

**Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)
Module 5: Design Report (Sample Design and Data Collection Report)**

September 14, 2016

Country: **Greece**
Date of Election: **September 20, 2015**

Prepared by: **Ioannis Andreadis, Associate Professor**

Date of Preparation: **April 1, 2019**

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.

<p>Name: Ioannis Andreadis Title: Principal Investigator of ELNES 2015b Associate Professor of Quantitative Methods Organization: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki School of Political Sciences Address: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki School of Political Sciences Egnatias 45, 54625, Thessaloniki, Greece Telephone: 2310 991992 Fax: 2310 991983 E-Mail: john@polsci.auth.gr Website: http://www.polres.gr/en/andreadis/</p>	<p>Name: Theodore Chadjipadelis Title: Professor of Applied Statistics 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 Website: http://www.eps.auth.gr/en/polsci/faculty/5034</p>
--	--

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

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki School of Political Sciences
Address: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of Political Sciences Egnatias 45, 54625, Thessaloniki, Greece
Data Collection Supervisor: Ioannis Andreadis Telephone: 2310 991992 E-Mail: john@polsci.auth.gr Website: http://www.polsci.auth.gr/

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan Address: 426 Thompson Street Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48104-1248 United States
Telephone: (734) 763-1348 Fax: (734) 764-3341 E-Mail: cps-center@umich.edu Website: https://www.isr.umich.edu/cps/index.html
Organization: Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:

Organization: Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:
--

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:
--

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive:

It is already available

Study Design

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

Post-Election Study (with interviewing starting within 6 months after the election)

Post-Election Study (with interviewing starting more than 6 months after the election)

Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study

Between Rounds

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:

October 29, 2015

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

February 29, 2016

3a. 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 - using a questionnaire on paper
- In person, face-to-face - using an electronic/computerized questionnaire
- Telephone**
- Mail or self-completion supplement
- Internet**

3b. Was there a mode change *within* interviews (e.g., selected self-completion elements within the questionnaire)?

- No**
- Yes; please provide details:

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:

4c. If the survey was entirely or partly conducted via the Internet, please indicate whether it was based on an access panel (i.e. respondents were selected from a group of pre-screened panelists):

- Yes
- No**

4d. If the survey was based on an Internet access panel, please describe the access panel (company, population [does it include persons without initial access to the Internet and how are they interviewed], method of recruiting members, total size of access panel, method of selecting survey respondents from the panel):

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 1997 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 1997 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? _____ %

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 (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. If interviews were conducted via the Internet, what is the estimated percentage of households without access to the Internet? 40 %

http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_414_en.pdf
(p. 44)

10g. If interviews were conducted via the Internet, were provisions taken to include members of the population without access to the Internet? And if so, which?

Yes

No

If "Yes", please explain:

We have offered telephone interviews to respondents who did not have an email address or access to the internet.

If "No", what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

10h. 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:

10i. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: **<18 % because most of the households without a landline are single-member households or households with a small number of members.**

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 and/or based on an Internet access panel, please also describe the original sample, from the beginning of the study.

ELNES 201b (i.e. the Hellenic National Election Voter Study for the September 2015 Greek Parliamentary Election) was conducted as a mixed-mode survey in the period between October 29, 2015 and February 29, 2016. For the recruitment of our sample we used telephone (CATI); while for the main data collection phase we used web (CAWI) in combination with telephone interviews (CATI). The recruitment of the respondents was done with a random selection of telephone numbers, using a Random Digital Dialing (RDD) method. 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. 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 (push-to-web). Every email address collected during the recruitment phase was uploaded to the epolls.eu web survey system and an e-mail with the invitation and the link to the survey was sent to the respondent.

We also sent email invitations to 750 respondents and we have called 47 respondents of the 2015a 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 4 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 or Internet access: 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

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, and in the case of multi-stage selection processes the stage[s] at which stratification occurred):

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 respondents self-select into the survey, at any stage?

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. Almost all of them had experience of at least one more similar study because they had participated in ELNES 2015a

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training. If possible please differentiate between general interviewer training and study-specific components:

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

26a. Please provide a description of the content, structure and time used for general training of interviewers:

All interviewers attended a seminar of 2 hours on the available equipment and on how to contact the respondents. During the seminar, they had the opportunity to learn how to deal with various reactions by the respondents and what to answer to their questions.

26b. Please provided a description of the content, structure and time used for training interviewers in the specifics of the study within which CSES was run:

All interviewers attended a seminar of 2 hours in which all the questions of the CSES questionnaire were presented and discussed.

Contacts

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

1.4

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

0.2

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

2

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?

3

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 of Thessaloniki and that they can safely respond without worrying about their privacy. They were also informed that their responses will help Greece be a part of an international project of election studies (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. Regarding the question that the survey was completed by the correct respondent, as with every web survey, we have to assume that only the invited respondents have access to their email accounts.

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

Response Rate

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 called 9843 phone numbers. In 1624 cases we had to deal with an invalid number (fax numbers, not in use, etc); in 2858 cases our call was not answered (we stopped trying after the second callback). Our calls were answered in 5361 cases. In all these cases we have asked for an email address and in case the respondents did not have an email address we have offered a telephone interview. We were able to collect 1056 email addresses and we got the initial agreement for 201 telephone interviews. In addition, we had 750 email addresses and 47 telephone numbers of people who have participated in ELNES 2015a and they had agreed to participate in future ELNES studies. Thus, from the contact phase we have a total of 1806 email addresses and 248 telephone numbers for personal interviews. From the 1806 email addresses, 143 were not valid, 8 changed their mind and send an email that they do not want to participate, 131 dropped-out before completing the web survey and 868 completed the web questionnaires. From the 248 telephones, 9 changed their mind before we ask the first question, 21 dropped-out before completing the telephone interview, 210 completed the telephone interview and we were not able to communicate with 8 of our 47 ELNES 2015a telephone contacts.

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:	2054
B. Number of valid households:	1247
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	143
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	664
E. Number of completed interviews:	1078
F. Number of partial interviews:	152
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	17
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	
I. Other non-response:	

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:

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.

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

Education	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 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 and education. A detailed report is available at: Andreadis, Ioannis. Weights for the September 2015 Hellenic Voter Study. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].

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:

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%	7.1%	11.8%
26-40	26.8%	26.5%	26.4%
41-64	38.5%	53.4%	37%
65 and over	23.6%	13%	24.9%
<u>Education</u>			
ISCED97 (0-2)	46.7%	5%	37.1%
ISCED97 (3-4)	35.3%	28.2%	38.2%
ISCED97 (5-6)	18.0%	66.9%	24.7%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	49%	51.5%	48.1%
Female	51%	48.5%	51.9%

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>