Technical Report (revised)

Making Electoral Democracy Work

Switzerland National Elections –

Zürich and Lucerne

November 30, 2012

Proprietary Warning

The information contained herein is proprietary to the Making Electoral Democracy Work Team and may not be used, reproduced or disclosed to others except as specifically permitted in writing by the originator of the information. The recipient of this information, by its retention and use, agrees to protect the same and the information contained therein from loss, theft or compromise. Any material or information provided the Making Electoral Democracy Work Team and all data collected by Harris/Decima will be treated as confidential by Harris/Decima and will be stored securely while on Harris/Decima's premise (adhering to industry standards and applicable laws).

OTTAWA
1800-160 Elgin St.
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
K2P 2P7
Tel: (613) 230-2200
Fax: (613) 230-3793

MONTRÉAL
400-1080 Beaver Hall Hill
Montréal, Québec, Canada
H2Z 1S8
Tel: (514) 288-0037
Fax: (514) 288-0138

TORONTO
405-2345 Yonge St.
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
M4P 2E5
Tel: (416) 962-2013
Fax: (416) 962-0505

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

About Making Electoral Democracy Work 1

Swiss National Elections Surveys – Zürich and Lucerne 1

Survey Methodology 3

Pre-launch 3

Questionnaire Design – CAWI *3*

Programming *3*

Survey Pre-Tests *3*

Sample Design and Selection *3*

Survey Administration 5

Supplier Panel Information *5*

Sampling and Quota Control *5*

Invites and Reminders *6*

Incentives *7*

Passwords *7*

Sample Distribution and Response Rate 8

In-Survey Quality Assurance (ISQ) 11

Data Analysis 12

Data Validity and Integrity Checks *12*

Data Cleaning *12*

Additional Variables Created *13*

Weighting *15*

Appendix A: Pre-election Surveys Quota Completions by Date 18

Appendix C: Invitation E-mail and Information and Consent Screen 23

Appendix D: Weight Reports 28

Introduction

We are pleased to submit this technical report to the Making Electoral Democracy Work team. Harris/Decima assembled a team of seasoned researchers from our Public Affairs team to work on this project. Their roles were as follows:

- Doug Anderson served as the Senior Project Manager. Mr. Anderson was responsible for overall project direction and ensuring the contractual obligations were met. He directed the project team, ensured quality control throughout the life cycle of the project and reviewed final deliverables.
- Danielle Armengaud served as Lead Consultant and the project analyst overseeing the overall management of the project, suppliers and sampling. Furthermore, Ms. Armengaud was the main point of client contact during the project.
- Sareda Quah served as Project Manager, being responsible for the day-to-day management of the project and acting as primary field liaison.

About Making Electoral Democracy Work

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada has awarded a significant grant for a seven-year research project entitled *Making Electoral Democracy Work (MEDW)* to Professor André Blais of the University of Montreal (Principal Investigator) and an international team of researchers.

This project brings together an exceptional team of economists, political scientists and psychologists from Canada, Europe, and the United States to undertake the most ambitious study ever undertaken on the impact of electoral rules on the functioning of democracy. The project will examine 26 elections in five countries.

The goal of the project is to examine the determinants of vote choice (including decision to vote or not to vote) in different election contexts.

Swiss National Elections Surveys – Zürich and Lucerne

The MEDW Team sought the services of a public opinion research firm to collect online data from residents in Zürich and Lucerne, Switzerland through surveys related to the National elections held on October 23, 2011. This study included a pre- and post election survey implemented through a return to sample methodology.

Harris/Decima completed 1083 and 1134 pre-election surveys and 865 and 873 post-election surveys online in Zurich and Lucerne, respectively.

This report presents a detailed description of the survey methodology used to complete this research, including sample design, recruitment, survey administration, response rates, weighting and recommendations for the future. This document contains all the details necessary to replicate this study in the future.

Number of Completed Surveys

Harris/Decima completed the following number of surveys, seen in the table below.

	Dates	Total # qualified completes
Zürich		
Pre-election survey	October 13 – 22, 2011	1083
Post-election survey	October 25 – November 6, 2011	865
Lucerne		
Pre-election survey	October 13 – 22, 2011	1134
Post-election survey	October 25 – November 6, 2011	873

These total numbers of completes exclude respondents who failed two or more In-Survey Quality (ISQ) Measures but includes respondents who failed only one. For more information, please see the section describing *In-Survey Quality Measures*.

Survey Methodology

Pre-launch

Questionnaire Design – CAWI

The MEDW team was responsible for providing the English and German versions of the pre and post election survey questionnaire.

Harris/Decima provided limited consultation on the questionnaire design to facilitate online survey administration. This survey was fielded in German and all translation of the survey instruments were provided by the MEDW team.

Programming

Once the survey was finalized, it was programmed by Harris/Decima's in-house programming team. Harris/Decima uses the *Confirmit Horizons Platform* software for data collection in online surveys. *Confirmit* includes support for random respondent selection, respondent identity verification via passwords (numeric passwords up to 12 digits) and for quota control. It also features adaptive questionnaire logic designed to provide many of the same methodological safeguards associated with traditional CATI telephone interviewing (i.e., randomized ordering of variables being tested in a battery, skip patterns based on responses given). The package allows the project manager to track non-responses to survey requests and provides estimates of non-response bias.

Survey Pre-Tests

Prior to being finalized, the online surveys were pre-tested or slow started with approximately 20 respondents. After the slow start, Harris/Decima analysts checked all of the frequencies and skip logic to ensure it elicited the required information, before launching the full survey the following day.

Sample Design and Selection

The sample for this survey was designed to yield 1,000 complete pre-election survey interviews and a return-to-sample target of 750 interviews from the post-election survey. In an agreement with the MEDW team, any completes beyond the return-to-sample target of 750 within the agreed-upon field period were also included. A stratified, quota-based sampling approach was used, since this generates substantive estimates across and within specific key segments of interest, which in turn permits extrapolation to the broader population with greater confidence. Quotas were set by controlling for age, gender and education status.

Based on census statistics[1], the following demographic quotas were set for the pre-election surveys:

Canton Zürich:

	Gender					
	Total - %	**Total - Quota**	**Male – % of population**	**Male – Quota**	**Female – % of Population**	**Female – Quota**
Total	100%	1000	49%	486	51%	514
Age						
18 - 34 years	28%	285	14%	143	14%	142
35 - 54 years	39%	388	20%	195	19%	191
55 - 99 years	33%	327	15%	148	18%	181

		% of Population	**Quota**
Education[2]	Lower education: No formal education, Obligatorische Schule (Primar-, Real-, Sekundar-, Bezirks-Orientierungsschule, Pro-, Untergymnasium, Sonderschule)	11%	108
	Middle education: Diplommittelschule (bis 2 Jahre), Verkehrsschule, Sozialjahr, Vorkurs für Pflegeberufe (1/2 Jahre), berufsvorbereitende Schule, Anlehre, Berufslehre oder Vollzeit-Berufsschule (z.B. Handelsschule, Lehrwerkstätte)	50%	499
	Higher education: Maturitätsschule, Berufsmatura, Diplommittelschule (3 Jahre), Lehrkräfte-Seminarien (z.B. Kindergarten, Primarschule, Fachlehrkräfte), Höhere Fach- und Berufsausbildung (z.B. eidg. Fachausweis, eidg. Fach-, Meisterdiplom, Höhere Kaufmännische Gesamtschule HKG, Techniker TS), Höhere FachSCHULE (z.B. HTL, HWV, HFG,	39%	393

[1] Source: MACH Basic 10 study, Undertaken by LINK; the largest media usage study in Switzerland, based on approx. 20,000 interviews per year, latest data from 2010. Weighted according to latest census (Statistik des jährlichen Bevölkerungsstandes (ESPOP), 1981-2009).

[2] Education quotas were set as "soft quotas" and not nested with age and/or gender.

	HFS), bei Vollzeitausbildung mit Mindestdauer von 3 Jahren (inkl. Nachdiplom), Universität, Fachhochschule, Hochschule (inkl. Nachdiplom)		

Canton Lucerne:

	Gender					
	Total - %	**Total - Quota**	**Male – % of population**	**Male – Quota**	**Female – % of Population**	**Female – Quota**
Total	100%	1000	49%	488	51%	512
Age						
18 - 34 years	30%	298	15%	147	15%	150
35 - 54 years	39%	395	21%	206	19%	190
55 - 99 years	41%	307	13%	135	17%	172

		% of Population	Quota
Education[3]	Lower education	14%	141
	Middle education	53%	529
	Higher education	33%	330

Given that the post-election survey was a return to sample only, no quotas were set for this portion of this study.

Survey Administration

Supplier Panel Information

Harris/Decima contracted The LINK Institut (LINK: http://www.link.ch/) as a sample provider for this study. For detailed descriptions of LINK's panel, including company profile, panel recruitment, panel and sample management, policies and compliance, partnerships and multiple panel membership information and data quality and validation, please see Appendix B.

Sampling and Quota Control

Quotas were monitored daily by the Harris/Decima project manager and by the project team using a monitoring tool supplied by the Confirmit survey platform ("Reportal"). Sample pulls and reminders were based on quota needs.

[3] Education quotas were set as "soft quotas" and not nested with age and/or gender.

Sample was pulled by LINK on the following dates for the Zürich study:

- October 11, 2011

And for the Lucerne study:

- October 11, 2011

Sample was pulled based on the following criteria:

- Age greater than 18
- Language set to German
- Area set to Zürich/Lucerne
- Education levels
- Gender
- Swiss citizenship

For the post-election surveys, no further sample was pulled – invites and reminders were sent only to those who completed the pre-election survey.

Invites and Reminders

To complete the online survey, respondents were sent an invitation and clicked on a survey URL with an embedded password to be redirected to the Harris/Decima site where the survey was hosted. The survey included an information and consent form which provided information about the study, encouraged their participation, provided them with the necessary privacy information and reiterated that by clicking "Weiter" (German translation of 'next') on the survey they consented to participation.

