METHODOLOGY REPORT FOR 40 COUNTRIES SURVEY

Last Updated: 23 March 2026

Contents

Introduction

This survey has been conducted by YouGov Norway AS on behalf of Centre for Research on Discretion and Paternalism (DIPA), Department of Government, University of Bergen (UiB) and is part of the Discretion and CPS-WORLD projects (Grant Agreement Nr. 724460 and 324966).[1] It seeks to explore citizens' attitudes towards family, parents' and children's rights and welfare and consist of 34 questions.

Respondents from all 41 OECD countries, including 27 different languages, have participated in the survey. The survey is designed by professors Jill Berrick, Siri Gloppen and Marit Skivenes, with a few exceptions that are detailed in the herewith report. Professor Marit Skivenes is the principal investigator (PI) of the project and has been the responsible PI for the data collection process, whereas PhD fellow Mathea Loen has been responsible for administering all steps of the data collection process. The survey is administered in the following 41 countries (in alphabetical order):
Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, UK (England), UK (Scotland), UK (Wales), UK (Northern Ireland), USA.

The survey is administered via an ad-hoc website or web platform provided by YouGov. The questionnaire is displayed in the national language(s) of the country in which it is administered. The samples are representative of the national population with regard to gender, age and geographic location. The data is provided with two sampling weights: post-stratification weights to further ensure representativeness of the sample at the country level; population size weights to correct for identical sample size despite the different sizes of the countries in the survey. Data collection took place between 17 July 2023 and 28 June 2024.

Aim of the Survey

The data will be used primarily by PI Prof. Skivenes and the DIPA-team and researchers at CPS-WORLD (see https://discretion.uib.no/people/staff/) and affiliated project members, in order to examine defining elements of child protection systems and their boundaries by analysing public and judiciary perspectives across the world, enabling empirical advancements and theoretical innovations. This transdisciplinary endeavour will lay the foundation as a conceptual tool for comparative research on governments' responsibilities to and for children in potentially vulnerable situations. The use of the data will give rise to academic publications, conference papers and presentations, policy briefs, scientific reports, newspaper chronicles, webpage content, and social media posts.

Data Provider

YouGov Norway AS (Hereafter YouGov) conducted the survey on behalf of the Centre for Research on Discretion and Paternalism, UiB. This includes the setup of a web survey platform, respondent consent procedure, data collection, creation of data files, and data delivery. YouGov collects data from own (or a local collaborator's) survey panels in the respective countries. Representative samples (based on age, gender, and geography) from the adult (18 +) population in the countries were drawn from these panels, and the data material consists of samples of 1000 respondents from each country[2]. Table 1 below shows information about panel sizes, languages, and the final sample size[3] (n = 41,232 respondents).

Table 1 Information on countries, panels and sample sizes (YouGov's survey panels)

Country	Language	Sample size survey	Panel size (per June 22)
Australia	English	1007	398,304
Austria	Austrian	1030	84,767
Belgium	French and Dutch	1043	183,751

[1] This survey was part of the procurement ANSK-23-0026, between The University of Bergen and YouGov Norway AS, and constitutes the survey called "Survey A – 41 countries" in the procurement inquiry, which contained the following specifications: 15 minutes questionnaire length with translations of the questionnaire.
[2] Exceptions to this are Northern Ireland (N=500), Luxembourg (N=700), and the US (N=2000).
[3] Prior to the exclusion of Luxembourg data, the final sample size was 41,942 respondents

Country	Language	Sample size survey	Panel size (per June 22)
Canada	English and French	1017	538,632
Chile[a]	Spanish	1004	29,000
Columbia	Spanish	1035	583,613
Costa Rica[a]	Spanish	1015	68,649
Czech Republic	Czech	1035	52,234
Denmark	Danish	1029	250,441
Estonia[a]	Estonian	995	72,725
Finland	Finnish	1040	103,652
France	French	1042	896,237
Germany	German	1043	859,211
Greece	Greek	1027	65,982
Hungary	Hungarian	1013	65,003
Iceland[a]	Icelandic	1050	34,000
Ireland	English	1033	67,777
Israel[a]	Hebrew	872	283,000
Italy	Italian	1017	334,511
Japan[a]	Japanese	1018	2,200,000
South Korea[a]	Korean	1002	680,000
Latvia[a]	Latvian	1008	126,609
Lithuania[a]	Lithuanian	1016	184,154
Luxembourg[a]	Luxembourgish, French and German	709	29,299
Mexico	Spanish	1029	321,123
Netherlands	Dutch	1044	113,407
New Zealand[a]	English	1006	235,300
Norway	Norwegian	1016	175,774
Poland	Poland	1006	228,357
Portugal	Portuguese	1028	91,107
Slovak Republic	Slovakian	1011	70,161
Slovenia[a]	Slovenian	1028	108,641
Spain	Spanish	1014	382,478
Sweden	Swedish	1034	265,749
Switzerland	French and German	1023	118,760
Turkey	Turkish	1025	342,490
UK (England)	English	1044	2,668,204[b]
UK (Scotland)	English	1014	-
UK (Wales)	English	1008	-
UK (Northern Ireland)	English	506	-
USA	English	2006	5,677,393

[a] YouGov does not have their own panel in this country, the panel is provided by a subcontractor.
[b] Total UK panel size.

YouGov received the finalised survey form from DIPA, including questions, response alternatives, and instructions regarding skips and filters. They provided a set of standard background questions for the survey. YouGov also provided translations from English to 27 languages (46 country-languages) through the translation company Toppan. The survey was then administered as ad-hoc surveys via YouGov's platform.

Question formulation

The design of the survey is a collaborative project between three researchers affiliated with DIPA and/or the CPS-World project. Most of the questions were developed by these contributors, principal investigator and professor Marit Skivenes (DIPA/UiB), professor Siri Gloppen (UiB-CMI Lawtransform, UiB), and professor Jill D. Berrick (DIPA/UC Berkeley). Some questions are replications of previous surveys, and some questions are based on previous design (an overview is provided in Table 9). The background questions are standard questions provided by YouGov.

The question formulation took place in Spring 2023, with each contributor developing and suggesting questions. Both question formulation and response alternatives were discussed among the contributors through several rounds of revision, to ensure measurement validity and reliability as well as comprehensibility for the respondents participating in the survey. PI Marit Skivenes reviewed and made the final decisions about questions and response alternatives with assistance from the survey coordinator. All questions were developed in English, which served as basis for translations.

Translations and quality checks

The original questionnaire was finalised and sent to YouGov on 22 June 2023. The original questionnaire was written in American English and used for the US respondents. It was translated into British English by YouGov (Toppan) and this translation constituted the master document. Before the questionnaire was rewritten in British English, the collaborators and data provider revised questions, concepts, response alternatives and the questionnaire structure thoroughly. PI Marit Skivenes reviewed and made the final decisions about questions and response alternatives. The master document was approved 13 July.

Furthermore, Toppan translated the questions into 27 languages required. The translation agency was instructed to allocate the best suited translators for a societal/political survey. For multi-language countries, the questionnaires are typically based on the translated versions from other countries. E.g., for Switzerland, the translations were based on translations from Germany and France. This was problematic, as some errors in one country translations occurred, which then caused subsequent errors in the other country translations (see
National variation/special circumstances to note).

