

## Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES) Module 6 Design Report

Version: December 2022

Country/territory: Austria Date of election: September 29, 2024 Prepared by: Sylvia Kritzinger, Katharina Pfaff, Julia Partheymüller (AUTNES) Date of preparation: December 19, 2024
---

The answers provided in this Design Report are used to create variables in the CSES dataset, enable the CSES Secretariat to evaluate the eligibility of election studies for inclusion in the cross-national dataset, and provide users with important information for their analyses.

Notes to collaborators...

- All sections of the Design Report must be filled in for an election study deposit to be considered complete. The CSES Secretariat is available to provide clarification and support.
- Where brackets [ ] appear, answer by placing an “X” within the appropriate bracket(s).
- If more space or iterations are required to answer any question, please lengthen the document and duplicate items as necessary.
- In your deposited dataset, please be sure to include any weight variables, as well a variable that indicates the mode of interview for each observation (respondent) that is included.
- If you have an existing methodology report for your study, we would appreciate receiving an electronic copy of it, to supplement the information in your completed Design Report. We will make both your Design Report and any supplemental methodological report available for download from the CSES website. We encourage you to cut-and-paste information from your existing methodology report into your answers below, as appropriate.

### **Section A1. Collaborator(s)**

Collaborators are the contact persons for election studies that appear in CSES. Collaborators are not necessarily who collected the data. This collaborators list will appear on the CSES website.

Collaborator name: Sylvia Kritzinger  
Affiliation: University of Vienna  
Email: [sylvia.kritzinger@univie.ac.at](mailto:sylvia.kritzinger@univie.ac.at)

Collaborator name: Katharina Pfaff  
Affiliation: University of Vienna  
Email: [katharina.pfaff@univie.ac.at](mailto:katharina.pfaff@univie.ac.at)

Collaborator name: Julia Partheymüller  
Affiliation: University of Vienna  
Email: [julia.partheymueller@univie.ac.at](mailto:julia.partheymueller@univie.ac.at)

### **Section A2. Data Collection Organization**

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection...

Organization name: Department of Government, University of Vienna

Website: <https://staatswissenschaft.univie.ac.at/en/>

### **Section A3. Funding Organization(s)**

Organization(s) that funded the data collection...

Organization name: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research

Website: <https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/en.html>

Organization name: Department of Government, University of Vienna

Website: <https://staatswissenschaft.univie.ac.at/en/>

### **Section A4. 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 name: Austrian Social Science Data Archive (AUSSDA)

Website: <https://data.aussda.at/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.11587/BS8ZDC>

### **Section B. 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
- Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

2. For the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared, please provide the following three pieces of information...

The date that interviewing began: September 30, 2024

The date that interviewing ended: October 21, 2024

The number of days between the date of the election and when interviewing began: 1

3. Was the survey that included the CSES Module part of a panel study?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please describe the design of the panel study, including the date at which interviewing for each prior wave began and ended:

*The Digitize! Online Panel is a probability-based offline recruited online panel. All participants were recruited through prior online surveys conducted as part of the Digitize! Online Panel Survey within the Digitize! Project.*

*The population universe comprises eligible voters for the Austrian Parliamentary Election on 29 September 2024 (Austrian citizens, aged 16 years and older at election day). The survey was terminated for respondents who reported being under the age of 16 on 29 September 2024.*

Wave 1: 7 February 2022 – 8 March 2022  
Wave 2: 20 June 2022 – 31 July 2022  
Wave 3: 24 November 2022 – 28 March 2023  
Wave 4: 24 March 2023 – 31 July 2023  
Wave 5: 13 September 2023 – 3 December 2023  
Wave 6: 29 February 2024 – 21 May 2024

4. How many respondents answered the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared? That is, how many records/observations are there in the CSES portion of your study?  
n = 1,569

5. Did respondents give their consent to share their responses as part of the CSES dataset, in accordance with local human rights regulations and data protection laws?

