

**Online Appendix of the paper “Generalization of Classic Question Order Effects across Cultures”**

**Appendix A: Study Descriptions for Each Data Collection**

***USA (Gallup)***

**Sampling.** The study was funded by the Gallup organization and data were collected in the Gallup panel. Its target population consists of the general non-institutionalized population aged 18 and older in the United States. However, persons without an Internet connection were not included in the sample of the Multi-National Study of Questionnaire Design (MSQD). Most panel members were recruited from Gallup Nightly tracking, a nightly study of 1,000 Americans on various topics. The sample for Gallup Nightly tracking is drawn using random digit dialling, which includes a stratification of 50% landline users and 50% cell phone users with additional quotas by region. Landline respondents are chosen at random within each household based on which member had the most recent birthday. For the cell phone frame, the person that answers the phone is selected for the sample. At the end of this survey, the respondents are asked whether they would like to participate in future surveys. If respondents answer affirmatively, they are asked to join the Gallup Panel. For the MSQD study, a stratified random sample was drawn from the Gallup Panel. The sample was stratified by age, education, and race.

**Data collection.** Only panel members that agreed to participate in surveys via the web received an invitation via email. A total of 5,000 persons were invited. The field period lasted from April 2, 2014, until April 10, 2014. Two additional reminders were sent during this time. A total of 2,012 interviews could be obtained. The completion rate was 39.4% (see AAPOR RR6), and the cumulative response rate was 1.6% (AAPOR CUMRR).

*USA (TESS)*

**Sampling.** The Knowledge Panel, in which the survey questions of the MSQD were implemented, is conducted by GfK. The study was sponsored by Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS). The general target population is the general US-American population aged 18 and older. Before 2009 random digit dialling methodology was used to recruit panel members, since 2009 the Knowledge Panel recruitment is subsequently complemented and replaced by the drawing of an address-based sample frame provided by the US Postal Service's Delivery Sequence File. Randomly sampled addresses are invited to join Knowledge Panel through a series of mailings, which are also available in Spanish to account for the Hispanic population. Non-responders are approached by telephone if a phone number can be matched to the sampled address. Invited households have the possibility to join the panel using various means (postal reply, calling a hotline and logging in on a recruitment website). Households in the sample that do not have the necessary equipment to take part in the web-based survey receive a netbook computer and free Internet services. For specific surveys, samples are drawn from the pool of panel members using a probability proportional to size (PPS) weighted sampling approach.

**Data collection.** Respondents take part in the survey in the form of a self-administered web survey. Respondents are rewarded with a variety of small incentives (small cash awards, gift prizes or sweepstake opportunities). The field period lasted from April 7, 2014, until April 15, 2015. A total of 1,666 were invited and 1,029 interviews could be obtained. The completion rate was 61.8% (see AAPOR RR6), and the cumulative response rate was 5.6% (AAPOR CUMRR).

*Canada*

**Sampling.** The Canadian study was conducted by Social Sciences Research Laboratories (SSRL) at the University of Saskatchewan and funded by the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Saskatchewan. Recruitment for the survey consisted of two parts. The first was telephone recruitment using random digit dialling. In the second part, the telephone recruitment was complemented using a random probability-based online panel (Probit panel) provided by the Probit organization. In both data collections, respondents were sampled proportionately for each province in Canada. The target population was the general Canadian population aged 18 and older excluding persons without Internet access.

**Data collection.** From March 25, 2014, until April 2, 2014, a link to an online survey was distributed via email to respondents who provided an email address in the recruitment telephone interview. The response rate was 20%. Members of the online panel received the link to the survey between July 4, 2014, and July 22, 2014. 26,677 individuals were invited to participate in the survey via telephone and online. A total of 1,317 interviews could be obtained. The completion rate was 7% (see AAPOR RR6). The information necessary to calculate the cumulative response rate was not provided by the SSRL.

***Denmark***

**Sample Design.** The data of the Danish subsample were collected in the context of the ISSP 14 module which was administered by the University of Aalborg. The target population was the general population aged 18 and older. A single random sample was drawn from the Central Population Register (CPR), which was provided by the national statistics office Denmark (Statistics Denmark). Neither stratification nor clustering was employed. The target population included the General Danish population from the age of 18 to 79.

**Data collection.** The data were collected in the period from November 1, 2013 to January 3, 2014. A mixed methods design (online, mail, and telephone) was implemented to collect the data. An introduction letter was sent via mail including a link to a web survey and a personal code to activate the survey. If respondents did not complete the survey, then telephone interviews were conducted. Additionally, a self-completion paper questionnaire was sent if requested. Respondents had the possibility to participate in a lottery to win an Apple iPad. 2,499 persons were invited to participate in the survey, and a total of 1,325 complete interviews (1,273 online, 34 mail, 18 telephone), and an additional 63 partial online interviews could be obtained. The response rate was 55.6% (see AAPOR RR6).

***Germany (GIP)***

**Sampling.** The German Internet Panel (GIP) is coordinated by the University of Mannheim. The target population of the GIP consists of the general population aged 16-75 living in private households in 2012. The GIP is based on a three-stage probability sample. In the first stage, 250 PSUs, situated in 208 local administrative districts, were sampled. The sampling was stratified by state, governmental district, and level of urbanity. The households were drawn using a random route approach with a random starting point in each PSU with a separate listing of households. A total of 5,500 households were obtained in this sampling procedure. All household members were invited to join the panel. Computer-assisted face-to-face interviews were employed to recruit participants. A total of 1,603 panel members were willing to take part in the panel after the recruitment interview. Households without access to the Internet and/or a computer received the necessary equipment and support.

