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**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Müller, Wolfgang C.</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>University of Vienna, Department of Government</td>
<td>Rooseveltplatz 3, 1090 Vienna, AUSTRIA</td>
<td>+43-1-4277-49711</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:wolfgang.mueller@univie.ac.at">wolfgang.mueller@univie.ac.at</a></td>
<td><a href="http://staatswissenschaft.univie.ac.at/">http://staatswissenschaft.univie.ac.at/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kritzinger, Sylvia</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>University of Vienna, Department of Government</td>
<td>Rathausstraße 19/9, 1010 Vienna, AUSTRIA</td>
<td>+43-1-4277-49902</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sylvia.kritzinger@univie.ac.at">sylvia.kritzinger@univie.ac.at</a></td>
<td><a href="http://staatswissenschaft.univie.ac.at/">http://staatswissenschaft.univie.ac.at/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomgaarden, Hajo</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>University of Vienna, Department of Communication</td>
<td>Rathausstraße 19/9, 1010 Vienna, AUSTRIA</td>
<td>+43-1-4277-499 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fax:  
E-Mail: hajo.boomgaard@univie.ac.at  
Website:  
http://www.hajoboomgaard.com/  

| Website: |  |
**Data Collection Organization:**

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization: IPR Umfrageforschung, Dr. Richard Költringer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: Rathausstraße 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020 Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +43 660 340 47 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:iprmail@chello.at">iprmail@chello.at</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.ipr.co.at">http://www.ipr.co.at</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Organization(s):**

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization: Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding scheme: Hochschulraum-Strukturmittel 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritenplatz 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010 Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +43 1 53120-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:ministerium@bmbwf.gv.at">ministerium@bmbwf.gv.at</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="https://bmbwf.gv.at/">https://bmbwf.gv.at/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: AUSSDA – The Austrian Social Science Data Archive
Address: Teinfaltstraße 8
1010 Vienna
AUSTRIA
Telephone: +43 1 4277 15323
Fax:
E-Mail: info@aussda.at
Website: http://www.aussda.at/

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive: March 13, 2018 (Online: http://dx.doi.org/10.11587/GDBBPJ)

Study Design

1. Timing of the study that the CSES Module was included in:
   [X] Post-Election Study (with interviewing starting within 6 months after the election)
   [ ] Post-Election Study (with interviewing starting more than 6 months after the election)
   [ ] Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study
   [ ] Between Rounds

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:

   October 19, 2017

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

   November 30, 2017
3a. 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 - using a questionnaire on paper
[ ] In person, face-to-face - using an electronic/computerized questionnaire
[X] Telephone
[ ] Mail or self-completion supplement
[ ] Internet

3b. Was there a mode change within interviews (e.g., selected self-completion elements within the questionnaire)?
[X] No
[ ] Yes; please provide details:

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:

4c. If the survey was entirely or partly conducted via the Internet, please indicate whether it was based on an access panel (i.e. respondents were selected from a group of pre-screened panelists):
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

4d. If the survey was based on an Internet access panel, please describe the access panel (company, population [does it include persons without initial access to the Internet and how are they interviewed], method of recruiting members, total size of access panel, method of selecting survey respondents from the panel):
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.

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
   [ ] 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:
Sample Design and Sampling Procedures

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

Eligible voters for the Austrian Parliamentary Election on October 15, 2017 (Austrian citizens, aged 16 years and older at election day).

Eligibility Requirements

9a. Must a person be a certain age to be interviewed?
   [X] Yes
   [ ] No

   If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

   At least 16 years old (on October 15, 2017)

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:
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:

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:

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:
10d. If interviews were conducted by telephone, what is the estimated percentage of households without a phone? ___1___ %

Please explain:

Percentage of households without mobile or fixed telephone access based on the Special Eurobarometer 438 (fieldwork in October 2015).


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. If interviews were conducted via the Internet, what is the estimated percentage of households without access to the Internet? ______ %

10g. If interviews were conducted via the Internet, were provisions taken to include members of the population without access to the Internet? And if so, which?

[ ] Yes
[X] No

If “Yes”, please explain:

If “No”, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? ______ %

10h. 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:
10i. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: ___1___% 

See question 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 and/or based on an Internet access panel, please also describe the original sample, from the beginning of the study.

All Austrian municipalities were included in the sampling. The number of households (i.e., telephone lines) was selected proportional to the size of the municipality. The target person within each household was selected with the next-birthday method.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

Municipalities

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

All Austrian municipalities were included.

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.

13. Were there further stages of selection?

[X] Yes
[ ] No

13a. If there were further stages of selection, what were the sampling units at each of the additional stages?

Second stage: households
Third stage: target person within the household
13b. If there were further stages of selection, how were the sampling units selected at each of the additional stages?

Second stage: households randomly selected proportional to the size of the municipality
Third stage: target person within the household randomly selected with the next birthday method

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.

See question 13b.

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

See question 13b.

14b. Could more than one respondent be interviewed from a single household?
   [ ] Yes
   [X] No

   If yes, please explain:

15. Did the sample design include clustering at any stage?
   [ ] Yes
   [X] No

   If yes, please describe:
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, and in the case of multi-stage selection processes the stage[s] at which stratification occurred):

On the second stage, households were drawn proportional to the size of the municipality.

