Technical Report

Making Electoral Democracy Work

State Election –

Lower Saxony

March 19, 2013

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 3

About Making Electoral Democracy Work 3

German State Elections Surveys – Lower Saxony 3

Number of Completed Surveys 4

Survey Methodology 5

Pre-launch 5

Questionnaire Design – CAWI *5*

Programming *5*

Survey Pre-Tests *5*

Sample Design and Selection *5*

Survey Administration 6

Supplier Panel Information *6*

Sampling and Quota Control *7*

Invites and Reminders *8*

Incentives *9*

Passwords *10*

Sample Distribution and Response Rate 10

In-Survey Quality Assurance (ISQ) 12

Data Analysis 13

Data Validity and Integrity Checks *13*

Data Cleaning *13*

Additional Variables Created *14*

Weighting *16*

Appendix A: Pre-election Surveys Quota Completions by Date 19

Appendix B: Supplier Panel Information 20

Appendix C: Invitation E-mail and Information and Consent Screen 40

Appendix D: Weight Reports 45

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.
- Sareda Quah served as Lead Consultant and the project analyst overseeing the overall management of the project, suppliers and sampling. Furthermore, Ms. Quah was the main point of client contact during the project.

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.

German State Elections Surveys – Lower Saxony

The MEDW Team sought the services of a public opinion research firm to collect online data from residents in Lower Saxony, Germany through surveys related to the State election held on January 20, 2013. This study included a pre- and post- election survey implemented through a return to sample methodology.

Harris/Decima completed 1,023 pre-election surveys and 855 post-election surveys online in Lower Saxony.

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
Lower Saxony		
Pre-election survey	January 11-19, 2013	1,023
Post-election survey	January 21-February 4, 2013	855

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

	Gender					
	Total - %	**Total - Quota**	**Male – % of population**	**Male – Quota**	**Female – % of Population**	**Female – Quota**
Total	100%	1000	48.7%	487	51.3%	513
Age						
18 - 34 years	23.1%	231	11.8%	118	11.3%	113
35 - 54 years	36.8%	368	18.6%	186	18.2%	182
55 - 99 years	40.1%	401	18.3%	183	21.8%	218

Level of Education	ISCED	%	Quota
Lower secondary incomplete	"0-1"	3%	**30**
Lower secondary	"2"	12%	**120**
Secondary	"2"		
Technical high secondary	"3-4"	62%	**620**
High secondary, post secondary	"3-4"		
Tertiary degree incomplete	"5-6"	23%	**230**
Tertiary degree	"5-6"		
Total			**1,000**

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

Survey Administration

In a combined effort, the Lower Saxony State election surveys contacted panel members from GMI, Survey Sampling International (SSI) and Harris/Decima's HPOL.

Supplier Panel Information

Harris/Decima contracted Global Market Insite (GMI) (http://www.gmi-mr.com) as a sample provider for this study. In addition, SSI was also contracted to aid GMI. For

[1] Source for gender and age: European Commission Eurostat; Source for education: Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/data/database

detailed descriptions of GMI and SSI'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.

Sample was pulled by GMI on the following dates:

- 1/11/2013

By SSI on the following dates:

- 1/11/2013-1/18/2013[2]

By HPOL on the following dates:

- 1/12/2013
- 1/14/2013
- 1/16/2013
- 1/18/2013

Sample was pulled based on the following criteria:

- Age greater than 18
- Language set to German
- Area set to Lower Saxony[3]
- Education levels
- Gender
- German 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.

[2] Since SSI uses a router system, they pull general sample every day.

[3] GMI and HPOl SSI targeted "Lower Saxony" region. SSI targeted the regions that make up Lower Saxony including includes Braunschweig, Hanover, Lüneburg, Weser-Ems.

