</td>
<td>control n %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reminder sent</td>
<td>259 (104)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>402 (185)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registration</td>
<td>79 (30.5)</td>
<td>20 (19.2)</td>
<td>112 (28.8)</td>
<td>24 (13.0)</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within both recruitment incentives groups, the incentive in the reminder letter had a significant effect. Among those respondents who received a €5 unconditional incentive during the recruitment interview, the €5 incentive in the reminder letter is associated with an 11.3 %-points higher online registration rate (t=-2.2). Among respondents who received an €10 conditional incentive during the recruitment interview, the incentive in the reminder letter is associated with a 14.8 %-points higher registration rate (t=-4.0).

**2.5. Representativeness**

As a probability-based face-to-face recruited online panel including the online and offline population the GIP strives for a quality that is comparable to the quality of the established face-to-face surveys in Germany, such as the SOEP or the ALLBUS (see also Bosnjak et al. 2013). The literature shows that the online mode of data collection is of little concern to data quality in terms of measurement errors but is of concern in terms of representativeness when recruited as non-probability panels (e.g. Yeager et al. 2011). To investigate the GIP’s representativeness we compared GIP respondents in the first wave of online data collection to nonrespondents and population statistics. Data on the complete gross sample
and the population stemmed from two data sources: (1) linked auxiliary street-level data from a commercial provider (microm) for the gross sample and (2) population statistics from the 2011 Census. Logistic regression analyses with the linked commercial data showed no effects of urbanicity, region (East/West Germany), age, household type and unemployment rate on response to the online panel. Only three characteristics were found significant predictors of response: the level of education (the online panel over-represents those living in areas with a high proportion of university graduates), the purchasing power (people living in more prosperous areas were more likely to participate) and immigration (areas with higher proportions of immigrants were under-represented) (Krieger and Blom 2013).

Comparing the GIP sample to population distributions of the German Census conducted in 2011, we further found that the GIP underrepresents the oldest age groups, while the representation of men and women is quite exact. As Table 2 shows, however, including previously offline respondents in the panel improves the representativeness of the GIP with regard to both age and gender.

| Table 2: The GIP sample compared to the German population statistics (%) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                             | Census                     | GIP sample online | GIP sample offline | GIP sample total |
| age                         | 25 – 29                    | 9.1              | 12.1              | 6.2              | 11.6              |
|                             | 30 – 39                    | 17.9             | 17.6              | 12.4             | 17.1              |
|                             | 40 – 49                    | 25.2             | 27.3              | 20.4             | 26.7              |
|                             | 50 – 64                    | 30.8             | 33.9              | 42.5             | 34.6              |
|                             | 65 – 74                    | 17.1             | 9.2               | 18.6             | 9.9               |
| gender                      | Male                       | 48.8             | 51.3              | 38.3             | 50.2              |
|                             | Female                     | 51.2             | 48.8              | 61.7             | 49.8              |

Note: Since the youngest age group published in the Census statistics is 15-24, while in the GIP the youngest participants were 16, we do not provide a comparison for this group.

3. Maintaining the GIP: Methodology and Results

As a longitudinal survey the GIP not only aspires to recruit a representative and sizeable sample, but also aims for a high level of retention throughout the future waves. In this section, we therefore describe the
measures taken to ensure high retention rates and report retention rates during the first five waves of the GIP.

3.1. Panel maintenance

The literature on attrition typically distinguishes three main components (Lepkowski and Couper 2002): failure to locate the sample unit, failure to make contact and failure to gain cooperation. Locating the sample unit is of concern especially in face-to-face panel surveys, where geographic mobility of all or part of a household might lead to a loss of respondents (see Fitzgerald et al. 1998 and Zabel 1998). The risk of failure to locate a sample unit is lower in online panels because the primary contact is through email addresses, which typically remain stable as people move, and because of the high frequency of interviews (for example, bi-monthly in the GIP as compared to once a year in the SOEP). Furthermore, GIP panel members can change the email address at which they receive invitations through their account on the study website and through the hotline.

Failure to make contact might, however, also be a problem in the GIP. For example, if a sample unit’s mailbox is full or if spam filters re-direct our invitation, emails might not reach a potential respondent. In the GIP these potential problems are counteracted in two ways. First of all, the email invitation is just one of two routes through which a sample unit may access the questionnaire; the other is a direct access via the study’s website with login name and password. Our questionnaires are fielded regularly every two months and are always made available on the first day of the uneven months. Therefore, even if the invitation email does not reach our panel members, they can find their way to the questionnaire via the study website. Second, if a panel member has failed to participate in the panel for two consecutive waves or our invitation email bounces, they are called by the survey organization to encourage their renewed participation and to inquire whether there were any technical problems preventing them to participate in the waves.
Finally, failure to gain cooperation may well be the greatest concern for longitudinal online surveys. In the GIP several additional measures are taken to maintain motivation. By motivating sample members the survey can be made more salient to them (Groves et al 2000), for example by providing information about the survey results. In the GIP we feedback study results bi-monthly during even months, i.e. during those months when panel members are not interviewed. Short descriptive reports of results from previous waves are made available through the study website together with a short introduction of the researchers conducting the research. Respondents are alerted to these via email. By this way we aim to personalize our contact with the panel members.

