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Jaksch & Partner

**Address:**
Schillerstraße 8
4020 Linz
Austria

**Telephone:** +43-732-604260
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If appropriate, please indicate the primary location where the full, original election study dataset (not just the CSES portion) will be archived:
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Website: http://www.gesis.org/en/
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Study Design

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

   [X] 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
   [X] Telephone
   [ ] Mail or self-completion supplement
   [ ] Internet
4a. Was the survey part of a panel study?

[ ] Yes
[X] 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?

[X] 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?

[X] Yes, by group discussion
[ ] Yes, an expert checked it
[X] Yes, by back translation
[ ] Other; please specify: __________
[ ] No
[ ] Not applicable

7b. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?

[ ] Yes
[X] No
[ ] Not applicable
7c. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?

[ ] Yes
[X] 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?

[X] 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?

[X] Yes
[ ] No

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

[ ] Yes
[x] 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
[X] 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
[x] 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
[X] 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?


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?

[X] 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
[X] 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?

[X] 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?

[X] Yes

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?

[X] 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
[X] No

If yes, please explain:

NA

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

[ ] Yes
[x] 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.

[X] 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  
[X] No

If yes, please describe:

NA

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

[ ] Yes  
[X] No

If yes, please describe:

NA

19. Under what circumstances was a household designated non-sample? Please check all that apply:

[X] Non-residential sample point
[X] All members of household are ineligible
[ ] Housing unit is vacant
[X] No answer at housing unit after 5 callbacks
[X] Other (Please explain): No landline or mobile phone

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?

[ ] Yes  
[X] No

Please describe:

21a. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a random digit dial (RDD) sample?

[X] Yes  
[ ] No

21b. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a listed sample?

[X] Yes
21c. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a dual frame sample?
   [X] 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
   [X] No

   (If yes, please provide a copy of the letter.)

24b. Prior to the study, was a payment sent to the respondent?

   [ ] Yes
   [X] No

   If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):
24c. Prior to the study, was a token gift sent to the respondent?

[ ] Yes
[X] 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
[X] No

If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):

NA

24e. Were any other incentives used?

[ ] Yes
[X] 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?

[X] 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?

[X] 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  
[X] 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  
[X] No  

If yes, how much?

NA

29d. Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer?

[X] 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  
[X] 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?

[X] 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Total % of the overall sample</th>
<th>Total % of the net sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response after 5 contact attempts</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact/incorrect number</td>
<td>6721</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No private household</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing units with no eligible respondents</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed interviews</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupted interviews</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target respondent identified, but refused</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target respondent identified, but unable to participate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target respondent identified, but language problems</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons for non-response</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: 15000

B. Number of valid households: 4516

C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households: 2121

D. Number of households of unknown validity: 8363

E. Number of completed interviews: 1000

F. Number of partial interviews: 0

G. Number of refusals and break-offs: 739

H. Number non-contact (never contacted): 2596

I. Other non-response: 181

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 populated being studied?

[X] 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?

[X] 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
[X] 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?

[X] 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-demographic characteristic</th>
<th>Expected values</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>0.9596266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>1.0413541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 17 years old</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.895487824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 21 years old</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.11606746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 to 24 years old</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.785431919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years old</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>0.894537224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years old</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>1.159870201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years old</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>1.00823682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 years old</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>0.723889363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years old</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>0.857264839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no school/primary school/lower secondary level</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>1.514841246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocational training/vocational school</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>1.180769324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher vocational school (BMS)</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>1.208392491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary school leaving certificate (=Matura)</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>0.702221346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university-related institution/tertiary education</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>0.510783365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single person household</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>0.612022608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 person household</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>0.767099931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 person household</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>1.269328972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ person household</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>1.61488756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region ('Bundesland')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.172542138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1.082551663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>0.975238053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>0.799262923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.93061584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>1.187456822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>1.126306287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.04811777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>1.212360714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>0.7647609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military or civilian service</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maternity leave</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.9736272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.4862963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retired</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>0.6499326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanently incapable of employment/disabled</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4.6330867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housewife/househusband</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.6519552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pupils/students</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2.6087592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6447072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x no school/primary school/lower secondary level</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>2.342925189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x vocational training/vocational school</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>0.891813564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x higher vocational school (BMS)</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>1.839811078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x secondary school leaving certificate (=Matura)</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>0.548555095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x university-related institution/tertiary education</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>0.550767804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male x no school/primary school/lower secondary level</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>0.813384537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male x vocational training/vocational school</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>1.984067276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male x higher vocational school (BMS)</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>0.93864182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male x secondary school leaving certificate (=Matura)</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>0.751532475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male x university-related institution/tertiary education</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>0.380770603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x 15 to 17 years old</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>2.698216539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x 18 to 21 years old</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>2.156658917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x 22 to 24 years old</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>1.059388303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x 25 to 34 years old</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>0.948372615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x 35 to 44 years old</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>0.987943994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x 45 to 54 years old</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>0.929975821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female x 55 to 64 years old</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>0.614389016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**40c. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct for non-response?**

[ ] Yes  
[X] 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  
[X] No

If yes, please describe:

NA

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Population Estimates</th>
<th>Completed Interviews</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unweighted Distribution</td>
<td>Weighted Distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Secondary</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Secondary ('BMS')</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Secondary ('Matura')</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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](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.