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" (translation of 'next' in German) 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 as follows:

GMI			
	Date	**# Invites**	**# Reminders**
Pre-election survey	January 11, 2013	4,953	0
	January 13, 2013	0	157
	January 14, 2013	0	2,540
Total		**4,953**	**2,697**
Post-election survey	January 21, 2013	660	0
	January 23, 2013	16	173
Total		**676**	**173**

SSI			
	Date	**# Invites**	**# Reminders**
Pre-election survey	January 11, 2013 to	150,000-250,000**	0
	January 18, 2013		0
Total		**150,000-250,000****	**0**
Post-election survey	January 21, 2013	184	0
	January 23, 2013	0	109
	January 24, 2013	0	60
Total		**184**	**169**

** Note that we cannot report a specific number of invites due to the nature of SSI's system – SSI uses SSI Dynamix, a platform that integrates respondents from multiple panel sources. People are no longer sampled for individual projects but are instead offered a survey at random from the list of available projects that day. Respondents will first be asked a random set of screening questions to determine the project(s) for which they qualify and then will be assigned

to the best survey for the participant to complete at that moment. For this reason, we are unable to report exact numbers of survey invitations sent out for this particular project. SSI reports that their traffic stream fluctuates between 150,000 and 250,000 respondents per day, but we cannot determine how many of those would have been invited to this particular study.

HPOL			
	Date	**# Invites**	**# Reminders**
Pre-election survey	January 12, 2013	1,499	0
	January 14, 2013	77	1,235
	January 16, 2013	537	1,239
	January 18, 2013	0	58
Total		**2,113**	**2,532**
Post-election survey	January 21, 2013	158	0
	January 23, 2013	0	62
	January 25, 2013	0	41
Total		**158**	**103**

Incentives

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

GMI:
Respondents from GMI's panel were given 50 MarketPoints as an incentive for completing the pre-election survey, and another 25 MarketPoints for completing the post-election survey.

SSI:

Incentives vary across SSI's various sub panels. Within those panels, incentives are mainly driven by survey length. Participants are given points based on the panel they are on. In most cases, these vary from the dollar equivalent of $0.50 to $2.00 CAD.

HPOL:

HPOL respondents were given 100 HIpoints or 75 Aeorplan miles for completing the pre-election and another 100 HIpoints or 75 Aeorplan miles for completing the post-election survey.

Passwords

Harris/Decima provided GMI 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:

GMI		
	Pre	Post
A: Total Invitations	4,954	681
B: Undeliverables	0	0
C: Net Usable invitations (A-B)	4,954	681
D: Total Completes	681	575
E: Qualified break offs	42	32
F: Disqualified (ISQ)	38	5
G: Not responded	4,075	69
H: Quota filled	118	0
Contact Rate (d+e+f+h)/c	**17.74%**	**89.88%**
Participation Rate (d+f+h)/c	**16.90%**	**85.17%**

SSI		
	Pre	Post
A: Total Invitations	(150,000-250,000)	184
B: Undeliverables	N/A	0
C: Net Usable invitations (A-B)	(150,000-250,000)	184
D: Total Completes	184	149
E: Qualified break offs	24	12
F: Disqualified (ISQ)	10	0
G: Not responded	N/A	23
H: Quota filled	7	0
Contact Rate (d+e+f+h)/c	**N/A**	**87.50%**
Participation Rate (d+f+h)/c	**N/A**	**80.98%**

HPOL		
	Pre	Post
A: Total Invitations	2,116	158
B: Undeliverables	3	0
C: Net Usable invitations (A-B)	2,113	158
D: Total Completes	158	131
E: Qualified break offs	70	8
F: Disqualified (ISQ)	15	2
G: Not responded	1,716	17
H: Quota filled	154	0
Contact Rate (d+e+f+h)/c	**18.79%**	**89.24%**
Participation Rate (d+f+h)/c	**15.48%**	**84.18%**

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:

- Pre-election survey: 20 minutes
- Post-election survey: 10 minutes

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
Lower Saxony		
Pre-election survey	January 11, 2013	383
	January 12, 2013	300
	January 13, 2013	114
	January 14, 2013	80
	January 15, 2013	35
	January 16, 2013	92
	January 17, 2013	15
	January 18, 2013	4
Post-election survey	January 21, 2013	74
	January 22, 2013	494
	January 23, 2013	141
	January 24, 2013	53
	January 25, 2013	29

	January 26, 2013	23
	January 27, 2013	15
	January 28, 2013	9
	January 29, 2013	4
	January 30, 2013	2
	January 31, 2013	3
	February 1, 2013	2
	February 3, 2013	6

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 using three German panel sources (GMI, SSI, and HPOL), 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.