We received the translated questionnaires in Word format and the test link to the web platform with the survey continuously as each translation was ready. The word document contained the survey questions and response alternatives, scripting instructions and information about filters and skips. The test link displays the survey questions and responses the way that respondents would see them. This allows us to test that randomisation keys, filters and skips work properly. All test links were reviewed thoroughly and in combination with the word document for each language and country. The word documents with translations were sent to our external quality checkers for review (this process is described in more detail below).

External quality checkers

The external quality checkers were recruited from our network and our network's network. Most of them are familiar with child protection terminology and native to the country for which they were checking the translation. They were asked to be particularly aware of terms and concepts related to child protection, and make sure that concepts were translated in a way that is locally known, whilst still being as close to the English master document as possible, in order to ensure comparability. Most of the country-languages had one or more external quality checker (see Table 2 below for a list of external reviewers). They did not receive any compensation for their work.

The quality checkers were asked to come up with alternative formulations when they disagreed on any of the translations. Some concepts and words were particularly difficult to translate so it required extensive discussions between external reviewers and the survey contributors, ensuring that the translations were measurement validity and reliability. We did not experience any quality checkers that disagreed with each other. If there had been any disagreements between two quality checkers, we would have gone with the alternative that kept the formulation closer to the master document.

Following the external quality checks, the translated surveys were returned to YouGov with corrections. For some country-translations where YouGov collaborates with a local data provider, we also received input from the local partners on the translations. It then took another few rounds of reviews and discussions before we agreed on the final formulations. Once the questionnaires for each country-language were approved by us, YouGov prepared the questions for soft launch.

We had screenshots taken of all the questions in the survey, including all languages, as they were presented to respondents in the digital survey platform. These screenshots are available for relevant reviewers upon request.

Table 2 List of external reviewers (and affiliation)

Country	External quality checker (affiliation)
Australia	Prof. Judith Cashmore (The University of Sydney)
Austria	Prof. Katrin Kriz (Emmanuel College, Boston)
Belgium (FR)	Prof. Johan Vanderfaeillie and PhD Candidate Camille Verheyden (Vrije Universiteit Brussel)
Belgium (NL)	Prof. Johan Vanderfaeillie and PhD Candidate Camille Verheyden (Vrije Universiteit Brussel)
Canada (EN)	Prof. Sarah Maiter (York University, Toronto)
Canada (FR)	No external reviewer. We implemented the same corrections as for France.
Chile	Prof. Cristian Pérez Muños (University of Central Florida)
Columbia	Prof. Ernesto Duran Strauch (Universidad Nacional de Colombia)
Costa Rica	Prof. Evelyn Villareal (Estado de la Nación)
Czech Republic	Senior Researcher Victoria Shmidt (University of Graz)
Denmark	Prof. Vibeke Asmussen Frank (VIA University College)
Estonia	Prof. Judit Strompl (University of Tartu)
Finland	Prof. Tarja Pösö (University of Tampere)
France	PhD Candidate Lucie Ducarre (University of Bergen)
Germany	Dr. Jenny Krutzinna (University of Oslo)
Greece	Patrick Talatas (University of Bergen) and Dr. Jens Manglerud (Nordic Library at Athens)
Hungary	PhD Candidate Alida Steigler (University of Oslo) and Prof. Orsolya Szeibert (Eötvös Loránd University)
Iceland	Prof. Emerita Guðrún Kristinsdóttir (University of Iceland)
Ireland	Prof. Kenneth Burns (University College Cork)
Israel	Prof. Emeritus Rami Benbenishty (Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Bar Ilan University)
Italy	Ass. Prof. Teresa Bertotti (University of Trento)
Japan	Ass. Prof. Saki Nagano (Musashino University)
South Korea	Prof. Bong Joo Lee (Seoul National University)
Latvia	Dr. Ilona Kronberga (University of Latvia)
Lithuania	Giedre Seduike (Christian Michelsen Institute)
Luxembourg (FR)	Justin Petkus (Miami University, Luxembourg)
Luxembourg (DE)	Justin Petkus (Miami University, Luxembourg)
Luxembourg (LB)	Justin Petkus (Miami University, Luxembourg)
Mexico	Prof. Marta Frías Armenta (Universidad de Sonora)
Netherlands	Dr. Amarens Matthisen (University of Toronto)
New Zealand	Prof. Claire Breen (University of Waikato)
Norway	Dr. Hege Helland and Dr. Audun Løvlie (University of Bergen)
Poland	Ass. Prof. Anna Sledzinska-Simon (University of Wrocław) and Prof. Atina Krajewska (University of Birmingham)
Portugal	Ass. Prof. Jorge Ferreira (Instituto Universitário de Lisboa) and PhD Candidate Larissa Madrigada (FGV Sao Paulo)
Slovak Republic	Prof. Beáta Balogová (University of Prešov)
Slovenia	Prof. Vesna Leskošek (University of Ljubljana)
Spain	Prof. Sagrario Segado (National Distance Education University)
Sweden	Prof. Ingrid Höjer (University of Gothenburg)
Switzerland (FR)	Ass. Prof. Gaëlle Aeby (HES-SO Valais-Wallis)
Switzerland (DE)	Prof. Stefan Schnurr (Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz)
Turkey	Dr. Gökhan Sen (University of Oslo)
UK (England)	Prof. Emerita June Thoburn (University of East Anglia)

Country	External quality checker (affiliation)
UK (Scotland)	Prof. Elaine Sutherland (Stirling University) and Dr. Lesley-Anne Barnes Macfarlane (University of Glasgow)
UK (Wales)	Dr. Julie Doughty (University of Cardiff)
UK (Northern Ireland)	Prof. Campbell Killick (Ulster University)
USA	Prof. Jill Berrick (University of California, Berkeley)

Table 3 Survey process overview

Country	Test link	Full launch	Data received
Australia	14.07.23	20.07.23	01.09.23
Austria	28.07.23	21.08.23	29.09.23
Belgium (FR)	28.07.23	25.10.23	01.12.23
Belgium (NL)	28.07.23	25.10.23	01.12.23
Canada (EN)	14.07.23	15.09.23	12.10.23
Canada (FR)	28.07.23	15.09.23	12.10.23
Chile	28.07.23	26.09.23	03.11.23
Columbia	28.07.23	11.09.23	20.10.23
Costa Rica	31.07.23	11.09.23	30.11.23
Czech Republic	25.07.23	04.08.23	14.09.23
Denmark	25.07.23	31.08.23*	30.11.23
Estonia	26.07.23	21.08.23	08.02.24
Finland	26.07.23	04.08.23	14.09.23
France	26.07.23	08.08.23	08.09.23
Germany	28.07.23	28.08.23	29.09.23
Greece	28.07.23	03.01.24	08.02.24
Hungary	25.07.23	31.08.23	14.09.23
Iceland	31.07.23	24.01.24	11.04.24
Ireland	14.07.23	17.07.23	11.08.23
Israel	26.07.23	07.05.24	28.06.24
Italy	25.07.23	11.08.23	26.09.23
Japan	25.07.23	13.10.23	01.12.23
South Korea	25.07.23	11.09.23	21.12.23
Latvia	26.07.23	04.08.23	01.12.23
Lithuania	25.07.23	18.09.23	01.12.23
Luxembourg (FR)	31.07.23	26.09.23	03.11.23
Luxembourg (DE)	31.07.23	26.09.23	03.11.23
Luxembourg (LB)	31.07.23	26.09.23	03.11.23
Mexico	31.07.23	01.09.23	12.10.23
Netherlands	26.07.23	21.08.23	29.09.23
New Zealand	14.07.23	20.07.23	01.09.23
Norway	26.07.23	06.10.23	03.11.23
Poland	26.07.23	16.11.23	21.12.23
Portugal	26.07.23	15.11.23	08.02.24
Slovak Republic	26.07.23	08.09.23	12.10.23
Slovenia	31.07.23	15.09.23	23.11.23
Spain	26.07.23	01.09.23	13.10.23
Sweden	26.07.23	10.08.23	14.09.23
Switzerland (FR)	28.07.23	04.10.23	01.12.23
Switzerland (DE)	28.07.23	04.10.23	01.12.23
Turkey	26.07.23	11.09.23	13.10.23
UK (England)	11.07.23	17.07.23	07.08.23
UK (Scotland)	11.07.23	19.07.23	22.08.23
UK (Wales)	11.07.23	17.07.23	28.08.23
UK (Northern Ireland)	11.07.23	19.07.23	31.08.23

