**Appendix**

**Further background information on the survey**

This study presents an original survey that is intended to help researchers better understand the micro and macro level dynamics that drive support (or lack thereof) of EU regional polices. The survey includes over 35 substantive questions as well as seven demographic and background questions of the respondent; geo-coded at the NUTS 1, NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 level. The survey was funded largely in part from an EU Horizon 2020 grant (*references cut for anonymity*). The fieldwork was conducted during the summer of 2017 by an international survey firm based in Rheims, France (Efficience3, ‘E3’), who have conducted several other large EU-wide surveys on behalf of the EU Commission. The data was delivered to the authors in September 2017.

E3 conducted the interviews themselves in several countries and used sub-contracting partners in others[[1]](#footnote-1). In all, 17,147 interviews were carried out in 15 EU member states. The respondents, from 18 years of age or older, were contacted randomly via telephone in the local language. Telephone interviews approximately 12-15 minutes in length were conducted via both landlines and mobile phones, with both methods being used in most countries. All interviews were made by employees with at least one year of professional experience and used *Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing* (CATI). Between 12%-15% of all interviews were randomly check for quality control by supervisors, with no reported irregularities. Decisions about whether to contact residents more often via land or mobile lines was based on local expertise of market research firms in each country, with mobile being first choice in all cases. For purposes of regional placement, respondents were asked the post code of their address to verify the area/ region of residence if mobile phones were used.

*Sampling method*

Ideally, a survey would be a mirror image of actual societal demographics – gender, income, education, rural-urban, ethnicity, etc. However, sampling on demographics is much more costly. Based on E3’s expert advice, to achieve a random sample, the ‘next birthday method’ was employed. The next birthday method is an alternative to the so-called quotas method. When using the quota method for instance, one obtains a (near) perfectly representative sample – e.g. a near exact proportion of the amount of men, women, certain minority groups, people of a certain age, income, etc. However, as one searches for certain demographics within the population, one might end up with only ‘available’ respondents, or those that are more ‘eager’ to respond to surveys, which can lead to less variation in the responses, or even bias in the results. The ‘next-birthday’ method, which simply requires the interviewer to ask the person who answers the phone who in their household will have the next birthday, still obtains a reasonably representative sample of the population. The interviewer must take the person who has the next coming birthday in the household (if this person is not available, the interviewer makes an appointment), thus not relying on whomever might simply be available to respond in the household. So, where the quota method is stronger in terms of a more even demographic spread in the sample, the next-birthday method is stronger at ensuring a better range of opinion.

The next-birthday method was thus chosen because we felt that what we might have lost in demographic representation in the sample would be made up for by a better distribution of opinion. In attempt to compensate for some key demographic over/under-representation, we provide weights based on age and gender for each region, comparing the sample drawn to actual demographic statistics from Eurostat. A breakdown of the sample response rate, land line vs. mobile phone use, etc. is listed in the table below by country.

*Sample and further survey information*

The survey included 15 EU countries. These 15 countries in this sample represent over 85% of the proportion of the EU population. Countries were selected for purposes of the selected case study reports as well as on the bases of variation with respect to geography, size, and institutional quality. The countries in the sample of this survey are the following and they are often refereed to via the following official abbreviations:

**Table A1: Sample information**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Abbreviation** | **respondents** | **Mobile rates** | **landline rates** | **response rate** | **refusal rate** |
| Austria | AT | 1000 | 30% | 70% | 10,0% | 46,5% |
| Bulgaria | BG | 503 | 82,10% | 17,90% | 32,0% | 21,0% |
| Estonia | EE | 5000 | 92% | 8% | 13,5% | 38,0% |
| France | FR | 1500 | 65% | 35% | 10,0% | 26,0% |
| Germany | DE | 1500 | 35% | 65% | 12,5% | 46,5% |
| Hungary | HU | 1000 | 100% | - | 22,0% | 33,0% |
| Italy | IT | 2000 | 38,5 | 61,5 | 16,2% | 9,3% |
| Latvia | LV | 500 | 100% | 0% | 13,0% | 24,0% |
| Netherlands | NL | 500 | 57% | 43% | 9,8% | 29,1% |
| Poland | PL | 2000 | 80% | 20% | 12,1% | 15,7% |
| Romania | RO | 1015 | 100% | 0% | 10,0% | 47,0% |
| Slovakia | SK | 1014 | 100% | 0% | 10,0% | 48,0% |
| Spain | ES | 2014 | 68% | 32% | 7,5% | 17,1% |
| Sweden | SE | 580 | 5,5% | 94,5% | 12,5% | 28,3% |
| UK | UK | 1500 | 37% | 63% | 12,5% | 46,5% |
|   |   | total= 17147 |  |  |  |  |

1. <http://www.efficience3.com/en/accueil/index.html>. For names of the specific firms to which Efficience 3 sub-contracted in individual countries, please write cati@efficience3.com [↑](#footnote-ref-1)