The survey was accessible 24 hours a day, seven days a week from any web-enabled computer.

Reminders were sent periodically to those who had not yet completed the survey.

Invites and reminders were sent by LINK as follows:

	Date	# Invites	# Reminders
Zürich and Lucerne			
Pre-election survey	October 13, 2011	598	
	October 14, 2011	5524	
	October 18, 2011	658	
	October 19, 2011		2912
Total		**6780**	**2912**
Post-election survey	October 24, 2011	300	
	October 25, 2011	1917	
	November 2, 2011		441
Total		**2217**	**441**

Incentives

As is customary with all online panel surveys, participants were provided with an incentive upon the completion of the survey.

Respondents were given the choice of the following incentives for the pre-election survey:

- phone vouchers which allow you to call landlines in Switzerland for free for 60 minutes
- credit for your Manor Card
- 200 Coop super-points
- 200 Migros cumulus-points
- Voucher(s) for buch.ch
- A donation for one of 3 suggested charities

And for the post-election survey:

- phone vouchers which allow you to call landlines in Switzerland for free for 60 minutes
- credit for your Manor Card
- 150 Coop super-points
- 150 Migros cumulus-points
- Voucher(s) for buch.ch
- A donation for one of 3 suggested charities

Passwords

Harris/Decima provided LINK with a generic link so that when respondents came into the survey their password was appended to the end of the URL. Cookies were enabled to control access to the survey so respondents could only complete the survey once.

Sample Distribution and Response Rate

The table below presents the overall participation rate for the pre-election and post-election surveys:

	Zürich		Lucerne	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A: Total Invitations	3460	1083	3351	1134
B: Undeliverables[4]	4	0	4	0
C: Net Usable invitations (A-B)	3456	1083	3347	1134
D: Total Completes	1085	865	1136	874
E: Qualified break offs	184	57	181	83
F: Disqualified (ISQ)	2	0	2	1
G: Not responded	2185	161	2028	176
H: Quota filled	17	0	0	0
Contact Rate (d+e+f+h)/c	37%	85%	39%	84%
Participation Rate (d+f+h)/c	32%	80%	34%	77%

As a point of reference, LINK experiences an average response rate of 55% in Switzerland across all projects. All surveys are different and response rates do vary from project to project. In general, political surveys tend to have a lower response rate because they may ask for sensitive information on voting habits. As well, interest in politics and the length of this particular survey may have played a role in lower response rates.

Average lengths, once outliers were removed, were:

- Zürich pre-election survey: 24 minutes
- Zürich post-election survey: 10 minutes
- Lucerne pre-election survey: 24 minutes
- Lucerne post-election survey: 10 minutes

[4] These are estimations. LINK panelists with undeliverable email addresses are set to "inactive" and called by phone for correction of e-mail address. Number of undeliverables for this study is therefore negligible.

The following table indicates how many completes were achieved each day. For a more detailed breakdown of these numbers by quota please see Appendix A.

Completions by Date: Pre and Post Wave

	Date	# Completions
Zürich		
Pre-election survey	Thursday October 13, 2011	29
	Friday October 14, 2011	279
	Saturday October 15, 2011	264
	Sunday October 16, 2011	162
	Monday October 17, 2011	107
	Tuesday October 18, 2011	57
	Wednesday October 19, 2011	114
	Thursday October 20, 2011	71
	Friday October 21, 2011	0
	Saturday October 22, 2011	0
Post-election survey	Monday October 24, 2011	75
	Tuesday October 25, 2011	488
	Wednesday October 26, 2011	107
	Thursday October 27, 2011	45
	Friday October 28, 2011	29
	Saturday October 29, 2011	17
	Sunday October 30, 2011	17
	Monday October 31, 2011	7
	Tuesday November 1, 2011	4
	Wednesday November 2, 2011	40
	Thursday November 3, 2011	19
	Friday November 4, 2011	7
	Saturday November 5, 2011	3
	Sunday November 6, 2011	7
Lucerne		
Pre-election survey	Thursday October 13, 2011	36
	Friday October 14, 2011	269
	Saturday October 15, 2011	270
	Sunday October 16, 2011	138
	Monday October 17, 2011	126
	Tuesday October 18, 2011	44
	Wednesday October 19, 2011	160
	Thursday October 20, 2011	91
	Friday October 21, 2011	0

	Saturday October 22, 2011	0
Post-election survey	Monday October 24, 2011	72
	Tuesday October 25, 2011	484
	Wednesday October 26, 2011	131
	Thursday October 27, 2011	52
	Friday October 28, 2011	23
	Saturday October 29, 2011	15
	Sunday October 30, 2011	10
	Monday October 31, 2011	11
	Tuesday November 1, 2011	10
	Wednesday November 2, 2011	28
	Thursday November 3, 2011	14
	Friday November 4, 2011	7
	Saturday November 5, 2011	5
	Sunday November 6, 2011	11

In-Survey Quality Assurance (ISQ)

Harris Interactive uses a multi-layered approach to ensure that fraudulent respondents, those who intentionally misrepresent themselves by providing inaccurate information, and/or those who misrepresent themselves as more than one individual by joining a panel under multiple email addresses, are detected and removed and do not affect client results.

As this study was conducted with LINK's Swiss panel, which has been proven to be a very high-quality panel, we relied on our In-Survey Quality Assurance measures to ensure an extra "check" for bad respondents.

Respondents generally enter our surveys intending to participate as thoughtfully as we desire, but occasionally some will be pressed for time or will find a survey excessively long or burdensome. In those situations, some respondents may "speed" to complete the survey quickly.

In an effort to identify respondents who are speeding or appear unengaged in the survey, we have developed a series of ISQ metrics. They consist of the following:

- Minimum Length of Interview
- Incorrect response to respondent instruction
- Identification of straight-lining activity at a grid question
- Less than 5 characters at a mandatory open-ended response
- Illogical responses to survey questions

For this survey, the first three of these five metrics were utilized:

- Minimum length of interview for the pre-election study was set at 8 minutes and for the post-election study, at 2 minutes
- The respondent instruction question added early in the questionnaire was as follows:
  "To ensure that your browser is downloading the content of this survey properly, please select the number four below."
  - ❍ One (1)
  - ❍ Two (2)
  - ❍ Three (3)
  - ❍ Four (4)
  - ❍ Five (5)
  - ❍ Don't know (9)
- Respondents giving the same answer for all questions in the Q28 (pre-election) and PQ26 (post-election) batteries were flagged as "straightliners."

A respondent was disqualified if they "failed" two or more of these measures.

Data Analysis

Upon completion of data collection, Harris/Decima cleaned and weighted the data.

Data Validity and Integrity Checks

Our custom system immediately identifies cases where the interview length is unrealistically short, contradicts established facts or presents patterns of response deserving attention. As a result, we can determine whether a case should be excluded from the final sample if necessary. All of these checks are preformed manually and cleaned out of the data in the back end of the project. Harris/Decima uses a checklist to ensure all data that is delivered to the client has gone through a rigorous quality control process. During this time Harris/Decima also cross referenced all IDs between the pre and post surveys to ensure all responses were valid. A few test cases were removed from the data. As well, postal code information was removed to preserve anonymity of participants. The zip code variable (SD2E) appears in the datafile but does not contain any data.

Data Cleaning

Harris/Decima analysts have considerable experience in cleaning data files, conducting statistical routines, producing tabular output, and weighting data to provide an accurate measure of the population as a whole.

The following are the basic steps taken when cleaning data files:

- Ensure that all coded questions have updated codes and multiple mentions do not have duplicate codes;
- Create all new variables as a result of programming;
- Confirm that all relevant variables are included in the data file;
- Final frequency check (for out-of-range values) and recodes created, including those for outliers;
- Verify that variable names and question numbers match the final version of the questionnaire; and
- Create and verify new variable creations (against source variables) as outlined in the analysis plan and perform spell check on all variables.

In addition to these generic rules, project specific requirements are also taken into account. It is also noteworthy that because the CAWI software controls the questionnaire flow and data entry, data are typically quite clean from the outset.

Additional Variables Created

Harris/Decima created a number of extra variables to assist the MEDW team in navigating and analyzing the data:

Time Stamps (Variables T_int to T_pq1_end2): The way that timing variables work in this study is that they each capture how long the survey has taken (in seconds) at the point the respondent crosses the variable. To analyze how long someone has taken between two timestamps, subtract the first time stamp variable from the second and this will represent how long it took the respondent to get from the first variable to the second. In order to convert to minutes, divide the outcome by 60.

Section: The section variable aides in selecting the appropriate respondent group for analysis:

Value	Label	Segment
1	Pre-election complete	Those who only completed the pre-election survey
2	Pre-election incomplete	Those who started but did not complete the pre-election survey
3 (empty)	Post-election complete	Those who only completed the post-election survey
4 (empty)	Post-election incomplete	Those who started but did not complete the post-election survey and who did not complete the pre-election survey
5	Pre and post election complete	Those who completed both surveys
6	Pre complete and post incomplete	Those who completed the pre-election survey and started the post-election survey, but did not complete it
7 (empty)	Pre incomplete and post complete	Those who started but did not complete the pre-election survey and competed the post-election survey
8	Neither section started	Those who dropped out of the survey in the screening section before Q1

This variable can be recoded to select appropriate respondent groups for analysis. For example, (1 + 5 + 6) are all those who completed the pre-election survey.

Last question answered (Lastq): indicates the last question an "incomplete" respondent answered before dropping out of the survey.

ISQ fail variables: Ten variables were created to indicate how respondents did on the in-survey-quality measures. As discussed, it is recommended to only exclude those who

failed two or three of the measures. The two variables (one for the pre-election survey and one for the post-election survey) that can be used to filter for those respondents are bolded in the table below.

