



THE QUALITY OF  
GOVERNMENT INSTITUTE

# THE PERCEIVE SURVEY DATASET

## CODEBOOK

Scholars who wish to use this dataset in their research are kindly requested to cite the following article:

**Bauhr, Monika and Nicholas Charron. 2019. "The EU as a Savior and a Saint? Corruption and Public Support for Redistribution." *Journal of European Public Policy* 0 (0): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2019.1578816>**

<https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government>  
The QoG Institute  
P.O. Box 711  
405 30 Gothenburg  
Sweden  
[infoqog@pol.gu.se](mailto:infoqog@pol.gu.se)



UNIVERSITY OF  
GOTHENBURG

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	The Quality of Government Institute . . . . .	5
1.2	The QoG Data . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>PERCEIVE Survey and Its Methodology</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Background and general survey information . . . . .	6
2.2	Sampling . . . . .	6
2.3	Sample and further survey information . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Individual Level Dataset</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Identification Variables . . . . .	9
3.1.1	Response ID (ID) . . . . .	9
3.1.2	Type of Interview (TYPETEL_) . . . . .	9
3.1.3	Country of Respondents (COUNTRY) . . . . .	9
3.1.4	Language of Interview (LANGUAGE) . . . . .	9
3.1.5	Sample (SAMPLE) . . . . .	9
3.1.6	NUTS1 Abbreviation Code (D8_NUTS1) . . . . .	10
3.1.7	NUTS2 Abbreviation Code (D8_NUTS2) . . . . .	10
3.1.8	NUTS3 Abbreviation Code (D8_NUTS3) . . . . .	10
3.1.9	Region Code (region_code_n) . . . . .	10
3.1.10	Case Study Region (CSregion) . . . . .	10
3.2	Survey Questions . . . . .	11
3.2.1	EU Cohesion Policy (Q1.1) . . . . .	11
3.2.2	EU Regional Policy (Q1.2) . . . . .	11
3.2.3	EU Structural Funds (Q1.3) . . . . .	11

3.2.4	EU funded project in your region or area (Q1.4)	11
3.2.5	Aggregate Results for Knowledge on EU Policies (Q1.5)	11
3.2.6	Source of Information (Q2)	12
3.2.7	Benefit from EU Funds (Q3)	12
3.2.8	Biggest problem in the region (Q4)	12
3.2.9	EU and Biggest Problem of Regions (Q5.1)	12
3.2.10	National Institutions and Biggest Problem of Regions (Q5.2)	13
3.2.11	Regional/local Institutions and Biggest Problem of Regions (Q5.3)	13
3.2.12	Supported Political Party (Q6)	13
3.2.13	Participation in EU Elections (Q7)	13
3.2.14	EU Membership (Q8)	13
3.2.15	Regional Identity (Q9.1)	14
3.2.16	National Identity (Q9.2)	14
3.2.17	European Identity (Q9.3)	14
3.2.18	Being European: Right to Leave and Work in Abroad (Q10.1)	15
3.2.19	Being European: Euro Currency (Q10.2)	15
3.2.20	Being European: Christianity (Q10.3)	15
3.2.21	Being European: European Flag (Q10.4)	15
3.2.22	Being European: Common European History and Culture (Q10.5)	16
3.2.23	Trust in Other People (Q11)	16
3.2.24	q22_1 - On a 1-10 scale, with '1' being 'don't trust at all', and '10' being 'complete trust', how much do you personally trust other people in your area?	16
3.2.25	Immigration (Q12)	16
3.2.26	Income Inequality (Q13)	17
3.2.27	Strong Leaders (Q14)	17
3.2.28	EU Enlargement - Randomized Question A (Q15.1)	17

3.2.29	EU Enlargement - Randomized Question B (Q15.2)	17
3.2.30	EU Enlargement - Randomized Question C (Q15.3)	18
3.2.31	EU Enlargement - Randomized Question D (Q15.4)	18
3.2.32	Control and Treatment Groups for Q15 (treatmentQ15)	18
3.2.33	EU Enlargement - Combined Responses (Q15combined)	19
3.2.34	Corruption in the EU (Q16.1)	19
3.2.35	Corruption in National Institutions (Q16.2)	19
3.2.36	Corruption in Regional/Local Institutions (Q16.3)	19
3.2.37	Economic Satisfaction (Q17)	20
3.2.38	Current Economic Conditions vs Past (Q18)	20
3.2.39	Classifying Economic Wealth of Region - Control Group (Q19a)	20
3.2.40	Classifying Economic Wealth of Region - Treatment Group (Q19b)	20
3.2.41	Classifying Economic Wealth of Region - Combined Responses (Q19combined)	21
3.2.42	Actual Economic Wealth of Region (Q19info)	21
3.2.43	Control and Treatment Groups for Q19 (Q19treatment)	21
3.2.44	Support for EU Cohesion Policy (Q20)	21
3.2.45	Financial Contribution of Your Country to EU Cohesion Policies (Q21)	22
3.2.46	Less Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 1 (Q22A.1)	22
3.2.47	Less Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 2 (Q22A.2)	22
3.2.48	Less Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 3 (Q22A.3)	23
3.2.49	Less Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 4 (Q22A.4)	23
3.2.50	Less Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 5 (Q22A.5)	24
3.2.51	Same/More Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 1 (Q22B.1)	24
3.2.52	Same/More Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 2 (Q22B.2)	24
3.2.53	Same/More Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 3 (Q22B.3)	25

