





Table of Contents

GREECE.....	I
I. Survey details	3
I.1 Fieldforce.....	3
I.2 Briefing of interviewers.....	3
II. Sampling	4
III. Fieldwork procedures	4
III.1 Final disposition codes.....	5
III.2 Outcome indicators	6
III.3 The use and estimated effectiveness of the response enhancement techniques.....	7
III.4 Soft refusal conversion	7
III.5 Quality control of interviewing	8
IV. Qualitative report of the fieldwork agency	9
V. Weighting.....	10
VI. Country-specific variables.....	11



I. Survey details

<i>Fieldwork organization:</i>	Metron Analysis
<i>Fieldwork period:</i>	09/06/2009 – 03/07/2009
<i>Languages (s) of interviewing:</i>	Greek
<i>Mode of interviewing:</i>	Phone interviews: 100% fixed line
<i>Number of interviewers:</i>	71
<i>Translation:</i>	Questionnaire was provided by EUI in local language and the fieldwork agency was asked to review and suggest changes if necessary. Changes were then either accepted or rejected by EUI.

I.1 Fieldforce

Team: 3 supervisors, 71 interviewers and 4 recruiters of interviewers

All interviewers were experienced interviewers (average 1.8 years, minimum 1 year, and maximum 10 years of experience as an interviewer). 45 of the interviewers attended official trainings for the EES which were held on the 6, the 9th, the 10th and the 11th of June by the fieldwork manager. The remaining 26 interviewers were trained separately by the Supervisor.

The interviewers received a written training manual as well, with additional information on the survey, the eligibility criteria of respondents, and instructions on how to conduct the interviews.

I.2 Briefing of interviewers

Number of interviewers received EES specific personal briefing at central training	45
Length of EES specific personal briefing per interviewer	60-80 mins
Written EES instructions	yes
Training in refusal conversion	yes



II. Sampling

Universe:	general population, aged 18 and over.
Coverage:	National
Sample size:	1.000
Selection of households:	RDD
Selection of respondents:	Most recent birthday within the household.
Number of recalls:	Up to 15 attempts

Table I. Regional distribution of the sample

Basis of classification: NUTS 2 level		Total population 18+	Target		Sample	
			N	%	N	%
GR11	EASTERN MAKEDONIA AND THRAKI	514405	56	5,6	55	5,5
GR12	CENTRAL MAKEDONIA	1575837	171	17,1	171	17,1
GR13	WESTERN MAKEDONIA	253826	28	2,8	29	2,9
GR14	THESSALIA	634634	69	6,9	69	6,9
GR21	IPIROS	297851	32	3,2	32	3,2
GR22	IONIAN ISLANDS	179293	19	1,9	19	1,9
GR23	WESTERN GREECE	623369	68	6,8	66	6,6
GR24	CENTRAL GREECE	509575	55	5,5	56	5,6
GR25	PELOPONNISSOS	537871	58	5,8	58	5,8
GR30	ATTIKI	3166748	343	34,3	343	34,3
GR41	NORTHERN AEGEAN	173516	19	1,9	19	1,9
GR42	SOUTHERN AEGEAN	254806	28	2,8	27	2,7
GR43	KRITI	506041	55	5,5	56	5,6
Total		9227773	1000	100	1000	100

*source: EUSTAT, 2007



III. Fieldwork procedures

III.1 Final disposition codes

Table 2. Fieldwork outcome

Completed interviews	1.0/1.10	1000
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)	2.000	5713
Refusal and breakoff	2.100	4705
Refusal	2.110	4702
Household-level refusal	2.111	4462
Known-respondent refusal	2.112	240
Break off	2.120	3
Non-contact	2.200	328
Respondent never available	2.210	316
Telephone answering device (confirming HH)	2.220	12
Answering machine household-no message left	2.221	3
Answering machine household-message left	2.222	9
Other, non-refusals	2.300	680
Deceased respondent	2.310	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	2.320	581
Language problem	2.330	99
Household-level language problem	2.331	0
Respondent language problem	2.332	99
No interviewer available for needed language	2.333	0
Miscellaneous	2.350	0
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)	3.000	309
Unknown if housing unit	3.100	309
Not attempted or worked	3.110	0
Always busy	3.120	2
No answer	3.130	242
Answering machine-don't know if household	3.140	21
Call blocking	3.150	44
Technical phone problems	3.160	0
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	3.200	0
No screener completed	3.210	0
Other	3.900	0
Not eligible (Category 4)	4.000	8376
Out of sample - other strata than originally coded	4.100	0
Fax/data line	4.200	828
Non-working/disconnect	4.300	2527
Non-working number	4.310	2520
Disconnected number	4.320	0
Temporarily out of service	4.330	7
Special technological circumstances	4.400	1002



