

METHODOLOGY RAPPORT FOR SURVEY

Contents

Introduction.....	2
Summary	2
Aim of the Survey	2
Data Provider.....	2
Question formulation	3
Translations and quality checks	4
Questions.....	5
Experiments.....	5
Replicated questions	6
National variation/special circumstances to note.....	7
Norway	7
Finland	8
Romania.....	8
Survey company methodology.....	9
Ethical considerations	9

Introduction

This survey has been conducted by Faktum Markedsanalyse AS on behalf of Centre for Research on Discretion and Paternalism (DIPA), Department of Government, University of Bergen (UiB) and is part of the Legitimacy challenges for children's rights and the child protection system project (funded by the Norwegian Research Council, Grant Agreement Nr. 302042). The survey is designed to examine citizens' attitudes towards child protection and children's rights. Respondents from four countries have participated in the survey: Norway, Finland, Romania, and Poland.¹ The following report contains information regarding the development, translation and quality checking of survey questions, data collection methodology, and ethical considerations.

Summary

The questionnaire on citizens' attitudes towards child protection and children's rights (consisting of 31 questions) was sent to representative samples in four countries (Norway, Finland, Poland, and Romania) based on age, gender, and region between 08.05.2023 and 27.06.2023. The survey also includes seven different experiments. We received data from a total of 4000 respondents, 1000 respondents from each country. Professor Marit Skivenes is the principal investigator (PI) for the project and data collection, and PhD fellow Mathea Loen has been responsible for administering all steps of the data collection process.

Aim of the Survey

The data will be used primarily by PI Prof. Skivenes and the team of the Centre for Research on Discretion and Paternalism (DIPA) (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

Centre for Research on Discretion on Paternalism (DIPA) hired Faktum Markedsanalyse AS (Hereafter Faktum) to implement a web survey (setup of a web survey platform, respondent consent procedure, data collection, creation of data files, and data delivery) with representative samples from the adult population in all four countries (Norway, Finland, Poland, and Romania). Faktum provided a sample of 1000 respondents from each country, based on age, gender and geography. Faktum provided a set of standard background questions for the survey:

- Gender
- Age
- Region in the country

¹ This survey was part of the procurement ANSK-22-0562, between The University of Bergen and Faktum Markedsanalyse AS, and constitutes the survey called "Survey C – 4 countries" in the procurement inquiry, which contained the following specifications: 12 minutes questionnaire length with translations of the questionnaire.

- Annual income (total gross income for household)
- Education
- Employment

Faktum cooperates with Syno International (Syno), an international survey company, to provide the necessary methods for data collection and processing. For this survey, Syno provided the programming, scripting, and data management. The samples for this survey were drawn from Syno's own panel, as well as panels from CINT and Gallup. Table 1 below shows information about the panel sizes, languages, and privacy regulations.

Faktum/Syno received the finalised survey form from DIPA, including questions, response alternatives, and instructions regarding skips and filters. Faktum also provided translations from English to Norwegian, Finnish, Polish and Romanian through the translation company Taurho Transcribes. The survey was then administered as ad-hoc surveys via Syno's platform (which is designed to work for PC, laptop, smartphones, and tablets).

Table 1 Information on panels (Syno's survey panels)

Country	Panel size	Language in survey form	Privacy regulations
Norway	253,428	Norwegian	EU Rules; GDPR
Finland	352,418	Finnish	EU Rules; GDPR
Poland	2,002,841	Polish	EU Rules; GDPR
Romania	1,388,362	Romanian	EU Rules; GDPR

Question formulation

The design of the survey is undertaken by a collaboration between five researchers affiliated with DIPA. Most of the questions in the survey were developed by these contributors, which are Marit Skivenes (principal investigator, UiB), Asgeir Falch-Eriksen (UiB/OsloMet), Øyvind Tefre (HVL), Victor Cepoi (UiB), and Mathea Loen (survey administrator, UiB). Some questions are replications of previous surveys, and some questions are based on previous design (an overview is provided in Table 4). The background questions are standard information provided by Faktum and in addition the research team added background questions on self-placement on political left-right scale, marital status, number of children in household, and the income variables for Romania and Finland.