Variable	Segment	Pre or post survey
Pre_grid	Straight line grid isq fail.	Pre
Pre_resp	Respondent instruction isq fail	Pre
Pre_time	Minimum length of survey isq fail	Pre
Pre_fail	**Failed two or more isq measures**	**Pre**
Post_grid	Straight line grid isq fail.	Post
Post_resp	Respondent instruction isq fail	Post
Post_time	Minimum length of survey isq fail	Post
Post_fail	**Failed two or more isq measures**	**Post**

Electoral Constituency (Elec_con): In the final data set, Harris/Decima appended all the electoral constituency information, based on postal codes provided by the respondents (variable SD2EA1) and information provided by MEDW.

Q1 and PQ1 combined variables (Q1a_beginning, Q1b_beginning, Q1c_beginning, Pq1a_beginning, Pq1b_beginning, Pq1c_beginning): The Q1 and PQ1 batteries were split sample questions, meaning that half the sample received those questions at the beginning of the surveys and the other half at the end. These variables combine the answers from those two split samples for a base_all variable for each question in the battery.

Date variables: Two date variables were created; one for the pre-election study **(Pre_dat)** and one for the post-election study **(Post_dat)**. These are the dates (day and month) that participants completed or otherwise exited (i.e. dropped out of) the survey.

Collapsed Age variable (Age_col): This variable collapses the respondents' ages into three categories (18-34; 35-54 and 55+), which is used for weighting purposes.

Collapsed Education variable (Edu_col): This variable collapses the respondents' education level into three categories (low, middle and high – for details, please see section on quotas), which is used for weighting purposes.

Age by Gender (Age_gend): Collapsed age variable by gender, which is used for weighting purposes.

Collapsed vote variable (Pre_vote): Provided by MEDW, and was used for weighting purposes.

Collapsed vote variable (Pre_vote_col1): Created using Pre_vote variable with the smaller parties being group as 'other' for weighting purposes. Non-voters (those that are sysmis in pre_vote) were coded as "don't know"/"refused" since their vote choice if they were to vote is unknown.

Collapsed vote variable (Post_vote): Provided by MEDW, and was used for weighting purposes.

Collapsed vote variable (Pre_vote_col2): Created using pre_vote variable with the smaller parties being group as 'other' for weighting purposes. Non-voters (those that are sysmis in pre_vote) were coded into the 'non-voter' choice option. What applies for the PRE_ vars applies to the POST_ ones as well.

Likelihood to vote (Pre_int): Created from Q6 and Q7 variables in order to indentify who is likely to vote**,** used to create weights. Q6=1 OR ANY (Q7, 1, 2, 3) = Yes; all else is no.

Likelihood of having voted (Post_int): Created from PQ5_1 and PQ5_2 variables in order to indentify who is likely to have voted**,** used to create weights. PQ5_1=4 OR PQ5_2=1 = Yes; all else is no.

Weighting

At the conclusion of the data collection and cleaning, Harris/Decima weighted the data by each quota stratum to reflect the actual proportions found in the population. This ensures the findings from the research can be extrapolated to the entire population with accuracy.

RIM weighting (Random Iterative Method - also called raking) was used to create weights. This method of weighting puts selected non-interlocking and grouped interlocking variables in isolation through an iterative sequence of weighting adjustments. The sequence adjusts for each rim in turn and then repeats itself as many times as is required in order to obtain a convergence, in which the sum of the weighted rims matches the target population estimates, or is as close as it is possible to achieve. The number of iterations is indicated in the table below.

Other conventional weighting methods could be used to weight survey data. In many cases, cell weighting (or post-stratification) is applied. This method is the simplest of ways to bring sample proportions in line with population proportions based on census data. It divides the population into a number of cells, such as two gender cells or three age cells. The proportion of the population in each cell is then divided by the proportion for each cell found in the final sample:

Cellweight (W) = proportion in population in cell/proportion in sample in cell

The main reason why this method was not used, was that the information for each desired cell was not available. As weights were based on interlocking information on age, gender, region, education, vote turnout and vote distribution, it was impossible to find correct population information to weight back to as there is no published data available. Moreover, should this information have become available, the sheer number of cells would have made for small cell-sizes, risking very high or very low weights for certain populations.

RIM weighting, on the other hand, only uses marginal distributions, therefore allowing for more covariates. It was deemed a more appropriate and methodologically sound weighting method in this study.

The data used for the demographic weights were taken from the same sources as used for the quotas. The source of the official turnout and statistics were supplied to Harris/Decima by the MEDW team.

As a matter of convention, the average weight was set to 1 so that the unweighted base is the same as the weighted base.

Although weighting caps were set, these caps are not hard, but were instead capped by trimming and then after normalization the range in some instances moved slightly.

The datafile includes the following weights:

Name	Factors	Use for Pre/Post	# iterations – Zürich	# iterations – Lucerne	Cap - low	Cap - high
PRE_WEIGHT1	age, gender, education	Pre	20	20	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT2	age, gender, education and likelihood to vote (vote turnout)	Pre	20	20	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT3	age, gender, education, likelihood to vote (vote turnout), and vote intention (actual election results)	Pre	20	20	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT3B[5]	age, gender, education, and vote intention (actual election results)	Pre	20	20	0.2	5

[5] Weights 3 and 3B are used to create weights that account, in addition to demographic attributes, for a respondent's likelihood to vote (whether they intend to vote at the time of the pre-election survey or whether they have voted at the time of the post-election survey) and whom they intend to vote for (in the pre-election survey) or who they have voted for (in the post-election survey). Weight 3 does this by using a separate rim for likelihood to vote and vote intent. Weight 3B, however, combines a respondent's likelihood and intent into a single rim by adding the code 'Non-voter' to the VOTE_COL variable and then setting the weight target for those respondents to the non-voter target based on election results while the vote intent targets are set based on election results multiplied by voter turnout. This method avoids voters being weighted up in the vote intent rim and then weighted down (equally) in the likelihood to vote rim, as each party's vote intent targets are only based on actual voter turnout.

PRE_WEIGHT4	age, gender, education and and vote intention (actual election results)	Pre	20	20	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT1	age, gender, education	Post	20	20	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT2	age, gender, education and likelihood to vote (vote turnout)	Post	20	20	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT3	age, gender, education, likelihood to vote (vote turnout), and vote recall (actual election results)	Post	20	20	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT3B[5]	age, gender, education, and vote recall (actual election results)	Post	20	20	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT4	age, gender, education, and vote recall (actual election results)	Post	20	20	0.2	5

Appendix A: Pre-election Surveys Quota Completions by Date

Canton Zürich:

		Low education	Middle education	High education
Education	Thursday October 13, 2011	0	15	14
	Friday October 14, 2011	16	114	149
	Saturday October 15, 2011	16	129	119
	Sunday October 16, 2011	12	76	74
	Monday October 17, 2011	3	55	49
	Tuesday October 18, 2011	7	26	24
	Wednesday October 19, 2011	9	36	69
	Thursday October 20, 2011	4	36	31
	Total	**67**	**487**	**529**
		18-34	**35-54**	**55+**
Age	Thursday October 13, 2011	5	13	11
	Friday October 14, 2011	64	104	111
	Saturday October 15, 2011	58	101	105
	Sunday October 16, 2011	36	59	67
	Monday October 17, 2011	32	49	26
	Tuesday October 18, 2011	16	26	15
	Wednesday October 19, 2011	47	34	33
	Thursday October 20, 2011	29	28	14
	Total	**287**	**414**	**382**
		Male	**Female**	
Gender	Thursday October 13, 2011	17	12	
	Friday October 14, 2011	148	131	
	Saturday October 15, 2011	141	123	
	Sunday October 16, 2011	83	79	
	Monday October 17, 2011	51	56	
	Tuesday October 18, 2011	26	31	
	Wednesday October 19, 2011	54	60	
	Thursday October 20, 2011	23	48	
	Total	**543**	**540**	

Canton Lucerne:

		Low education	Middle education	High education
Education	Thursday October 13, 2011	4	16	16
	Friday October 14, 2011	24	130	115
	Saturday October 15, 2011	15	151	104
	Sunday October 16, 2011	15	63	60
	Monday October 17, 2011	5	69	52
	Tuesday October 18, 2011	0	27	17
	Wednesday October 19, 2011	12	71	77
	Thursday October 20, 2011	3	36	52
	Total	**78**	**563**	**493**
		18-34	**35-54**	**55+**
Age	Thursday October 13, 2011	5	18	13
	Friday October 14, 2011	77	108	84
	Saturday October 15, 2011	63	90	117
	Sunday October 16, 2011	32	67	39
	Monday October 17, 2011	36	49	41
	Tuesday October 18, 2011	16	15	13
	Wednesday October 19, 2011	57	66	37
	Thursday October 20, 2011	31	41	19
	Total	**317**	**454**	**363**
		Male	**Female**	
Gender	Thursday October 13, 2011	24	12	
	Friday October 14, 2011	152	117	
	Saturday October 15, 2011	136	134	
	Sunday October 16, 2011	64	74	
	Monday October 17, 2011	60	66	
	Tuesday October 18, 2011	14	30	
	Wednesday October 19, 2011	51	109	
	Thursday October 20, 2011	23	68	
	Total	**524**	**610**	

Appendix B: Supplier Panel Information

LINK

Panel Information

1) What is the size of your panel in each of the following regions and countries:
    a. Switzerland: Lucerne and Zurich

panelists who are eligible voters
Lucerne: 5'400, Zurich: 17'100

2) What panel recruitment techniques do you currently employ?
    a. Please describe your recruitment sources.

100% CATI recruited from nationally representative surveys; no self sampling, no snowball system; no double entry

3) Describe your panel quality control process(es).