Country	Test link	Full launch	Data received
USA	15.06.23	17.07.23	31.08.23
Master	11.07.23	-	-

*Denmark was relaunched due to an error in one question.

Questions

In addition to background questions, each respondent receives a maximum of 34 questions. Some receive less since some questions generate follow-up questions when selecting only certain response alternatives. Of the 34 questions, some have several items, and they are typically displayed as a matrix with alternatives in the rows and response alternatives in the columns. Some of the shorter questions were displayed on the same page.

Background variables

The survey collects a combination of standard background variables from the YouGov questionnaire, and background questions developed by the project. Panellists that recently answered a background question in another survey are not asked the background question again to reduce response exhaustion. The information is instead pulled from YouGov's system. Additionally, information about panellists' age, gender, and geographic location is used for sampling to ensure population representativeness. The background questions and measures are presented below.

- Gender
- Age
- Region
- Gross household income
- Education
- Employment
- Political orientation
- Religious orientation
- Marital status
- Number of children in household

To measure gender, respondents in some country-languages were prompted with "Gender", and others were asked "Are you..?". Respondents could answer "Male" or "Female" (Iceland includes a third option for non-binary). In some country-languages respondents are asked in which year they are born, in others they are asked how old they are. The region-question is formulated as "In which region do you live", and these are unique for each country. For some countries, two different region variables were provided, consisting of larger and smaller regions (e.g. region/municipality). The region variable is also grouped to match national representative sampling in each country.

Gross household income is an income variable that measures monthly or yearly (depending on the country) income. In addition, YouGov provides another Income variable based on an OECD model that groups respondents into three tiers of income (Lower/Middle/Higher) based on the country median national income. It is derived from the income variable and sorts respondents into the "Lower" category if they earn less than 75 % of the median, "Middle" if they earn between 75 % and 200 % of the median, and "Higher" if their salary is over 200 % of the median.

However, we did not receive the income level variable for 10 countries, which are Chile, Costa Rica, Estonia, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Slovenia, and South Korea. As the variable is deemed important, we decided to create and code these countries' income level by using the gross household income and an additional median disposable income data from OECD Income Distribution Database. We decided to use this income metric as it is the only data that could be calculated with median from the accessed database. When the country's gross household income is monthly, we adjusted the median income from yearly to monthly by dividing it by 12 months.

While we aimed to follow YouGov's original categorisation for the income level, the result of the 75% and 200% calculation from the OECD median does not adhere easily to the existing gross household income's categories or bins for each country. Therefore, in determining the lower and upper limit for the income level category, we selected the category that has the smallest absolute difference to YouGov's limit. The categories that fall below and including the selected category for the lower limit, will be considered as lower-level income. Categories after that, up to and including the selected category for the higher limit, will be considered as middle-level income. The categories beyond the higher limit will be considered as the higher-level income category. To illustrate this, we describe the adjustments and its detail in Table 4 and the result of categorisation on
Table 5.

Table 4 Income Level Adjustment for the 10 Countries

		Lower Limit				Higher Limit			
Country	Median (OECD DB)	75% from Median	Chosen Lower Limit Value	Lower Limit from Median	Diff. to 75%	200% from Median	Chosen Higher Limit Value	Higher Limit from Median	Diff. to 200%
Chile	564,216	423,162	450,000	79.76%	4.76%	1,128,431	1,200,000	212.68%	12.68%
Costa Rica	3,762,014	2,821,511		146.20%	71.20%	7,524,028	5,500,000	146.20%	-53.80%
Estonia	16,581	12,436	10,000	60.31%	-14.69%	33,162	35,000	211.08%	11.08%
Iceland	5,404,955	4,053,716	4,500,000	83.26%	8.26%	10,809,910	10,500,000	194.27%	-5.73%
Latvia	11,635	8,726	10,000	85.95%	10.95%	23,270	25,000	214.87%	14.87%
Lithuania	10,957	8,218	10,000	91.27%	16.27%	21,914	20,000	182.53%	-17.47%
Luxembourg	4,139	3,104	3,000	72.48%	-2.52%	8,278	7,000	169.13%	-30.87%
New Zealand	49,613	37,210	40,000	80.62%	5.62%	99,226	100,000	201.56%	1.56%
Slovenia	18,490	13,868	15,000	81.12%	6.12%	36,980	35,000	189.29%	-10.71%
South Korea	2,645,000	1,983,750	2,500,000	94.52%	19.52%	5,290,000	6,000,000	226.84%	26.84%

Table 5 Income Level Categorization Results for the 10 Countries

Country	Gross Household Bins As Lower Level	Gross Household Bins As Middle Level	Gross Household Bins As Higher Level
Chile	1 – 3	4 - 6	7 - 10
Costa Rica	–	1	2 – 11
Estonia	1 – 2	3 – 7	8 – 15
Iceland	1 – 4	5 – 10	11 - 13
Latvia	1 – 2	3 – 5	6 – 15
Lithuania	1 – 2	3 – 4	5 – 15
Luxembourg	1 – 5	6 – 12	13 – 14
New Zealand	1 – 3	4 – 9	10 – 13
Slovenia	1 – 3	4 – 7	8 – 15
South Korea	1	2 – 4	5 – 8

Costa Rica is the only country in the list that we had a significant issue when categorising the gross household income. The country's median income from OECD (3,762,014 Costa Rican Colon in 2022) falls in the first/lowest gross household income bin. 5,5 mill CRC (the lowest category) is in fact 146 % of the median. 200 % of the median (7,524,028 CRC) is within the second gross income category. This means that there is no gross household bin that can represent the lower income level category, as the separation between medium and high income was set between the first and second category (5,500,000 CRC, which is closer to 200 % than rather than the 75% limit (Table 4). The overall distribution of income variable is additionally heavily skewed towards the lower category, which is problematic. Unfortunately, there is nothing that neither YouGov nor the local survey team in Costa Rica could do about this variable post data collection. We kept the categorisation according to Table 5 and do therefore not have any values for "low income" for Costa Rica.