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: Eight 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**

Q1 and PQ1 combined variables (Q1A, Q1B, Q1C, PQ1A, PQ1B, PQ1C): 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 (year, month, and day) that participants completed or otherwise exited (i.e. dropped out of) the survey.

Collapsed Age variable (qt2b): This variable collapses the respondents' ages into three categories (18-34; 35-54 and 55+), which is used for weighting purposes.

Age by Gender (age_gend): Collapsed age variable by gender, used to create weights.

Collapsed vote variable (PRE_VOTE): Created from Q6B and Q7B – the questions asking about which party list they voted for/will vote for. Q7B was only used if they did not answer Q6B because they were non/unlikely voters, and was used for weighting purposes.

Collapsed vote variable (POST_VOTE): Created from PQ7 – question asking about which party list they voted for, and was used for weighting purposes.

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. 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	Cap - low	Cap - high
PRE_WEIGHT1	age, gender, education	Pre	4	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT2	age, gender, education and likelihood to vote (vote turnout)	Pre	5	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT3	age, gender, education, likelihood to vote (vote turnout) and vote intention (actual election results)	Pre	20	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT3B[4]	age, gender, education, and vote intention (actual election results)	Pre	5	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT4[5]	age, gender, education and vote intention (actual election results)	Pre	5	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT1	age, gender, education	Post	4	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT2	age, gender, education and likelihood of having voted (vote turnout)	Post	4	0.2	5

[4] 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.

[5] Weights 3B and 4 use the same variables, but the weight target within those variables are different, so the weighting is different. Weight 3B uses weight targets that ensure the weighting accounts for both likelihood to vote and vote intent, where weight 4 only accounts for vote intent.

Name	Factors	Use for Pre/Post	# iterations	Cap - low	Cap - high
POST_WEIGHT3	age, gender, education, likelihood of having voted (vote turnout) and vote recall (actual election results)	Post	20	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT3B[4]	age, gender, education, and vote recall (actual election results)	Post	5	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT4[5]	age, gender, education and vote recall (actual election results)	Post	4	0.2	5

Appendix A: Pre-election Surveys Quota Completions by Date

		Lower secondary incomplete	Lower secondary/ Secondary	Technical high secondary/ High secondary, post secondary	Tertiary degree incomplete/ Tertiary degree
Education	January 11, 2013	1	201	103	78
	January 12, 2013	2	167	72	59
	January 13, 2013	0	71	21	22
	January 14, 2013	0	39	19	22
	January 15, 2013	0	18	8	9
	January 16, 2013	0	54	12	26
	January 17, 2013	0	9	2	4
	January 18, 2013	0	3	1	0
		18-34	35-54	55+	
Age	January 11, 2013	106	159	118	
	January 12, 2013	63	130	107	
	January 13, 2013	20	54	40	
	January 14, 2013	35	14	31	
	January 15, 2013	10	5	20	
	January 16, 2013	10	11	71	
	January 17, 2013	3	5	7	
	January 18, 2013	0	0	4	
		Male	Female		
Gender	January 11, 2013	194	189		
	January 12, 2013	142	158		
	January 13, 2013	47	67		
	January 14, 2013	30	50		
	January 15, 2013	20	15		
	January 16, 2013	63	29		
	January 17, 2013	7	8		
	January 18, 2013	0	4		

Appendix B: Supplier Panel Information

HPOL

Panel Information

Below are our answers to the ESOMAR questions about online panels.