**Data collection.** Panel members received an email with the invitation to take part in the online survey. Panel members, who did not complete the survey, received more reminders per email and an additional reminder via telephone. Previously offline households were reminded via postal mail. Respondents received 4€ for participation in the wave in addition to an annual bonus of 5€ or 10€ depending on the regularity of their participation. The data for this study were collected in the period from November 1, 2013 to November 30, 2013.

***Germany (GESIS)***

**Sampling.** The GESIS Panel is administered by GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences. The GESIS panel is a probability-based mixed-mode access panel infrastructure. The target population encompasses the German-speaking population aged between 18 and 70 years at the time of recruitment and permanently residing in Germany. The approx. 4,900 panelists were recruited offline in 2013, based on a random sample drawn from municipal population registers. A two-stage probability sampling scheme has been employed: on the first stage sampling of municipalities, on the second stage sampling of individuals. The sampled individuals were contacted by an interviewer at their homes in order to conduct a personal recruitment interview.

**Data collection.** Respondents willing to participate in the panel were asked in the recruitment interview whether they would like to participate online using a self-administered web survey or offline by filling out a paper questionnaire. Independently from the survey mode the survey is conducted in, all participants were invited per mail, and online respondents received an additional invitation email on February 21, 2014. Each invited panelist received an unconditional incentive of 5€ in the advance letter, and the offline respondent received the paper questionnaire in the letter as well. A total of 4,888 active panel members was invited to take part in the panel wave for the current study; 1,847 were invited in the offline mode and 3,041 in the online mode. Respondents invited per mail did not receive any reminders, online respondents received two reminders on February 27, 2014, and on March 6, 2014. End of field time was April 14, 2014. A total of 4,298 panel members participated in the survey. The completion rate was 86,4% based on 4,221 completed interviews (see AAPOR RR6). The recruitment rate was 35.5% and the profile rate 64.5%. This resulted in a cumulative response rate of 19.8% (AAPOR CUMRR).

***Iceland***

**Sampling.** The survey was implemented using a random sample from the Social Science Research Institute (SSRI) Internet Panel administered by the SSRI at the University of Iceland, which also funded the study in Iceland. The SSRI internet panel is based on a simple random sample drawn from the National Population Register which was provided by Registers Iceland. The recruitment was done via telephone interviews between 2010 and 2013 through different studies. Some studies had the sole purpose of recruiting panelists, while others were substantial CATI surveys. These interviews were concluded with an invitation to take part in the online panel. A stratified random sample of 4,987 individuals from the SSRI Internet Panel was invited to take part in the Multi-National Study of Questionnaire Design (MSQD). The sample was stratified by gender, age and residence to reflect the composition of the Icelandic population in the best possible way (population information was acquired from Statistics Iceland). The target population is the general population aged 18 and above.

**Data collection.** The data collection was carried out between November 7, and November 27, 2013. Respondents received an invitation to participate in the survey via email. The email included a link that referred the respondents to the web page with the survey. Respondents had the chance to win lottery prizes, which were gift certificates worth approx. 70€. A total of 4,987 individuals were invited to take part in the survey, and 3,141 interviews could be obtained. The completion rate was 62.4% (see AAPOR RR6). The information necessary to calculate the cumulative response rate was not provided by the SSRI Internet Panel.

*Japan*

**Sampling.** The Japanese survey was funded by the Environment Research and Technology Development Fund of the Ministry of the Environment, Japan. The data collection was part of another survey that consisted of questions concerning Japanese lifestyles, climate change, and energy choice. The data collection in Japan was administered by the National Institute for Environmental Studies. A two-stage probabilistic sampling was used. A random sample was drawn from the Basic Residents registry. The target population consisted of the general population aged 20 and above.

**Data collection.** The survey was conducted using face to face interviews in the period between October 10, and November 4, 2014. The respondents did not receive any incentives for their participation in the survey. A total of 3,000 persons were invited to take part in the survey, and a total of 1,548 interviews could be obtained. The response rate was 51.6% (AAPOR RR1).



*Netherlands*

**Sampling.** The data collection for the Netherlands was implemented in the LISS Panel conducted by the research institute CentERdata. The LISS Panel was funded by The Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The target population for the LISS Panel was the Dutch-speaking population permanently residing in the Netherlands aged 16 years or older. Sampling units of the LISS panel are not individuals but households. The address frame for the sampling procedure is provided by Statistics Netherlands using a 10% sample from the population register GBA (Gemeentelijke Basisadministratie). For each address in the sample, a contact centre company which is part of TNT post searched for the telephone number. This included landline numbers only. A single random sample of households was drawn without any stratification. The initial recruitment took place in 2007. The first refreshment sample was drawn between June and December 2009 to improve the representativeness of the panel by oversampling the difficult to reach groups, which had below-average response rates in the initial recruitment. The refreshment sample was stratified on three variables: household type, age, and ethnicity. Another refreshment sample was recruited between October 2011 and May 2012, using the same sampling methodology as in 2007. Households were contacted first with an announcement letter, including an unconditional incentive of 10€. Next, respondents were contacted by an interviewer in a mixed mode design. Households for which a telephone number was available were contacted via telephone (CATI). The remaining households were visited by an interviewer and a face-to-face recruitment interview was conducted. After the short recruitment interview, all members of the household were invited to join the panel. Willing participants in possession of the necessary equipment received a confirmation email, a letter with a login code, an information booklet, and a reply card. Participants without the necessary

technical equipment to become panel members were loaned equipment to provide access to the Internet via a broadband connection. In the confirmation email, the potential participants were promised another 10€ incentive for logging in or sending back the reply card.