Careful recruiting (100% CATI), Multiple validation checks during the survey. Data mining (fraud protection).
Response rates are monitored. Panelists with low response rates (<20%) are excluded from the panel.
Quality of interviews is tracked by control questions (consistency), answer patterns and length of interviews. Panelists with bad quality and/or fraudulent respondents are excluded from the panel.
Panel management: we reply personally within 24 hours (during working days) on any questions from our panelists; if an Email address is no longer valid, each panelist gets contacted by phone to be asked for the new address.
Sampling done by experienced project managers.

4) What panel profiling information, demographic or otherwise, is available?
    a. How are your panelists profiled?

profiling questionnaire at opt-in and update questionnaires

    b. How often are your panelists profiled?

invitation to update questionnaire once a year

    c. What information is included in your profiling surveys?

Sociodemographic variables as well as hundreds of other data (consumer behaviour etc.)

    d. What questions are mandatory and optional in the profiling survey?

all questions are mandatory, "no answer" option for sensitive questions

5) How will you confirm geographic residency of participant?

Geographic residency is updated once a year in the update questionnaire. We recommend to ask geographic residency in the screener as well.

6) What will your approach be should there be challenges in meeting the required quotas?

We estimate feasibility carefully. If there should be challenges all the same, we suggest to extend the field time and/or open up adjacent quota cells.

Sample

1) How is sample pulled?

Within the quota cells at random (or complete survey if necessary)

2) What sample sources do you use?

our own LINK Internet Panel

3) How is your sample composed?

100% LINK Internet Panel

4) How will you ensure demographic quotas and representativeness is met to the aforementioned standards in this study?

Sampling done and controlled by experienced project managers

Paradata

1) What para-data will be available for this study?
    a. Census information? ***yes***
    b. Electoral district? ***yes***
    c. Age? ***yes***
    d. Gender? ***yes***
    e. Region? ***yes***
    f. Sub-region? ***yes***
    g. Education? ***yes***
    h. Any other relevant information? ***yes, other sociodemographic information, e.g. Income, urban/rural, …***

Passwords

1) How does your company typically employ passwords in internet surveys? ***embedded in unique links***
2) Are you capable of embedding passwords in unique links provided by Harris/Decima to ensure controlled access to the survey? ***yes***

Non-Response Information

1) Please indicate if your firm is capable of providing the non-response information on page 4. ***yes***

Response Rates

1) Please indicate the anticipated response rate for the following:
    a. The Pre Test ***50-55%, if minimum 10 days of field***
    b. The Post Test ***75-85%, if minimum 10 days of field***

Incentives

1) What is your standard incentive structure?

Incentives for all respondents are a choice of: prepaid codes for phone calls (provider independent), participation in the 2 biggest retail bonus programs offered in Switzerland (covering >80% of the population),vouchers for online book stores, donation. Incentives vary with the length of the questionnaire along 5 minute-steps.

2) Can your incentive structure be customized for this project? ***yes***
3) What incentive structure do you recommend for this project?

same as 1)

Panel Usage

1) What is the average number of surveys sent to a panelist per month?

About 1 invitation per month

2) What types of surveys (academic, commercial, government) do you usually send to your clients?

all types, most surveys are commercial surveys

3) Do you have procedures for cleaning your panel of non-responsive panelists?

exclusion of panelists who respond to less than 20% of invitations

Challenges

1) Please briefly describe any challenges you foresee in completing this research and your firms proposed solutions.

Feasibility of detailed quotas for the second wave in Lucerne. Solution: re-invitation of panelists who participated in the first wave

Appendix C: Invitation E-mail and Information and Consent Screen

Invitation

Pre-election survey:

LINK online research

Guten Tag «first name» «last name»

Wir laden Sie herzlich zu unserer aktuellen Umfrage ein.

Klicken Sie bitte auf den folgenden Link, um zum Fragebogen zu gelangen:
ZUM FRAGEBOGEN

Wenn Sie nach wenigen Fragen zu den von uns gesuchten Personen gehören, dauert das Ausfüllen des Fragebogens etwa 20 Minuten. **In diesem Fall können Sie am Ende des Fragebogens Ihre Prämie aus 6 Angeboten auswählen:**

- Telefongutscheine, mit denen Sie insgesamt 60 Minuten gratis auf dem Festnetz in der Schweiz telefonieren können
- Gutschrift auf Ihre Manor Karte
- 200 Coop Superpunkte
- 200 Migros CUMULUS-Punkte
- Gutschein(e) von buch.ch
- eine Spende für eines von 3 vorgeschlagenen Hilfswerken

Falls Sie Zugangsprobleme oder technische Fragen haben, antworten Sie bitte auf diese Email (panel@link.ch).

Mit freundlichen Grüssen

LINK Institut für Markt- und Sozialforschung
Stefanie Nater

Informationen zum Datenschutz (Privacy Policy) finden Sie hier.

Post-election survey:

LINK online research

Guten Tag «first name» «last name»

Das internationale Meinungsforschungsinstitut Harris/Decima führt in Zusammenarbeit mit LINK momentan den zweiten Teil der Umfrage durch, die Sie vor einigen Tagen beantwortet haben. **Da Sie den ersten Teil bereits ausgefüllt haben, würden wir uns sehr über eine weitere Teilnahme von Ihnen freuen.** Dieser Teil wird nur ca. 10 Minuten in Anspruch nehmen.

Klicken Sie bitte auf den folgenden Link, um zum Fragebogen zu gelangen:

ZUM FRAGEBOGEN

Am Ende des Fragebogens können Sie Ihre Prämie aus 6 Angeboten auswählen:

- Telefongutscheine, mit denen Sie insgesamt 60 Minuten gratis auf dem Festnetz in der Schweiz telefonieren können
- Gutschrift auf Ihre Manor Karte
- 150 Coop Superpunkte
- 150 Migros CUMULUS-Punkte
- Gutschein(e) von buch.ch
- eine Spende für eines von 3 vorgeschlagenen Hilfswerken

Falls Sie Zugangsprobleme oder technische Fragen haben, antworten Sie bitte auf diese Email (panel@link.ch).

Mit freundlichen Grüssen

LINK Institut für Markt- und Sozialforschung
Stefanie Nater

Informationen zum Datenschutz (Privacy Policy) finden Sie hier.

Landing Page:

Vielen Dank, dass Sie sich entschlossen haben an unserer Umfrage teilzunehmen. Wir führen eine Forschungsstudie zum Thema Wahlen und Demokratie durch und würden gerne Ihre Meinung erfahren. Die Teilnahme an der Studie ist freiwillig, Ihre Angaben werden absolut vertraulich behandelt und nur zu wissenschaftlichen Forschungszwecken verwendet. Sie müssen 18 Jahre alt, Schweizer Staatsbürger und im Kanton Zürich stimmberechtigt sein, um teilnehmen zu können.

Die Studie besteht aus zwei Teilen. Wir bitten Sie heute, den ersten Teil auszufüllen. Dies ist eine Umfrage, die ca. 20 Minuten in Anspruch nehmen wird. Beim zweiten Teil handelt es sich um eine weitere, aber kürzere Umfrage. Wenn Sie heute an der Umfrage teilnehmen, werden wir Sie zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt wieder kontaktieren und um die Beantwortung des zweiten Fragebogens bitten. Auch die Teilnahme an diesem zweiten Teil ist freiwillig.

Wenn Sie weitere Zusatzinformationen über die Studie lesen möchten, dann klicken Sie bitte HIER.

Wenn Sie mit der Umfrage beginnen möchten, ohne die Zusatzinformationen zu lesen, dann klicken Sie bitte WEITER. Mit Beendigung der Umfrage willigen Sie in die Teilnahme an der Studie ein.

Wenn Sie zu irgendeinem Zeitpunkt Fragen zur Studie, zur Art der Durchführung oder zu Ihren Rechten als Forschungsteilnehmer haben, kontaktieren Sie bitte eine der Personen, die in der ZUSATZINFORMATION (<-Link) aufgeführt sind.

Additional Information:

Der Zweck dieser Seite ist es, Sie über die Einzelheiten unserer Studie zu informieren. Sie müssen 18 Jahre alt, Schweizer Staatsbürger und im Kanton ZH stimmberechtigt sein, um teilnehmen zu können.

Der Zweck dieser Studie ist die Erfassung von Informationen über Ihre Einstellungen und Meinungen zu Wahlen und Demokratie. Die Teilnahme an dieser Studie ist freiwillig. Sie können sich jederzeit weigern, daran teilzunehmen und sie können die Umfrage jederzeit abbrechen.

Die Studie besteht aus zwei Teilen. Den ersten können Sie heute abschliessen, was ca. 20 Minuten in Anspruch nehmen wird. Der zweite Teil wird nach dem 23.Oktober 2011 verschickt. Wenn Sie die heutige Befragung beenden, werden wir Sie erneut anschreiben und Sie bitten, auch an der zweiten Umfrage teilzunehmen. Eine heutige Teilnahme verpflichtet Sie aber keinesfalls zur Teilnahme an der zweiten Umfrage.

Der Nutzen dieser Studie liegt darin, dass Ihre Antworten dabei helfen werden, unser

Verständnis von Wahlen in Zürich zu verbessern. Es ist möglich, dass Sie nicht von der Teilnahme an sich profitieren. Es sind keine Risiken bekannt, die Ihnen bei der Teilnahme an der Studie entstehen könnten.

Wenn Sie die heutige Umfrage abschliessen, werden Sie mit einer der folgenden Angebote entschädigt :

- Telefongutscheine, mit denen Sie insgesamt 60 Minuten gratis auf dem Festnetz in der Schweiz telefonieren können
- Gutschrift auf Ihre Manor Karte
- 200 Coop Superpunkte
- 200 Migros CUMULUS-Punkte
- Gutschein(e) von buch.ch
- Eine Spende für eines von 3 vorgeschlagenen Hilfswerken

Sollten Sie auch die zweite Umfrage abschliessen, werden sie mit einem der folgenden Angebote entschädigt.