The question formulation took place 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. All questions were developed in English, which compromised the "master document" and basis for translations.

Translations and quality checks

The English “master document” was sent to Faktum in April 2023 for translations. DIPA recruited native-speaking external quality checkers, with expertise in child protection and /or welfare state systems, from each country to review the translations. The following researchers assisted with the external quality checks:

- Norway
 - Barbara Ruiken (University of Bergen, Norway)
- Finland
 - Tarja Pösö (Tempere University, Finland)
 - Ira Malmberg-Heimonen (OsloMet, Norway)
- Poland
 - Alicja Olkowska (OsloMet, Norway)
 - Malgorzata Agnieszka Cyndecka (University of Bergen, Norway)
- Romania
 - Victor Cepoi (University of Ljubljana, Slovenia; University of Bergen, Norway) and Gabriel Bădescu (Babes-Bolyai University, Romania)

After receiving the initial translations from Faktum, the quality checkers/country experts reviewed the translations. 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. The external reviewers are all familiar with child protection terminology.

The quality checkers/country experts 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 contributors, ensuring that the translations were measuring what it was supposed to measure. Following the external quality checks, the translated surveys were returned to Faktum for scripting.

After test link and script were received, the contributors conducted careful and extensive revision of the test link and script. Three background questions (Political orientation, Marital status, Number of children in household) that were supposed to be part of the initial form were left out. DIPA had previously conducted a survey in the same countries where these questions had been used, so without much extra effort, these questions were added to the forms for each country before the revisions and feedback on the test link and script were sent back to Faktum.

Faktum’s standard background questions were added to the forms after the review of the initial translations. Upon discussions with country experts, it became clear that some of these background questions were not ideal for our purpose. We ended up using new or previously used questions for some of the background questions in some of the countries. These are specified below, including information about the source and existing translations. Once the revisions were done, Faktum initiated soft launch in each country, with responses ranging from 29 to 64 (see table 2 above).

An overview of the process (with dates) is presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Survey process overview

	Norway	Finland	Poland	Romania
Initial translation received	25.04.2023	01.05.2023	01.05.2023	01.05.2023
Feedback on translations sent to Faktum	27.04.2023	12.05.2023	11.08.2023	09.08.2023
Test link and script received	03.05.2023	16.05.2023	16.05.2023	11.05.2023
Soft launched²	08.05.2023	26.05.2023	27.05.2023	31.05.2023
Soft launch data received	08.05.2023	29.05.2023 (05.06.2023)	30.05.2023	01.06.2023
N soft launch respondents	64	48 (143)	51	29
Full data received	27.06.2023	27.06.2023	27.06.2023	27.06.2023
N total respondents	1000	1000	1000	1000

During all steps (question formulation, translation, quality check, scripting, review of test link) of the process, there have been internal discussions among collaborators in this survey. Another survey project was developed for the PARTICIPATION project at DIPA, and experiences have been exchanged between coordinators of the two surveys. In addition, the principal investigator on the CHALLENGES project has quality-checked all aspects of the survey.

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.

Questions

Experiments

There are seven different experiments within the questionnaire. Table 3 below shows the questions and their experimental designs.

² The survey was soft launched in Finland twice due to changes made in the income variable.

Table 3 Overview of experiments in survey

Q No.	n treatments	Control	Distribution	Randomisation
6	2	No	50 % for each treatment	Yes*
9	2	No	50 % for each treatment	Yes
15	4 incl. control	Yes	25 % for each treatment (incl. control)	Yes
22	2	No	50 % for each treatment	Yes
24	3	No	33 % for each treatment	Yes
26	2	No	50 % for each treatment	Yes*
28	4	no	50 % for each treatment	Yes

* Randomisation was the same for Q6 and Q26, due to a link between the two questions.