Another form of personalization is to give panel members several means of feeding back their experiences with each interview. The hotline at the survey organization can be reached via email and telephone (a toll-free number). Instances where the participant voices serious concerns are forwarded to the principal investigator of the GIP, who carefully answers each query. Furthermore, the panel members are asked for feedback at the end of each questionnaire, both in closed rating questions as well as by providing an open question for more general feedback.

Persistence is another way to gain cooperation from panel members. In addition to the initial invitation email at the start of fieldwork, we send out a first reminder email after approximately one week, a second reminder email after another week and attempt contact by phone in the fourth week if the panel member missed two consecutive waves.

Finally, we use monetary incentives at each wave, to demonstrate to the panel members that we value their participation in our research. For each interview of 20-25 minutes each respondent receives €4 with an annual bonus of €5, if panel member participate in all but one interviews, and a bonus of €10, if they participate in all interviews of that year. As far as attrition is concerned, research shows that cash incentives are more effective than vouchers or incentives in kind (see Booker et al. 2011 for a review). For operational reasons, however, we are not able to send letters with cash to panel members. Instead, when registering for the panel, members are asked whether they would like to receive their incentive via
bank transfer - in this case we ask them for their bank details - as an Amazon gift voucher or whether they would like to donate the money. In 2012/13, 57% of panel members preferred to be paid in cash via bank transfer, 31% opted for the Amazon gift voucher and 12% chose to donate the money to charitable organizations.

3.2. Retention

Figure 2 displays the proportion of respondents participating in waves 1 through 5, conditional on being registered sample members. While 96% of sample members participated in wave 1, this drops to 73-80% in waves 2 through 5. Note that these rates are based on the full registered sample. Since panel members can omit one or more waves and then return to the panel again, a wave-on-wave retention rate, as reported by some other panel studies, is less informative for the GIP (see Cheshire et al. 2011 for different types of retention rates).

![Figure 2: Retention rates for the first five waves of the GIP; % of the registered sample at each wave](image)

Note that registration for the panel was possible until 16th April 2013. Late registrants first received the core questionnaire (wave 1) before they could continue with the respective wave. Persons who registered after November 2012 were thus never invited to wave 2, persons who registered after January 2013 were never invited to waves 2 and 3, and persons who registered after March 2013 were never invited to waves 2, 3 and 4.
Figure 2 further shows that differences between previously offline respondents and all registered participants are rather small, except for a slight drop in participation of the former in wave 2, which is recovered again from wave 3 onwards. In addition, the retention rates show no evidence of a differential effect of the incentives used during the face-to-face recruitment; the €5 unconditional and the €10 conditional incentives perform similarly well. This means that the higher response rate achieved by the €5 unconditional incentive in the face-to-face recruitment is not counteracted by lower participation rates during the first five waves of the online panel.

4. Conclusion

The GIP combines in many ways the advantages of high-quality offline surveys with the benefits of an online format. The recruitment stage and first waves of data collection have demonstrated that an online panel based on a probability sample and face-to-face recruitment can be successfully established and maintained in Germany. The response and retention rates achieved so far are comparable or higher than those of existing data collections in face-to-face mode in Germany. Furthermore, analyses into the representativeness of the online sample showed no major coverage or nonresponse biases. This was in part achieved by including formerly offline households, thus improving the representation of the older and female segments of the population, and in part by employing traditional sampling and face-to-face fieldwork methods during the recruitment. Finally, the GIP methodology is more cost-effective than typical face-to-face surveys. This is exemplified by the fact that the 15-minute face-to-face GIP recruitment interview is approximately as expensive as conducting 12 online GIP waves of 20-25 minutes each, including the costs of incentives.