3.2.54	BREXIT Vote (UK Only) (UKQ1)	25
3.2.55	Current choice on BREXIT (UKQ2)	25
3.3	Demographic Variables	26
3.3.1	Gender of Respondent (D1)	26
3.3.2	Education of respondent (D2)	26
3.3.3	Education of respondent, recoded (D2recoded)	26
3.3.4	Age of Respondent (D3)	26
3.3.5	Age of Respondent, recoded (D3recoded)	26
3.3.6	Residency (D4)	27
3.3.7	Employment, binary (D5a)	27
3.3.8	Employment, sector (D5c)	27
3.3.9	Type of Employment (D5d)	27
3.3.10	Private Sector Employment, detailed (D5e)	27
3.3.11	Employment, combined categories (D5combined)	28
3.3.12	Population (D6)	28
3.3.13	Household Income (D7)	28
3.3.14	Household Income, categorical (D7b)	28
3.3.15	Household Income, recoded (D7recoded)	28
3.4	Weights	30
3.4.1	Design Weight (Dweight)	30
3.4.2	Iweight (Iweight)	30
3.4.3	Post-stratification weight (PSweight)	30
3.4.4	Population Weight (Pweight)	30

## 4 Bibliography

32

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The Quality of Government Institute

The Quality of Government Institute (QoG) was founded in 2004 by Professor Bo Rothstein and Professor Sören Holmberg. It is an independent research institute within the Department of Political Science at the University of Gothenburg. The institute conducts research on the causes, consequences and nature of Good Governance and the Quality of Government, that is, trustworthy, reliable, impartial, uncorrupted, and competent government institutions.

The main objective of the research is to address the theoretical and empirical problems of how political institutions of high quality can be created and maintained. A second objective is to study the effects of Quality of Government on a number of policy areas, such as health, environment, social policy, and poverty. While Quality of Government is the common intellectual focal point of the research institute, a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives are applied.

## 1.2 The QoG Data

The Quality of Government Data is a collection of different types of datasets that are related to the concept of Quality of Government. These data are open-source tools created to facilitate the access of the academic community to high quality information.

There are three main types of datasets: the first one is the compilation datasets (Standard, Basic and OECD) which gather other sources variables into a comprehensive time-series spanning more than 200 countries and more than 70 year data points. There are also researchers' datasets (e.g. Swedish Municipalities Dataset), which are QoG researchers' efforts to contribute to their field with specialized data at different observation levels (country, region, individual etc.). Last but not least, there are the original datasets such as the European Quality of Government Index.

The most updated versions of QoG datasets can be accessed from Data Downloads section on the QoG Website: <https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads>. Previous versions of all our datasets are also available in the Data Archive: <https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/data-archive>

## 2 PERCEIVE Survey and Its Methodology

### 2.1 Background and general survey information

The PERCEIVE original survey is intended to help researchers better understand the micro and macro level dynamics that drive support (or lack thereof) of EU regional polices. The survey includes over 35 substantive questions as well as seven demographic and background questions of the respondent. Each respondent is geo-coded at the NUTS 1, NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 level. The survey questionnaire was originally written by scholars at the University of Gothenburg, Nicholas Charron and Monika Bauhr, with help and feedback from various PERCEIVE partners. The fieldwork was conducted during the summer of 2017 by an international survey firm based in Rheims, France (Effience3, ‘E3’). The results were returned to the University of Gothenburg in September, 2017.

E3 conducted the interviews themselves in several countries and used sub-contracting partners in others <sup>1</sup>. In all, 17,147 interviews were carried out in 15 EU member states. The respondents, from 18 years of age or older, were contacted randomly via telephone in the local language. Telephone interviews approximately 12-15 minutes in length were conducted via both landlines and mobile phones, with both methods being used in most countries. All interviews were made by employees with at least one year of professional experience and used *Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing* (CATI). Between 12%-15% of all interviews were randomly check for quality control by supervisors, with no reported irregularities. Decisions about whether to contact residents more often via land or mobile lines was based on local expertise of market research firms in each country, with mobile being first choice in all cases. For purposes of regional placement, respondents were asked the post code of their address to verify the area/ region of residence if mobile phones were used.