- Telefongutscheine, mit denen Sie insgesamt 60 Minuten gratis auf dem Festnetz in der Schweiz telefonieren können
- Gutschrift auf Ihre Manor Karte
- 200 Coop Superpunkte
- 200 Migros CUMULUS-Punkte
- Gutschein(e) von buch.ch
- Eine Spende für eines von 3 vorgeschlagenen Hilfswerken

Ihre Angaben werden zu jeder Zeit streng vertraulich behandelt.

Falls Sie zu irgendeinem Zeitpunkt Fragen zu dieser Studie haben, können Sie folgende Personen kontaktieren:

Dr. Laura Stephenson
Department of Political Science
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada
00-1-519-661-2111 ext. 85164
Email: lstephe8@uwo.ca

Marian Bohl, M.A./Prof. Dr. Hanspeter Kriesi Institut für Politikwissenschaft der Universität Zürich
Affolternstrasse 56
8050 Zürich
Tel: 0041 44 634 3979
E-Mail: marian.bohl@ipz.uzh.ch

Falls Sie Fragen zur Durchführung dieser Studie oder zu Ihren Rechten als Studienteilnehmer haben können Sie folgende Stelle kontaktieren:

Büro für Forschungsethik der Universität von Western Ontario, Kanada (englisch oder französisch)
00-1-519-661-3036

Mit Beendigung der Umfrage erklären Sie Ihre Zustimmung zur Teilnahme an der Studie.

Wenn Sie mit der ersten Umfrage der Studie beginnen möchten, klicken Sie bitte WEITER.

Appendix D: Weight Reports

Zurich

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT1
- PRE_WEIGHT1 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 31.71%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1083
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1083.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.3	154.87	154	14.22	1.007712	155.19	14.33	5.674935	0.404474
Male - 35 to 54	19.5	211.19	210	19.39	1.007712	211.62	19.54	6.410937	0.456931
Male - 55 plus	14.8	160.28	179	16.53	0.897284	160.61	14.83	7.971746	0.568176
Female - 18 to 34	14.3	154.87	133	12.28	1.162163	154.57	14.27	5.667934	0.394591
Female - 35 to 54	19.1	206.85	204	18.84	1.012013	206.45	19.06	8.157567	0.401285
Female - 55 plus	18	194.94	203	18.74	0.958427	194.56	17.96	9.035142	0.444455

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	3.8	41.15	30	2.77	1.3718	41.15	3.8	1.457106	1.215421
Male - Middle	22.5	243.68	204	18.84	1.194485	243.68	22.5	1.284382	1.071347
Male - High	22.4	242.59	309	28.53	0.785087	242.59	22.4	0.824617	0.687841
Female - Low	7.1	76.89	37	3.42	2.078189	76.89	7.1	2.450371	1.860066
Female - Middle	27.3	295.66	283	26.13	1.044731	295.66	27.3	1.238251	0.939951
Female - High	16.9	183.03	220	20.31	0.831941	183.03	16.9	0.941706	0.714845

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT2
- PRE_WEIGHT2 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, pre_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 31.71%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1083
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1083.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED	INPUT	WEIGHT	OUTPUT	MAX. RESP.	MIN. RESP.

	%	#	#	%		#	%	RIM WEIGHT	RIM WEIGHT
Male - 18 to 34	14.3	154.87	154	14.22	1.007712	155.19	14.33	5.674935	0.404474
Male - 35 to 54	19.5	211.19	210	19.39	1.007712	211.62	19.54	6.410937	0.456931
Male - 55 plus	14.8	160.28	179	16.53	0.897284	160.61	14.83	7.971746	0.568176
Female - 18 to 34	14.3	154.87	133	12.28	1.162163	154.57	14.27	5.667934	0.394591
Female - 35 to 54	19.1	206.85	204	18.84	1.012013	206.45	19.06	8.157567	0.401285
Female - 55 plus	18	194.94	203	18.74	0.958427	194.56	17.96	9.035142	0.444455

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	3.8	41.15	30	2.77	1.3718	41.15	3.8	6.154077	0.404474
Male - Middle	22.5	243.68	204	18.84	1.194485	243.68	22.5	7.971746	0.523939
Male - High	22.4	242.59	309	28.53	0.785087	242.59	22.4	7.517212	0.494065
Female - Low	7.1	76.89	37	3.42	2.078189	76.89	7.1	9.035142	0.740585
Female - Middle	27.3	295.66	283	26.13	1.044731	295.66	27.3	4.814015	0.394591
Female - High	16.9	183.03	220	20.31	0.831941	183.03	16.9	6.384173	0.523293

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	49.8	539.33	983	90.77	0.548661	539.33	49.8	0.834171	0.394591
No, will not vote	50.2	543.67	100	9.23	5.43666	543.67	50.2	9.035142	4.273932

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3
- PRE_WEIGHT3 –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, pre _vote_col1, pre_int
Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 31.54%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1083
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1083.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.3	154.87	154	14.22	1.007712	155.19	14.33	5.523301	0
Male - 35 to 54	19.5	211.19	210	19.39	1.007712	211.62	19.54	6.314919	0
Male - 55 plus	14.8	160.28	179	16.53	0.897284	160.61	14.83	7.714897	0
Female - 18 to 34	14.3	154.87	133	12.28	1.162163	154.57	14.27	5.785546	0
Female - 35 to 54	19.1	206.85	204	18.84	1.012013	206.45	19.06	8.411129	0
Female - 55 plus	18	194.94	203	18.74	0.958427	194.56	17.96	9.020912	0

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED	INPUT	WEIGHT	OUTPUT	MAX. RESP.	MIN. RESP.

	%	#	#	%		#	%	RIM WEIGHT	RIM WEIGHT
Male - Low	3.8	41.15	30	2.77	1.3718	41.15	3.8	6.071174	0
Male - Middle	22.5	243.68	204	18.84	1.194485	243.68	22.5	7.714897	0
Male - High	22.4	242.59	309	28.53	0.785087	242.59	22.4	7.361388	0
Female - Low	7.1	76.89	37	3.42	2.078189	76.89	7.1	9.020912	0
Female - Middle	27.3	295.66	283	26.13	1.044731	295.66	27.3	4.750224	0
Female - High	16.9	183.03	220	20.31	0.831941	183.03	16.9	6.303754	0

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
SVP	25.4	275.08	221	20.41	0.71994	159.11	14.69	1.088218	0.524332
SP	15.9	172.2	206	19.02	0.483487	99.6	9.2	0.741454	0.357253
FDP	9.8	106.13	84	7.76	0.730805	61.39	5.67	1.104269	0.532066
GRÜNE	6.6	71.48	76	7.02	0.543983	41.34	3.82	0.785878	0.407343
GRÜNLIBERALE	9.4	101.8	139	12.83	0.423611	58.88	5.44	0.643912	0.310254
Other	19	205.77	207	19.11	0.57496	119.02	10.99	0.880006	0.42401
Unkown	13.9	150.54	150	13.85	3.62444	543.67	50.2	9.020912	0

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	49.8	539.33	983	90.77	0.548661	539.33	49.8	1.104269	0
No, will not vote	50.2	543.67	100	9.23	5.43666	543.67	50.2	9.020912	4.346516

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3B
- PRE_WEIGHT3B –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, pre _vote_col2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 31.49%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1083
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1083.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.3	154.87	154	14.22	1.007712	155.19	14.33	5.671251	0.265254
Male - 35 to 54	19.5	211.19	210	19.39	1.007712	211.62	19.54	6.42085	0.351533
Male - 55 plus	14.8	160.28	179	16.53	0.897284	160.61	14.83	7.88721	0.368898
Female - 18 to 34	14.3	154.87	133	12.28	1.162163	154.57	14.27	5.771864	0.251785
Female - 35 to 54	19.1	206.85	204	18.84	1.012013	206.45	19.06	7.755992	0.266265
Female - 55 plus	18	194.94	203	18.74	0.958427	194.56	17.96	8.689608	0.298316

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	3.8	41.15	30	2.77	1.3718	41.15	3.8	5.960742	0.265254
Male - Middle	22.5	243.68	204	18.84	1.194485	243.68	22.5	7.876488	0.350505
Male - High	22.4	242.59	309	28.53	0.785087	242.59	22.4	7.88721	0.350982
Female - Low	7.1	76.89	37	3.42	2.078189	76.89	7.1	8.689608	0.531314
Female - Middle	27.3	295.66	283	26.13	1.044731	295.66	27.3	4.820262	0.251785
Female - High	16.9	183.03	220	20.31	0.831941	183.03	16.9	6.838522	0.357209

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
SVP	13.3	144.04	221	20.41	0.65176	144.04	13.3	0.931262	0.43601
SP	8.4	90.97	206	19.02	0.441612	90.97	8.4	0.629502	0.294728
FDP	5.2	56.32	84	7.76	0.670429	56.32	5.2	0.939648	0.439936
GRÜNE	3.5	37.91	76	7.02	0.49875	37.91	3.5	0.653067	0.336867
GRÜNLIBERALE	4.9	53.07	139	12.83	0.381777	53.07	4.9	0.537782	0.251785
Other	9.9	107.22	207	19.11	0.517957	107.22	9.9	0.742642	0.347699
Non-voter	50.2	543.67	100	9.23	5.43666	543.67	50.2	8.689608	4.068408
Unkown	4.6	49.82	50	4.62	0.99636	49.82	4.6	1.531587	0.717077