This paper aims to guide researchers using the GIP data as well as practitioners seeking to set up similar online panels. We describe and analyze some key aspects of the panel. First of all, the GIP is based on a probability sample of the general population. By conducting the initial recruitment interviews face-to-face we were able to base the online panel on a traditional area probability sample. Second,
offline households which were equipped with a Be
PC and/or broadband internet turned out to be
important for the data quality, since this improves the panel’s representativeness. Third, our incentives
experiments yield strong positive effects of unconditional cash incentives during recruitment and
response did not differentially diminish during the online waves. Finally, various panel maintenance
measures have been implemented to increase the stability and longevity of the GIP. They range from
incentives at each waves and reminder emails/phone calls to personalizing the contact with our panelists
by feeding back research results and introducing them to our research team. Though we cannot prove
this empirically, the high retention rates in GIP might point towards the joint effectiveness of these
measures.

Overall, our experience shows that investing in the recruitment and maintenance of an online
panel like the GIP is worthwhile in terms of representativeness of the panel and its longevity.
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Appendix A: Advance letter in two versions

conditional incentive

Universität Mannheim
Familie Musterfrau
Musterstraße 123
73485 Musterstadt

Gesellschaft im Wandel

Sehr geehrte Familie Musterfrau,
en Brief von der Universität Mannheim? Anlass dafür ist unsere Studie „Gesellschaft im Wandel“, die wir zurzeit in ganz Deutschland durchführen. Wir möchten Sie mit diesem Schreiben herzlich bitten, uns zu unterstützen und an dieser Studie teilzunehmen, denn ihre Meinung zählt!

In den nächsten Tagen wird eine Interviewerin von TNS Infratest Sozialforschung in unserem Auftrag aufsuchen. Ihre Teilnahme ist aber selbstverständlich freiwillig. Als kleines Dankeschön wird Ihnen das Interviewer/in 50 Euro zu verdeutlichen.

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Unterstützung!

Mit freundlichen Grüßen,

[Signature]

Prof. Christina Gathmann
Projektleiterin „Gesellschaft im Wandel“
TNS Infratest Sozialforschung

unconditional incentive

Universität Mannheim
Familie Musterfrau
Musterstraße 123
73485 Musterstadt

Gesellschaft im Wandel

Sehr geehrte Familie Musterfrau,
en Brief von der Universität Mannheim? Anlass dafür ist unsere Studie „Gesellschaft im Wandel“, die wir zurzeit in ganz Deutschland durchführen. Wir möchten Sie mit diesem Schreiben herzlich bitten, uns zu unterstützen und an dieser Studie teilzunehmen, denn Ihre Meinung zählt!

In den nächsten Tagen wird eine Interviewerin von TNS Infratest Sozialforschung in unserem Auftrag aufsuchen. Ihre Teilnahme ist aber selbstverständlich freiwillig. Als kleines Dankeschön haben wir Ihnen das Interview 50 Euro beigelegt.

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Unterstützung!

Mit freundlichen Grüßen,

[Signature]

Prof. Christina Gathmann
Projektleiterin „Gesellschaft im Wandel“
TNS Infratest Sozialforschung

P.S.: Kostenfreie Hotline für Rückfragen: 0800/1001425 (TNS Infratest Sozialforschung)
Appendix B: Additional information accompanying the advance letter

Gesellschaft im Wandel
Informationsblatt zur Studie

Warum gerade Sie?
Alle Haushalte, die wir um Teilnahme bitten, wurden durch ein wissenschaftliches Zufallsverfahren ausgewählt. Ihre Teilnahme an der Studie ist natürlich freiwillig, aber sehr wichtig, weil nur durch die Beteiligung möglichst aller ausgewählten Haushalte aussagekräftige Ergebnisse erzielt werden.

Zusammen mit den Personen in weiteren 2.500 Haushalten stehen Sie stellvertretend für die Bevölkerung in Deutschland.

Worum geht es?
In der Studie geht es um Ihre Meinungen, Einstellungen und Erwartungen zu verschiedenen Themen wie Familie und Freunde, Arbeit und Freizeit, Wirtschaft und Politik, kurzum: Es geht um das Leben in Deutschland.

Diese Befragung ist Teil einer längerfristig angelegten Studie, die auf Dauer Wissenschaftlern verschiedener Fachrichtungen die Grundlage für ihre Arbeit liefert.

Wie funktioniert es?
In den nächsten Tagen wird sich ein Interviewer von TNS Infratest Sozialforschung bei Ihnen melden und einen Termin für ein kurzes Gespräch mit Ihnen vereinbaren.

Ihre Angaben werden selbstverständlich vertraulich behandelt, Bundes- und Landesdatenschutzgesetze werden genauestens eingehalten.

Unsere Studie wird von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft gefördert und dient keinerlei kommerziellen Zwecken.

Was haben Sie davon?
Sie helfen uns, das Zusammenleben in unserer Gesellschaft besser zu verstehen und Lösungsmöglichkeiten für einige der dringenden gesellschaftlichen Probleme zu erarbeiten.