### 2.2 Sampling

Ideally, a survey would be a mirror image of actual societal demographics – gender, income, education, rural-urban, ethnicity, etc. However, sampling on demographics is much more costly. We thus sought the next best solution. Based on E3’s expert advice, to achieve a random sample, we used what was known in survey-research as the ‘next birthday method’. The next birthday method is an alternative to the so-called quotas method. When using the quota method for instance, one obtains a (near) perfectly representative sample – e.g. a near exact proportion of the amount of men, women, certain minority groups, people of a certain age, income, etc. However, as one searches for certain demographics within the population, one might end up with only ‘available’ respondents, or those that are more ‘eager’ to respond to surveys, which can lead to less variation in the responses, or even bias in the results. The ‘next-birthday’ method, which simply requires the interviewer to ask the person who answers the phone who in their household will have the next birthday, still obtains a reasonably representative sample of the population. The interviewer must take the person who has the next coming birthday in the household (if this person is not available, the interviewer makes an appointment), thus not relying on whomever might simply be available

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.effience3.com/en/accueil/index.html>. For names of the specific firms to which Effience 3 sub-contracted in individual countries, please write [cati@effience3.com](mailto:cati@effience3.com)

to respond in the household. So, where the quota method is stronger in terms of a more even demographic spread in the sample, the next-birthday method is stronger at ensuring a better range of opinion. The next-birthday method was thus chosen because we felt that what we might have lost in demographic representation in the sample would be made up for by a better distribution of opinion. In attempt to compensate for some key demographic over/under-representation, we provide weights based on age and gender for each region, comparing the sample drawn to actual demographic statistics from Eurostat. In the end, we find variation in response and refusal rates by country, which could have to do with many factors including the sensitivity of one of the primary the topics at hand – corruption. A breakdown of the sample response rate, land line vs. mobile phone use, etc. is listed in the table below by country.

### 2.3 Sample and further survey information

The survey included 15 EU countries. These 15 countries in this sample represent over 85% of the proportion of the EU population. Countries were selected for purposes of the cases study report countries as well as on the bases of variation with respect to geography, size, and institutional quality.

The design however was somewhat unique, and could be described as semi-stratified in some cases. To aid in research of the PERCEIVE project’s pre-selected case study regions, at least 500 randomly drawn respondents were taken from each of the select regions. All other respondents were taken randomly throughout each country. Thus for countries such as Germany or France with no pre-selected regions, the respondents were randomly drawn. In the case of Spain for example, at least 500 would be taken from its pre-selected region (Extremadura) and then the other 150 respondents would be taken at random (including Extremadura). The countries in the sample of this survey are the following and they are often referred to via the following official abbreviations:

**Sample information**

Country	Abbreviation	respondents	Mobile rates	landline rates
Austria	AT	1000	30%	70%
Bulgaria	BG	503	82.1%	17.9%
Estonia	EE	5000	92%	8%
France	FR	1500	65%	35%
Germany	DE	1500	35%	65%
Hungary	HU	1000	100%	0%
Italy	IT	2000	38.5%	61.5%
Latvia	LV	500	100%	0%
Netherlands	NL	500	57%	43%
Poland	PL	2000	80%	20%
Romania	RO	1015	100%	0%
Slovakia	SK	1014	100%	0%
Spain	ES	2014	68%	32%
Sweden	SE	580	5.5%	94.5%
UK	UK	1500	37%	63%
Total			129991	100.0



Case Study Region	Abbreviation	respondents
Burgenland	AT11	517
Extremadura	ES43	541
Emilia-Romania	ITD5	581
Calabria	ITF6	535
Dolnoslaski	PL51	579
Warmińsko-mazurskie	PL62	538
Sud Est	RO22	532
Norra Mellansverige.	SE31	516
Essex	UKH3	524

## 3 Individual Level Dataset

### 3.1 Identification Variables

#### 3.1.1 Response ID (ID)

Unique and anonymous ID assigned to each respondent.

#### 3.1.2 Type of Interview (TYPETEL\_)

whether mobile or landline was used in the interview.

1. Landline
2. Mobil Phone

#### 3.1.3 Country of Respondents (COUNTRY)

Unique country code, numeric.

Language	Language Code	Language	Language Code	Language	Language Code
France	1	Italy	10	Poland	18
Bulgaria	3	Netherlands	13	Spain	19
Slovakia	5	Sweden	14	Germany	20
Hungary	6	UK	15	Estonia	21
Romania	8	Latvia	17	Austria	22

#### 3.1.4 Language of Interview (LANGUAGE)

The language in which the interview was conducted, numeric.