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT4
- PRE_WEIGHT4 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, pre _vote_col1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 90.37%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1083
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1083.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.3	154.87	154	14.22	1.007712	155.19	14.33	1.93475	0.647662
Male - 35 to 54	19.5	211.19	210	19.39	1.007712	211.62	19.54	1.985384	0.664612
Male - 55 plus	14.8	160.28	179	16.53	0.897284	160.61	14.83	1.411998	0.538951
Female - 18 to 34	14.3	154.87	133	12.28	1.162163	154.57	14.27	2.837953	0.756256
Female - 35 to 54	19.1	206.85	204	18.84	1.012013	206.45	19.06	2.509985	0.668859
Female - 55 plus	18	194.94	203	18.74	0.958427	194.56	17.96	2.449865	0.561347

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	3.8	41.15	30	2.77	1.3718	41.15	3.8	1.985384	0.936432

Male - Middle	22.5	243.68	204	18.84	1.194485	243.68	22.5	1.741216	0.821267
Male - High	22.4	242.59	309	28.53	0.785087	242.59	22.4	1.142662	0.538951
Female - Low	7.1	76.89	37	3.42	2.078189	76.89	7.1	2.837953	1.424927
Female - Middle	27.3	295.66	283	26.13	1.044731	295.66	27.3	1.701054	0.734398
Female - High	16.9	183.03	220	20.31	0.831941	183.03	16.9	1.300224	0.561347

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
SVP	25.4	275.08	221	20.41	1.244715	275.08	25.4	2.837953	0.796755
SP	15.9	172.2	206	19.02	0.835908	172.2	15.9	2.145243	0.602277
FDP	9.8	106.13	84	7.76	1.2635	106.13	9.8	2.449865	0.926614
GRÜNE	6.6	71.48	76	7.02	0.9405	71.48	6.6	2.153658	0.683645
GRÜNLIBERALE	9.4	101.8	139	12.83	0.732388	101.8	9.4	1.424927	0.538951
Other	19	205.77	207	19.11	0.994058	205.77	19	2.444216	0.686213
Unkown	13.9	150.54	150	13.85	1.00358	150.54	13.9	2.130441	0.598121

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT1
- POST_WEIGHT1 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 87.03%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 865
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 865.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.3	123.7	113	13.06	1.096898	123.95	14.33	1.656299	0.880214
Male - 35 to 54	19.5	168.68	173	20	0.977006	169.02	19.54	1.400881	0.744476
Male - 55 plus	14.8	128.02	155	17.92	0.827635	128.28	14.83	1.076401	0.572037
Female - 18 to 34	14.3	123.7	94	10.87	1.313344	123.45	14.27	3.449944	1.00241
Female - 35 to 54	19.1	165.22	164	18.96	1.005449	164.89	19.06	2.707924	0.78681
Female - 55 plus	18	155.7	166	19.19	0.936127	155.4	17.96	2.172771	0.631317

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	3.8	32.87	27	3.12	1.217407	32.87	3.8	1.466143	0.952822
Male - Middle	22.5	194.63	151	17.46	1.288907	194.63	22.5	1.656299	1.076401
Male - High	22.4	193.76	263	30.4	0.73673	193.76	22.4	0.880214	0.572037
Female - Low	7.1	61.42	24	2.77	2.558958	61.42	7.1	3.449944	2.172771
Female - Middle	27.3	236.15	219	25.32	1.078288	236.15	27.3	1.443094	0.908859

Female - High	16.9	146.19	181	20.92	0.807652	146.19	16.9	1.00241	0.631317

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT2
- POST_WEIGHT2 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, post_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 47.46%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 865
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 865.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.3	123.7	113	13.06	1.096898	123.95	14.33	4.869589	0.491666
Male - 35 to 54	19.5	168.68	173	20	0.977006	169.02	19.54	4.504587	0.454813
Male - 55 plus	14.8	128.02	155	17.92	0.827635	128.28	14.83	3.769783	0.380622
Female - 18 to 34	14.3	123.7	94	10.87	1.313344	123.45	14.27	5.267225	0.540395
Female - 35 to 54	19.1	165.22	164	18.96	1.005449	164.89	19.06	4.912994	0.504052
Female - 55 plus	18	155.7	166	19.19	0.936127	155.4	17.96	4.756193	0.487965
EDUC_GEND	**PROJECTED**		**INPUT**		**WEIGHT**	**OUTPUT**		**MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT**	**MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT**
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	3.8	32.87	27	3.12	1.217407	32.87	3.8	2.795953	0.380622
Male - Middle	22.5	194.63	151	17.46	1.288907	194.63	22.5	4.869589	0.662913
Male - High	22.4	193.76	263	30.4	0.73673	193.76	22.4	3.558813	0.484473
Female - Low	7.1	61.42	24	2.77	2.558958	61.42	7.1	5.267225	0.836372
Female - Middle	27.3	236.15	219	25.32	1.078288	236.15	27.3	3.385701	0.537609
Female - High	16.9	146.19	181	20.92	0.807652	146.19	16.9	3.073062	0.487965
PRE_INT	**PROJECTED**		**INPUT**		**WEIGHT**	**OUTPUT**		**MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT**	**MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT**
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, voted	49.8	430.77	739	85.43	0.582909	430.77	49.8	0.926236	0.380622
No, did not vote	50.2	434.23	126	14.57	3.44627	434.23	50.2	5.267225	2.164482

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT3
- POST_WEIGHT3 –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, post_vote_col1, post_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 47.16%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 865
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 865.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.3	123.7	113	13.06	1.096898	123.95	14.33	4.839208	0
Male - 35 to 54	19.5	168.68	173	20	0.977006	169.02	19.54	4.514988	0
Male - 55 plus	14.8	128.02	155	17.92	0.827635	128.28	14.83	3.723098	0
Female - 18 to 34	14.3	123.7	94	10.87	1.313344	123.45	14.27	5.070564	0.428299
Female - 35 to 54	19.1	165.22	164	18.96	1.005449	164.89	19.06	4.838235	0
Female - 55 plus	18	155.7	166	19.19	0.936127	155.4	17.96	4.644213	0

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	3.8	32.87	27	3.12	1.217407	32.87	3.8	2.835619	0
Male - Middle	22.5	194.63	151	17.46	1.288907	194.62	22.5	4.839208	0
Male - High	22.4	193.76	263	30.4	0.73673	193.76	22.4	3.576121	0
Female - Low	7.1	61.42	24	2.77	2.558958	61.41	7.1	5.070564	0.658913
Female - Middle	27.3	236.15	219	25.32	1.078288	236.14	27.3	3.346216	0
Female - High	16.9	146.19	181	20.92	0.807652	146.19	16.9	3.071702	0.392287

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
SVP	24.6	212.79	161	18.61	0.788258	126.91	14.67	1.145807	0.492984
SP	15.4	133.21	170	19.65	0.467338	79.45	9.18	0.719403	0.309524
FDP	9.5	82.18	68	7.86	0.720732	49.01	5.67	1.074085	0.587212
GRÜNE	6.4	55.36	54	6.24	0.611428	33.02	3.82	0.911243	0.518087
GRÜNLIBERALE	9.1	78.72	103	11.91	0.455788	46.95	5.43	0.629542	0.304191
Other	18.5	160.03	166	19.19	0.57494	95.44	11.03	0.844957	0.461945
Unkown	16.5	142.73	143	16.53	3.036573	434.23	50.2	5.070564	0

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	49.8	430.77	739	85.43	0.582909	430.77	49.8	1.145807	0
No, will not vote	50.2	434.23	126	14.57	3.44627	434.23	50.2	5.070564	2.181615

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT3B
- POST_WEIGHT3B -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, post_vote_col2
Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 47.30%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 865
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 865.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.3	123.7	113	13.06	1.096898	123.95	14.33	4.811472	0.379142
Male - 35 to 54	19.5	168.68	173	20	0.977006	169.02	19.54	4.419396	0.348246
Male - 55 plus	14.8	128.02	155	17.92	0.827635	128.28	14.83	3.652775	0.278645
Female - 18 to 34	14.3	123.7	94	10.87	1.313344	123.45	14.27	5.130791	0.417824
Female - 35 to 54	19.1	165.22	164	18.96	1.005449	164.89	19.06	4.841553	0.39427
Female - 55 plus	18	155.7	166	19.19	0.936127	155.4	17.96	4.690423	0.381963

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	3.8	32.87	27	3.12	1.217407	32.87	3.8	2.78037	0.278645
Male - Middle	22.5	194.63	151	17.46	1.288907	194.63	22.5	4.811472	0.4822
Male - High	22.4	193.76	263	30.4	0.73673	193.76	22.4	3.699389	0.370748
Female - Low	7.1	61.42	24	2.77	2.558958	61.42	7.1	5.130791	0.639604
Female - Middle	27.3	236.15	219	25.32	1.078288	236.15	27.3	3.336227	0.402613
Female - High	16.9	146.19	181	20.92	0.807652	146.19	16.9	3.165111	0.381963

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
SVP	14.1	121.97	161	18.61	0.757547	121.97	14.1	1.1143	0.458422
SP	8.9	76.99	170	19.65	0.452853	76.99	8.9	0.699654	0.287837
FDP	5.5	47.58	68	7.86	0.699632	47.58	5.5	1.024683	0.543875
GRÜNE	3.7	32.01	54	6.24	0.592685	32.01	3.7	0.866009	0.505498
GRÜNLIBERALE	5.2	44.98	103	11.91	0.436699	44.98	5.2	0.583401	0.278645
Other	10.5	90.83	166	19.19	0.547139	90.83	10.5	0.794212	0.421547
Non-voter	50.2	434.23	126	14.57	3.44627	434.23	50.2	5.130791	2.110803
Unkown	1.9	16.44	17	1.97	0.966765	16.44	1.9	1.374156	0.602845

