

INSTITUTE OF STATISTICAL RESEARCH ANALYSIS AND DOCUMENTATION

ITHAKIS 29, 112 57 ATHENS

url: <http://www.aueb.gr/statistical-institute>

June 2006

Greek Deliberative Poll for Candidate Selection: Preliminary Results

Table: Voting Intention

Candidate	T2 %	T3 %	Change
Alexandris	24.2%	38.7%	+14.5%*
Veloudos	2.0%	1.8%	-0.2%
Vlahos	18.2%	8.1%	-10.0%
Diakoliou	14.1%	14.4%	+0.3%
Karanasiou	16.1%	18.0%	+1.9%
Bregiannis	25.3%	18.9%	-6.4%

Note:

- *The percentage change for Alexandris is significant at $p < 0.01$ level. Percentages were calculated based only on those who offered opinions before and after.
- Percentages for T2 and T3 each sum up to 100%; the no preference option is not included

Table: Voting Intention, Changes in No Preference

	T2 %	T3 %	Change
No preference	20.8%	8.3%	-12.5%

Note: 1. Percentages reflect opinion at each time.

Table: Thermometer Ratings

Question	N	T1 Mean	T3 Mean	T3-T1	S.E.	Significant
Alexandris	63	47.44	61.90	24.46	3.54	Yes
Veloudos	57	34.60	34.21	-0.39	4.00	No
Vlachos	69	39.94	42.38	2.44	3.09	No
Diakoliou	66	39.30	45.67	6.36	3.84	No
Karanasiou	64	41.05	48.13	7.07	3.92	No
Bregiannis	74	50.20	58.95	8.74	3.29	Yes

Note:

1. Mean is on a scale from 0 to 100, 100 being highest
2. Analyses only include participants that completed pre and post surveys.
3. All significant questions are significant at the 0.01 level.

**Table: Thermometer Ratings, No Opinion
Distribution at T1**

Candidate	T1 %
N=1275	
Alexandris: Never heard of him	82.5%
Veloudos: Never heard of him	76.5%
Vlachos: Never heard of him	63.8%
Diakoliou: Never heard of her	73.2%
Karanasiou: Never heard of her	80.4%
Breyiannis: Never heard of him	76.1%

Note: 1. Analysis consists of all respondents at T1.

Table: Issue Priorities

Question (No. of cases =138)	T1 Mean	T3 Mean	T3-T1	S.E.	Significant
Instituting a private university in Marousi	4.85	5.51	0.66	0.36	No*
The Mall	4.52	6.50	1.98	0.38	Yes
The operation of multinational companies based in Marousi	4.17	6.67	2.50	0.37	Yes
The integration of immigrants into society	7.43	7.20	-0.23	0.27	No
Reducing poverty	7.71	7.45	-0.26	0.24	No
Tackling unemployment	8.13	7.47	-0.66	0.25	Yes
Managing school budgets	6.80	7.71	0.91	0.29	Yes
Building new municipal sports venues	7.34	7.75	0.41	0.24	No
Long term municipal budgets	6.93	7.83	0.89	0.27	Yes
Organized parking	6.88	7.95	1.07	0.32	Yes
Improving public transport	8.38	8.05	-0.33	0.21	No
The maintenance of public schools	8.40	8.25	-0.15	0.21	No
Providing municipal healthcare	8.54	8.36	-0.18	0.22	No
Finding open spaces	8.45	8.61	0.16	0.24	No
Municipal waste management	8.88	8.75	-0.13	0.21	No
Maintenance of public roads	8.88	8.80	-0.08	0.25	No
Expanding public participation in the decision making process	8.25	8.93	0.68	0.21	Yes
Public accountability of elected officials in the municipality	8.41	8.97	0.56	0.23	Yes
The transparent management of public funds by the municipality, particularly concerning public works and expenditures.	9.17	9.35	0.18	0.17	No

Note:

1. Mean is on a scale from 0 to 10, 10 being extremely significant
2. Analyses only include participants that completed pre and post surveys
3. Participants that selected don't know or provided no answer were placed at the midpoint of the scale.
4. All significant questions are significant at the 0.01 level.
5. *Not significant at 0.01 level, but very close to 0.05 level.

Table: Process Questions

Question: How valuable was...	Results (0 to 10 scale)
Participating in the small group discussions (N=131)	90%+ said 7 or above
Meeting and talking to other participants outside of the formal discussions (N=127)	84%+ said 7 or above
The large-group sessions with the candidates (N=128)	89%+ said 7 or above
The event as a whole (N=129)	94%+ said 7 or above

Note:

1. Mean is on a scale from 0 to 10, 10 being highest