

**Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)  
Module 4: Design Report (Sample Design and Data Collection Report)**

December 29, 2016

Country: <b>Greece</b> Date of Election: <b>January 25, 2015</b>  Prepared by: <b>Ioannis Andreadis, Associate Professor</b> <b>Evangelia Kartsounidou, PhD Candidate</b>  <b>Laboratory of Applied Political Research</b> <b>School of Political Sciences, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki</b>  Date of Preparation: <b>June - December 2015</b>
---

NOTES TO COLLABORATORS:

- Where brackets [ ] appear, answer by placing an “X” within the appropriate bracket or brackets.
- If more space is needed to answer any question, please lengthen the document as necessary.

**Collaborator(s):**

Collaborators are the contact persons for election studies that appear in the CSES dataset - they are not necessarily the parties who collected the data. These collaborators and their contact information will be listed on the CSES website.

Name: <b>Ioannis Andreadis</b> Title: <b>Associate Professor of Quantitative Methods</b>  Organization: <b>Aristotle University of Thessaloniki</b> <b>School of Political Sciences</b> <b>Laboratory of Applied Political Research</b>  Address: <b>Aristotle University of Thessaloniki</b> <b>School of Political Sciences</b> <b>Egnatias 45, 54625, Thessaloniki, Greece</b>  Telephone: <b>2310 991992</b> Fax: <b>2310 991983</b> E-Mail: <a href="mailto:john@polsci.auth.gr">john@polsci.auth.gr</a> Website: <a href="http://www.polres.gr/en/andreadis/">http://www.polres.gr/en/andreadis/</a>	Name: <b>Theodore Chadjipadelis</b> Title: <b>Professor of Applied Statistics</b>  Organization: <b>Aristotle University of Thessaloniki</b> <b>School of Political Sciences</b> <b>Laboratory of Applied Political Research</b>  Address: <b>Aristotle University of Thessaloniki</b> <b>School of Political Sciences</b> <b>Egnatias 45, 54625, Thessaloniki, Greece</b>  Telephone: <b>2310 997912</b> Fax: <b>2310 991950</b> E-Mail: <a href="mailto:chadji@polsci.auth.gr">chadji@polsci.auth.gr</a> Website: <a href="http://www.eps.auth.gr/en/polsci/faculty/5034">http://www.eps.auth.gr/en/polsci/faculty/5034</a>
--	---

<p>Name: <b>Eftichia Teperoglou</b> Title: <b>Lecturer</b></p> <p>Organization: <b>Aristotle University of Thessaloniki</b> <b>School of Political Sciences</b> <b>Laboratory of Applied Political Research</b></p> <p>Address: <b>Aristotle University of Thessaloniki</b> <b>School of Political Sciences</b> <b>Egnatias 45, 54625, Thessaloniki, Greece</b></p> <p>Telephone: <b>+302310991988</b> Fax: E-Mail: <a href="mailto:efteperoglou@polsci.auth.gr">efteperoglou@polsci.auth.gr</a> Website: <a href="http://www.eps.auth.gr/el/polsci/faculty/5047">http://www.eps.auth.gr/el/polsci/faculty/5047</a></p>	
---	--

**Data Collection Organization:**

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

<p>1. Organization: <b>Aristotle University of Thessaloniki</b> <b>School of Political Sciences</b></p> <p>Address: <b>Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of Political Sciences</b> <b>Egnatias 45, 54625, Thessaloniki, Greece</b></p> <p>Data Collection Supervisor: Ioannis Andreadis Telephone: <b>2310 991992</b> E-Mail: <a href="mailto:john@polsci.auth.gr">john@polsci.auth.gr</a> Website: <a href="http://www.polsci.auth.gr/">http://www.polsci.auth.gr/</a></p>
--

**Funding Organization(s):**

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

**1.**

Organization:

**Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of Political Sciences  
Laboratory of Applied Political Research**

Address:

**Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of Political Sciences  
Egnatias 45, 54625, Thessaloniki, Greece**

Telephone: **2310 997912**

Fax: **2310 991950**

E-Mail: [chadji@polsci.auth.gr](mailto:chadji@polsci.auth.gr)

Website: <http://www.polsci.auth.gr/>

**2.**

Organization:

**ISCTE IUL - LISBON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE  
(Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology)**

Address:

**AV. DAS FORCAS ARMADAS  
1649-026, Lisboa, Portugal**

Telephone: **+351 210 464 018**

Fax: **+351 217 940 074**

E-Mail: [gcp.cies@iscte.pt](mailto:gcp.cies@iscte.pt)

Website: <http://www.cies.iscte-iul.pt>

**Archiving Organization**

If appropriate, please indicate the primary location where the full, original election study dataset (not just the CSES portion) will be archived:

Organization: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research  
Address: Ann Arbor, MI

Telephone:

Fax: E-Mail:

Website: <http://doi.org/10.3886/E51483V1>

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive: 06/08/2016

**Study Design**

1. Timing of the study that the CSES Module was included in:

- Post-Election Study**
- Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study
- Between Rounds

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: June 12, 2015

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: September 8, 2015

3. Mode of interviewing for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared:  
(If multiple modes were used, please mark all that apply.)