Language	Language Code	Language	Language Code	Language	Language Code
French	1	Italian	10	Latvian	17
Bulgarian	3	Spanish	11	Estonian	18
Slovak	5	Dutch	13	Russian	19
Hungarian	6	Swedish	14	German	20
Romanian	8	English	15	Polish	21

#### 3.1.5 Sample (SAMPLE)

whether the response is a part of the general population sample or control sample.

1. General population sample
2. Control sample (respondent from select region)

### **3.1.6 NUTS1 Abbreviation Code (D8\_NUTS1)**

Abbreviation code of NUTS1-level region to which the observation belongs. The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, (NUTS), is a geocode standard for referencing the administrative divisions of countries for statistical purposes. NUTS 1: major socio-economic regions.

### **3.1.7 NUTS2 Abbreviation Code (D8\_NUTS2)**

Abbreviation code of NUTS2-level region to which the observation belongs. The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, (NUTS), is a geocode standard for referencing the administrative divisions of countries for statistical purposes. NUTS 2: basic regions for the application of regional policies.

### **3.1.8 NUTS3 Abbreviation Code (D8\_NUTS3)**

Abbreviation code of NUTS3-level region to which the observation belongs. The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, (NUTS), is a geocode standard for referencing the administrative divisions of countries for statistical purposes. NUTS 3: small regions for specific diagnoses.

### **3.1.9 Region Code (region\_code\_n)**

Regional geocode for merging with PERCEIVE regional dataset.

### **3.1.10 Case Study Region (CSregion)**

Is the respondent from the selected case-study region?

1. No
2. Yes

## 3.2 Survey Questions

*If you use any of these variables, make sure to cite the following article:*

**Bauhr, Monika and Nicholas Charron. 2019. “The EU as a Savior and a Saint? Corruption and Public Support for Redistribution.” *Journal of European Public Policy* 0 (0): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2019.1578816>**

### 3.2.1 EU Cohesion Policy (Q1.1)

In general, have you ever heard about the EU Cohesion Policy?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

### 3.2.2 EU Regional Policy (Q1.2)

In general, have you ever heard about the EU Regional Policy?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

### 3.2.3 EU Structural Funds (Q1.3)

In general, have you ever heard about the EU Structural Funds?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

### 3.2.4 EU funded project in your region or area (Q1.4)

In general, have you ever heard about any EU funded project in your region or area?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

### 3.2.5 Aggregate Results for Knowledge on EU Policies (Q1.5)

Has the respondent ever heard of any of these four EU policies asked in Q1.1-4 (EU Cohesion Policy, EU Regional Policy, EU Structural Funds and any EU-funded project in your region or area)?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

### **3.2.6 Source of Information (Q2)**

Where did you hear about the project in your region? (Follow-up question if the answer was "yes" in Q1)

- (1) TV
- (2) Billboard
- (3) Print or online newspaper
- (4) Social media
- (5) Workplace
- (6) Workplace
- (98) Other

### **3.2.7 Benefit from EU Funds (Q3)**

To your knowledge, have you ever benefited in your daily life from any project funded by the EU?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (99) Don't know/Refused

### **3.2.8 Biggest problem in the region (Q4)**

In the past 5 years or so, which of the following do you think has been the biggest problem facing your region? (asked in randomized order)

- (1) Poor education
- (2) Poor infrastructure & transportation
- (3) Corruption and poor governance
- (4) Unemployment
- (5) Environmental concerns
- (6) Poor wages / poverty
- (98) Other

### **3.2.9 EU and Biggest Problem of Regions (Q5.1)**

How effective do you think the European Union will be at dealing with the biggest problem in your region?

- (1) Very effective
- (2) Somewhat effective
- (3) Not so effective

### **3.2.10 National Institutions and Biggest Problem of Regions (Q5.2)**

How effective do you think (COUNTRY's) national governing institutions will be at dealing with the biggest problem in your region?

- (1) Very effective
- (2) Somewhat effective
- (3) Not so effective

### **3.2.11 Regional/local Institutions and Biggest Problem of Regions (Q5.3)**

How effective do you think your regional/local governing institutions will be at dealing with the biggest problem in your region?

- (1) Very effective
- (2) Somewhat effective
- (3) Not so effective

### **3.2.12 Supported Political Party (Q6)**

Turning a bit to politics, what political party would you vote for if the national parliamentary election were tomorrow?

Selection is made from the provided current party list by country.

### **3.2.13 Participation in EU Elections (Q7)**

Now thinking about EU elections, have you voted in either of the last two EU parliamentary elections? (referring to 2009 and 2014 elections)

- (0) Neither
- (1) Once
- (2) Both times
- (99) Don't know/Refused

### **3.2.14 EU Membership (Q8)**

In general, do you think that (YOUR COUNTRY'S) EU membership is a good thing, a bad thing, neither good nor bad, not sure?