**Data collection.** The field time of the survey that included the MSQD questions was between January 6, 2014, and January 28, 2014. Respondents were invited by email to participate in the self-administered web survey and received two additional email reminders. Pilot participants were excluded for this specific study. For each completed hour of interviews with the LISS Panel, respondents received 15€, that was paid quarter-yearly via bank transfer. A total of 2,796 household members was selected for this study, of which 2,257 completed the interview. The completion rate was 80.6% (see AAPOR RR6). The information necessary to calculate the cumulative response rate was not provided by the LISS Panel.

## *Norway*

**Sampling.** The data of the Norwegian subsample were collected by the University of Bergen that implemented the survey questions in the Norwegian Citizen Panel (NCP). The target population encompasses the general population who has access to the Internet aged between 18 and 95. In the first wave in 2013, a national random sample of 25,000 individuals was drawn from the “National Population Register” (NPR) provided by the Norwegian Tax Agency. The register consists of all persons born in Norway as well as persons formerly or currently residing in Norway. In the recruitment process, each person considered in the sample received a postal notification with information about the project and information on how to participate. The letters were sent out on November 6, 2013. The invitation to join the panel, in general, was complemented with the invitation to participate in the first wave. Participants could log in with the login-data they received with the announcement letter. As an incentive, participants had the chance to win a travel gift card worth approx. 2,700€ (25,000 NOK) when providing an email address and joining the panel. Reminders were sent via postcard on November 22, 2013, and another email was sent to those who provided an email address but did not take part in the survey on November 25, 2013. A refreshment sample of additional 25,000 potential participants was drawn in the third wave, using the same sampling procedure and methodology as in the first wave. The recruitment letter was sent on October 13, 2014. Similarly, to the first wave, newly recruited respondents received one reminder by post card on October 23, 2014, and one email reminder on October 31, 2014. Two new recruitment methods were used: a) reminders were also sent via SMS when a participant had not participated in the survey after receiving a letter and a postcard, and b) a random subset of persons in the gross sample were recruited via telephone

after they received the announcement letter. Like the first recruited sample, the newly recruited respondents had the chance to win a travel gift card of the same value.

**Data collection.** The questions of the MSQD were asked in two parts. Part one was collected in the third wave and included the abortion experiment, part two was collected in the fourth wave of the citizen panel and included the financial contributions experiment. Wave three was a recruitment wave and was conducted using web survey interviews in the period between October 13, 2014, and December 13, 2014. The first contact was via mail. Afterward three reminders were sent (first reminder postcard, second reminder text message, and third reminder phone call). A total of 24,395 persons were invited to take part in survey, and 5,453 complete interviews could be obtained (the total is 5,588 if incomplete submissions with substantial response sets are included).

Besides the new recruitment from Wave 3, respondents previously recruited in Wave 1 were invited to respond to the Wave 3 questionnaire. From 4,833 individuals contacted, 2,927 responded. In sum, 29,228 individuals were contacted for the Wave 3 questionnaire (whether new recruitment or existing panel members); of these 8,515 responded, for a response rate of 29.1%.

Note, however, that the response rate of 29% may be somewhat confusing, as it represents a compound of a study completion rate (the share of existing survey panel members completing the wave) and recruitment rate (the share of individuals invited by postal mail in connection with Wave 3 to take part in the panel actually completing the Wave 3 questionnaire). The study completion rate for the existing members recruited in Wave 1 was 61%; the response rate for the new invitees in Wave 3 was 22%.

Wave 4 was a regular panel wave and conducted using web survey interviews in the period between March 9, 2015 and March 31, 2015. The first contact was via email. Afterward three reminders were sent out (first and second reminder email, third reminder text message). Although a total of 10,509 persons was invited to take part in the survey, in practice only 9,494 had taken part in at least one of the two preceding rounds; non-participants were thus considered as having withdrawn. Given a total of 6,297 interviews, the completion rate was thus 66% (see AAPOR RR6).

The NCP does not operate with outright “profile interviews.” Thus, cumulative response rates should be calculated directly as the relationship between all responses received and all individuals contacted. In wave 3, this rate is 17% (AAPOR CUMRR); in wave 4 it is 13% (AAPOR CUMRR).

### ***Portugal***

**Sampling.** The Portuguese study was funded by the Portuguese Foundation of Science and Technology (FCT, grant PTDC/IVC-CPO/3921/2012), and the data collection was administered by the ISCTE-IUL (Instituto universitário de Lisboa). The target population is the Portuguese electoral population aged 18 years and older, living on the mainland and in possession of a landline connection. The sample was drawn using Random Digit Dialling and cases were probabilistically selected proportional to the region's population.

**Data collection.** The data collection (mixed mode: online and telephone) was carried out between June 30, 2014, and October 14, 2014. In the recruitment call, respondents were invited to take part in the survey via phone or in a web survey. As an incentive, the participants had the chance to obtain one of ten book vouchers. A total of 1,204 interviews could be obtained: 166 via the web-based questionnaire and 1,038 via the telephone version.