- In person, face-to-face
- Telephone**
- Mail or self-completion supplement
- Internet**

4a. Was the survey part of a panel study?

- Yes
- No**

4b. If the survey was part of a panel study, please describe the design of the panel study, including the date at which interviewing for each prior wave began and ended:

### **Translation**

Please provide copies of questionnaires in all languages used as part of the election study deposit. For questionnaires in a language other than English, please also provide a version of each translated back into English. Note: Questions are based on those developed for the ISSP.

5. Was the questionnaire translated?

- Yes, translated by member(s) of research team**
- Yes, by translation bureau
- Yes, by specially trained translator(s)
- No, not translated

6. Please list all languages used for the fielded module:

### **Greek**

7a. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?

- Yes, by group discussion**
- Yes, an expert checked it
- Yes, by back translation
- Other; please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- No
- Not applicable

7b. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?

- Yes**
- No
- Not applicable

7c. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?

- Yes
- No**
- Not applicable

7d. If the questionnaire was translated, please provide a list of all questions which caused problems when translating. For each question listed, describe what problems were encountered and how they were solved:

### **Sample Design and Sampling Procedures**

8. Please describe the population that your sample is meant to be representative of:

- a) **Minimum age:18**
- b) **Voting rights**
- c) **Greek nationality**

### **Eligibility Requirements**

9a. Must a person be a certain age to be interviewed?

**Yes**

No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

**(voting age) (born in 1996 and later)**

9b. Must a person be a citizen to be interviewed?

**Yes**

No

9c. Must a person be registered to vote to be interviewed?

**Yes (by law all Greek citizens born 1996 and later are registered)**

No

9d. Please list any other interviewing requirements or filters used:

### Sample Frame

10a. Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? \_\_\_\_\_ %

If yes, please explain:

10b. Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? NA

If yes, please explain:

10c. Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? \_\_\_\_\_ %

If yes, please explain:

10d. If interviews were conducted by telephone, what is the estimated percentage of households without a phone? 18 %

Please explain:

[http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_414\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_414_en.pdf) (p.19)

10e. If interviews were conducted by telephone, were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled?

Yes

No

If no, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? \_\_\_\_\_ %

10f. Were other persons excluded from the sample frame?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? \_\_\_\_\_ %

If yes, please explain:

10g. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: \_\_\_\_\_ %

## Sample Selection Procedures

11. Please describe, in your own words, how the sample for the study was selected. If the survey is part of a panel study, please also describe the original sample, from the beginning of the study.

The 2015 Hellenic (Greek) National Election Voter Study was conducted as a mixed-mode survey in the period between June 12, 2015 and September 8, 2015. For the recruitment of our sample we used telephone (CATI); while for the main data collection phase we used web (CAWI) in combination with some telephone interviews (CATI). The recruitment of the respondents was done with a random selection of telephone numbers, using a Random Digital Dialling (RDD) method. The recruitment process lasted from June 12 until July 16. As for the mode of questionnaire completion a mixed-mode survey design was preferred combining web (CAWI) and telephone interviews (CATI). The Web was the main mode of the survey and the telephone interview was used as an auxiliary method for the respondents who do not have internet access or email account. For instance, a very limited number of Greek people in the 65+ age group use web tools and most of them have no or limited access to the Internet. These people were encouraged to answer the questionnaire through a telephone interview. The selected respondents who were contacted on the phone, were asked to provide their email address if they wanted to participate in a web survey conducted by Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Every email address collected during the recruitment phase was uploaded to the epolls.gr web survey system and an e-mail with the invitation and the link to the survey was sent to the respondent. At this point it should be noted that during this phase we also sent invitations to about 400 respondents of the 2012 voter study who had indicated that they would be willing to participate in future ELNES surveys. In the following weeks after the initial invitation reminders were sent to the respondents who had not completed the questionnaire. Maximum 6 follow-up reminders were sent through email to the respondents, in order to increase the response rate of the survey.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

### Households

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

### Randomly

12c. Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?

- Yes  
 No

Please explain how the units were randomly selected. If the units were not randomly selected, please provide a justification for why the units were not randomly selected.