Yes

No

*Consent to sharing responses as a part of the Digitize! Survey was given (no particular mentioning of CSES).*

### **Section C. Sample frame, selection, and eligibility**

6. Please describe the population that your study is meant to be representative of.

*Respondents are representative of all Austrian citizens above the age of 16 (all eligible voters).*

7. What steps were taken as part of the sampling and/or data collection process to ensure that the sample is representative of the target population? In what ways were those steps successful, and in what ways were they not (please provide evidence wherever possible)?

*The Digitize! project employs a probability-based sampling method, drawing addresses from residents aged 16 and above from Austria's Central Register of Residents (Zentrales Melderegister, ZMR), with sampling stratified by region (NUTS3).*

8. Please list the criteria for an individual to be eligible to be interviewed in your study. For example minimum age, citizenship, voter registration, etc.

*Only respondents who indicated in their recruitment survey that they hold Austrian citizenship were eligible to participate in this survey. Respondents younger than 16 on election day as well as respondents currently not residing in Austria were not eligible.*

9. Please describe the sample frame, its type and source, and its coverage of the population.

*Sampling frame as described above. Coverage as described in the method report attached.*

10. Were any of the following excluded from the sample frame? Mark all that apply.

- Specific regions of the country
- Institutionalized persons
- Military personnel
- Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

For each group that was excluded, please provide additional details about the exclusion (for instance, the regions excluded), why the exclusion, and what percent of the total eligible population was excluded from the sample frame in each instance. Please also indicate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame.

*Not applicable.*

11. Please describe in detail how the sample for the study was selected from the sampling frame. For multi-stage samples, please sure to list all sampling stages, and describe the sampling units and selection methods at each stage. Furthermore, please describe how individual respondents were identified and selected in the final stage. If the survey is part of a panel study, please describe not just the current wave but also the original sample. For telephone samples, please indicate whether the sample was a random digit dial (RDD) sample, listed sample, or dual frame sample. For surveys conducted by mail, indicate whether a listed sample.

12. Were probability-based methods used for all stages of the selection process? That is, units were randomly selected throughout the process, including at initial recruitment (if a panel).

- Yes
- No

If no, please describe all instances where non-probability methods were used and provide a justification for each as to why random selection was not used.

13. Did your sampling design make use of one or more of the following techniques? Please mark all that apply.

- Stratification (*only for the recruitment survey of the panel*)
- Cluster sampling
- Quota sampling
- Interviewing more than one respondent from a single household

- Respondent or household substitution
- Non-sample replacement methods

Definitions:

- Stratification involves the division of the population into groups according to certain characteristics (for instance by demographic characteristics). Random selection then occurs within each of the groups that result to ensure their adequate inclusion.
- Cluster sampling divides the population into groups and then uses random selection to include some of the groups but not others. For example, a cluster sample might divide a large country into geographic areas and then select only some of the areas while excluding others, to avoid the need (and cost) of interviewer travel to all areas.
- In quota sampling, a respondent is sometimes selected based on demographic characteristics, rather than randomly, to ensure certain target distributions are met.
- Substitution is replacing one sampling unit with another when the first sampled unit is difficult to reach and/or interview.

**Section D1. Interviewing Mode(s)**

14. Please indicate the mode(s) of interviewing for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared. Mark all that apply.

- Interviewer-administered: In person (sometimes called face-to-face)
- Interviewer-administered: Video
- Interviewer-administered: Telephone
- Self-completion: Paper (by mail, supplement, etc.)
- Self-completion: Internet
- Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

**Section D2. Interviewing Mode(s): Mixed-Mode**

*not applicable*

15. If the survey in which the CSES Module appeared was mixed-mode (that is, made use of more than one mode type)...

Was the mixed-mode design intended to address a particular problem or problems?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please elaborate:

Were all modes available to respondents from the beginning, or was there a mode progression (that is, if the respondent did not respond by one mode, another mode was subsequently offered to them)? If the latter, please describe the mode progression.

Were individuals assigned a mode after recruitment or was this part of the recruitment?

- Assigned a mode after recruitment
- Assigned a mode as part of the recruitment

Did respondents self-select the mode by which they would respond?

- Yes
- No

Did the design include a mode change *within* interviews (e.g., selected self-completion elements within the same questionnaire)?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide details:

If there were substantial differences in the distribution of key demographics across modes, please note them here.