A total amount of 19,312 telephone numbers were called. This resulted in 9,589 telephone calls (interviews, refusals, breakdown refusals, language barrier, fax numbers, business number) and 9,713 non-successful calls (e. g. answering machines, busy numbers, etc.). The response rate was 6.2% (AAPOR RR1).

*Sweden*

**Sampling.** The data of the Swedish subsample were collected by the Laboratory of Opinion Research (LORE) based at the University of Gothenburg. In 2014, the majority of the funding of LORE was provided by the University of Gothenburg. Additional funds are provided through panel user fees (academic works only). The data collection for the project was implemented in the already existing Citizen Panel (Wave 9). The target population is the Swedish population, which is defined as Swedish citizens and foreign nationals residing in Sweden over a year who are aged between 18 and 70 years. The sample of the MSQD consisted only of probability based recruitment from population samples and the self-recruited sub-sample in the Citizen Panel was excluded. The sample frame for the random population sample was the Swedish population register which was provided by the Swedish Tax Agency.

For this study, a single recruitment cohort was used, and for that particular recruitment, 23,500 persons were invited to register for participation in the panel. This sample was selected using simple random sampling and was contacted by a mailed invitation to become a panel participant. This recruitment resulted in 2,605 people becoming new panel members. LORE does not use separate steps for initial registration and a profile survey, rather those who accept to join the panel complete the profile survey at that same occasion as the initial consent. The combined recruitment and profile rate for this recruitment cohort was 11% ( $2,605/23,500$ ). This can also be formulated as  $RECR \times PROR = 11\%$ .

For this specific study, 2,500 panel members from this recruitment cohort of 2,605 were randomly selected to answer the questions of this specific study.

**Data collection.** The persons in the sample received an email with a unique direct link to the survey. One reminder was sent to persons that did not take part in the survey. The fieldwork

was carried out between March 6, 2014, and April 7, 2014 using the online survey platform Qualtrics. Of the 2,500 persons invited to take part in the survey, 1,770 was successfully contacted in the survey. Respondents did not receive any incentives for their participation. The completion rate (COMR) was 69.0% (see AAPOR RR6). The cumulative response rate (AAPOR CUMRR) was 7.6% ( $11\% \times 69\%$ ).



***Taiwan***

**Sampling.** The data of the Taiwanese subsample were collected by the Center for Survey Research (CSR) at the Center for Humanities and Social Sciences, Academia Sinica. The funding agency was the Center for Humanities and Social Sciences, Academia Sinica. The sampling procedure was based upon email addresses that were provided at the end of different previously conducted random probability surveys: Nutrition and Health Survey (2009), Taiwan Genomic Survey (2009), Taiwan Social Change Survey (2011), Taiwan Weather Change Survey (2012 and 2013), and Taiwan Panel Study of Family Dynamics (2007-2014). All these surveys were conducted by the CSR. The funding agency of the Nutrition and Health Survey was the Ministry of Health and Welfare (formerly the Department of Health), Taiwan. The Taiwan Genomic Survey and the Taiwan Social Change Survey were funded by the Ministry of Science and Technology (formerly the National Science Council), Taiwan. The Taiwan Weather Change Survey and the Taiwan Panel Study of Family Dynamics were funded by Academia Sinica, Taiwan.

The sampling procedure is based upon email addresses that were provided in different surveys: Nutrition and Health Survey (2009), Taiwan Genomic Survey (2009), Taiwan Social Change Survey (2011), and Taiwan Weather Change Survey (2012 and 2013). Additionally, email addresses from the Taiwan Panel Study of Family Dynamics (2007-2014) were added in the second round of data collection.

In the above surveys, the Taiwan Genomic Survey, the Taiwan Social Change Survey, and the 2013 Taiwan Weather Change Survey are cross-sectional in-person surveys. The 2009 Nutrition and Health Survey and the 2012 Taiwan Weather Change Survey are telephone surveys. The Taiwan Panel Study of Family Dynamics is an in-person longitudinal project.

The target population of the Taiwan Genomic Survey, the Taiwan Social Change Survey, the Taiwan Weather Change Survey, and the Nutrition and Health Survey was the Taiwanese population aged between 18 and 70. The target population of the Taiwan Weather Change Survey and the Nutrition and Health Survey was the Taiwanese population aged 18 and older.

In the Taiwan Genomic Survey, the Taiwan Social Change Survey, and the 2013 Taiwan Weather Change Survey, a stratified three-stage PPS sampling based on official population registers was employed. At the first stage of sampling, the townships of Taiwan were divided into six strata according to population density, education, proportion of the population aged 65 or older, proportion of the population aged 15-64, proportion of industrial employees, and proportion of service employees. In the first stage of sampling, townships were randomly selected from each stratum. In the second stage, two villages were randomly selected from each chosen township. In the final stage, individuals were randomly selected from the chosen villages.

The 2009 Nutrition and Health Survey and the 2012 Taiwan Weather Change Survey are random-digit-dialling (RDD) telephone surveys. The database for landline prefix was provided by the National Communications Commission, Taiwan. For any randomly selected telephone number prefix, the last three digits were generated by the CAI system. As to each connected telephone line, a predesigned sampling procedure is adopted to select one person from the qualified household members.