The education variable ("What is your **highest** level of education?") is a 10-point categorical scale from 1 ("I did not complete any formal education") to 10 ("Doctoral or equivalent degree"). The scale is the same in most countries[4], however, some of the values might have unique explanations that fits the education

[4] Exceptions are the US and Greece

system of each country. E.g. “Lower secondary education” is specified with either “(GCSEs or equivalent level)” or “(Junior High/Middle School)”.

The employment variable (“Which, if any, of the following options best describes your current employment status?”) has eight categories, in addition to “Other” and “Prefer not to say”:

- Working full time
- Working part time
- Temporarily unemployed (i.e. between jobs)
- Retired
- Permanently disabled
- Taking care of home or family
- Student
- Unemployed

The question about children in household (“how many of the people in your household are under 18?”) has six or seven categories, from “0” to [“5 or more” / “6 or more”]. Respondents can also answer “Don’t know” and “Prefer not to say”. The marital status-variable (“what is your current marital or relationship status?”) slightly varies in different countries, with either six or eight categories in addition to “Other” and “Prefer not to say”. The more elaborate category distinguishes between marriage and civil partnership (value 1), and between being in a relationship and living, or not living together (value 2).

- Married or common law
- In a relationship
- Single
- Divorced
- Separated
- Widowed

The political orientation-variable is measured as respondents’ intention to vote in the next election: “If there was a general election held tomorrow, which party would you vote for?”. YouGov already had lists of political parties as part of their question catalogue in some countries, and in the others, the translators (local to the country in question) were asked to help provide the list. The translators from Toppan were familiar with societal/political issues, and thus also familiar with the political system and parties in the country for which they were translating, and additionally, one of the coordinators at YouGov sense-checked the parties against online sources. The requirement to be included in the list were, in addition to new parties standing for elections, parties who received a minimum of 10 % of the votes in the previous election, and who still stand for election. In addition to the parties, respondents also had the option to choose “Would not vote”, and the UiB team also asked to have “Don’t know”, or “Prefer not to say” added. For some countries, there were also options to choose “Vote blank” or “Ineligible to vote”.

From the question we also generated a variable that categorises respondents’ orientation into left, centre, or right. This variable is a joint effort with our collaborators from the Norwegian Business School (NHH) and their network. We used World Political Cleavages and Inequality Database (WPID) as our starting point in the process as the database has coded most countries and political parties that are present in our data. For countries or political parties that are not covered by WPID, we used online resources to identify the political parties’ orientation. To ensure that our coding is faithful, we requested help from our translation quality checkers (Table 2) and other reviewers from NHH network. The compiled list of our collaborators for this variable can be found in Table 6.

Table 6 List of external reviewers (and affiliation) for political orientation

Country	Reviewers (Affiliation)
Australia	Alex Odlum (University of Lausanne)
Austria	Rene Karadakic (Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health)
Belgium	Tom Demeulemeester (University of Lausanne)
Canada	Sarah Maiter (York University)

Chile	Cristian Pérez Muñoz (University of Florida, Center for Latin American Studies)
Colombia	Catalina Franco (Norwegian School of Economics)
Costa Rica	Daniel Carvajal (Aalto University)
Czech Republic*	-
Denmark	Jonas Pilgaard Kaiser (TU Berlin)
England	Ottilie Tilston (University of Lausanne)
Estonia	Katre Luhamaa (University of Tartu)
Finland	Mikko Silliman (Aalto University)
France	Lucie Ducarre (University of Bergen)
Germany	Marlis Schneider (Norwegian School of Economics)
Greece	Jens Mangerud (Nordic Library at Athens)
Hungary	Adam Feher (University of Lausanne)
Iceland*	-
Ireland	Kenneth Burns (University College Cork)
Israel	Rami Benbenishty (Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Bar Ilan University)
Italy	Alessandro Pizzigolotto (University of Copenhagen)
Japan	Saki Nagano (Musashino University)
Latvia*	-
Lithuania	Giedre Seduikiene (Christian Michelsen Institute)
Luxembourg*	-
Mexico	Pablo Ignacio Soto-Mota (El Colegio de México)
Netherlands*	-
New Zealand	Claire Breen (University of Waikato)
Northern Ireland	Campbell Killick (Ulster University)
Norway*	-
Poland	Mateusz Mysliwski (Norwegian School of Economics)
Portugal*	-
Scotland	Ottilie Tilston (University of Lausanne)
Slovakia	Beáta Balogová (University of Prešov)
Slovenia	Vesna Leskošek (University of Ljubljana)
South Korea	Bong Joo Lee (Seoul National University)
Spain	Qquillacori Lopez (Norwegian School of Economics)
Sweden	David Bilen (Norwegian School of Economics)
Switzerland	Genevieve Guex (University of Lausanne)
Turkey*	-
US*	-
Wales*	-

*For Czech Republic, Iceland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, US, and Wales, we did not have external reviewers. However, we used different online sources compared to the initial orientation coding to ensure its quality.

The religious affiliation question is a standard YouGov question, and the following response alternatives are available for the question “Do you regard yourself as belonging to any particular religion, and if so, to which of these do you belong?”

- I do not regard myself as belonging to any particular religion
- Christianity – Protestantism
- Christianity – Catholicism

- Christianity – Other
- Islam – Sunni
- Islam – Shia
- Judaism
- Hinduism
- Buddhism
- Shinto
- Other
- Prefer not to say
- Don't know

One exception where we added "Christianity – Orthodox" when we fielded the survey in Greece, since this was not part of the standard list. Most citizens in Greece identify as Orthodox, and our country-language expert strongly argued for included this. The religious orientation question also included the option "Other". For us, it was important for respondents to also be able to say "Prefer not to say" and "Don't know", and these were added as alternatives.

When presented with both political orientation and religious orientation, the respondents were also informed that, "By answering this question, you will be giving your consent to YouGov using information about your [religious or philosophical beliefs/political opinions]. You can change this on your Account page at any time".

Attention checkers

We included attention checkers at two different points in the survey. The first attention checker was at the very beginning of the survey - after the background questions but before any of the substantial questions started. This attention checker asked respondents to select "Strongly agree" from the list of response alternatives that included five options ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents were informed that the question is a quality control question. The second attention checker was placed after 26 questions. Here we asked respondents to choose the number 4 from a list ranging from 1-5.

Roughly 16 % (n=6689) of the respondents failed either one or two of the attention check questions. 5200 respondents failed the first question, 511 respondents failed the second question, whilst 968 respondents failed both questions. From this distribution, we further examined the failure rate per country, which is derived from the number of respondents per country that failed either or both attention check questions by the total number of respondents per country. The results shows that Colombia (35.56%), Iceland (35.33%), and Slovakia (28.88%) have the highest failure rates. On the other hand, the lowest failure rates went to South Korea (5.69%) and Japan (7.07%).

Our first inquiry to this matter was to investigate whether failing the attention checks is correlated with being an outlier in terms of the time spent on the survey (i.e. completing the survey much faster or slower than other respondents). Our conclusion is that those who failed the attention checks did not deviate substantially in the time spent on the survey.

Secondly, we investigated whether the data collected is compromised if we remove observations that failed the attention check questions, particularly on the questions related to the experiments. For the initial test, we compared the data with and without those observations on the variables Q7-Q9 to which respondents are randomly assigned. The result for both datasets showed a similar conclusion in regard to the findings on the mean difference of the treatment groups' sub-questions, with one sub-question as an exception as there is a difference in conclusion. This test suggests that if we decided to only use the data with only observations that passed attention check questions, we would have a roughly similar result as if we used the whole data. Such comparisons will also be made for all other experimental questions to ensure full transparency.