Replicated questions

Some of the questions fielded in this survey are replications or based on previous surveys, some of which are questions that have been conducted by DIPA affiliates, and others are from large crossnational surveys. The table below provides an overview of these questions, their source, and whether translations in the four languages exists, including English for the 'master document'. Where translations existed, they were used in this survey.

Table 4 Overview of replicated questions

Question	Source	Translations
Q6 – A1	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). <i>Social Policy & Administration</i> 51(7): 1330-1347. https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12226	English Norwegian
Q7	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. <i>Journal of Social Policy</i> : 1-20. 10.1017/S004727942300003X	All countries

Question	Source	Translations
Q9 – B1	ISSP Research Group (2016). International Social Survey Programme: Family and Changing Gender Roles IV - ISSP 2012. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5900 Data file Version 4.0.0, https://doi.org/10.4232/1.12661 .	English Norwegian Finnish Polish
Q12	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. <i>Children and Youth Services Review</i> . https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2023.106960	English Norwegian
Q16	Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. 2004. Does Identity or Economic Rationality Drive Public Opinion on European Integration? <i>Political Science & Politics</i> 37(3):415-420. doi:10.1017/S1049096504004585	English Norwegian*
Q17-Q19	Madsen, M., Mayoral, J., Strezhnev, A., & Voeten, E. (2022). Sovereignty, Substance, and Public Support for European Courts’ Human Rights Rulings. <i>American Political Science Review</i> , 116(2), 419-438. doi:10.1017/S0003055421001143	English Polish*
Q20	Engelhardt, A.M., Feldman, S. & Hetherington, M.J. 2021. Advancing the Measurement of Authoritarianism. <i>Political Behavior</i> https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-021-09718-6	English
Q22	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. <i>Children and Youth Services Review</i> . 120 (2021) 105749	English Norwegian

* A translation exists but is not accessible.

National variation/special circumstances to note

Norway

Q14

An error in Q14 for the Norwegian survey was detected as instructions to respondents on how to answer the question were inconsistent with the response alternatives. This question was initially published for Norwegian respondents in the following way:

“When the child protection services decide what to do with a child that is in a vulnerable situation, whose opinion should matter the most? (Should matter the least = 1 – Should matter the most = 4)”

An instruction following the question then wrote: “Select an alternative in the list to the left. Start with the one you rank the highest and continue with the lower ranks”. However, the first selection gave the number 1, and since our instructions were that the option with 1 was the least important, the two pieces of instructions were contradictory.

To compensate for this error Q14 was included in an omnibus survey that Faktum conducts in Norway bi-weekly³ the following week. The question text was then changed to “Should matter the most = 1 – Should matter the least = 4”, which coordinated with the instructions from Faktum. We also added a short text to describe the topic of the question, since it was part of a larger omnibus with many questions on different topics. The text was: “We now ask about the child protection, and about your opinion on whose opinions should be weighed”. The omnibus survey collects 1000 responses from the Norwegian population (18 years and older), with representative quotas for gender, age, and region.

We may compare the two sets of responses and examine the extent the incorrect instructions made any differences. This is not ideal since we do not get omnibus respondents’ answers to the other questions in the survey, but this was the best we could do.

Finland

Upon reviewing the soft launch data for Finland, we discovered that the income variable was poorly distributed (only 2 % had answered in any of the top three categories, n = 48), and we thus asked for it to be readjusted for an additional fee. The 48 respondents were deleted. We then received another set of soft launch data after 143 respondents.

Income

Faktum’s standard income variable in Finland is the following:

“What is your annual income (before taxes):”

1. Less than 10000 euro
2. 10000-19999 euro
3. 20000-39999 euro
4. 40000-59999 euro
5. More than 60000 euro
6. Don’t want to say

An overview of the distribution of this variable from an omnibus survey (N = 1009) showed that it was normally distributed. However, the income variables in the other countries had 6 categories, and we wanted to be able to directly compare, so we changed the categories to the following:

1. Less than 15000 euro
2. 15000-39999 euro
3. 40000-64999 euro
4. 65000-89999 euro
5. 90000-129000 euro
6. More than 130000 euro
7. Don’t want to say

However, after the soft launch (n= 48), the distribution was very skewed towards the bottom categories, only two respondents choosing the 2 top categories. After consulting with our country expert and the Faktum team, we changed the categories to the following, and conducted 1000 interviews with the new income variable.