The main respondents of Taiwan Panel Study of Family Dynamics (PSFD) are composed of four birth cohorts, including: (1) cohort born during 1953-64, (2) cohort born during 1935-54, (3) cohort born during 1964-76, and (4) cohort born during 1977-83. These four groups of respondents were first interviewed in 1999, 2000, 2003, and 2009, respectively. A stratified three-stage PPS sampling method was used in the first-wave surveys of the 1953-64 and 1935-54

birth cohorts (conducted in 1999 and 2000 respectively). The townships of Taiwan were divided into ten strata according to population, population features, industrial development, public facilities, financial situation and geographical conditions. In the first stage of sampling, townships were randomly selected from each stratum. In the second stage, villages were randomly selected from each chosen township. In the third stage, individuals were randomly selected from the chosen villages. For the first-wave survey of 1964-76 birth cohort (conducted in 2003), individuals were randomly sampled from the townships and villages selected in 1999. Similar to 1999 and 2000 surveys, stratified three-stage PPS sampling method was adopted in the 2003 survey. For the first-wave survey of the 1977-83 birth cohort (conducted in 2009), townships of Taiwan were divided into six strata according to population density, education, proportion of the population aged 65 or above, proportion of the population aged 15-64, proportion of industrial employees, and proportion of service employees. In the first stage of sampling, townships were randomly selected from each stratum. In the second stage, two villages were randomly selected from each chosen township. In the third stage, individuals were randomly selected from the chosen villages. The respondents who completed interviews in the first wave were contacted on an annual basis till 2012. Since 2012, the sample has been traced biennially.

**Data collection.** Those participants of the surveys above who provided an email address were contacted and invited to take part in the self-administered web survey. Four reminders were sent to those not participating. The first round of data collection which was carried out from July 21, 2014, to August 10, 2014, led to a participating sample of 327 out of an initial sample consisting of 2,315 individuals invited. The completion rate was 15.3% (see AAPOR RR6). The cumulative response rate was 2.3% (AAPOR CUMRR).

The second round of data collection was based on an address list from the Taiwan Panel Study of Family Dynamics excluding those participants that were ever coded as “refusal” in the panel study. The survey was conducted using the same methodology as in the preceding field period. Five reminders were sent to non-responders. The field period started on February 24, 2015, and ended on March 31, 2015. 1,419 panelists were initially invited to take part in the survey, of which 463 interviews could be obtained. The completion rate was 37% (see AAPOR RR6). The cumulative response rate was 14.9% (AAPOR CUMRR).

The overall cumulative response rate was 4.6% (AAPOR CUMRR). Participants in the survey were eligible for a raffle draw with prizes from approximately 5€ (NT\$ 200) to approximately 140€ (NT\$5,000).

*United Kingdom*

**Sampling.** The University of Essex implemented the questions of the MSQD in the already existing Understanding Society Innovation Panel. The target population of the panel was the general population aged 16 and older living in private households in England, Scotland, and Wales. Areas north of the Caledonian Canal were excluded. In the first wave of the Innovation Panel, a three-stage random sample was drawn. At the first stage, a systematic random sample of 120 postcode sectors from the Postcode Address File was drawn with probability proportional to population size after ordering by Government Office Region, the percentage of household heads classified as National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification categories 1 and 2 (non-manual), and population density. At the second stage, in each PSU 23 addresses were drawn as a systematic random sampling. At the final stage of sampling, interviewers conducted face-to-face interviews with all persons belonging to the target population and residing at the sample address at the time the interviewer conducted the recruitment interview. In Wave 4, an additional 960 addresses and in Wave 7, an additional 1,560 addresses from the original PSUs were added using systematic random sampling as refreshment samples.

**Data collection.** Wave 7 of the Innovation panel employed a mixed-mode design, which was started in Wave 5 and was continued in Wave 6. In the fifth wave, a random sample of two-thirds of households was allocated to the web design employing a self-administered web survey, and the remaining subsample was interviewed face-to-face by interviewers. All newly recruited respondents of Wave 7 were allocated to the face-to-face mode. Because of administration and survey management issues, the sample was divided into two tranches. For one tranche the fieldwork for the group assigned to the web survey started three weeks earlier than the face-to-face-fieldwork, for the other tranche the fieldwork started five weeks earlier than the face-to-

face-fieldwork. The field period for the web survey ran from May 21, 2014, to June 12, 2014, for the first tranche and for the second tranche from May 21, 2014, to June 24, 2014. The persons in the face-to-face sample were interviewed between July 10, 2014, and October 19, 2014. Adults in households allocated to the web design group were sent an advance letter and an email if they provided an address. They received a URL and a unique log-in code. Several reminders were sent via email and eventually a reminder letter. Web respondents could join the face-to-face group if they did not complete the questionnaire online three weeks after the initial letter was sent but could then still enter the web survey if they wished to. The face to face field work for the web sample started June 13, 2014 and ended July 9, 2014 for the first tranche and for the second tranche between June 25, 2014 and July 24, 2014. An experiment concerning conditional and unconditional incentives was conducted. 50% of the households were issued to standard unconditional incentives. The incentives differed in their amount and their conditionality. Respondents recruited in wave 7 were allocated to three random groups, receiving either £10, £20 or £30 unconditionally. Respondents from the recruitment in former waves received an unconditional incentive if they were part of the face-to-face group or were randomly allocated to one of the following groups. Group 1 received a £10 unconditional incentive, Group 2 received the same amount, and in addition, a £20 incentive for full-household completion by web and Group 3 received an unconditional incentive of £30. A total of 5,415 adults were invited, and a total of 2,262 individual interviews with adults could be obtained. The individual response rate was 42.5% (see AAPOR RR6), and the response rate of the refreshment sample was 29.2% (AAPOR RR1). The cumulative response rate on the household level was 36.2% (AAPOR CUMRR).