We brought up this issue with YouGov, our survey providers, to cross-check our findings. They found that the data quality on the overall sample level is good as there is no suspicious behaviour detected. However, when investigating on the country level and the two attention questions, they also noticed the fail rate

difference between the first attention and the second attention question where the former is substantially higher.

During the discussion, we agreed that this result was out of expectation as respondents usually have a better attention and concentration in the beginning. YouGov argued that there might be an issue with the first question itself as it was less straightforward than the second attention question. They added that by having the phrase "This is a quality control question" before the instruction, it might make the question more unclear. Nevertheless, they suggested that while using the whole data is still possible, another option is to remove only the respondents that failed the second attention question. We decided to do the latter and use the cleaned data for further analyses on the survey items.

The following Table 7 shows each country's failure rate (for only the second attention check-question) and its respective number of observations, sorted by highest fail rate to lowest. By removing the observations that failed the second attention question, we removed roughly 3.6% or 1479 observations.

Table 7 Country's Failure Rate and Number of Observations

Country	Failure Rate (%)	Number of Observations
Colombia	7.826	81
Turkey	6.341	65
Greece	6.329	65
Slovakia	5.935	60
Iceland	5.81	61
Ireland	5.324	55
Poland	5.268	53
Switzerland	5.181	53
Latvia	5.159	52
Austria	4.951	51
Hungary	4.64	47
Mexico	4.568	47
Costa Rica	4.532	46
Czech Republic	4.444	46
France	4.415	46
Belgium	4.219	44
Slovenia	3.988	41
Canada	3.835	39
Netherlands	3.736	39
Lithuania	3.346	34
US	3.34	67
Spain	3.254	33
Estonia	3.216	32
Germany	2.78	29
Denmark	2.721	28
Portugal	2.626	27
Sweden	2.515	26
Italy	2.458	25
Luxembourg	2.398	17
Norway	2.362	24
Chile	2.191	22
Wales	2.083	21
Scotland	1.777	18
Australia	1.49	15
England	1.437	15
Finland	1.346	14
Japan	1.277	13

New Zealand	1.193	12
South Korea	1.098	11
Northern Ireland	0.988	5
Total	3.6% of All Observation	1479

Experiments

There are eleven different experiments within the questionnaire, and all are randomised independently of each other and distributed among the respondents. The table below shows the questions and their experimental designs. In addition to these questions, in one question (Q32), the order of response alternatives was randomised to avoid question order bias.

Table 8 Overview experimental questions

Q No.	N treatments	Distribution	Follow up question
Q5-6	2	50 %	No
Q7-9	3	33 %	No, but consists of six items
Q11-14	3	25 %	Q11-14A
Q15-16	2	50 %	Q15-16A or B
Q17-18	2	50 %	No, but consists of three items
Q20-22	3	33 %	Q20-22A
Q23-26	4	25 %	Q23-26A
Q27-28	2	50 %	Q27-28A
Q30-31	2	50 %	No, but consists of three items
Q39-40	2	50 %	Q39-40A
Q41-Q48	4	25 %	Q42; Q44; Q46; Q48

Replicated questions

Some of the questions fielded in this survey are replications from previous surveys, some of which are questions that have been conducted by DIPA affiliates, and others are from large cross-national surveys. The table below provides an overview of the replication questions, their source, and whether translations in the four languages exists, including English for the 'master document'. Where translations existed, those formulations were also used in this survey.

Table 9 Overview of replicated questions

Question	Source
Q1-3	Swedlow, B. and Wyckoff, M. L. 2009. "Value Preferences and Ideological Structuring of Attitudes in American Public Opinion." *American Politics Research* 37 (6): 1048–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X09333959.
Q11-14	Gallup 2020, Welfare section of survey in 60 countries, collaboration between UiB (Skivenes) and NHH (Cappelen & Tungodden)
Q17-18	Loen, M. and Skivenes, M. 2023. Legitimate child protection interventions and the dimension of confidence: A comparative analysis of populations views in six European countries. *Journal of Social Policy:* 1-20. 10.1017/S004727942300003X
Q27-28	Burns, K., Helland, H.S., Križ, K., Sánchez-Cabezudo, S.S., Skivenes, M. and Strömpl, J. 2021. Corporal punishment and reporting to child protection authorities: An empirical study of population attitudes in five European countries. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 120 (2021) 105749
Q29; Q36; Q38	"Four country survey" conducted by the Centre for Research on Discretion and Paternalism in May and June 2023. Methodology report and questionnaire available at https://discretion.uib.no/supplementary-documentation/#1552296903999-5fea5d9a-4dc9
Q30-31; Q39-48	Bartling, B., Cappelen, A.W., Hermes, H., Skivenes, M., Tungodden, B. 2023. Free to fail? Paternalistic preferences in the United States, DICE Discussion Paper, No. 400, ISBN 978-3-86304-399-5, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Düsseldorf

Question	Source
Q32	Engelhardt, A.M., Feldman, S. & Hetherington, M.J. 2021. Advancing the Measurement of Authoritarianism. *Political Behavior* https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-021-09718-6
Q33-35	Madsen, M., Mayoral, J., Strezhnev, A., & Voeten, E. 2022. Sovereignty, Substance, and Public Support for European Courts' Human Rights Rulings. American Political Science Review, 116(2), 419- 438. doi:10.1017/S0003055421001143
Q37	Juhasz, I.B. and Skivenes, M. 2016. The Population's Confidence in the Child Protection System – A Survey Study of England, Finland, Norway and the United States (California). *Social Policy & Administration* 51(7): 1330-1347. https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12226
Q49-50	Berrick, J.B., Skivenes, M. and Roscoe, J.N. 2023. Public perceptions of child protection, children's rights, and personal values: An assessment of two states. Children and Youth Services Review. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.childyouth.2023.106960

National variation/special circumstances to note

Australia (English)
No special circumstances to note.

Austria (Austrian)
Q7-Q9, Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22, Q33, Q35, Q38: Gender inclusive wording (-in/ -innen) added to translations of words such as "Social worker", "case worker", "judge", "Austrian", "politician".

Q11-Q14a: No word exists for parent (singular) in German/Austrian, so "Die Eltern" (plural) was applied.

Q20-Q22: Original translation missing parts of sentence "with her friends". This was added by our country expert.

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use "drugs".

Q29-3: Austria does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied "ethnic minorities" ("Etnische minderheden").

Belgium (French and Dutch)
French
Gender inclusive wording added to translations of words, including "child" ("un.e enfant"), adjectives describing children (".e", ".se", ".ve") in Q32, "proud" in Q35 (fier.ère).

Q5/Q6: Original translation missing sentence "The 12-year-old likes the current school and does not want to change schools". This was added by our country expert.

Q20-Q22: Gender inclusive wording (-ice) added to translation of "Teacher".

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use "illicit substances".

Q29-3: Belgium does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied "ethnic minorities" ("Les minorités ethniques").

Q39-Q48 Preamble: Original translation missing sentences "The decisions you make are independent of each other" and "Remember that your decisions have real consequences". This was added by our country expert.