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT4
 - POST_WEIGHT4 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC_GEND, post_vote_col1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 84.44%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 865
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 865.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.3	123.7	113	13.06	1.096898	123.95	14.33	2.239482	0.725303
Male - 35 to 54	19.5	168.68	173	20	0.977006	169.02	19.54	1.891219	0.612511
Male - 55 plus	14.8	128.02	155	17.92	0.827635	128.28	14.83	1.419352	0.459687
Female - 18 to 34	14.3	123.7	94	10.87	1.313344	123.45	14.27	4.312444	0.837993
Female - 35 to 54	19.1	165.22	164	18.96	1.005449	164.89	19.06	2.342562	0.669184
Female - 55 plus	18	155.7	166	19.19	0.936127	155.4	17.96	2.954306	0.51656

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	3.8	32.87	27	3.12	1.217407	32.87	3.8	1.909686	0.819512
Male - Middle	22.5	194.63	151	17.46	1.288907	194.63	22.5	2.239482	0.864747
Male - High	22.4	193.76	263	30.4	0.73673	193.76	22.4	1.190475	0.459687
Female - Low	7.1	61.42	24	2.77	2.558958	61.42	7.1	4.312444	1.799926
Female - Middle	27.3	236.15	219	25.32	1.078288	236.15	27.3	1.981515	0.744178
Female - High	16.9	146.19	181	20.92	0.807652	146.19	16.9	1.375439	0.51656

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
SVP	24.6	212.79	161	18.61	1.321677	212.79	24.6	4.312444	0.678908
SP	15.4	133.21	170	19.65	0.783588	133.21	15.4	2.919944	0.459687
FDP	9.5	82.18	68	7.86	1.208456	82.18	9.5	2.954306	0.754506
GRÜNE	6.4	55.36	54	6.24	1.025185	55.36	6.4	1.860591	0.626854
GRÜNLIBERALE	9.1	78.72	103	11.91	0.764223	78.72	9.1	1.288652	0.490683
Other	18.5	160.03	166	19.19	0.964006	160.03	18.5	2.153694	0.550036
Unkown	16.5	142.73	143	16.53	0.998077	142.73	16.5	2.933499	0.461821

Lucerne

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT1
- PRE_WEIGHT1 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 87.98%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1134
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1134.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15	170.1	121	10.67	1.377096	166.63	14.69	3.241942	1.161274
Male - 35 to 54	21	238.14	241	21.25	0.967967	233.28	20.57	2.046913	0.733211
Male - 55 plus	13	147.42	162	14.29	0.891429	144.41	12.73	1.768015	0.633308
Female - 18 to 34	15	170.1	196	17.28	0.884874	173.44	15.29	1.960226	0.645838
Female - 35 to 54	19	215.46	213	18.78	1.031384	219.68	19.37	2.109183	0.694915
Female - 55 plus	17	192.78	201	17.72	0.97791	196.56	17.33	1.967136	0.648114

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	5	56.7	27	2.38	2.1	56.7	5	3.241942	1.768015
Male - Middle	24	272.16	245	21.6	1.110857	272.16	24	1.717267	0.936523
Male - High	19	215.46	252	22.22	0.855	215.46	19	1.161274	0.633308
Female - Low	9	102.06	51	4.5	2.001176	102.06	9	2.109183	1.960226
Female - Middle	29	328.86	318	28.04	1.034151	328.86	29	1.075503	0.999548
Female - High	14	158.76	241	21.25	0.658755	158.76	14	0.694915	0.645838

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT2
- PRE_WEIGHT2 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, pre_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 42.88%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1134
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1134.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15	170.1	121	10.67	1.377096	166.63	14.69	10.85638	0.764229
Male - 35 to 54	21	238.14	241	21.25	0.967967	233.28	20.57	6.910657	0.486472

Male - 55 plus	13	147.42	162	14.29	0.891429	144.41	12.73	8.384231	0.590203
Female - 18 to 34	15	170.1	196	17.28	0.884874	173.44	15.29	4.308361	0.321926
Female - 35 to 54	19	215.46	213	18.78	1.031384	219.68	19.37	5.447024	0.407008
Female - 55 plus	17	192.78	201	17.72	0.97791	196.56	17.33	6.50039	0.485717

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	5	56.7	27	2.38	2.1	56.7	5	10.85638	1.088754
Male - Middle	24	272.16	245	21.6	1.110857	272.16	24	5.813881	0.583057
Male - High	19	215.46	252	22.22	0.855	215.46	19	4.8508	0.486472
Female - Low	9	102.06	51	4.5	2.001176	102.06	9	6.50039	0.67877
Female - Middle	29	328.86	318	28.04	1.034151	328.86	29	4.073507	0.425355
Female - High	14	158.76	241	21.25	0.658755	158.76	14	3.082994	0.321926

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	50.9	577.21	979	86.33	0.589587	577.21	50.9	1.710391	0.321926
No, will not vote	49.1	556.79	155	13.67	3.592219	556.79	49.1	10.85638	2.043362

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3
- PRE_WEIGHT3 –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, pre _vote_col1, pre_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 41.88%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1134
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1134.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15	170.1	121	10.67	1.377096	166.63	14.69	11.54267	0
Male - 35 to 54	21	238.14	241	21.25	0.967967	233.28	20.57	7.180691	0
Male - 55 plus	13	147.42	162	14.29	0.891429	144.41	12.73	8.49426	0
Female - 18 to 34	15	170.1	196	17.28	0.884874	173.44	15.29	4.254049	0
Female - 35 to 54	19	215.46	213	18.78	1.031384	219.68	19.37	5.30029	0
Female - 55 plus	17	192.78	201	17.72	0.97791	196.56	17.33	6.185925	0

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	5	56.7	27	2.38	2.1	56.7	5	11.54267	0.803042

Male - Middle	24	272.16	245	21.6	1.110857	272.16	24	6.066817	0
Male - High	19	215.46	252	22.22	0.855	215.46	19	4.813337	0
Female - Low	9	102.06	51	4.5	2.001176	102.06	9	6.185925	0
Female - Middle	29	328.86	318	28.04	1.034151	328.86	29	4.012061	0
Female - High	14	158.76	241	21.25	0.658755	158.76	14	2.955032	0

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CVP	22.3	252.88	230	20.28	0.680826	156.59	13.81	2.145468	0.377725
FDP	20.6	233.6	143	12.61	1.011557	144.65	12.76	1.977227	0.559565
SVP	15.1	171.23	205	18.08	0.517228	106.03	9.35	1.488619	0.262082
SP	9.5	107.73	100	8.82	0.667087	66.71	5.88	1.342885	0.380043
Other	14.7	166.7	254	22.4	0.40639	103.22	9.1	1.290857	0.227265
Unkown	17.8	201.85	202	17.81	2.756406	556.79	49.1	11.54267	0

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	50.9	577.21	979	86.33	0.589587	577.21	50.9	2.145468	0
No, will not vote	49.1	556.79	155	13.67	3.592219	556.79	49.1	11.54267	2.03217

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3B
- PRE_WEIGHT3B –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, pre _vote_col2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 41.85%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1134
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1202.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15	170.1	121	10.67	1.377096	166.63	14.69	11.89983	0.506044
Male - 35 to 54	21	238.14	241	21.25	0.967967	233.28	20.57	7.497016	0.318813
Male - 55 plus	13	147.42	162	14.29	0.891429	144.41	12.73	9.079257	0.386098
Female - 18 to 34	15	170.1	196	17.28	0.884874	173.44	15.29	4.224049	0.208958
Female - 35 to 54	19	215.46	213	18.78	1.031384	219.68	19.37	5.305596	0.262461
Female - 55 plus	17	192.78	201	17.72	0.97791	196.56	17.33	6.212876	0.307343

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	5	56.7	27	2.38	2.1	56.7	5	11.89983	0.7624

Male - Middle	24	272.16	245	21.6	1.110857	272.16	24	5.966452	0.382259
Male - High	19	215.46	252	22.22	0.855	215.46	19	4.976152	0.318813
Female - Low	9	102.06	51	4.5	2.001176	102.06	9	6.212876	0.42956
Female - Middle	29	328.86	318	28.04	1.034151	328.86	29	3.921463	0.271131
Female - High	14	158.76	241	21.25	0.658755	158.76	14	3.022235	0.208958

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CVP	12.7	144.02	230	20.28	0.626165	144.02	12.7	2.016262	0.348153
FDP	11.7	132.68	143	12.61	0.927818	132.68	11.7	1.870233	0.512592
SVP	8.6	97.52	205	18.08	0.475727	97.52	8.6	1.394747	0.240835
SP	5.4	61.24	100	8.82	0.61236	61.24	5.4	1.272098	0.348656
Other	8.4	95.26	254	22.4	0.375024	95.26	8.4	1.210139	0.208958
Non-voter	49.1	556.79	155	13.67	3.592219	556.79	49.1	11.89983	2.054776
Unkown	4.1	46.49	47	4.14	0.989234	46.49	4.1	1.728198	0.571565

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT4
- PRE_WEIGHT4 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, pre _vote_col1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 80.67%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1134
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1134.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15	170.1	121	10.67	1.377096	166.63	14.69	4.070224	0.811232
Male - 35 to 54	21	238.14	241	21.25	0.967967	233.28	20.57	3.856455	0.499115
Male - 55 plus	13	147.42	162	14.29	0.891429	144.41	12.73	2.104671	0.41948
Female - 18 to 34	15	170.1	196	17.28	0.884874	173.44	15.29	3.231506	0.448905
Female - 35 to 54	19	215.46	213	18.78	1.031384	219.68	19.37	3.379289	0.469434
Female - 55 plus	17	192.78	201	17.72	0.97791	196.56	17.33	3.046288	0.423175

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	5	56.7	27	2.38	2.1	56.7	5	4.070224	1.308731
Male - Middle	24	272.16	245	21.6	1.110857	272.16	24	3.106103	0.648534
Male - High	19	215.46	252	22.22	0.855	215.46	19	2.009065	0.41948
Female - Low	9	102.06	51	4.5	2.001176	102.06	9	3.379289	1.230048
Female - Middle	29	328.86	318	28.04	1.034151	328.86	29	1.812668	0.659804
Female - High	14	158.76	241	21.25	0.658755	158.76	14	1.162582	0.423175

