

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

Country:	Austria
Date of Election:	September 29, 2013
Prepared by:	Kathrin Thomas, Christian Glantschnigg (AUTNES, Vienna)
Date of Preparation:	24 January 2014

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: Kritzinger, Sylvia Title: Prof. Organization: University of Vienna Department of Methods in the Social Sciences Address: Rathausstraße 19/9 1010 Vienna Austria Telephone: +43-1-4277-49902 Fax: +43-1-4277-9499 E-Mail: sylvia.kritzinger@univie.ac.at Website: http://methods.univie.ac.at/	Name: Müller, Wolfgang C. Title: Prof. Organization: University of Vienna Department of Government Address: Rooseveltplatz 3/1 1090 Vienna Austria Telephone: +43-1-4277-49701 Fax: +43-1-4277-49711 E-Mail: wolfgang.mueller@univie.ac.at Website: http://staatswissenschaft.univie.ac.at/
---	---

<p>Name: Schönbach, Klaus Title: Prof. Organization: University of Vienna Department of Communication</p> <p>Address: Währinger Straße 29 1090 Vienna Austria</p> <p>Telephone: +43-1-4277-493 31 Fax: E-Mail: klaus.schoenbach@univie.ac.at Website: http://publizistik.univie.ac.at/en/home/</p>	<p>Name: Title: Organization:</p> <p>Address:</p> <p>Telephone: Fax: E-Mail:</p> <p>Website:</p>
--	--

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: Jaksch & Partner
Address: Schillerstraße 8 4020 Linz Austria
Telephone: +43-732-604260 Fax: +43-732-604260-42 E-Mail: office@jaksch-partner.at Website: http://www.jaksch-partner.at/

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: Austrian Science Fund (FWF)
Address: Haus der Forschung Sensengasse 1 1090 Vienna Austria
Telephone: +43-1-505 67 40 Fax: +43-1-505 67 39 E-Mail: office@fwf.ac.at Website: www.fwf.ac.at

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: GESIS Data Archive Address: P.O. Box 12 21 55 68072 Mannheim Germany Telephone: +49 (0)621-1246-0 Fax: +49 (0)621-1246-100 E-Mail: info@gesis.org Website: http://www.gesis.org/en/
--

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive: 2014

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:

October 1, 2013

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

October 29, 2013

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:

NA

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.

Copies of the original version, the German version as well as a report of the deviations in the questions wording are provided in the AUTNES documentation.

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:

German

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:

All deviances from the original questionnaire are recorded in section **X.X** of the AUTNES documentation. The deviation notes also record differences and problems with regard to the translation of the questionnaires.

Sample Design and Sampling Procedures

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

The sample is meant to be representative of the Austrian eligible voters. These are all persons aged 16 and over.

Eligibility Requirements

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

- Yes
- No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

Austrian citizens aged 16 and older

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

NA

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:

NA

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:

NA

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:

NA

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

1 % (Source: <http://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/3674/umfrage/haushalte-ohne-telefonanschluss-in-der-eu-nach-laendern/>, last accessed: 6 Dec 2013)

Please explain: The percentage of households without landlines or mobile phones is marginal and had no effect on the survey.

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:

NA

10g. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: 1 % (see also 10d.)

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 sampling method employed was stratified random sampling. The primary sampling factor was the nine Austrian provinces (“Bundesländer”). Only within these provinces an unlimited random sample was drawn, where respondents were sampled proportional to the population size. Phone numbers were randomly selected using a dual sampling frame (RDD: 89.1% and RLD: 10.9%). Within each household, the last-birthday method helped to randomly select the respondent. The last birthday method is a method of selecting respondents from within a sampled household in random-digit dialling surveys. It is a quick and easy option to sample randomly on the household level

The sample is representative of the Austrian eligible voters. These are citizens aged 16 and older.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

Nine provinces (“Bundesländer”).

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

Proportional to population size.

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.

The nice provinces (“Bundesländer”) are core federal bodies and thus a characteristic that needs to be accounted for.

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?

Administrative districts and city and towns.

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

Proportional to population size.

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.

The provinces were then divided into administrative districts proportional to their population size. Phone numbers were randomly selected using dual sampling frame (RDD: 89.1% and RLD: 10.9%). The last-birthday methods helped to randomly select the respondent within each household.

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

Individuals were selected using the last birthday method, which asks for the eligible person within the sampling unit who had the most recent birthday. This is a non-intrusive, easy and time efficient approach to randomly select in the final stage.

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

NA

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

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

NA

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):

The characteristics used for stratification were geographic (provinces, administrative districts and city/town sizes)

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

NA

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

NA

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 5 callbacks
 Other (Please explain): No landline or mobile phone

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, percentage of list frame: 10.9%, percentage of RDD: 89.1%.