Number changed	4.410	869
Cell phone	4.420	0
Call forwarding	4.430	133
Residence to residence	4.431	133
Non-residence to residence	4.432	0
Pager	4.440	0
Non-residence	4.500	1549
Business, government office, other organizations	4.510	1540
Institution	4.520	6
Group quarters	4.530	3
No eligible respondent	4.700	29
Quota filled	4.800	2441
Other	4.900	0
Total phone numbers used		15398

III.2 Outcome indicators

Table 3. Outcome rates

I=Complete Interviews (1.1)	1,000
P=Partial Interviews (1.2)	0
R=Refusal and break off (2.1)	4,705
NC=Non-Contact (2.2)	328
O=Other (2.0, 2.3)	680
e=estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible (enter a value in line 62 or accept the value in line 62 as a default)	0.531
Estimate of e is based on proportion of eligible households among all numbers for which a definitive determination of status was obtained (a very conservative estimate). This will be used if you do not enter a different estimate in line 62.	0.531
UH=Unknown household (3.1)	309
UO=Unknown other (3.2, 3.9)	0
Response Rate 1	
$I/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)$	0.142
Response Rate 2	
$(I+P)/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)$	0.142
Response Rate 3	
$I/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))$	0.145
Response Rate 4	
$(I+P)/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))$	0.145
Cooperation Rate 1	
$I/(I+P+R+O)$	0.157
Cooperation Rate 2	
$(I+P)/((I+P)+R+O)$	0.157
Cooperation Rate 3	
$I/((I+P)+R)$	0.175



Cooperation Rate 4	
$(I+P)/((I+P)+R)$	0.175
Refusal Rate 1	
$R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O) + UH + UO)$	0.670
Refusal Rate 2	
$R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O) + e(UH + UO))$	0.684
Refusal Rate 3	
$R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O))$	0.701
Contact Rate 1	
$(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC+ (UH + UO)$	0.909
Contact Rate 2	
$(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC + e(UH+UO)$	0.928
Contact Rate 3	
$(I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC$	0.951

The average interview length was: 28,0 min.

III.3 The use and estimated effectiveness of the response enhancement techniques

In the introduction of the survey the use of an international institution such as the “European University Institute” contributed to the ‘status’ of the survey and made the respondents more receptive to the survey. As the fieldwork was progressing, we monitored the response rate of each interviewer and excluded those who showed low response rate.

Throughout the survey, the interviewers were instructed to be rather hesitant to categorize a contact as a “hard refusal” and were trained continuously on how to handle “hard refusals”. The soft refusals were called back by the best interviewers and/or by the survey’s supervisors.

Appointments were arranged, in cases where the person first contacted did not give us any information about the eligible person or in cases of elderly people who could not understand the “last birthday” method.

III.4 Soft refusal conversion

In case of soft refusal, an experienced supervisor specifically trained for this task called up the respondent, politely introduced the survey again and asked for cooperation. If respondent refused this time too, no more contacts were made with him/her. If the person was cooperative, the interviewer conducted the interview. It could happen that the respondent was willing to take part but did not have time to complete the survey at the time of the re-call, in this case interviewer fixed an appointment with him/her.