RDD for initial contact. Then,

- if the respondent had email address: push telephone to web (CAWI)

- if the respondent had no email address and was aged +65: Telephone interview (CATI):

13. Were there further stages of selection?

- Yes  
 No

13a. If there were further stages of selection, what were the sampling units at each of the additional stages?

13b. If there were further stages of selection, how were the sampling units selected at each of the additional stages?

13c. If there were further stages of selection, were units at each of these stages randomly selected?

- Yes  
 No  
 Not applicable

Please explain how the units were randomly selected. If the units were not randomly selected, please provide a justification for why the units were not randomly selected.

14a. How were individual respondents identified and selected in the final stage?

The individual who answered the phone call was asked to participate in the survey after verifying that the respondent is eligible to vote

14b. Could more than one respondent be interviewed from a single household?

- Yes  
 No

If yes, please explain:

15. Did the sample design include clustering at any stage?

- Yes  
 No

If yes, please describe:

16. Did the sample design include stratification?

Definition: Stratification involves the division of the population of interest according to certain characteristics (for instance: geographic, political, or demographic). Random selection then occurs within each of the groups that result.

- Yes

No

If yes, please describe (please include the list of characteristics used for stratification):

For RDD the geographical area was sampled at the first stage, the area code was identified and the telephone numbers were completed during the second stage by random sampling.

17. Was quota sampling used at any stage of selection?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

18. Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of the selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

19. Under what circumstances was a household designated non-sample? Please check all that apply:

Non-residential sample point

All members of household are ineligible

Housing unit is vacant

No answer at housing unit after 2 callbacks

Other (Please explain):

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?

Yes

No

Please describe:

21a. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a random digit dial (RDD) sample?

- Yes  
 No

21b. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a listed sample?

- Yes  
 No

21c. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a dual frame sample?

- Yes  
 No

If yes, what % list frame \_\_\_\_\_ and what % RDD \_\_\_\_\_

22. For surveys conducted by mail, was the sample a listed sample?

- Yes  
 No

Please describe:

23. For surveys conducted on the Internet, did any respondents self-select into the survey?

- Yes  
 No

Please explain:

Invitations were sent only to respondents who have been randomly called (RDD) and were asked to provide their email address in order to receive an invitation by email. Each invitation is unique and corresponds to a specific token. After the submission of the completed questionnaire the token is deactivated. This means that each respondent can participate in the survey only once. Any third party that has not been invited by the aforementioned procedure does not have any access at all to the questionnaire of the survey. The procedure ensures that the sample cannot be tampered with uninvited self-selected participants.

## **Incentives**

24a. Prior to the study, was a letter sent to the respondent?

- Yes  
 No

(If yes, please provide a copy of the letter.)

24b. Prior to the study, was a payment sent to the respondent?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):

24c. Prior to the study, was a token gift sent to the respondent?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

24d. Did respondent receive an additional payment after their participation? (Do not include any payment made prior to the study.)

Yes

No

If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):

24e. Were any other incentives used?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

## **Interviewers**

25. Please describe the interviewers (e.g., age, level of education, years of experience):

AGE: 22 to 27 years' old

EDUCATION: 5 graduates of the School of Political Science), 1 Political Analysis post-graduate student and 1 PhD student working on Web Surveys and Survey Methodology

AVERAGE EXPERIENCE: All the interviewers were trained by the PI; they are knowledgeable about surveys and in particular of the social and political context.

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

**Seminars on the questionnaire and guidance on how to conduct the investigation and any difficulties they will face.**

**Contacts**

27a. What was the average number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample?

**1**

27b. For households where contact was made, what was the average number of contact attempts prior to first contact?

**0**

27c. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-sample**?

**3**

28d. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-interview**?

**1**

28e. During the field period, what were the maximum number of days over which a household was contacted?

**2**

28f. During the field period, did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household?

**Yes**

**No**

If yes, please describe:

During the recruitment phase, households which had not answer at the first phone call were contacted again during a different time of day (if the first phone call was in the morning, the next would be in the following afternoon or vice versa).

### Refusal Conversion

29a. Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

Yes

No

Please describe:

Respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed were assured that this is an academic project conducted by Aristotle University and that they can safely respond without worrying about their privacy. They were also told that their responses will help Greece be a part of an international project on election behavior (CSES)

29b. Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part?

Yes

No

(If yes, please provide a copy of the letter or letters.)

If yes, please describe:

29c. Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part?

Yes

No

If yes, how much?

29d. Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer?

Yes

No

29e. What was the maximum number of re-contacts used to persuade respondents to be interviewed?

0

29f. Were any other methods used to persuade respondents reluctant to be interviewed to take part?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Citizens selected for the web surveys were sent reminders.

### **Interview/Survey Verification**

Definition: Interview/survey verification is the process of verifying that an interview was conducted and that the survey was administered to the correct respondent, for quality control purposes.