## Appendix B: Translated Question Wordings

### *Contributions Experiment*

Source questions (US (Gallup and TESS), UK, and Canada)

“Do you think labor unions should be permitted to spend their money to help elect or defeat candidates for political offices?”

“Do you think businesses should be permitted to spend their money to help elect or defeat candidates for political offices?”

(Yes / No)

French (Canada)

“Pensez-vous que les syndicats devraient être permis de dépenser leur argent pour aider les candidats d’être élus ou défaits pour les postes politiques?”

“Pensez-vous que les entreprises devraient être permises de dépenser leur argent pour aider les candidats d’être élus ou défaits pour les postes politiques?”

(Oui / Non)

Danish (Denmark)

“Mener du, at det bør være tilladt for fagforeninger at bruge penge på at støtte politiske partier?”

“Mener du, at det bør være tilladt for virksomheder at bruge penge på at støtte politiske partier?”

(Ja / Nej)

German (Germany: GIP and GESIS)

“Finden Sie, dass es Gewerkschaften erlaubt sein sollte, ihr Geld dazu zu verwenden, die Wahl bestimmter Parteien zu unterstützen bzw. um zu verhindern, dass bestimmte Parteien gewählt werden?”

„Finden Sie, dass es Unternehmen erlaubt sein sollte, ihr Geld dazu zu verwenden, die Wahl bestimmter Parteien zu unterstützen bzw. um zu verhindern, dass bestimmte Parteien gewählt werden?“

(Ja / Nein)

Icelandic (Iceland)

„Telur þú að stéttarfélagum ætti að vera heimilt að nýta fjármuni sína til að styðja eða koma í veg fyrir að frambjóðendur nái kjöri í kosningum til pólitískra embætta?“

“Telur þú að fyrirtækjum ætti að vera heimilt að nýta fjármuni sína til að styðja eða koma í veg fyrir að frambjóðendur nái kjöri í kosningum til pólitískra embætta?“

(Já / Nei)

Dutch (Netherlands)

“Denkt u dat vakbonden moet worden toegestaan om hun geld uit te geven om kandidaten voor politieke functies te helpen om te worden gekozen of om dat te verhinderen?“

„Denkt u dat bedrijven moet worden toegestaan om hun geld uit te geven om kandidaten voor politieke functies te helpen om te worden gekozen of om dat te verhinderen?“

(Ja / Nee)

Norwegian (Norway)

“Tillatt for fagforeninger å bruke penger som støtte til å velge eller slå kandidater til politiske stillinger”

“Tillatt for virksomheter å bruke penger som støtte til å velge eller slå kandidater til politiske stillinger”

(Ja / Nei)

Swedish (Sweden)

„Anser du att fackföreningar bör tillåtas att använda sina pengar för att hjälpa eller besegra politiska partier eller kandidater i val?”

“Anser du att företag bör tillåtas att använda sina pengar för att hjälpa eller besegra politiska partier eller kandidater i val?”

(Ja / Nej)

Chinese (Taiwan)

請問您認為應該允許工會使用其經費去支持或是反對政治候選人嗎？

請問您認為應該允許企業使用其經費去支持或是反對政治候選人嗎？

(應該 / 不應該 )



***Abortion Experiment***

Source questions (US (Gallup and TESS), UK, and Canada)

“Do you think it should be possible for a pregnant woman to obtain a legal abortion if she is married and does not want any more children?”

“Do you think it should be possible for a pregnant woman to obtain a legal abortion if there is a strong chance of serious defect in the baby?”

(Yes / No)

French (Canada)

“Pensez-vous qu'il devrait être possible pour une femme enceinte d'obtenir un avortement légal si elle est mariée et ne veut pas d'autres enfants?”

“Pensez-vous qu'il devrait être possible pour une femme enceinte d'obtenir un avortement légal s'il y a une possibilité significative d'une anomalie grave chez le bébé?”

(Oui / Non)

Danish (Denmark)

„Mener du, at det bør være muligt for en gravid kvinde at få foretaget en abort, hvis hun er gift og ikke ønsker flere børn?”

„Mener du, at det bør være muligt for en gravid kvinde at få foretaget en abort, hvis der er en stor risiko for, at barnet er handicappet?”

(Ja / Nej)

German (Germany: GIP and GESIS)

“Sollte es Ihrer Meinung nach einer Frau gesetzlich möglich sein, einen Schwangerschaftsabbruch vornehmen zu lassen, wenn sie verheiratet ist und keine Kinder mehr haben möchte?”

„Sollte es Ihrer Meinung nach einer Frau gesetzlich möglich sein, einen Schwangerschaftsabbruch vornehmen zu lassen, wenn das Baby mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit eine ernsthafte Schädigung haben wird?”

(Ja / Nein)

Icelandic (Iceland)

“Telur þú að það eigi að vera mögulegt fyrir ófríska konu að fá löglega fóstureyðingu ef hún er gift og vill ekki eignast fleiri börn?”