The results of these attempts are summarised in the table below:

Table 4. Soft refusal conversion success rate

	all	Turned to hard refusal		Turned to other status		Converted into interview		Success rate % of all contacted
		N	% of all	N	% of all	N	% of all	
Soft Refusal	583	293	50%	256	44%	34	6%	10%

III.5 Quality control of interviewing

The outcome of the quality control is summarised below. Based on these check no corrective action was necessary

<i>N of interviews back-checked:</i>	100
<i>Mode of back-checking:</i>	phone (100% fixed line)
<i>Eligible person interviewed:</i>	99%
<i>Sat. with interviewers (top2box):</i>	79%



IV. Qualitative report of the fieldwork agency



In their own words:

Gallup Monitoring was uttered to check the average length of completed interviews, working time and completed interviews per interviewer.

Furthermore, VNC software was uttered to manage simultaneous listening to the interview and the interviewer's 'ticking' the answers to the questions. All interviewers were monitored. More specifically, there were monitored on average 13 interviews per day (more than 25 per day during the first week and 2 or less per day during the last week), 2 interviews per hour and 287 interviews in all. On average, 20% of the interviews of each interviewer were monitored.

The only problem was that due to the length of the questionnaire some of the respondents interrupted the interview on the questions towards the end of the questionnaire. Consequently, effort was made to decrease such behaviour by explaining to the respondents how valuable their participation was and by reassuring them that the questionnaire was about to finish.

The fieldwork progressed smoothly and with no particular problems. However, one should note two facts that constitute the framework of the survey and that might have affected the respondents' willingness to participate to such a survey. First of all the participation in the European election was one of the lowest ever in Greece (only 52.63% of the electorate voted), reflecting amongst others the civilians' indifference to the Euroelections and the politicians. Secondly, most of the news during the period of the fieldwork was about corruption and the 'relationships' between politicians and large enterprises (the international case of Siemens).

Back-checking:

10% of the interviews were back checked.

In 99% of the cases the interview was proven to be held with the right person in the household (last birthday). Furthermore, the average length of the interview was stated to be 25 minutes, a duration which is in line with the duration of the average interview (29 min).

Discrepancies (between original interview and back-checks) found in the age and gender (due to voice timbre) were not problematic since in the case of age only 3 would alter the age category of the respondent.

As far as the interviewers' evaluation was concerned, 79% of the respondents whom we called back, stated that they were extremely satisfied with the interviewer.



V. Weighting

A non-response population weighting was implemented on the EES dataset to correct for sampling disparities. The following variables were used in the raking procedure:

Age

Sex

Education

Region

The table below presents a comparison of the sample (unweighted and weighted) and the universe.

Table 5. Weighting targets

	label	Class size by EUSTATS 2007 ('000)	Proportion in universe	Number of cases in EES	Unweighted proportion in EES	Weighted proportion in EES
Age&Sex						
1	male, 18-29	926172	10,037	78	7,800	10,032
2	female, 18-29	851899	9,232	101	10,100	9,227
3	male, 30-49	1703389	18,459	178	17,800	18,447
4	female, 30-49	1660053	17,990	256	25,600	17,991
5	male, 50-64	981543	10,637	97	9,700	10,641
6	female, 50-64	1030697	11,170	147	14,700	11,175
7	male 65+	918973	9,959	75	7,500	9,964
8	female 65+	1155047	12,517	68	6,800	12,523
	<i>total</i>	9227773	100	1000	100	100
Education (based on ISCED)						
1	Primary education or first stage of basic education - level 1 + level 0 + no education (ISCED 1997)	5447674	49,823	111	11,100	49,819
2	Lower secondary or second stage of basic education - level 2 (ISCED 1997)	1159432	10,604	48	4,800	10,603
3	Upper secondary and post- secondary education - level 3 + 4 (ISCED 1997)	3061823	28,003	343	34,300	28,006
5	Tertiary education - levels 5-6 (ISCED 1997)	1265168	11,571	498	49,800	11,572
	<i>total</i>	10934097	100	1000	100	100
Regions (based on NUTS)						
EL1	Eastern Macedonia And Thraki	2978703	32,280	325	32,500	32,285
EL2	Ipiros - Ionian Islands - WesternGreece - Central Greece -Peloponnissos	2147118	23,268	230	23,000	23,271
EL3	Attiki	3166748	34,318	343	34,300	34,318
EL4	Northern Aegean - Southern Aegean - Kriti	934363	10,126	102	10,200	10,126
	<i>total</i>	9227773	100	1000	100	100

*source: EUSTAT, 2007



VI. Country-specific variables

Q4: Which political party do you think would be best at dealing with [the most important issue]?