30. Was interview/survey verification used?

**Yes**

No

If yes, please describe the method(s) used:

All telephone contacts (either email collection or telephone interview) were monitored by the PI of the study or his assistant. However, we have not checked if the web survey was completed by the owner of the email address or someone else having access to his/her email account.

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: 100%

Note: If multiple modes of interviewing were used for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared, please repeat the following questions as appropriate for each of the modes used.

31. What was the response rate of the survey that the CSES Module appeared in? Please show your calculations. (If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the response rate of the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

During the recruitment phase we have talked with 9872 respondents to collect 1845 email addresses and 49 completed questionnaires via telephone interviews. We have complimented the 1845 collected email addresses with 400 email addresses of people who have participated in ELNES 2012 and they had agreed to participate in future ELNES studies. Thus, we have sent the initial invitation to 2245 email addresses. From the 2245 email addresses, who were invited to participate in the web survey at epolls.gr, 307 were either invalid or unavailable. After sending all reminders until September 6th we have ended up with 959 completed questionnaires, 336 partially completed questionnaires, 25 refusals (people who informed us that they have changed their mind and they are not interested in participating) and 618 email invitations without any reaction at all (we do not know if the invitation and the reminders have made it to the inbox of the respondent) and we classify these cases as unknown validity.

32. Please provide the following statistics for the survey that the CSES Module appeared in. (If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the statistics for the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

A. Total number of households in sample:	2294
B. Number of valid households:	1369
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	307
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	618
E. Number of completed interviews:	1008
F. Number of partial interviews:	336
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	25
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	0
I. Other non-response:	0

The sum of B+C+D should equal the value of A. If not, please describe why:

If statistic D (number of households of unknown validity) has a value greater than zero (0), please estimate the proportion of households of unknown validity that are valid:

In most of the cases, if the email address was wrong, we would receive a “delivery failure” notification and we would classify the case in category C. Thus, we estimate that almost all of the 618 cases without any reaction by the respondent are valid but we do not know if the respondent had the chance to read the email.

The sum of E+F+G+H+I should equal the value of B. If not, please describe why:

If statistic I has a value greater than zero (0), please describe what cases fall into this category:

33. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, how many waves were conducted prior to the wave that included the CSES Module?

34. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, what was the total panel attrition between the first wave of the study and the wave that included the CSES Module? Please show your calculations.

35. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please provide the number of completed interviews for the wave that included the CSES Module:

36. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please provide the following statistics for panel attrition by age and education. In each cell, indicate the percent of all completed interviews in each category for the indicated wave.

<b>Age</b>	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
18-25	%	%
26-40	%	%
41-64	%	%
65 and over	%	%

<b>Education</b>	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
None	%	%
Incomplete primary	%	%
Primary completed	%	%
Incomplete secondary	%	%
Secondary completed	%	%
Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational	%	%
University incomplete	%	%
University degree	%	%

### Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

37. Are weights necessary to make the sample representative of the population being studied?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

Older, female and less educated voters are under-represented

38. Are weights included in the data file?

Yes

No

39. If weights are included in the data file, please describe in detail how the weights were constructed:

Weights were constructed using the method of raking on gender, age, education, region and valid votes. A detailed report is available at: Andreadis, Ioannis. Weights for the 2015 Hellenic Voter Study. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 06/08/2016. <http://doi.org/10.3886/E74764V1>

40a. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

40b. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to match known demographic characteristics of the population?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Weights were constructed using the method of raking on gender, age, education and region

40c. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct for non-response?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

40d. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct to the official election results?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

If there are vote share differences between the sample estimates and the official election results when we use the weights constructed using the method of raking on gender, age, education and region, we run a final round of raking including vote share as an additional variable.

41. Comparison of Completed Interviews to Population (please provide as percentages of the total):

Characteristic	Population Estimates	Completed Interviews	
		Unweighted Distribution	Weighted Distribution
<u>Age</u>			
18-25	11.1%	6.7%	12.0%
26-40	26.8%	35.8%	30.7%
41-64	38.5%	49.7%	42.1%
65 and over	23.6%	7.8%	15.1%
<u>Education</u>			
ISCED97 (0-2)	46.7%	3.1%	25.1%
ISCED97 (3-4)	35.3%	17.5%	26.3%
ISCED97 (5-6)	18.0%	79.4%	46.6%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	49%	56%	48%
Female	51%	44%	52%

42. Please indicate the source of the population estimates in the prior question. English language sources are especially helpful. Include website links or contact information if applicable.

Table A03. Resident population, by gender, age group and education level (Greek) available as file: A1602\_SAM03\_TB\_DC\_00\_2011\_05\_F\_GR.xls at <http://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SAM03/2011>