- (1) A good thing
- (2) A bad thing
- (3) Neither good nor bad
- (99) Not sure

Note: This question is not included in the UK survey.

**3.2.15 Regional Identity (Q9.1)**

On a 0-10 scale, with '0' being 'I don't identify at all, and '10' being 'I identify very strongly', how strongly do you identify yourself with your region?

Don't identify at all									Identify very strongly
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

**3.2.16 National Identity (Q9.2)**

On a 0-10 scale, with '0' being 'I don't identify at all, and '10' being 'I identify very strongly', how strongly do you identify yourself with your country?

Don't identify at all									Identify very strongly
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

**3.2.17 European Identity (Q9.3)**

On a 0-10 scale, with '0' being 'I don't identify at all, and '10' being 'I identify very strongly', how strongly do you identify yourself with Europe?

Don't identify at all									Identify very strongly
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### 3.2.18 Being European: Right to Leave and Work in Abroad (Q10.1)

People have many different opinions about what 'being European' means. On a scale from 0-10, where '0' means "not at all important" and '10' means "very important", how important is the following statement for you in terms of 'being European'?

**The right for all EU citizens to live and work in any other EU country.**

Not imp. at all										Very important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

### 3.2.19 Being European: Euro Currency (Q10.2)

People have many different opinions about what 'being European' means. On a scale from 0-10, where '0' means "not at all important" and '10' means "very important", how important is to have the common Euro currency for you in terms of 'being European'?

Not imp. at all										Very important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

### 3.2.20 Being European: Christianity (Q10.3)

People have many different opinions about what 'being European' means. On a scale from 0-10, where '0' means "not at all important" and '10' means "very important", how important is the Christian religion for you in terms of 'being European'?

Not imp. at all										Very important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

### 3.2.21 Being European: European Flag (Q10.4)

People have many different opinions about what 'being European' means. On a scale from 0-10, where '0' means "not at all important" and '10' means "very important", how important is the European flag for you in terms of 'being European'?



Not imp. at all										Very important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

### 3.2.22 Being European: Common European History and Culture (Q10.5)

People have many different opinions about what 'being European' means. On a scale from 0-10, where '0' means "not at all important" and '10' means "very important", how important is to share a common European history and culture for you in terms of 'being European'?

Not imp. at all										Very important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

### 3.2.23 Trust in Other People (Q11)

Generally speaking, using a scale on which 0 means that "people cannot be trusted" and 10 means that "most people can be trusted", where would you locate yourself on this scale?

### 3.2.24 q22\_1 - On a 1-10 scale, with '1' being 'don't trust at all', and '10' being 'complete trust', how much do you personally trust other people in your area?

People cannot be trusted										Most people can be trusted
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

### 3.2.25 Immigration (Q12)

(COUNTRY) should have more restrictions on immigration than it does today.

Fully disagree										Fully agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

### 3.2.26 Income Inequality (Q13)

(COUNTRY's) national government should take measures to reduce differences in income levels among people in (COUNTRY).

Fully disagree									Fully agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### 3.2.27 Strong Leaders (Q14)

(COUNTRY) should have a strong leader that can solve problems quickly, who does not have to worry about elections and parliamentary rules.

Fully disagree									Fully agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### 3.2.28 EU Enlargement - Randomized Question A (Q15.1)

The following sentence is read to 25% of survey respondents, who are randomly selected for the control group.

**The EU should continue to let more countries become members, under the condition that they meet all of EU's membership requirements.**

Fully disagree									Fully agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### 3.2.29 EU Enlargement - Randomized Question B (Q15.2)

The following sentence is read to 25% of survey respondents, who are randomly selected for the first treatment group.

**The EU should continue to let more countries become members, SUCH AS NORWAY, under the condition that they meet all of EU's membership requirements**

Fully disagree									Fully agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### 3.2.30 EU Enlargement - Randomized Question C (Q15.3)

The following sentence is read to 25% of survey respondents, who are randomly selected for the second treatment group.

**The EU should continue to let more countries become members, SUCH AS TURKEY, under the condition that they meet all of EU's membership requirements**

Fully disagree									Fully agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### 3.2.31 EU Enlargement - Randomized Question D (Q15.4)

The following sentence is read to 25% of survey respondents, who are randomly selected for the third treatment group.

**The EU should continue to let more countries become members, SUCH AS SERBIA, under the condition that they meet all of EU's membership requirements**

Fully disagree									Fully agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### 3.2.32 Control and Treatment Groups for Q15 (treatmentQ15)

Which version of question 15 is asked to the respondent?