- 01 - ΝΔ
- 02 - ΠΑΣΟΚ
- 03 - ΚΚΕ
- 04 - ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
- 05 - ΛΑΟΣ
- 06 - ΟΙΚΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΠΡΑΣΙΝΟΙ

Q8: In a typical week, how many days do you watch the following news programmes?

- a. Κεντρικό Δελτίο 20.00 (Mega)
- b. Ειδήσεις NET (21.00)

(Q9: Is there any other channel on which you watch the news more often than these?)

Q10: Which one?

- 01 - ET-1
- 02 - NET
- 03 - ET-3
- 04 - Βουλή Tv (κοινοβούλιο)
- 05 - Alpha Tv
- 06 - Alter Channel
- 07 - Antenna
- 08 - Star Channel
- 09 - ΤηλεΆστυ
- 10 - 902 Tv

Q12: In a typical week, how many days do you read the following newspapers?

- a. Τα Νέα
- b. Καθημερινή
- c. Ελευθεροτυπία

(Q13: Is there any other newspaper that you read more frequently than these?)

Q14: Which one?

- 01 - Αδέσμευτος Τύπος (Μήτσης)
- 02 - Αδέσμευτος Τύπος (Ρίζος)
- 03 - Απογευματινή
- 04 - Απόφαση
- 05 - Αυγή
- 06 - Αυριανή
- 07 - Βήμα
- 08 - Βραδινή
- 09 - Έθνος
- 10 - Ελεύθερη Ώρα
- 11 - Ελεύθερος
- 12 - Ελεύθερος Τύπος
- 13 - Εστία



- 14 - Καρφί
- 15 - Νέα
- 16 - Νίκη
- 17 - Ριζοσπάστης
- 18 - Χώρα
- 19 - Μετρόραμα
- 20 - City press
- 21 - Ελευθερία

(Q24: A lot of people abstained in the European Parliament elections of June 4/7, while others voted. Did you cast your vote?)

Q25: Which party did you vote for?

- 01 - ΝΔ
- 02 - ΠΑΣΟΚ
- 03 - ΚΚΕ
- 04 - ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
- 05 - ΛΑΟΣ
- 06 - ΟΙΚΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΠΡΑΣΙΝΟΙ

Q26: If you had voted in the European Parliament elections, which party would you have voted for?

- 01 - ΝΔ
- 02 - ΠΑΣΟΚ
- 03 - ΚΚΕ
- 04 - ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
- 05 - ΛΑΟΣ
- 06 - ΟΙΚΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΠΡΑΣΙΝΟΙ

Q27: Which party did you vote for at the [General Election] of [Year of Last General Election]?

- 01 - ΝΔ
- 02 - ΠΑΣΟΚ
- 03 - ΚΚΕ
- 04 - ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
- 05 - ΛΑΟΣ
- 06 - ΟΙΚΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΠΡΑΣΙΝΟΙ

Q28: And if there was a general election tomorrow, which party would you vote for?

- 01 - ΝΔ
- 02 - ΠΑΣΟΚ
- 03 - ΚΚΕ
- 04 - ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
- 05 - ΛΑΟΣ
- 06 - ΟΙΚΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΠΡΑΣΙΝΟΙ

Q39: We have a number of parties in (country) each of which would like to get your vote. How probable is it that you will ever vote for the following parties? Please specify your views on a scale where 0 means “not at all probable” and 10 means “very probable”.

- a - ΝΔ



- b - ΠΑΣΟΚ
- c - ΚΚΕ
- d - ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
- e - ΛΑΟΣ
- f - ΟΙΚΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΠΡΑΣΙΝΟΙ

Q47: And about where would you place the following parties on this scale? Which number from 0 to 10, where 0 means “left” and 10 means “right” best describes (Party X)?

- a - ΝΔ
- b - ΠΑΣΟΚ
- c - ΚΚΕ
- d - ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
- e - ΛΑΟΣ
- f - ΟΙΚΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΠΡΑΣΙΝΟΙ

Q81: And about where would you place the following parties on this scale? Which number from 0 to 10, where 0 means “already gone too far” and 10 means “should be pushed further” best describes (party X)?