### **Section D3. Interviewing Mode(s): Telephone**

*not applicable*

16. If the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared was entirely or partly conducted by telephone...

What is the estimated percentage of households without a phone? \_\_\_\_\_ %

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? \_\_\_\_\_ %

### **Section D4. Interviewing Mode(s): Internet**

17. If the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared was entirely or partly conducted via the Internet...

What is the estimated percentage of households without access to the Internet (that is, the percent of the eligible population excluded due to lack of Internet access)? 5% (see <https://staatswissenschaft.univie.ac.at/en/>)

Were provisions taken to include members of the population without access to the Internet?

- Yes
- No

If “Yes”, please explain:

If “No”, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? \_\_\_ *We cannot estimate this share of the population as we have no information on how many of the 5% of citizens without internet access are voters eligible to vote.* \_\_\_

Did the survey make use of an access panel (i.e. respondents were selected from a group of pre-screened panelists)?

Yes

No

If yes, 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):

*The probability-based offline recruited Digitize! online panel included 3,723 panelists*

Did respondents self-select into the survey, at any stage?

Yes

No (*but respondents self-select into becoming member of the Digitize! Online Panel.*)

If yes, please explain:

### **Section E. Respondent Persuasion**

18. What was the average number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample (not just for survey completions)?

*On 30 September 2024, 3,723 panelists of the Digitize! Online Panel were invited via email to the online survey. All panelists, who had not yet participated, were sent a reminder on October 3. A final reminder was issued on 7 October 2024, targeting only panelists aged 65 and older, as well as those with lower levels of formal education. The average number of contact attempts is therefore 2-3.*

19. What was the maximum number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample (not just for survey completions)?

*The maximum number of contact attempts is 3.*

20. Did respondents receive incentive payments? Please mark all that apply.

Yes, during the screening process

Yes, in advance of their interview

Yes, after their interview

No

21. Were special efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

Yes

No

### **Section F: Interview/Survey Verification**

22. Was interview/survey verification used?

Yes

No

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: \_\_100\_\_ %

If yes, please describe the method(s) used for verification:

*Panelists received an individual survey link sent to their private email address. Once the survey was completed, the link could not be used again. Each email address is only registered once.*

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.

23. What steps, if any, were taken to ensure that respondents were providing truthful answers to the questions? Were any respondents removed from the final dataset (e.g. due to speeding, satisficing, completing multiple surveys, etc.)? Please provide details.

*There were no removals due to potential speeding or satisficing. Each survey link was only used once, i.e. completing multiple surveys was not feasible.*

### **Section G1. Response Rate**

Notes to collaborators:

- 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 mode used.
- Standard definitions for the below items, as well as a helpful response rate calculator, can be accessed on the website of the American Association for Public Opinion Research at: <https://www.aapor.org/Communications/AAPOR-Journals/Standard-Definitions.aspx>

24. For each of the following categories, please indicate the number of cases/records from the sample that fall into each. (If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the numbers for the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

*Completed based on answers for the CSES survey*

Interviews

I. Completed interviews I = 1,569  
*(Base: All essential questions asked, including Q137)*  
 P. Partial interviews P = 114  
*(Base: Having broken off before Q137)*

Non-interviews

R. Refusals and break-offs R = 114  
 NC. Non-Contact NC = 2,040  
 O. Other O = \_\_\_\_\_

Unknown Eligibility

UH. Unknown if household/occupied household unit UH = \_\_\_\_\_  
 UO. Unknown, other UO = \_\_\_\_\_  
*Not applicable*

25. Please calculate the response rate (RR2) by inserting the answers from Question 24 into the following formula.

$$RR2 = \frac{(I + P)}{(I + P) + (R + NC + O) + (UH + UO)}$$

26. If the number of cases with unknown eligibility (UH and/or UO in Question 24) is greater than zero, please estimate what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible. Please indicate the basis, evidence, and any scientific justification for this estimate.

**Section G2. Response Rate: Panel Studies**

27. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study...