- (0) Control group with the generic statement
- (1) Treatment group mentioning Norway
- (2) Treatment group mentioning Turkey
- (3) Treatment group mentioning Serbia

### 3.2.33 EU Enlargement - Combined Responses (Q15combined)

Combined responses from the randomized questions on EU Enlargement (Q15.1, Q15.2, Q15.3, Q15.4).

Fully disagree									Fully agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### 3.2.34 Corruption in the EU (Q16.1)

On a 0-10 scale, with '0' being that 'there is no corruption' and '10' being that corruption is widespread, how would you rate the European Union?

There is no corruption									Corruption is widespread
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### 3.2.35 Corruption in National Institutions (Q16.2)

On a 0-10 scale, with '0' being that 'there is no corruption' and '10' being that corruption is widespread, how would you rate (COUNTRY'S) national governing institutions?

There is no corruption									Corruption is widespread
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### 3.2.36 Corruption in Regional/Local Institutions (Q16.3)

On a 0-10 scale, with '0' being that 'there is no corruption' and '10' being that corruption is widespread, how would you rate your regional/local governing institutions?

There is no corruption									Corruption is widespread
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### **3.2.37 Economic Satisfaction (Q17)**

How satisfied are you with the current economic situation in your region today?

- (1) Very satisfied
- (2) Somewhat satisfied
- (3) Somewhat unsatisfied
- (4) Very unsatisfied

### **3.2.38 Current Economic Conditions vs Past (Q18)**

Compared with (5 years ago), do you think the economy in your region is:

- (1) Better
- (2) About the same
- (3) Worse

### **3.2.39 Classifying Economic Wealth of Region - Control Group (Q19a)**

In terms of the per person economic wealth, as in GDP per head, if we were to rank all EU regions from wealthiest to poorest and put them into four equal groups, with group 1 being the wealthiest group and 4 the poorest group, which of the 4 groups do you believe your region is in today?

- (1) Group 1 (In the wealthiest 25% of EU regions)
- (2) Group 2
- (3) Group 3
- (4) Group 4 (The poorest 25% of EU regions)

### **3.2.40 Classifying Economic Wealth of Region - Treatment Group (Q19b)**

In terms of the per person economic wealth, as in GDP per head, if we were to rank all EU regions from wealthiest to poorest and put them into four equal groups, with group 1 being the wealthiest group and 4 the poorest group, which of the 4 groups do you believe your region is in today?

- (1) Group 1 (In the wealthiest 25% of EU regions)
- (2) Group 2
- (3) Group 3
- (4) Group 4 (The poorest 25% of EU regions)

The treatment group receives the question and then receives the following information:

"In fact, according to the latest EU data, your region is in the \_\_\_\_\_ group."

### **3.2.41 Classifying Economic Wealth of Region - Combined Responses (Q19combined)**

In terms of the per person economic wealth, as in GDP per head, if we were to rank all EU regions from wealthiest to poorest and put them into four equal groups, with group 1 being the wealthiest group and 4 the poorest group, which of the 4 groups do you believe your region is in today?

- (1) Group 1 (In the wealthiest 25% of EU regions)
- (2) Group 2
- (3) Group 3
- (4) Group 4 (The poorest 25% of EU regions)

Note: This variable reflects the combined responses for q19.1 and q19.2.

### **3.2.42 Actual Economic Wealth of Region (Q19info)**

Ranking all EU regions from wealthiest to poorest and put them into four equal groups, with group 1 being the wealthiest group and 4 the poorest group, which of the 4 groups does the region actually belong to?

- (1) Group 1 (In the wealthiest 25% of EU regions)
- (2) Group 2
- (3) Group 3
- (4) Group 4 (The poorest 25% of EU regions)

### **3.2.43 Control and Treatment Groups for Q19 (Q19treatment)**

Was the respondent in the control or treatment group?

- 1. Control group
- 2. Treatment group (received info)

### **3.2.44 Support for EU Cohesion Policy (Q20)**

*As you might have heard, the EU cohesion policy aims to reduce regional differences within the EU in things like economic development, and employment. While all members contribute and receive some funds, the wealthier EU countries generally contribute more and poorer EU regions receive more funding on average.*

In your opinion, should the EU continue this policy, where wealthier countries contribute more, and poorer EU regions receive more funding?

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly disagree (99) Don't know

**3.2.45 Financial Contribution of Your Country to EU Cohesion Policies (Q21)**

In your opinion, compared with what it spends today, should (COUNTRY) contribute, more, about the same, or less to this EU policy?

- (1) More
- (2) About the same
- (3) Less

**3.2.46 Less Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 1 (Q22A.1)**

Could you just tell me on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means "Not agree at all" and 10 means "totally agree", as to why you would want (COUNTRY's) contribution to be less?