- a - ΝΔ
- b - ΠΑΣΟΚ
- c - ΚΚΕ
- d - ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
- e - ΛΑΟΣ
- f - ΟΙΚΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΠΡΑΣΙΝΟΙ

Q87: Do you consider yourself to be close to any particular party? If so, which party do you feel close to?

- 01 - ΝΔ
- 02 - ΠΑΣΟΚ
- 03 - ΚΚΕ
- 04 - ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
- 05 - ΛΑΟΣ
- 06 - ΟΙΚΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΠΡΑΣΙΝΟΙ

(Q89: Do you feel yourself a little closer to one of the political parties than others?)

Q90: Which party is that?

- 01 - ΝΔ
- 02 - ΠΑΣΟΚ
- 03 - ΚΚΕ
- 04 - ΣΥΡΙΖΑ
- 05 - ΛΑΟΣ
- 06 - ΟΙΚΟΛΟΓΟΙ – ΠΡΑΣΙΝΟΙ

Q101: What is the highest level of education you have completed in your education?

- 01 - Μερικές τάξεις του Δημοτικού
- 02 - Δημοτικό σχολείο
- 03 - Τριτάξιο Γυμνάσιο
- 04 - Εξατάξιο γυμνάσιο
- 05 - Εξατάξιο Γυμνάσιο / Λύκειο
- 06 - Τεχνικό – Επαγγελματικό Λύκειο



- 07 - Ινστιτούτο Επαγγελματικής Κατάρτισης ΙΕΚ
- 08 - KATEE / TEI
- 09 - Πανεπιστήμιο / Πολυτεχνείο
- 10 - Μεταπτυχιακές σπουδές –Master’s δίπλωμα
- 11 - Διδακτορικό Δίπλωμα

Q113: Just to confirm that I understand your answer correctly, would you say, that your current / last job is [NAME OF THE CODE ASSIGNED]?

- 01 - Επιστημονικά και τεχνικά επαγγέλματα (όπως: γιατρός, εκπαιδευτικός, μηχανικός, καλλιτέχνης, λογιστής/τρια)
- 02 - Υψηλόβαθμα διοικητικά επαγγέλματα (όπως: ανώτερος τραπεζικός υπάλληλος, διευθυνων στέλεχος μεγάλης εταιρείας, ανώτερος δημόσιος υπάλληλος, υψηλόβαθμος στέλεχος σωματείου)
- 03 - Υπαλληλικά επαγγέλματα (όπως: γραμματέας, κλητήρας, διοικητικός υπάλληλος γραφείου, υπάλληλος λογιστηρίου,)
- 04 - Επαγγέλματα πωλήσεων (υπεύθυνος/η πωλήσεων, ιδιοκτήτης/τρια καταστήματος, βοηθός σε κατάστημα, ασφαλιστής/τρια)
- 05 - Επαγγέλματα παροχής υπηρεσιών (όπως: ιδιοκτήτης/τρια εστιατορίου, αστυνομικός, σερβιτόρος, κομμωτής/τρια- κουρέας, φροντιστής, νοσηλεύτης/τρια)
- 06 - Ειδικευμένος εργάτης/τρια (όπως: εργοδηγός, μηχανικός οχημάτων, τυπογράφος, μόδιστρος, κατασκευαστής εργαλείων, ηλεκτρολόγος)
- 07 - Ημι-ειδικευμένος εργάτης/εργάτρια (όπως: κτίστης, οδηγός λεωφορείου, συσκευαστής, ξυλουργός, αρτοποιός)
- 08 - Ανειδίκευτος εργάτης/τρια (όπως: εργάτης, αχθοφόρος, ανειδίκευτος εργάτης σε εργοστάσιο)
- 09 - Γεωργο-κτηνοτρόφος (όπως: οδηγός τρακτέρ, ψαράς, γεωργός)
- 10 - Ιδιοκτήτης αγροκτήματος ζώων
- 11 - Φοιτητής/μαθητής
- 12 - Ποτέ δεν είχα επαγγελματική εργασία