Als kleines Dankeschön wird Ihnen der/die Interviewer/in 10 Euro überreichen.

Für Rückfragen haben wir die kostenfreie Hotline 0800/100/425 eingerichtet, unter der Sie der Projektleitung bei TNS Infratest Sozialforschung Ihre Fragen stellen können.
Appendix C: Data protection leaflet

Erklärung zum Datenschutz und zur absoluten Vertraulichkeit Ihrer Angaben bei persönlichen Interviews


Die Ergebnisse dieser Befragung werden ausschließlich in anonymisierter Form dargestellt. Das bedeutet: Aus den Ergebnissen kann niemand erkennen, von welcher Person die Angaben gemacht worden sind.

Das gilt auch bei Folge- oder Wiederholungs-Befragungen, wo es wichtig ist, nach einer bestimmten Zeit noch einmal ein Interview mit derselben Person durchzuführen, dabei auf Angaben aus dem Erstinterview zurückzugreifen und die statistische Auswertung so vorzunehmen, dass die Angaben aus mehreren Befragungen durch eine Code-Nummer, also ohne Namen und Adresse, miteinander verknüpft werden.

Falls Sie noch nicht 18 Jahre alt und zurzeit kein Erwachsener anwesend ist: Bitte zeigen Sie dieses Merkblatt auch Ihren Eltern mit der Bitte, es bildend Zu kunftigen für die Einhaltung der Datenschutzbestimmungen sind Winfried Hagenhoff, Geschäftsführer TNS Infratest Forschung GmbH, Harald Diebelski, Geschäftsführer TNS Infratest Sozialforschung GmbH und Prof. Christina Gathmann, Ph.D., Sonderforschungsbereich 854, Universität Mannheim verantwortlich.

Abschrift der TNS Infratest Infratest Institute
Landwehrstraße 34
BNFPO München
Telefon (089) 50 00-1
Fax (089) 50 00-2

Abschrift Universität Mannheim
Sonderforschungsbereich M84
Mannheimer Landwehrstraße 21
Tel.: (0621) 181-361
FAX: (0621) 181-368

Auf der Rückseite dieser Erklärung zeigen wir Ihnen den Weg Ihrer Daten von der Erhebung bis zur völlig anonymen Ergebnistabelle.

Was geschieht mit Ihren Angaben?

1. Ihre Antworten zu den Fragen werden vom Interviewer oder von Ihnen selbst in die Antwortfelder eingegeben bzw. eingehalten, z.B. so:


Sie können absolut sicher sein, dass die TNS Infratest Institute und die Universität Mannheim Ihren Namen und Ihre Anschrift nach Abschluss der Gesamtuntersuchung nicht wieder mit den Interviewdaten zusammenführen, so dass niemand erfährt, welche Antworten Sie gegeben haben.

Wir danken Ihnen für Ihr Mitwirken und Ihr Vertrauen in unsere Arbeit!
Appendix D: Leaflet about the BenPC used during the face-to-face interview
Appendix E: Leaflet about the study used during the face-to-face interview
Appendix F: Invitation letter to the online panel with login details

UNIVERSITÄT MANNHEIM

Universität Mannheim | Schloß | 68131 Mannheim

Gesellschaft im Wandel

Mannheim, «Datum»

«Sehr geehrte(r) Frau/Fürchen»,

ver ein paar Wochen war in unserem Auftrag ein(e) Interviewer(in) für ein kurzes Interview in Ihrem Haushalt. Heute möchten wir Sie gerne zur Fortsetzung der Studie „Gesellschaft im Wandel“ einladen.


Kennung: __________
Passwort: __________

Ihre Zugangsdaten finden Sie auch im beigefügten Kärtchen. Bitte behalten Sie diese für die Zukunft gut auf.

Vielen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme an unserem Projekt.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen,

Prof. Christina Gahmann
Projektleiterin „Gesellschaft im Wandel“

Gesellschaft im Wandel

Worum geht es?


Was haben Sie davon?


Freiwilligkeit und Anonymität

Die Teilnahme an jeder einzelnen Online Umfrage, zu der wir Sie nach Ihrer Registrierung per Email erläutern, ist freiwillig. Sie gehen mit der Registrierung keine dauerhafte Verpflichtung ein. Und außerdem erfolgen alle Auswertungen anonym gemäß den Vorgaben der Datenschutzgesetz.

Haben Sie Fragen oder Anregungen?

Internet: www.gesellschaft-im-wandel.de
E-Mail: info@gesellschaft-im-wandel.de
Telefon: 0621/382564 (kostenlos aus dem dt. Fest- und Mobilnetz)