**The money (COUNTRY) pays would be better spent in (COUNTRY).**

Not agree at all										Totally agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Note: Question 22A.1 is only asked the respondents who said the country should contribute less to EU Cohesion Policy.

**3.2.47 Less Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 2 (Q22A.2)**

Could you just tell me on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means "Not agree at all" and 10 means "totally agree", as to why you would want (COUNTRY's) contribution to be less?

**The money will be largely wasted due to corruption.**

Not agree at all									Totally agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Note: Question 22A.2 is only asked the respondents who said the country should contribute less to EU Cohesion Policy.

### 3.2.48 Less Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 3 (Q22A.3)

Could you just tell me on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means “Not agree at all” and 10 means “totally agree”, as to why you would want (COUNTRY’s) contribution to be less?

**The money only ends up helping wealthy EU regions in the end.**

Not agree at all									Totally agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Note: Question 22A.3 is only asked the respondents who said the country should contribute less to EU Cohesion Policy.

### 3.2.49 Less Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 4 (Q22A.4)

Could you just tell me on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means “Not agree at all” and 10 means “totally agree”, as to why you would want (COUNTRY’s) contribution to be less?

**(COUNTRY) pays too much while other EU countries do not pay their fair share.**

Not agree at all									Totally agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Note: Question 22A.4 is only asked the respondents who said the country should contribute less to EU Cohesion Policy.



**3.2.50 Less Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 5 (Q22A.5)**

Could you just tell me on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means “Not agree at all” and 10 means “totally agree”, as to why you would want (COUNTRY’s) contribution to be less?

**(COUNTRY) should instead be helping the worlds’ poorest people, outside of the EU.**

Not agree at all										Totally agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Note: Question 22A.5 is only asked the respondents who said the country should contribute less to EU Cohesion Policy.

**3.2.51 Same/More Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 1 (Q22B.1)**

Could you just tell me on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means “Not agree at all” and 10 means “totally agree”, as to why you would want (COUNTRY’s) contribution to be (more/about the same)?

**It is in (COUNTRY’s) interest to invest in poorer regions.**

Not agree at all										Totally agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Note: Question 22B.1 is only asked the respondents who said the country should contribute about the same or more to EU Cohesion Policy.

**3.2.52 Same/More Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 2 (Q22B.2)**

Could you just tell me on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means “Not agree at all” and 10 means “totally agree”, as to why you would want (COUNTRY’s) contribution to be (more/about the same)?

**It benefits everyone in the EU to invest in poorer regions.**

Not agree at all										Totally agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Note: Question 22B.2 is only asked the respondents who said the country should contribute about the same or more to EU Cohesion Policy.

**3.2.53 Same/More Contribution to EU Cohesion Policy - Argument 3 (Q22B.3)**

Could you just tell me on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means “Not agree at all” and 10 means “totally agree”, as to why you would want (COUNTRY’s) contribution to be (more/about the same)?

**(COUNTRY) has a humanitarian obligation to end poverty throughout the EU.**

Not agree at all										Totally agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Note: Question 22B.3 is only asked the respondents who said the country should contribute about the same or more to EU Cohesion Policy.

**3.2.54 BREXIT Vote (UK Only) (UKQ1)**

What did you vote in the BREXIT referendum?

- (1) Remain
- (2) Leave
- (3) Didn't vote
- (4) Refused

Note: This question was a part of the UK Survey only - in lieu of q8.

**3.2.55 Current choice on BREXIT (UKQ2)**

If the BREXIT referendum were held today, how would you vote?

- (1) Remain
- (2) Leave
- (3) Didn't vote
- (4) Refused

### **3.3 Demographic Variables**

#### **3.3.1 Gender of Respondent (D1)**

Gender of the respondent.

1. Male
2. Female

#### **3.3.2 Education of respondent (D2)**

Please tell me what is the highest level in school you have completed?

- (1) Elementary (primary) school or less (no diploma)
- (2) High (secondary) school (but did not graduated from it)
- (3) Graduation from high (secondary) school
- (4) Graduation from college, university or other third-level institute
- (5) Post-graduate degree (Masters, PhD) beyond your initial college degree
- (99) Don't know/Refused

#### **3.3.3 Education of respondent, recoded (D2recoded)**

What is the highest level in school you have completed?

- (1) Elementary (primary) school or less
- (3) Graduation from high (secondary) school
- (4) Graduation from college, university or other third-level institute
- (4) Post-graduate degree (Masters, PhD) beyond your initial college degree
- (99) Don't know/Refused

#### **3.3.4 Age of Respondent (D3)**

Age of the respondent, 999 if refused.

#### **3.3.5 Age of Respondent, recoded (D3recoded)**

Recoded categories for the age of respondents.