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CVP	22.3	252.88	230	20.28	1.099487	252.88	22.3	4.070224	0.674598
FDP	20.6	233.6	143	12.61	1.633594	233.6	20.6	3.856455	1.038867
SVP	15.1	171.23	205	18.08	0.835288	171.23	15.1	2.863682	0.474626
SP	9.5	107.73	100	8.82	1.0773	107.73	9.5	2.636532	0.710239
Other	14.7	166.7	254	22.4	0.656291	166.7	14.7	2.530955	0.41948
Unkown	17.8	201.85	202	17.81	0.999267	201.85	17.8	3.485577	0.577699

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT1
- POST_WEIGHT1 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 83.88%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 873
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max.873.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15	130.95	91	10.42	1.409643	128.28	14.69	2.152104	1.2005
Male - 35 to 54	21	183.33	180	20.62	0.997714	179.59	20.57	2.937455	0.644619
Male - 55 plus	13	113.49	142	16.27	0.782915	111.17	12.73	2.151614	0.472167
Female - 18 to 34	15	130.95	142	16.27	0.940265	133.52	15.29	2.122958	0.680228
Female - 35 to 54	19	165.87	161	18.44	1.050449	169.12	19.37	2.153028	0.689863
Female - 55 plus	17	148.41	157	17.98	0.963822	151.32	17.33	1.886327	0.604408

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	5	43.65	17	1.95	2.567647	43.65	5	2.937455	2.151614
Male - Middle	24	209.52	186	21.31	1.126452	209.52	24	2.152104	0.846442
Male - High	19	165.87	210	24.05	0.789857	165.87	19	1.2005	0.472167
Female - Low	9	78.57	39	4.47	2.014615	78.57	9	2.153028	1.886327
Female - Middle	29	253.17	236	27.03	1.072754	253.17	29	1.125649	0.986212
Female - High	14	122.22	185	21.19	0.660649	122.22	14	0.689863	0.604408

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT2
- POST_WEIGHT2 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, post_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 54.56%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 873
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 873.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15	130.95	91	10.42	1.409643	128.28	14.69	5.256937	0.89205
Male - 35 to 54	21	183.33	180	20.62	0.997714	179.59	20.57	8.371241	0.493897
Male - 55 plus	13	113.49	142	16.27	0.782915	111.17	12.73	7.103956	0.419128
Female - 18 to 34	15	130.95	142	16.27	0.940265	133.52	15.29	3.056659	0.386688
Female - 35 to 54	19	165.87	161	18.44	1.050449	169.12	19.37	3.685614	0.466255
Female - 55 plus	17	148.41	157	17.98	0.963822	151.32	17.33	3.720142	0.470623

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	5	43.65	17	1.95	2.567647	43.65	5	8.371241	1.715138
Male - Middle	24	209.52	186	21.31	1.126452	209.52	24	5.256937	0.596333
Male - High	19	165.87	210	24.05	0.789857	165.87	19	3.694796	0.419128
Female - Low	9	78.57	39	4.47	2.014615	78.57	9	3.720142	0.737982
Female - Middle	29	253.17	236	27.03	1.072754	253.17	29	2.587303	0.513255
Female - High	14	122.22	185	21.19	0.660649	122.22	14	1.949279	0.386688

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, voted	50.9	444.36	710	81.33	0.625855	444.36	50.9	2.021104	0.386688
No, did not vote	49.1	428.64	163	18.67	2.629712	428.64	49.1	8.371241	1.601627

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT3
- POST_WEIGHT3 –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, post_vote_col1, post_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 53.12%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 873
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 873.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15	130.95	91	10.42	1.409643	128.28	14.69	5.367315	0

Male - 35 to 54	21	183.33	180	20.62	0.997714	179.59	20.57	8.37299	0
Male - 55 plus	13	113.49	142	16.27	0.782915	111.17	12.73	7.045393	0
Female - 18 to 34	15	130.95	142	16.27	0.940265	133.52	15.29	3.161724	0
Female - 35 to 54	19	165.87	161	18.44	1.050449	169.12	19.37	3.798466	0
Female - 55 plus	17	148.41	157	17.98	0.963822	151.32	17.33	3.614989	0

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	5	43.65	17	1.95	2.567647	43.65	5	8.37299	1.128669
Male - Middle	24	209.52	186	21.31	1.126452	209.52	24	5.367315	0
Male - High	19	165.87	210	24.05	0.789857	165.87	19	3.740566	0
Female - Low	9	78.57	39	4.47	2.014615	78.57	9	3.798466	0
Female - Middle	29	253.17	236	27.03	1.072754	253.17	29	2.566391	0
Female - High	14	122.22	185	21.19	0.660649	122.22	14	1.95793	0

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CVP	21.4	186.82	159	18.21	0.758966	120.68	13.82	2.53362	0.493144
FDP	19.8	172.85	113	12.94	0.988081	111.65	12.79	3.230523	0.628789
SVP	14.4	125.71	133	15.23	0.610544	81.2	9.3	1.785139	0.347459
VSP	9.1	79.44	89	10.19	0.576577	51.32	5.88	1.998335	0.388956
Other	14.1	123.09	194	22.22	0.409848	79.51	9.11	1.34135	0.26108
Unkown	21.2	185.08	185	21.19	2.316989	428.64	49.1	8.37299	0

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	50.9	444.36	710	81.33	0.625855	444.36	50.9	3.230523	0
No, will not vote	49.1	428.64	163	18.67	2.629712	428.64	49.1	8.37299	1.629719

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT3B
- POST_WEIGHT3B -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, post_vote_col2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 53.22%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 873
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 873.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		

Male - 18 to 34	15	130.95	91	10.42	1.409643	128.28	14.69	5.391312	0.581093
Male - 35 to 54	21	183.33	180	20.62	0.997714	179.59	20.57	8.64285	0.313379
Male - 55 plus	13	113.49	142	16.27	0.782915	111.17	12.73	7.332789	0.265878
Female - 18 to 34	15	130.95	142	16.27	0.940265	133.52	15.29	3.110029	0.24926
Female - 35 to 54	19	165.87	161	18.44	1.050449	169.12	19.37	3.739645	0.299722
Female - 55 plus	17	148.41	157	17.98	0.963822	151.32	17.33	3.625084	0.29054

EDUC_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	5	43.65	17	1.95	2.567647	43.65	5	8.64285	1.113785
Male - Middle	24	209.52	186	21.31	1.126452	209.52	24	5.391312	0.374683
Male - High	19	165.87	210	24.05	0.789857	165.87	19	3.825719	0.265878
Female - Low	9	78.57	39	4.47	2.014615	78.57	9	3.739645	0.472386
Female - Middle	29	253.17	236	27.03	1.072754	253.17	29	2.535808	0.320319
Female - High	14	122.22	185	21.19	0.660649	122.22	14	1.97327	0.24926

VOTE_COL	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CVP	13.1	114.36	159	18.21	0.719264	114.36	13.1	2.465931	0.468214
FDP	12.1	105.63	113	12.94	0.934805	105.63	12.1	3.131167	0.594525
SVP	8.9	77.7	133	15.23	0.584188	77.7	8.9	1.751702	0.332601
SP	5.6	48.89	89	10.19	0.549303	48.89	5.6	1.95046	0.37034
Other	8.7	75.95	194	22.22	0.3915	75.95	8.7	1.312772	0.24926
Non-voter	49.1	428.64	163	18.67	2.629712	428.64	49.1	8.64285	1.641046
Unkown	2.5	21.83	22	2.52	0.992045	21.83	2.5	2.172837	0.661384

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT4
- POST_WEIGHT4 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ_gend, post_vote_col1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 77.50%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 873
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 873.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15	130.95	91	10.42	1.409643	128.28	14.69	3.610239	0.807952
Male - 35 to 54	21	183.33	180	20.62	0.997714	179.59	20.57	4.846594	0.423985
Male - 55 plus	13	113.49	142	16.27	0.782915	111.17	12.73	3.491891	0.305474
Female - 18 to 34	15	130.95	142	16.27	0.940265	133.52	15.29	2.797768	0.470345

Female - 35 to 54	19	165.87	161	18.44	1.050449	169.12	19.37	2.773673	0.466295
Female - 55 plus	17	148.41	157	17.98	0.963822	151.32	17.33	3.000542	0.376173
EDUC_GEND	**PROJECTED**		**INPUT**		**WEIGHT**	**OUTPUT**		**MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT**	**MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT**
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - Low	5	43.65	17	1.95	2.567647	43.65	5	4.846594	1.420878
Male - Middle	24	209.52	186	21.31	1.126452	209.52	24	3.610239	0.55542
Male - High	19	165.87	210	24.05	0.789857	165.87	19	1.985589	0.305474
Female - Low	9	78.57	39	4.47	2.014615	78.57	9	3.000542	1.220944
Female - Middle	29	253.17	236	27.03	1.072754	253.17	29	1.847099	0.601114
Female - High	14	122.22	185	21.19	0.660649	122.22	14	1.155901	0.376173
VOTE_COL	**PROJECTED**		**INPUT**		**WEIGHT**	**OUTPUT**		**MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT**	**MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT**
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CVP	21.4	186.82	159	18.21	1.174981	186.82	21.4	3.614261	0.559837
FDP	19.8	172.85	113	12.94	1.529681	172.85	19.8	4.846594	0.750721
SVP	14.4	125.71	133	15.23	0.945203	125.71	14.4	2.631779	0.407654
SP	9.1	79.44	89	10.19	0.892618	79.44	9.1	2.974871	0.460797
Other	14.1	123.09	194	22.22	0.6345	123.09	14.1	1.972117	0.305474
Unkown	21.2	185.08	185	21.19	1.000411	185.08	21.2	2.681599	0.415371