Company Profile

1. **What experience does your company have with providing online samples for market research?**

   For over a decade, Harris Interactive has been the leader in the online market research industry. We house both national and international online respondent panels, holistically representing samples from over 125 countries. Through extensive participant screening and categorization criteria, we are able to rapidly survey large portions of the general population as well as small, low-incidence target groups. Our online sampling also consists of 30 active specialty panels made up of particular populations of interest in surveying. Since its inception in 1997, our proprietary online panel respondents have completed more than 70 million online interviews across a broad set of industries and topics.

Sample Source

2. **Please describe and explain the types of source(s) for the online sample that you provide (are these databases, actively managed panels, direct marketing lists, web intercept sampling, river sampling or other)?**

   Our proprietary online panel is an actively managed respondent panel, continually monitored by our dedicated Panel Management team. Panel respondents have been recruited from a multitude of sources, including but not limited to, Co-registration offers on partners' websites, targeted emails sent by online partners to their audiences, graphical and text banner placement on partners; websites (including social media, news, search, and community portals) trade show presentations, targeted postal mail invitations, TV advertisements, and telephone recruitment of targeted populations. Our panel recruitment and maintenance operations allows the firm to provide representative sample of the general population as well as identify and reach underrepresented and hard-to-reach populations of interest. Each recruitment source is carefully vetted through a rigorous screened and updated along numerous demographic and psychographic variables to allow for precision in the online sample we provide.

3. **What do you consider to be the primary advantage of your sample over other sample sources in the marketplace?**

   The primary advantages of our sample include: the panel being actively managed by a dedication team of professionals, our numerous quality assurance practices to ensure respondent and data integrity of our robust screening and demographic profiling. Our rigorous interviewing and testing process allows us to efficiently vet

each recruitment source and to ensure a diverse respondent base. In addition, we have a deep understanding of sampling, survey design and weighting which allows us to project from panel samples to the population of interest. Our proprietary propensity weighting methods are also of note as a significant advantage when comparing our services to those of other providers.

4. **If the sample source is a panel or database, is the panel or database used solely for market research? If not, please explain.**

   Our panel is used solely for market and opinion research.

5. **How do you source groups that may be hard-to-reach on the internet?**

   For our proprietary online panel, we have recruited respondents by using hundreds of difference recruitment sources. We utilize special recruitment campaigns or techniques for special populations such as older adults, young adults and minorities in the U.S.

6. **What are people told when they are recruited?**

   When respondents are recruited into our panel, it is made very clear that they are joining a market research panel and that they will be asked periodically to participate in online research. They are shown the terms and conditions of panel membership as well as our privacy policy. Panelists must agree to our terms of use which state that panelists are limited to a single membership and can be removed if they are found in violation of this rule. A link to the Terms of Use is referenced on the registration page and in each survey invitation.

Panel Recruitment

7. **If the sample comes from a panel, what is your annual turnover/attrition/retention rate and how is it calculated?**

   The rate of panel attrition varies greatly by country and demographic, but on average our voluntary attrition rate is less than 3%. This figure is calculated by dividing the total number of active panel respondents by the number of panelists whom have terminated membership over a one year period.

8. **Please describe the opt-in process.**

   All panelists recruited have completed a 'confirmed' or 'double' opt-in (COI/DOI) process. This process requires that each registrant confirm his or her desire to join our panel by clicking on a link within an email that is sent to the registrant's email address upon registering. The content of the email specifies that by clicking on the link the registrant is expressly stating his or her desire to take part in the panel.

9. **Do you have a confirmation of identity procedure? Do you have procedures to detect fraudulent respondents at the time of registration with the panel? If so, please describe.**

   We collect a respondent's physical address when they establish an incentive account, at the time of incentive redemption and as part of special screening surveys

that are conducted on an ongoing basis. In an effort to detect fraudulent respondents at the time of registration, we perform de-duplication based on email address prior to the opt-in process. In addition, the registration page uses digital fingerprinting to monitor and exclude hits from the same computer.

10. **What profile data is kept on panel members? For how many members is this data collected and how often is this data updated?**

    Harris Interactive requires a minimum of information for panel membership: email address, gender, year of birth, country, and postal code. Additional demographic details, such as: income, race, education, etc. are gathered though normal survey taking activity. Key demographics are verified and updated with every survey taken. We also have a unique annual screening program through which we collect hundreds of variables on each participant (on a voluntary basis).