How many waves were conducted prior to the wave that included the CSES Module?  
*6 prior waves (see above)*

What was the response rate at the initial recruitment stage? Please show your calculations.  
 What percent of recruited respondents participated in the first wave of the study? Please show your calculations.

*In our case, individuals were invited by mail to participate in the first wave of the survey. The survey included a question that asked whether respondents wanted to become part of the panel. People signing up for the panel were invited to participate in subsequent waves. It is therefore unclear how to define the initial recruitment stage in our case.*

*Out of 28,000 invited individuals, 1,851 participated in the first wave, which corresponds to a response rate (RR2) of 6.6%. Out of these 1,851 respondents, 557 signed up for the panel and 281 actually participated in the second wave.*

*For detailed information on panel recruitment in each wave please consult the method report of the Digitize! Online Panel Survey:*

*Pfaff, Katharina; Weitzel, Daniel; Assenbaum, Laura; Brandl, David; Conte, Luca; Duschek, Béla; Klein, Vanessa; Kvir, Nikita; Meinel, Jakob; Moser, Jakob; Perner, Wanda; Prießnitz, Leonhard; Voith, Valentin; Walcherberger, Christina; Windisch, Franziska; Kritzing, Sylvia, 2022, "Digitize! Online Panel Survey (SUF edition)", <https://doi.org/10.11587/8SFV2L>, AUSSDA, V9, UNF:6:ani8ek+xcE8VEewfDG1oTw== [fileUNF]*

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.

*Recruitment for the panel was done on an ongoing basis. In every wave, panelists as well as previously uncontacted individuals were invited to participate in the survey. Individuals that took part in the survey for the first time were asked to become part of the panel. This means that the panel's composition changed from wave to wave, and it is thus unclear how to define panel attrition in our case.*

If there were substantial differences in the distribution of key demographics (for example, age, gender, education, etc.) between the first wave of the study and the wave that included CSES, please note them here.

Please provide the number of completed interviews for the wave that included the CSES Module.

*1,569 individuals completed the CSES survey (see question 24 in section G1).*

## **Section H. Post-Survey Adjustment Weights**

28. Are weights included in the data file?

Yes

No

If No, please explain why no weights are provided:

If Yes, please describe in detail: their construction, what they correct for, and how their use makes the survey dataset more representative of the population.

*Weights are calculated for post-stratification adjustment according to known population distributions (listed in Table 1). The weighting variable combines demographic and political criteria (i.e., vote recall for the 2024 election). We provide two weights:*

- *socio-demographic weight for respondents with a 100 % completion rate: **weightSOCDEMI\_panel***  
*This weight adjusts for all socio-demographic variables listed in Table 1 for all respondents entirely completing the survey (n=1,569). The variable vote recall 2024 is not considered for weightSOCDEMI.*
- *socio-demographic and political weight for respondents with a 100 % completion rate: **weightSOCDEM\_POL\_panel***

*In addition to all variables of weightSOCDEMI\_panel, this weight adjusts for the reported voting behavior in the 2024 Austrian general election for respondents with a 100%-completion rate (n= 1,569). Please note that even among the “completers”, the non-response rate for reported voting behavior is 13.96 % (refused), which could result in the weight being inefficient.*

29. Were any other steps taken to mitigate the impact of non-response in the dataset? If so, how do the adjustments affect the survey results?

*No other measures were taken.*

### **Section I. Translation**

Notes to collaborators...

- As part of your deposit, please provide the original questionnaire(s) in each language used.
- For questionnaires in a language other than English, if a back-translation to English happens to be available, we would appreciate receiving the back-translation, also.
- The below questions on translation are adapted from those developed for the ISSP.

30. 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

31. Please list all languages used for the fielded module.

*German*

32. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated? Please mark all that apply.

- Yes, a group worked together on it and reconciled their differences through discussion
- Yes, an expert checked it
- Yes, by back translation
- Other; please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- No
- Not applicable

33. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

34. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?

Yes, some of the questions (e.g., COVID) were not applicable any longer and therefore caused problems.

No

Not applicable

35. 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:

**Section J. Other**

36. Please list any additional advice you have for analysts about how the survey should be used, and any remaining special considerations in that regard.