„Telur þú að það eigi að vera mögulegt fyrir ófríska konu að fá löglega fóstureyðingu ef það eru miklar líkur á alvarlegum fæðingargalla hjá barninu?”

(Já / Nei)

Japanese (Japan)

結婚している女性が、「これ以上子どもが欲しくない」と言う理由で、妊娠した女性が中絶をしてもよいと思いますか？

生まれてくる赤ちゃんに重い障害がある可能性が高いと言う理由で、妊娠した女性が中絶をしてもよいと思いますか？

(はい / いいえ)

Dutch (Netherlands)

“Vindt u dat het voor een zwangere vrouw mogelijk moet zijn om een legale abortus te krijgen als zij gehuwd is en geen kinderen meer wil?”

„Vindt u dat het voor een zwangere vrouw mogelijk moet zijn om een legale abortus te krijgen als er een hoge kans bestaat op een ernstige afwijking bij de baby?”

(Ja / Nee)

Norwegian (Norway)

“Synes du det burde være mulig for en gravid kvinne å få lovlig abort hvis hun er gift og ikke ønsker seg flere barn?”

„Synes du det burde være mulig for en gravid kvinne å få lovlig abort hvis det er en stor sjanse for at barnet har en alvorlig defekt?”

(Ja / Nei)

Portuguese (Portugal)

„Acha que deveria ser possível a uma mulher grávida fazer um aborto legal se ela for casada e não quiser mais filhos?”

“Acha que deveria ser possível a uma mulher grávida fazer um aborto legal se existir uma forte possibilidade de o bebé ter deficiências graves?”

(Sim / Não)

Swedish (Sweden)

„Anser du att det bör vara möjligt för en gravid kvinna att genomgå en laglig abort om hon är gift och inte vill ha fler barn?”

„Anser du att det bör vara möjligt för en gravid kvinna att genomgå en laglig abort om det finns en hög risk för ett allvarligt fel på barnet?”

(Ja<sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub> / Nej)

Chinese (Taiwan)

如果懷孕的已婚女性不想再生小孩，請問您認為她是否可以合法墮胎？

如果懷孕女性的胎兒有很高的機率會有嚴重缺陷，請問您認為她是否可以合法墮胎？

(是 / 否)

**Appendix C: Replication of the Analyses with Weighted Data**

Table A1

*Support for Unions' and Businesses' Contributions when Asked First (Weighted Results)*

	% Support when Asked First		Difference	Weighted F-statistic	N
	Businesses	Unions			
Meet necessary condition					
UK	19.7	29.6	10.1	20.53***	2,147
Norway	18.1	25.3	7.2	5.54*	1,171
Necessary condition reversed					
Denmark	46.8	33.1	-13.7	25.45***	1,317
Iceland	7.8	5.0	-2.8	6.01*	2,981
Do not meet necessary condition					
U.S. (Gallup)	36.9	39.6	2.7	0.92	1,967

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$  (two-tailed tests)

Two results changed when data were weighted in the analyses. First, the Norwegian data now met the necessary condition of more support of unions' financial contributions than businesses financial contributions ( $\Delta = 7.2\%$ ,  $F(1, 1170) = 5.54$ ,  $p = .02$ ). Second, the U.S. (Gallup) data no longer met the necessary condition for the question order effect in the contributions experiment. When the U.S. data were weighted, there was only a 2.7 percent point difference between support for financial contributions by businesses and unions, which was not significant  $F(1, 1965) = .92$ ,  $p = .34$ .

Table A2

*Question Order Effects in the Contributions Experiment (Weighted Results)*

Country	Businesses Can Make Contributions					Unions Can Make Contributions				
	% Yes when Asked First	% Yes when Asked Second	Diff.	Weighted F-statistic	N	% Yes when Asked First	% Yes when Asked Second	Diff.	Weighted F-statistic	N
Meet necessary condition										
UK	19.7	25.6	5.9	8.00**	2,159	29.6	26.7	-2.9	1.63	2,147
Norway	18.1	23.5	5.4	3.15	1,167	25.3	21.2	-4.1	1.63	1,166
Necessary condition reversed										
Denmark	46.8	48.0	1.2	.20	1,305	33.1	38.4	5.3	3.96*	1,307
Iceland	7.8	11.4	3.6	8.5**	2,963	5.0	4.4	-0.6	.43	3,001
Do not meet necessary condition										
U.S. (Gallup)	36.9	40.5	3.6	1.66	1,967	39.6	35.1	-4.5	2.63	1,967

\*\*\* p &lt;.001, \*\* p &lt;.01, \* p &lt;.05 (two-tailed tests)

Results with weighted data were similar to the ones reported in the main text for those countries that continued to meet the necessary condition (UK, Denmark, Iceland). Results for the two countries in which weighting affected the necessary conditions were also in line with our expectations. First, there was a marginally significant increase in support of businesses' financial contributions when that question was preceded by the unions question ( $\Delta = 3.2\%$ ,  $F(1, 1166) = 3.15$ ,  $p = .08$ ) in the Norwegian data where the necessary condition for a question order effect was met. Second, in the U.S. (Gallup) where the necessary condition was not met with weighted data, support for contributions by businesses did not increase significantly when it was asked second ( $\Delta = 3.6\%$ ,  $F(1, 1965) = 1.66$ ,  $p = .20$ ) and support of unions' financial contributions was not significantly reduced when this question was in second position ( $\Delta = 4.0\%$ ,  $F(1, 1965) = 2.63$ ,  $p = .11$ ).