11. **What is the size and/or the capacity of the panel, based on active panel members on a given date? Can you provide an overview of active panelists by type of source?**

    We have a multi-million member global panel with membership base concentrated in North America and Western Europe. The breadth and depth of our panel far exceeds other online panels in the industry. This enhances capacity stems from ongoing and extensive screening efforts.

Panel Sample and Management

12. **Please describe your sampling process including your exclusion procedures if applicable. Can sample be deployed as batches/replicates, by time zones, geography, etc.? If so, how is this controlled?**

    We draw stratified random samples from our proprietary online panel based on known proportions of individuals in important demographic groups. To account for differential response rates, we can modify these sampling proportions, placing greater weight on those with lower response rates. To ensure that survey participants are distributed evenly across jobs, we also pull samples based on panel members; historical survey participation. Stratification by prior survey participation is superimposed behind the scenes on every stratified sample pull. We can exclude respondents from research in a variety of ways including, but not limited to: subject matter, time period and past participation depending upon the specific needs of the research project.

    Samples can be deployed as batches/replicates, by time zone, geography, etc. All outbound email sample files are batched in order to manage the speed at which we delivery email messages to various ISPs. Typically we design batches by size, but we can batch based on whatever sample selection criteria our clients desire.

13. **Explain how people are invited to take part in a survey. What does a typical invitation look like?**

The standard invitation format is text however; HTML is sometimes used for key segments such as lapsed respondents or young males. Invitations comply with industry standards and country-based laws.

14. **Please describe the nature of your incentive system(s). How does this vary by length of interview, respondent characteristics, or other factors you may consider?**

Our proprietary online panel respondents are offered HIpoints which are redeemable for cash and other rewards. The number of HIpoints awarded does vary based upon survey length. Respondents are also entered in HIstakes, a bi-monthly cash sweepstakes available to all survey respondents in countries where the sweepstakes is registered. Respondents may also view the aggregated answers to a select subset of the survey upon completion. We encourage feedback from our respondents and ask each one to evaluate their survey experience at the end of each study. In addition, we provide custom sweepstakes and cash incentives as appropriate for hard-to-reach professional groups.

15. **How often are individual members contacted for online surveys within a given time period? Do you keep data on panelist participation history and are limits placed on the frequency that members are contacted and asked to participate in a survey?**

In general, respondents can be contacted with a new survey invitation no more than once every 7-10 days. We can exclude respondents from research in a variety of ways including, but not limited to: subject matter, time period and past participation depending upon the specific needs of the research project.

Policies and Compliance

16. **Is there a privacy policy in place? If so, what does it state? Is the panel compliant with all regional, national, and local laws with respect to privacy, data protection and children e.g. EU Safe Harbor and COPPA in the United States? What other research industry standards do you comply with e.g. ICC/ESOMAR International Code on Market and Social Research, CASRO guidelines, etc.?**

Yes, Harris Interactive does have a privacy policy. The purpose of this privacy policy is to clearly communicate; the nature of the data we collect, how we manage personally identifiable information (PII), what a panelist can do to update their information or be removed from our panel. We comply with all governmental and industry regulations with respect to handling data.

Harris Interactive's Privacy Policy:
http://www.harrisinteractive.com/about/privacy.asp

Additionally, Harris Interactive conforms to the European Commission Directive on Data Protection, SYNTEC in France, the French law on "Informatique et Liberties", CNIL, the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) Code of Professional Ethics and Practices, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) fair information Practice Principles, the FTC's Children's Online Privacy Protection Act

(COPPA) Final Rule, the Children's Advertising Review Unit (CARU) Guidelines for Advertising on the Internet and Online Services, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), the Graham-Leach Bliley Act (GLB), the CAN-SPAM Act, and other privacy regulations and guidelines in the U.S. abroad. The German based offices of Harris Interactive – European Society for Opinion and Market Research (ESOMAR) specifically "Guidelines on Conducting Research on the Internet" as well as the BVM / ADM standards (specifically, 'Standards zur Qualitatsscherung bei Online-Befragungen).