Dutch
Gender inclusive wording added to translations of words, including "his/her" (zijn/haar") when referring to a child.

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use "drugs".

Q29-3: Belgium does not have what would typically be referred to as “Indigenous people”, so we applied “ethnic minorities” (“Ethnische minderheden”).

Canada (English and French)

English

No special circumstances to note.

French

Gender inclusive wording added to translations of words, including “child” (“un/-e enfant”), “his/her” (il/elle”), adjectives describing children (“(e)”, “/-se”, “/-ve”) in Q32, “citizen”, “proud”, in Q33 and Q35.

Q15/Q16: Gender inclusive ending added to “child” in this question, where the original, English translation specified that it is boy.

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use “illicit substances”.

Chile (Spanish)

Gender inclusive language used for child (“un(a) menor”, for plural: “la niñez”), “his/her” (hijo/hija), “(a)” added to translations of words such as “social worker” and “judge”, “teacher” in Q7-Q9, Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22, Q27-Q28, and Q37, and to adjectives describing children in Q32, “proud” in Q35.

Q15/Q16: Gender inclusive ending added to “child” in this question, where the original, English translation specified that it is boy.

Colombia (Spanish)

Gender inclusive language used for child (“un(a) menor”, for plural: “la niñez”), “his/her” (hijo/hija), “(a)” added to translations of words such as “social worker” and “judge”, “teacher” in Q7-Q9, Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22, Q27-Q28, and Q37.

Q15/Q16: Gender inclusive ending added to “child” in this question, where the original, English translation specified that it is boy.

Costa Rica (Spanish)

Gender inclusive language used for child (“un(a) menor”, for plural: “la niñez”), “his/her” (hijo/hija), “(a)” added to translations of words such as “social worker” and “judge”, “teacher” in Q7-Q9, Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22, Q27-Q28, and Q37.

Q15/Q16: Gender inclusive ending added to “child” in this question, where the original, English translation specified that it is boy.

Czech Republic (Czech)

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use “addictive substances”.

Q29-3: Czech Republic does not have what would typically be referred to as “Indigenous people”, so we applied “ethnic minorities” (“Národnostní menšiny”).

Denmark (Danish)

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use “illegal drugs”.

Q29-3: Denmark does not have what would typically be referred to as “Indigenous people”, so we applied ethnic minorities (“Etniske minoriteter”).

Estonia (Estonian)

No special circumstances to note.

Finland (Finnish)
No special circumstances to note.

France (French)
Gender inclusive wording added to translations of words, including "child" ("un/-e enfant"), "his/her" (il/elle"), adjectives describing children ("(e)", "/-se", "/-ve") in Q32, "citizen", "proud", in Q33 and Q35.

Q15/Q16: Gender inclusive ending added to "child" in this question, where the original, English translation specified that it is boy.

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use "illicit substances".

Q29-3: France does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied ethnic minorities ("Les minorités ethniques").

Q36-5: One in this item should have been removed ("conseils") from "à l'administration locale conseils", but was not.

Germany (German)
Q7-Q9, Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22, Q33, Q35, Q38: Gender inclusive wording (-in/ -innen) added to translations of words such as "Social worker", "case worker", "judge", "German", "politician".

Q11-Q14a: No word exists for parent (singular) in German, so "Die Eltern" (plural) was applied.

Q20-Q22: Original translation missing parts of sentence "with her friends". This was added by our country expert.

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use "drugs".

Q29-3: Germany does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied ethnic minorities ("Ethnische Minderheiten").

Greece (Greek)
Religion: Added the option of "Christianity – Orthodox" as most citizens in Greece identify as Orthodox, and our country-language expert strongly argued for included this. The option is not part of YouGov's standard Religion question.

Q29-3: Greece does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied ethnic minorities ("Εθνοτικέςμειονότητες").

Hungary (Hungarian)
Q29-3: Hungary does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied national and ethnic minorities ("Nemzeti és etnikai kisebbségek").

Iceland (Icelandic)
Q29-3: We used the term "Natives" in Iceland ("Innfædda").

Ireland (English)
Q29-3: Ireland does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied "Ethnic minorities".

Israel (Hebrew)
Q15/Q16: The questions vary the religious affiliation of the family (The biological parents are deeply religious [NONE (Q15)/ and belong to a small religious community (Q16)]), but as recommended by the country-expert, for question 16 we used "deeply religious and belong to a Christian group" in Israel.

Q29-3: Israel does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied ethnic minorities («מיעוטים אתניים»).

Italy (Italian)
Instead of using child (bambino/bambina) the Italian translation used the gender neutral "minore" (minor).

Q29-3: Italy does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied ethnic minorities ("Le minoranze etniche").

Japan (Japanese)
Q29-3: We used the term "First inhabitants" in Japan ("先住民").

South Korea (Korean)
Q29-3: We used the term "Minority" in South Korea ("소수민족").

Latvia (Latvian)
No special circumstances to note.

Lithuania (Lithuanian)
Q29-3: Lithuania does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied ethnic minorities ("Etninės mažumos").

Luxembourg (Luxembourgish, French, German)
German
Q7-Q9, Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22, Q33, Q35, Q38: Gender inclusive wording (-in/ -innen) added to translations of words such as "Social worker", "case worker", "judge", "citizen", "politician".

Q11-Q14a: No word exists for parent (singular) in German, so "Die Eltern" (plural) was applied.

Q20-Q22: Original translation missing parts of sentence "with her friends". This was added by our country expert.

Q29-3: Luxembourg does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied ethnic minorities ("Etnische minderheden").

Q39-Q48 Preamble: Original translation missing sentence "Remember that your decisions have real consequences". This was added by our country expert.

French
Gender inclusive wording added to translations of words, including "child" ("un/-e enfant"), "his/her" (il/elle"), adjectives describing children ("(e)", "/-se", "/-ve") in Q32, "citizen", "proud", in Q33 and Q35.

Q5/Q6: Original translation missing sentence "The 12-year-old likes the current school and does not want to change schools". This was added by our country expert.

Q15/Q16: Gender inclusive ending added to "child" in this question, where the original, English translation specified that it is boy.

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use "illicit substances".

Q29-3: Luxembourg does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied ethnic minorities ("Les minorités ethniques").

Q39-Q48 Preamble: Missing the following sentences "The decisions you make are independent of each other" and "Remember that your decisions have real consequences" and was not added by the country expert.

Luxembourgish
Q7-Q9, Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22, Q33, Q35, Q38: Gender inclusive wording added to translations of words such as “Social worker”, “case worker”, “judge”, “citizen”, “politician”.

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use “medication”.

Q29-3: Luxembourg does not have what would typically be referred to as “Indigenous people”, so we applied ethnic minorities (“Ethnesch Minoritéiten”).

Mexico (Spanish)
Gender inclusive language used for child (“un(a) menor”, for plural: “la niñez”), “his/her” (hijo/hija), “(a)” added to translations of words such as “social worker” and “judge”, “teacher” in Q7-Q9, Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22, Q27-Q28, and Q37.

Q15/Q16: Gender inclusive ending added to “child” in this question, where the original, English translation specified that it is boy.

Netherlands (Dutch)
Gender inclusive language used for “their” (“zijn/haar”) when referring to a child.