- (1) 18-29
- (2) 30-49
- (3) 50-64
- (4) 65 and above
- (99) Don't know/Refused

### **3.3.6 Residency (D4)**

About how many years have you lived in the area where the interview was conducted?

999 if refused to answer.

### **3.3.7 Employment, binary (D5a)**

Are you currently in an employment situation?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

### **3.3.8 Employment, sector (D5c)**

Do you work in the public or private sector?

- 1. Public sector
- 2. Private sector

### **3.3.9 Type of Employment (D5d)**

Do you work full time or part time? "

- 1. Full time
- 2. Part time

### **3.3.10 Private Sector Employment, detailed (D5e)**

Are you "self-employed/small business owner/freelancer" or "a private sector employee"?

- 1. Self-employed/small business owner/freelancer
- 2. Other private sector employee

### **3.3.11 Employment, combined categories (D5combined)**

Combined categories from employment questions.

1. Public sector
2. Private sector
3. Self-employed
4. Unemployed
5. Housewife/Houseman
6. Pensioner, retired
7. Student / Trainee
8. Other

### **3.3.12 Population (D6)**

About how many people live in the place the interview was conducted?

- (1) Less than 10,000 (rural)
- (2) 10,000 - 100,000 (small town or city)
- (3) 100,000 - 1,000,000 (large city or urban area)
- (4) More than 1,000,000 (very large city or urban area)
- (99) Don't know/Refused

### **3.3.13 Household Income (D7)**

Average total household net income per month (after taxes, in local currency).

Don't know/refused is coded as 999.

### **3.3.14 Household Income, categorical (D7b)**

Categorical variable for average total household net income per month (after taxes, in local currency).

Don't know/refused is coded as 999.

### **3.3.15 Household Income, recoded (D7recoded)**

Level of income, recoded.

- (1) Low
- (2) Medium
- (3) High
- (99) Don't know/Refused

## 3.4 Weights

### 3.4.1 Design Weight (Dweight)

Design weight, regional proportion of the population within countries. Design weights are included to compensate for the fact that certain people have a higher or lower likelihood of being selected for the survey than others.

The Dweight is equal to:

$$Dweight = \frac{\text{Population size aged 18 years and above in region}_x \text{ in country}_y}{\text{Net sample size of region}_x \text{ in country}_y}$$

It, therefore, has a mean value of '1' in each country. In all cases but Germany, Sweden, and the UK (which use NUTS1) NUTS 2 weights are applied.

### 3.4.2 Iweight (Iweight)

Age and gender weight by region. Population data is taken from Eurostat for all countries. Cross-tabulations from the population data were then collected and put together for each country and region and were compared with that of the cross-tabulations in the sample. The Iweights were calculated based on differences between the sample and population cells, such that demographic groups (older males for example) that were over (under) sampled relative to the population receive a lower (higher) weight.

### 3.4.3 Post-stratification weight (PSweight)

The PSweights are a combination of the design weights and the individual level weight. PSweights are recommended when comparing means, proportions, etc. across regions and/or countries to correct for sampling issues, in particular when comparing regions within countries with a select region which is over-sampled. However, for more sophisticated, multilevel statistical analyses, the researcher can/should include additional demographic controls as independent variables in the model, such as income or age for example.

### 3.4.4 Population Weight (Pweight)

Population weight for multi-country aggregation. The population weight is included for comparisons across countries and is included to adjust for a country's proportion in the sample relative to its actual population of the total population of all countries in the survey. The weights are thus at the country level and do not need to be included for single country, regional level analyses or analyses

where comparing country averages of certain survey items are of interest where the country-level is the primary unit of comparison. However, in obtaining sample-wide (or EU-wide) means or proportions, it is recommended to use the population weights.

The Pweight helps to correct for any potential bias in obtaining means, proportion, etc when combining data from two or more countries. Without the Pweight, the researcher risks (most often) over-represent smaller countries at the expense of larger ones. The Pweight thus is included to adjust so that every country is represented in relative proportion to its population size of the countries in the sample for each year.

The population size weight is calculated as  $PWEIGHT = (\text{Population size aged 18 years and above}) / (\text{Net sample size in the country})$ . Population data of the population is taken from Eurostat for the year 2016.



## 4 Bibliography

Bauhr, Monika and Nicholas Charron. 2020. *In God we Trust? Identity; institutions and International redistribution*. JCMS Journal of Common Market Studies. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13020>

Bauhr, Monika and Nicholas Charron. 2020. *Do Citizens' support cohesion policy? Measuring European support for redistribution within the EU and its correlates*. Journal of Regional Research. [https://investigacionesregionales.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2020/04/1.-Charron\\_vf.pdf](https://investigacionesregionales.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2020/04/1.-Charron_vf.pdf)