³ The omnibus is conducted among 1000 respondents from the Norwegian adult population (18 years +), with representative samples based on gender, age, and region.

1. Less than 15000 euro
2. 15000-24999 euro
3. 25000-34999 euro
4. 35000-49999 euro
5. 50000-99999 euro
6. More than 100 000 euro
7. Don't want to say

Romania

Income The standard income question in Romania, “What is your current household income?” had 17 categories ranging from “Less than 600 RON per month” to “More than 6600 RON per month”. An overview of the distribution in omnibus from 2021 (N=1001) suggested that these alternatives were not ideal, with 2-7 % in 16 of the 17 categories, and 19 % in the highest category. After discussing and researching the income levels in Romania, we changed the income question to the following:

1. Less than 1999 RON p/m
2. 2000-3999 RON p/m
3. 4000-5999 RON p/m
4. 6000-7999 RON p/m
5. 8000-9999 RON p/m
6. More than 9999 RON p/m
7. Don't want to say

Q13

One of the items in Q13 (“In your opinion, the following groups in our country currently have?”) is “Indigenous people”. As one of our country experts pointed out, this term does not translate well to Romanian, and there is no corresponding concept for indigenous people in Romanian. We opted to use “Ethnic minority” instead.

Survey company methodology

Short description of the survey company’s methodology⁴ (translated from the company’s own description): Faktum/Syno receives the completed questionnaire with all questions and response alternatives and potential skips and filters. Faktum/Syno creates the electronic questionnaire for their interview platform, Synotool, which will also include Syno’s standard privacy declaration on GDPR. They then send test links to the client for approval. After approval, the electronic questionnaire is softlaunched, and live results are quality controlled. The soft-launch results are sent to the client, and upon approval from the client, the full data collection is launched. The samples are representative in terms of gender, age and geographic location. The net sample is thus representative at the national level. The data collection in all countries are being monitored and controlled by a single project leader, and the client receives frequent progress reports. The results are delivered in agreed upon formats (CSV/Excel/SPSS/Stata). Faktum/Syno deletes all files and data in accordance with the client’s instructions (or alternatively by 30.07.2024). The client also receives the questionnaires in PDF format, exported from Synotool, codebook, description of method, and dropout rate. The data is also delivered with three different weight variables:

⁴ Information provided in procurement document.

- Weight_post_stratification (post_stratification weights to further ensure representativeness of the sample at the country level - by gender/age/region)
- Weight_population (population size weights to correct for identical sample size despite the different sizes of the countries in the survey)
- Weight_total (overall from both weight $\text{Weight_post_stratification} * \text{Weight_population}$)

Respondents participate voluntarily. They get access to the survey through a unique link that is sent to the participant by email invitation. All the respondents receive identical questionnaires (with variations due to language, experiments, and filters). The completed questionnaires are collected in a database organised by country. Throughout the data collection, several quality control measures are being implemented:

- Registration of fictitious alternatives – the interviews are stopped.
- Monotonous/unilateral responses – interviews are deleted.
- Analysis of time used to complete – interviews with deviations (less than 1/3 of median time spent on interview) are deleted.

Fictitious alternatives: The question about use of social media platforms contained some fictitious alternatives (platforms that don't exist). Any respondent who selected one of these alternatives were not permitted to continue with the survey. The fictitious alternatives are:

- Bebo
- FitFinder
- PlanetAll
- Yahoo! Mash

Ethical considerations

The project was registered in Rette (UiBs internal system for risk and compliance with data protection in research projects) with registration number R2808.

All respondents give informed consent to participate before they complete the survey, in one or more ways:

- When signing up to the panel from which the respondent has been selected.
- In this specific survey
- By generally accepting to respond to surveys that they receive from Faktum/Syno

The respondents have also accepted that their personal information is stored. Personal data is stored in accordance with the GDPR rules in each country.