Q29-3: The Netherlands does not have what would typically be referred to as “Indigenous people”, so we applied ethnic minorities (“Ethnische minderheden”).

New Zealand (English)
No special circumstances to note.

Norway (Norwegian)
Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use “drugs”.

Poland (Polish)
No special circumstances to note.

Portugal (Portuguese)
Gender inclusive language used for child (“o/a seu/ua filho/a”) and (“a”) added to translations of words such as “social worker”, “teacher”, “experts” in Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22, Q27-Q28, Q38.

Q29-3: Portugal does not have what would typically be referred to as “Indigenous people”, so we applied ethnic minorities (“Minorias étnicas”).

Slovak Republic (Slovakian)
Q29-3: Slovakia does not have what would typically be referred to as “Indigenous people”, so we applied ethnic minorities (“Etnické Menšiny”).

Slovenia (Slovenian)
Gender inclusive endings added to translations of words such as “social worker”, “teacher”, “experts” in Q7-Q9, Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22.

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use “illegal substances”.

Q29-3: Slovakia does not have what would typically be referred to as “Indigenous people”, so we applied ethnic minorities (“Etnične manjšine”).

Spain (Spanish)
Gender inclusive language used for child (“un(a) menor”, for plural: “la niñez”), “his/her” (hijo/hija), “(a)” added to translations of words such as “social worker” and “judge”, “teacher” in Q7-Q9, Q15/Q16, Q20-Q22, Q27-Q28, and Q37.

Q15/Q16: Gender inclusive ending added to "child" in this question, where the original, English translation specified that it is boy.

Q29-3: Spain does not have what would typically be referred to as "Indigenous people", so we applied ethnic minorities ("Las minorías étnicas").

Sweden (Swedish)
Gender inclusive language used for "their" ("hen") when referring to a child.

Q15/Q16: Gender inclusive ending added to "child" in this question, where the original, English translation specified that it is boy.

Q29-3: Although Sweden has what would typically be referred to as "indigenous people", ethnic minorities was applied ("Etniske minoriteter").

Switzerland (German and French)
German
Q7-Q9, Q37: In Switzerland, different cantons have different systems for child protection decision making, and in most the German speaking parts of Switzerland, child protection decisions are made by an interdisciplinary body consisting of minimum three members, thus "judge" was translated to "A member of the Child and Adult Protection Authority" ("Ein Mitglied der Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutzbehörde (KESB)").

Q11-Q14a: No word exists for parent (singular) in German, "Der/Die biologische Vater/Mutter" ("the biological father/mother") was applied.

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use "drugs".
Q39-Q48 Preamble: Original translation missing sentence "Remember that your decisions have real consequences". This was added by our country expert.

French
Gender inclusive wording added to translations of words, including "child" ("un/-e enfant"), "his/her" (il/elle"), adjectives describing children ("(e)", "/-se", "/-ve") in Q32, "citizen", "proud", in Q33 and Q35.

Q5/Q6: Original translation missing sentence "The 12-year-old likes the current school and does not want to change schools". This was added by our country expert.

Q7-Q9, Q37: In Switzerland, different cantons have different systems for child protection decision making, and in most French speaking parts of Switzerland, child protection decisions are made by an interdisciplinary body consisting of minimum three members, thus "judge" was translated to "A judge/member of the Child and Adult Protection Authority" ("Un juge/member d'une authorité de protection de l'enfant et de 'adulte (APEA)").

Q15/Q16: Gender inclusive ending added to "child" in this question, where the original, English translation specified that it is boy.

Q20-Q22: Original translation missing parts of sentence "with her friends" and was not added by our country expert.

Q24/Q26: Uses formulation where mother/father is described to use "illicit substances".

Q29-3: We used the term for ethnic minorities ("Les minorités ethniques") in French.

Q39-Q48 Preamble: Missing the following sentences "The decisions you make are independent of each other" and was not added by the country expert.

Turkey (Turkish)
No special circumstances to note.

UK England (English)
At the start of the survey, respondents were provided with a short introduction to the topic, as is the standard for YouGov's surveys in the UK:
"This survey is on the topic of child, family and welfare policies, and the results will be used to inform our client. Your YouGov Account will be credited 150 points for completing the survey. We have tested the survey and found that, on average it takes around 20 minutes to complete. This time may vary depending on factors such as your Internet connection speed and the answers you give. Please click the forward button below to continue".

UK Scotland (English)
At the start of the survey, respondents were provided with a short introduction to the topic, as is the standard for YouGov's surveys in the UK:
"This survey is on the topic of child, family and welfare policies, and the results will be used to inform our client. Your YouGov Account will be credited 150 points for completing the survey. We have tested the survey and found that, on average it takes around 20 minutes to complete. This time may vary depending on factors such as your Internet connection speed and the answers you give. Please click the forward button below to continue".

UK Wales (English)
At the start of the survey, respondents were provided with a short introduction to the topic, as is the standard for YouGov's surveys in the UK:
"This survey is on the topic of child, family and welfare policies, and the results will be used to inform our client. Your YouGov Account will be credited 150 points for completing the survey. We have tested the survey and found that, on average it takes around 20 minutes to complete. This time may vary depending on factors such as your Internet connection speed and the answers you give. Please click the forward button below to continue".

Q29-3: We used the term "Black and minority people" in Wales instead of "Indigenous people".

UK Northern Ireland (English)
At the start of the survey, respondents were provided with a short introduction to the topic, as is the standard for YouGov's surveys in the UK:
"This survey is on the topic of child, family and welfare policies, and the results will be used to inform our client. Your YouGov Account will be credited 150 points for completing the survey. We have tested the survey and found that, on average it takes around 20 minutes to complete. This time may vary depending on factors such as your Internet connection speed and the answers you give. Please click the forward button below to continue".

USA (English)
No special circumstances to note.

Currency

Q39-48 in the survey refers to two different sums of money of which one, based on the respondents' answer, is given to a random respondent who completes a task. These sums were converted to the national currencies in all countries. The default sums were USD 4 and USD 10. Our collaborators from the Norwegian Business School (NHH) converted these sums to all other currencies. The starting points for the conversion were PPP-adjusted values. It was essential to keep the two sums at the same relative size as the original (i.e., 4/10), so the further adjustments kept the deviation from the relative payment size to a minimum. Furthermore, deviation from the PPP-adjusted values were kept to a minimum, and the sums were rounded to integers based on a set of rules:

- below 5, round to full integers
- 5 to 30, round to multiples of 2
- 30 to 100, round to 20s

- 100 and above, round to 200s

Ethical considerations

The project was registered in Rette (UiBs internal system for risk and compliance with data protection in research projects) with registration number R3259. Collaborators at The Norwegian Business School (NHH) also applied and received an IRB approval from an ethics committee prior to fielding the survey.

For questions with sensitive information (political and religious beliefs), we made sure to include "I prefer not to answer" and "Don't know" options.

Participation incentives

YouGov incentivises panel members to participate in surveys. The following disclaimer is taken from the UiB and YouGov's contract:
"We do also incentivise panellists with points that can be redeemed for cash and gift cards, and these rewards are deliberately pitched on the conservative side versus other players in the market to mitigate the risk of attracting professional survey takers."

For any questions or inquiries about the survey or methodology, please contact PI Marit Skivenes (marit.skivenes@uib.no) as well as PhD Candidate Mathea Loen (mathea.loen@uib.no).