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

Yes

No

Please describe:

NA

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

Yes

No

Please explain:

NA

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:

NA

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):

NA

24e. Were any other incentives used?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

NA

Interviewers

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

In total, 57 interviewers of different age, education, gender and experience conducted interviews for Jaksch & Partner on behalf of the AUTNES. The average age of the interviewers was 39. The youngest interviewer was 16 years old; the oldest interviewer 71. There was also variation with regard to the interviewers' education. 20.4% completed compulsory education, 34.8% an apprenticeship or other training, 21% completed the Austrian vocational middle school (BMS). 13.7% finished schooling with the Matura and 10.1% have a university degree.

Please note, that the interviewers' gender was highly unbalanced. A very small percentage of the interviews were conducted by male interviewers, only 3.8%. Upon enquiry, the field institute explained that this was the current employment situation at Jaksch & Partner - most interviewers were female at the time of the field work. The field institute also ensured that the most experienced interviewers worked on this project. However, no further detailed information could

be provided with regard to their years of experience. All interviewers were trained by Jaksch & Partner under the supervision of senior advisors and members of the AUTNES team.

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

The survey was presented to the interviewers (experienced employees of the survey company) and discussed with them for around an hour in presence of a member of the AUTNES research team. Afterwards the interviewers were asked to practice under the supervision of the senior investigators on the project at Jaksch & Partner as well as a member of the AUTNES research team. Senior investigators and the AUTNES team member were available to answer questions regarding any component of the survey.

Contacts

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

The average number of contact attempts for the entire sample is 1.3.

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

The average number of contact attempts prior to first contact was 2.5.

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

5 attempts were made before declaring it a non-sample.

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

3 contacts were made with the household before declaring it a non-interview with the exception of those who objected strictly to the interview. There were very few cases where the interviewers were insulted on the first contact attempt, those persons were not re-contacted.

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

Households were contacted up to 8 days.

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: Interviewers were asked to re-contact household with a delay of 2 hours.

Refusal Conversion

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

- Yes
 No

Please describe: Interviewers tried to persuade those people who were not unsure whether or not to participate. Some households were passed on to more experienced interviewers. Up to 3 contact attempts were made to persuade respondents with the exception of respondents who insulted the interviewers on the first contact attempt.

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe (and provide a copy of the letter or letters):

NA

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, how much?

NA

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?

Respondents were re-contacted twice in order to persuade them to participate in the study, hence a total of 3 contact attempts were made to persuade respondents to be interviewed.

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

NA

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: respondents were contacted by phone by a member of the research team at Jaksch & Partner and evaluated the interview situation as well as verified the quality of the collected data.

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: 10%

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.)

The response rate for the CSES post-election Survey is 52.1%. Please see Table 1 for a detailed account.

Table 1: Response Rate

	Number of Cases	Total % of the overall sample	Total % of the net sample
No response after 5 contact attempts	4238	28.2%	
No contact/incorrect number	6721	44.8%	
No private household	1765	11.8%	
Housing units with no eligible respondents	356	2.4%	
		12.8%	
Completed interviews	1000		52.1%
Interrupted interviews	0		0.0%
Target respondent identified, but refused	739		38.5%
Target respondent identified, but unable to participate	78		4.1%
Target respondent identified, but language problems	84		4.4%
Other reasons for non-response	19		1.0%
Total	15000		100.0%

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:	<u>15000</u>
B. Number of valid households:	<u>4516</u>
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	<u>2121</u>
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	<u>8363</u>
E. Number of completed interviews:	<u>1000</u>
F. Number of partial interviews:	<u>0</u>
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	<u>739</u>
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	<u>2596</u>
I. Other non-response:	<u>181</u>

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

NA

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:

According to the field institute's estimate about 10% of the households with unknown validity may be valid.

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

NA

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

Statistic I is a sum of all cases of non-response. It includes those who were contacted, but were unable to participate (78 cases), those who were contacted, but had a language barrier of some kind (84 cases) and a few persons who could not participate for any other reasons (19 cases).

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

NA

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.

NA

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:

NA

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.

NA

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

Post-stratification demographic weights were necessary to even out minor offsets in the sample that did not perfectly coincide with the target population.

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:

Through an iterative process, an adjustment shall be made to the marginal distributions of the target population. The target distributions are based on the Micro Census data 2012 (Statistics Austria, StatCube, last accessed: Sept. 2013). StatCube takes the Austrian citizens aged ≥ 15 as reference, that is a total of 6,325,600 residents.

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:

NA

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:

The weight variable A5 is a post-stratification demographic weight and was created on the basis of the following socio-demographic characteristics:

- Gender
- Age
- Education
- Household size
- Region ('Bundesland')
- Employment status

Weights range from a minimum value of 0.51 to a maximum value of 3.57. Each respondent was assigned an own factorial weight. Table 1 displays the expected values used in the iterative weighting procedure in percent and provides the factor.