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

[ ] Yes
[X] No

If yes, please describe:

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

[ ] Yes
[X] No

If yes, please describe:

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 _______ callbacks
[ ] Other (Please explain):

not applicable

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
   [ ] No

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

   If yes, what % list frame ____ 50 ____ and what % RDD ____ 50 ____

   Also: 49% reached via mobile phone, 51% via landline.

22. For surveys conducted by mail, was the sample a listed sample?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

   Please describe:

23. For surveys conducted on the Internet, did respondents self-select into the survey, at any stage?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

   Please explain:
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:

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):

24e. Were any other incentives used?
   [ ] Yes
   [X] No
   If yes, please describe:
Interviewers

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

22 interviewers: 12 female, 10 male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>ISCED 7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>ISCED 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>ISCED 5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>ISCED 7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>ISCED 7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>ISCED 5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>ISCED 7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ISCED 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ISCED 4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>ISCED 7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training. If possible please differentiate between general interviewer training and study-specific components:

All interviewers participated in a training course where the questionnaire and possibly arising problems were discussed in detail.

26a. Please provide a description of the content, structure and time used for general training of interviewers:

The basic training of all interviewers follows the guideline "The Conduct of standardized interviews" by Peter Prüfer and Angelika Stiegler from the year 2002 (ZUMA How-to series, number 11). The basic training of all interviewers lasts for at least 3 days (including guided practical work).
26b. Please provided a description of the content, structure and time used for training interviewers in the specifics of the study within which CSES was run:

The specific training lasted at least 60 minutes.
Contacts

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

4.79 contact attempts

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

On average 2.63 contact attempts were made for households where contact was made.

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

1 attempt was made before declaring it a non-sample (i.e., number not working, non-target person).

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

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

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

No limit.

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:

Time was varied (morning, noon, afternoon, evening).
Refusal Conversion

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

[X] Yes
[ ] No

Please describe:

Reluctant interviewees were turned over to the most experienced interviewers.

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

[ ] Yes
[X] No

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

If yes, please describe:

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

[ ] Yes
[X] No

If yes, how much?

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?

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

[ ] Yes
[X] No

If yes, please describe:
**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:

   All interviews were checked for whether the correct phone number was dialed and whether the duration of the call corresponds to the expected length of the interview or not.

   If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: **100**

   %
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 was 43.3% of the initial net sample. Please see Table 1 for a detailed account.

Table 1: Sample size and response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial gross sample</strong></td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect/Non-working number (RDD)</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-target person</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial net sample</strong></td>
<td>2779</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent never available</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Successful interviews (response rate)</strong></td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>43.3</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: 3600

B. Number of valid households: 2779
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households: 821
D. Number of households of unknown validity: 

E. Number of completed interviews: 1203
F. Number of partial interviews: 
G. Number of refusals and break-offs: 622
H. Number non-contact (never contacted): 954
I. Other non-response: 

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

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

If statistic I has a value greater than zero (0), please describe what cases fall into this category:
33. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, how many waves were conducted prior to the wave that included the CSES Module?

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.

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:

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First wave of study</th>
<th>Wave that included CSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-64</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>First wave of study</th>
<th>Wave that included CSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete primary</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary completed</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete secondary</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary completed</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University incomplete</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

   Weights are calculated for post-stratification adjustment according to known population distributions (listed in the table provided for question 41) and were provided by the survey institute (IPR). The weighting variable combines demographic and political criteria (i.e., vote recall for the 2017 election). We provide:

   • An original or rough weight: “gew_roh”
   • A trimmed (winsorized) weight: “gew”

   The values of the rough weighting variable ranges between Min = 0.12 and Max = 9.97, the latter weighting variable limits the values to Min ≈ 0.4 and Max ≈ 2.5.

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:

   As in question 37:
   Weights are calculated for post-stratification adjustment according to known population distributions (listed in the table provided for question 41) and were provided by the survey institute (IPR). The weighting variable combines demographic and political criteria (i.e., vote recall for the 2017 election). We provide:

   • An original or rough weight: “gew_roh”
   • A trimmed (winsorized) weight: “gew”

   The values of the rough weighting variable ranges between Min = 0.12 and Max = 9.97, the latter weighting variable limits the values to Min ≈ 0.4 and Max ≈ 2.5.

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:

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:  
see question 39

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:

40d. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct to the official election results?

[X] Yes  
[ ] No

If yes, please describe:  
see question 39

41. Comparison of Completed Interviews to Population (please provide as percentages of the total):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER (=d02)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE rough (=d01a &amp; d01b recoded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 16-45</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 45</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE detailed (=d01a &amp; d01b recoded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE X EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 16-45 w/Matura</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 16-45, no Matura</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 45 w/Matura</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 45, no Matura</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER X EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female w/Matura</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, no Matura</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male w/Matura</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, no Matura</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGION (=d17)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSEHOLD SIZE (=d20 recoded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 persons</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more persons</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refused</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION (=d03 recoded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No school, primary school, lower secondary level (incl. Pre-vocational school)</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training/school</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher vocational school (BMS)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school leaving certificate (&quot;Matura&quot;)</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYMENT (=D06)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working (Codes 1-3)</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired (Code 7)</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil, Student (Code 6, excl. in vocational training)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (other Codes)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOTE RECALL 2017 incl. non-voters as category (=q12a &amp; q12b)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Voter</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPÖ</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÖVP</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPÖ</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greens</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEOS</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Pilz</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Invalid</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</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.

Population: Statistik Austria, Mikrozensus 2016; Election results: https://wahl17.bmi.gv.at/