Addendum – quality control and exclusion of data from Luxembourg

In addition to the data quality control performed by the data providers before we receive the data, we have performed several rounds of quality controls. We have reviewed and analyzed question translations, response styles and patterns, attention checker failure rates, deviations and outliers and representativity.

In our work with research paper, it became clear that the Luxembourgish sample was an extreme outlier. The sample has average question responses that frequently fall more than two standard deviations away from the averages in all other countries (see this report). This led us to conduct several additional rounds of examinations and tests.

Luxembourg is a small country with around 680.000 citizens, and the sample for our study constituted 709 respondents. The sample is underrepresented by older respondents (45+) and slightly overrepresented by the youngest respondent group (18-24), see Table 10 below. There are three official spoken languages in Luxembourg: French, German and Luxembourgish. Thorough translation re-checks were conducted, and no substantial deviations were found. Data provider YouGov do not register in their system a variable indicating which language the respondents used responding to the survey, and we can therefore not examine if deviations are stemming from one or several of the language subsamples.

Table 10 Population and sample characteristics, Luxembourg sample

		Sample				Population	
		Unweighted		Weighted**			
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	18-24	114	16,1	74403	14,0	53382	9,6
	25-34	188	26,5	116919	22,0	106857	19,3
	35-44	188	26,5	116919	22,0	106665	19,3
	45+	219	30,9	223209	42,0	286724	51,8
Gender	Female	355	50,1	265726	50,0	276502	49,9
	Male	354	49,9	265726	50,0	277126	50,1
Total		709	100,0	531452	100,0	553628	100,0

Notes: ** refers to number (N) and share (%) of samples when are assigned population weights, which is a product of post-stratification weights and number of populations. [1] Population data in Luxembourg is from 2025 (https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Topics%2C1%7CPopulation%20and%20employment%23B%23%7CPopulation%20structure%23B1%23&pg=0&fc=Topics&lc=en&snb=9&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_B1102&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&dq=A..&lom=LASTNOBSERVATIONS&lo=1&pd=2015%2C2025&to[TIME_PERIOD]=false).

We compared survey questions from our survey with comparable questions from the European Value Survey (albeit from 2008, as this is the latest survey including Luxembourg), and we find great differences in the aggregate responses (see this report). These deviations are largely unexplainable from a substantial (social, cultural, political) perspective and indicate that there is something wrong with our data.

The confirmation that the Luxembourg data is flawed, came when we reviewed the time respondents had spent responding to the survey questions. The sample has an unusually low LOI (length of interview), see Table 11 below and Report on Time Spent per Question Set per Country. A few excepts found in this report follows: Q28 has a vignette with 133 words and estimated reading time is 34 seconds (excl. the follow-up question). Median time spent on this question for Luxembourgish respondents is 4.52 seconds. The second lowest median time spent is Israel (26.01 seconds), and the highest spent time is Colombia with 44.77 seconds.

Q1-3 are short questions, around 80 words in total, which is estimated to take 20 seconds to read. The total time across the three questions takes on average 8.22 seconds in Luxembourg. The second lowest time spent is South Korea with 17.21 seconds, and the highest is again Colombia with 37.71 seconds.

The response time on Q41-48 also raise significant concern. The respondents receive a pair of two questions (e.g. Q41 and Q42). In total these questions are 260 words, and estimated reading time is over 1 minute. Respondents from Luxembourg used on average 4.25 seconds on the two questions in total. The other countries vary from 18.25 seconds (South Korea) to 53.50 seconds (Iceland).

In general, there are only a few questions across the entire questionnaire where Luxembourgish respondents spend double-digit seconds answering the questions.

Table 11 Length of interview, country averages

Country	Minutes	Seconds	Mean total time (sec)	Mean total time (mm:ss)
Iceland	35	30	2129.9616	35:30
Mexico	29	59	1799.4228	29:59
Australia	27	30	1649.9829	27:30
Costa Rica*	27	11	1630.7809	27:11
Colombia	24	58	1498.4607	24:58
Ireland	24	28	1468.0116	24:28
Estonia	23	54	1434.3871	23:54
Canada	22	52	1371.7802	22:52
Austria	22	26	1345.5575	22:26
Slovenia*	22	20	1340.0710	22:20
Italy	22	5	1324.9152	22:05
Chile	21	51	1311.1574	21:51
Israel*	21	49	1308.7530	21:49
Poland	21	47	1307.1950	21:47
Slovakia	21	43	1303.0618	21:43
US	21	26	1286.1460	21:26
Germany	21	23	1283.3471	21:23
Czech Republic	20	26	1225.7020	20:26
Sweden	20	5	1204.7212	20:05
New Zealand	20	0	1200.3388	20:00
Belgium	19	39	1179.1138	19:39
Portugal	19	39	1178.8644	19:39
Hungary	19	24	1163.6228	19:24
Norway	19	23	1162.9982	19:23
Finland	19	19	1159.4265	19:19
Wales	19	19	1159.3581	19:19
Denmark	19	9	1149.3915	19:09
Northern Ireland	19	6	1145.8869	19:06
Spain	19	0	1140.4089	19:00
Switzerland	18	45	1125.2006	18:45
England	18	33	1113.2230	18:33
Turkey	18	29	1109.2574	18:29
Greece	18	28	1107.8810	18:28
Scotland	18	14	1094.0139	18:14
Latvia*	18	14	1093.9277	18:14
France	17	51	1070.8658	17:51
Netherlands	17	42	1062.3272	17:42
Lithuania*	17	3	1023.4231	17:03
Japan	14	37	876.7460	14:37
South Korea	14	21	860.7339	14:21
Luxembourg*	7	59	479.2411	7:59

Note: Countries marked with asterisk (*) had data collected by YouGov's subcontractor CINT.

Data from Luxembourg was collected by YouGov's subcontractor, CINT, and this company was also responsible for data collection in Costa Rica, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia. As part of the quality control, we have thus also looked at the LOI for these countries (see also Table 11). No significant deviations were found in these samples.

In sum, this has made us conclude that the data collection process in Luxembourg is not valid, and that data is fabricated using a machine to respond to the questions, or the like.

It is also concerning that this has not been detected earlier by the team at YouGov which is responsible for data quality. After proposing this inquiry and discussions together with YouGov representative and UiB's procurement representative, the DIPA research team decided to exclude Luxembourg data.

Changes from the Previous Versions

23 March 2026

- Updated links to additional reports/analyses on the "Addendum" section. The reports: 1) Mean per Country, 2) Luxembourg Comparison between EVS and 41C data, and 3) Report on Time Spent per Question Set per Country; are now available on DIPA website, linked directly to the respective report files.

02 February 2026

- Further elaboration on the investigation and quality control of the data has been added, including a substantial presentation of the anomalies found in the sample from Luxembourg, and an examination of samples from the other countries that were collected from the same subcontractor that collected data in Luxembourg.

08 January 2026

- Added short explanation on the data from Luxembourg as it is removed effectively from the study dataset. This reflects the research team's internal decision on the case from 17 December 2025. Translation checks and adjustments on background variables (e.g.: income level, political orientation) for Luxembourg data prior to the anomaly findings are still included in this report for transparency purposes.

15 April 2025

- Added paragraph on political orientation (left, right, centre) background variable.