Socio-demographic characteristic		Expected values	Factor
Gender	male	48.4%	0.9596266
	female	51.6%	1.0413541
Age	15 to 17 years old	3.8%	3.895487824
	18 to 21 years old	5.2%	2.11606746
	22 to 24 years old	4.1%	1.785431919
	25 to 34 years old	14.2%	0.894537224
	35 to 44 years old	17.7 %	1.159870201
	45 to 54 years old	19.2%	1.00823682
	55 to 64 years old	14.7%	0.723889363
	65+ years old	21.0%	0.857264839
Education	no school/primary school/lower secondary level	23.9%	1.514841246
	vocational training/vocational school	36.3%	1.180769324
	higher vocational school (BMS)	13.4%	1.208392491
	secondary school leaving certificate (=Matura)	15.0%	0.702221346
	university-related institution/tertiary education	11.3%	0.510783365
Household size	single person household	19.8%	0.612022608
	2 person household	30.2%	0.767099931
	3 person household	19.9%	1.269328972
	4+ person household	30.1%	1.61488756
Region ('Bundesland')	Burgenland	3.4%	1.172542138
	Carinthia	7.2%	1.082551663
	Lower Austria	19.4%	0.975238053
	Upper Austria	17.7%	0.799262923
	Salzburg	6.8%	0.93061584
	Styria	14.7%	1.187456822
	Tyrol	8.4 %	1.126306287
	Vorarlberg	4.8%	1.04811777
	Vienna	17.5%	1.212360714
Employment status	employed	54.0%	0.7647609
	military or civilian service	0.0%	0.00
	maternity leave	1.8%	0.9736272
	unemployed	2.9%	1.4862963
	retired	27.9%	0.6499326
	permanently incapable of employment/disabled	0.8%	4.6330867
	housewife/househusband	5.4%	2.6519552
	pupils/students	6.8%	2.6087592
	other	0.4%	0.6447072
Gender x education	female x no school/primary school/lower secondary level	63.1%	2.342925189
	female x vocational training/vocational school	38.2%	0.891813564
	female x higher vocational school (BMS)	67.9%	1.839811078
	female x secondary school leaving certificate (=Matura)	51.6%	0.548555095
	female x university-related institution/tertiary education	51.2%	0.550767804
	male x no school/primary school/lower secondary level	36.9%	0.813384537
	male x vocational training/vocational school	61.8%	1.984067276
	male x higher vocational school (BMS)	32.1%	0.93864182
	male x secondary school leaving certificate (=Matura)	48.4%	0.751532475
male x university-related institution/tertiary education	48.8%	0.380770603	
Gender x age	female x 15 to 17 years old	46.7%	2.698216539
	female x 18 to 21 years old	48.3%	2.156658917
	female x 22 to 24 years old	49.4%	1.059388303
	female x 25 to 34 years old	48.3%	0.948372615
	female x 35 to 44 years old	49.9%	0.987943994
	female x 45 to 54 years old	51.3%	0.929975821
	female x 55 to 64 years old	51.9%	0.614389016

female x 65+ years old	57.3%	1.289118555
male x 15 to 17 years old	53.3%	0.593152884
male x 18 to 21 years old	51.7%	0.371670541
male x 22 to 24 years old	50.6%	1.149748359
male x 25 to 34 years old	51.7%	0.662665113
male x 35 to 44 years old	50.1%	1.103836895
male x 45 to 54 years old	48.7%	1.08036866
male x 55 to 64 years old	48.1%	0.837617901
male x 65+ years old	42.7%	0.822519509

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

NA

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:

NA

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

Characteristic	<u>Completed Interviews</u>		
	<u>Population Estimates</u>	<u>Unweighted Distribution</u>	<u>Weighted Distribution</u>
<u>Age</u>			
15-17	4.3%	1.1%	3.8%
18-21	5.7%	2.7%	5.2%
22-24	4.3%	2.4%	4.1%
25-34	13.8%	15.4%	14.2%
35-44	17.2%	14.8%	17.7%
45-54	19.1%	18.9%	19.2%
55-64	14.1%	19.5%	14.7%
65+	21.6%	25.2%	21.0%

<u>Education</u>			
Incomplete Secondary	24.5%	16.2 %	23.9%
Vocational Training	36.6%	31.0 %	36.3%
Complete Secondary (‘BMS)	13.8%	11.4 %	13.4%
Complete Secondary (‘Matura’)	14.4%	20.5%	15.0%
University Degree	10.7%	20.9 %	11.3%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	48.6%	50.6 %	48.4%
Female	51.4%	49.4 %	51.6%

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.

Statistik Austria. 2013. StatCube, Online resource:

http://www.statistik.at/web_de/services/datenbank_superstar/aufruf/index.html (last accessed June 2013). Please note, the link is available in English and German.