Table A3  
*Variation in the Contributions Question Order Effect By Education (Weighted Results)*

Country	Businesses Can Make Contributions				Unions Can Make Contributions			
	High versus Medium and Low Education		Low versus Medium and High Education		High versus Medium and Low Education		Low versus Medium and High Education	
	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Meet necessary condition								
UK	.49	.62	-.01	.99	.35	.72	.28	.78
Norway	-.28	.78	1.36	.18	.06	.95	-.87	.39
Necessary condition reversed								
Denmark	.74	.46	-1.20	.23	-.18	.86	.80	.42
Iceland	1.14	.26	-.80	.42	.51	.61	-.78	.44
Do not meet necessary condition								
U.S. (Gallup)	1.69 <sup>+</sup>	.09	-1.25	.21	-.46	.65	-1.21	.23
Total sample <sup>1</sup>	-1.33	.18	-.91	.36	.82	.41	-1.32	.19

Z-statistics are from interaction coefficients of logistic regression models.

<sup>1</sup>The total effect is calculated in a fixed effects multilevel model that includes all samples. Weights in samples for which actual weights were not provided are set to 1.

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , +  $p < .01$  (two-tailed tests)

Using weights, there was still not indication of moderation of the question order effect by education.

Table A4  
*Support for Abortion if a Married Woman Does Not Want More Children and If There Is a Strong Chance of a Birth Defect when Asked First (Weighted Results)*

	% Support when Asked First		Difference	Weighted F-statistic	N
	Married Woman	Birth Defect			
Meet necessary condition					
U.S. (Gallup)	63.9	70.1	6.2	5.15*	1,949
U.S. (TESS)	56.4	68.9	12.5	14.96***	1,015
UK	75.3	87.2	11.9	31.24***	2,189
Iceland	86.0	94.3	8.3	31.32***	2,968
Portugal	63.3	87.0	23.7	59.37***	1,204
Do not meet necessary condition					
Denmark	91.4	91.6	0.2	.03	1,316
Norway	85.8	85.4	-0.4	.03	1,587

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , +  $p < .01$  (two-tailed tests)

Using weighted data, there were no substantial changes with regard to the necessary condition for the question order effect in the abortion experiment.

Table A5

*Question Order Effects in the Abortion Experiment (Weighted Results)*

Country	Abortion When No More Children					Abortion When Genetic Defect				
	% Yes when Asked First	% Yes when Asked Second	Diff.	Weighted F-statistic	N	% Yes when Asked First	% Yes when Asked Second	Diff.	Weighted F-statistic	N
Meet necessary condition										
U.S. (Gallup)	63.9	53.7	-10.2	12.70***	1,955	70.1	72.2	2.1	.61	1,955
U.S. (TESS)	56.4	49.5	-6.9	4.37*	1,015	68.9	73.2	4.3	2.05	1,015
UK	75.3	63.0	-12.3	27.20***	2,183	87.2	88.8	1.6	.86	2,202
Iceland	86.0	72.8	-13.2	39.54***	2,984	94.3	96.8	2.5	7.41**	2,947
Portugal	63.3	49.5	-13.8	16.84***	1,204	87.0	88.7	1.7	.50	1,204
Do not meet necessary condition										
Denmark	91.4	81.9	-9.5	24.72***	1,308	91.6	92.1	0.5	.10	1,302
Norway	85.8	71.1	-14.7	26.78***	1,584	85.4	87.5	2.1	.85	1,579

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$  (two-tailed tests)

With weighted data, the question order effect in the U.S. (TESS) turned from marginally significant to statistical significance at the  $p < .05$  level ( $\Delta = 6.9\%$ ,  $F(1, 1015) = 4.37$ ,  $p = .04$ ). We now also observed a question order effect for the birth defect question in Iceland.

Table A6  
*Variation in the Abortion Question Order Effect By Education (Weighted Results)*

Country	Abortion When No More Children				Abortion When Genetic Defect			
	High versus Medium and Low Education		Low versus Medium and High Education		High versus Medium and Low Education		Low versus Medium and High Education	
	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Meet necessary condition								
U.S. (Gallup)	-.89	.37	1.70 <sup>+</sup>	.09	.89	.38	-1.47	.14
U.S. (TESS)	1.46	.14	-1.85 <sup>+</sup>	.06	-.22	.83	.68	.50
UK	-.59	.55	.76	.45	-1.08	.28	.25	.80
Iceland	1.18	.24	-.52	.60	-2.43*	.02	1.53	.13
Portugal	.09	.93	.53	.60	-2.61**	.01	1.08	.28
Do not meet necessary condition								
Denmark	-.97	.33	.99	.32	-.75	.45	.52	.61
Norway	1.82 <sup>+</sup>	.07	-2.22*	.03	1.62	.11	-.16	.88
Total sample <sup>1</sup>	1.47	.14	-.13	.90	-.88	.38	1.24	.22

Z-statistics are from interaction coefficients of logistic regression models.

<sup>1</sup>The total effect is calculated in a fixed effects multilevel model that includes all samples. Weights in samples for which actual weights were not provided are set to 1.

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , +  $p < .01$  (two-tailed tests)

Using weights, there was still not indication of moderation of the question order effect by education. The significant overall effect in the total sample with regard to asking the question about abortion if a married woman does not want any more children (high vs. medium and low education) was insignificant when weights were used.