Harris Interactive conforms to the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) Code of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research, the Principles of Disclosure of the National Council on Public Polls (NCPP), and the European Society of Opinion and Marketing Research (ESOMAR) Codes and guidelines for Survey Research.

17. What data protection/security measures do you have in place?

Harris Interactive provides security measure against unauthorized access to our client systems including programs, files and information. The security measures provided include:

- User Security: Users logging into the system gain level-specific access to information based upon assigned rights.
- Network Security: Users are required to log into the network before accessing any information.
- Survey Security: All surveys can use SSL (Secure Sockets Layer)
- Database Security: Our databases provide security features that permits users to access only the information that is relevant to their position, including encrypted passwords, internal and external user authentication, IP address restrictions, fine-grained database privileges, and group level access control.
- Client Project Materials: All study materials reside in restricted-access areas of our networks. Only Harris Interactive staff has access to these folders.
- Building Security: All Harris Interactive buildings are secure and require card access at all times.

All data is subject to stringent data backup policies and practices. Automated monitoring tools alert IT Operations staffs, who are on call 24 X 7. Our Disaster Recovery Plan includes replacement of work areas, phones, data and data equipment.

18. Do you apply a quality management system? Please describe it.

Harris Interactive is committed to quality in all phases of the research process, from Proposal Development through Job Close. To this end, we have developed a Research Process Management and Improvement System which encompasses the entire project life cycle. Process Improvement teams are assembled on a regular basis to map, analyze and develop recommendations for process improvement. Each team is focused on a targeted area of the overall process. In addition, a standing

committee reviews process and technology ideas that arise from production management. This committee reviews ideas against the current process and considers the impact on the overall procedure, prioritizes the ideas and then makes recommendations on which ideas should be implemented.

19. Do you conduct online surveys with children and young people? If so, please describe the process for obtaining permission?

Harris Interactive conducts a full range of custom research projects among children and teens for our clients in both commercial and public policy arenas. Our interviewing policies comply with legal codes of conduct in each country in which we conduct research. The four divisions of our company also abide by codes of conduct developed by governing bodies in the countries in which they are based:

- The U.S. based offices of Harris Interactive – Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO)
- The U.K. based offices of Harris Interactive – The Market Research Society (MRS)
- The German based offices of Harris Interactive – ESOMAR "Interviewing Children and Young People", BVM "Richtlinie fur die Befragung von Minderjahrigen"
- The French based offices of Harris Interactive – SYNTEC (French Market Research Association) and European Society for Opinion and Market Research (ESOMAR)

Our policies on interviewing children and teens apply to all surveys, including those that use sample provided by Harris Interactive, by our clients, or by other vendors.

20. Do you supplement your samples with samples from other providers? How do you select these partners? Is it your policy to notify a client in advance when using a third party provider? Do you de-duplicate the same when using multiple sample sources?

In certain situations, we will supplement our samples with sample from another provider. Typically, these situations involved hard-to-reach subgroups. Our policy is to always tell clients if we are using supplemental vendor sample. We de-dupe this sample using digital fingerprinting.

Harris Interactive employs a comprehensive vetting process with each one of our sample vendors. We ask each vendor to complete a thorough questionnaire in an effort to best understand the composition of their panel.

<u>Partnerships and Multiple Panel Membership</u>

21. Do you have a policy regarding multi-panel membership? What efforts do you undertake to ensure that survey results are unbiased given that some individuals belong to multiple panels?

We have conducted extensive testing and evidence to date shows no proof that multi-panel membership alone is a cause of bias or error. We have found, however, that those with multiple panel memberships are somewhat attitudinally different in

that they enjoy taking surveys and are more motivated to do so. Since our propensity score adjustment approach accounts for attitudinal correlates associated with participation in online surveys, we are confident that any possible biases have been minimized. To this end, we also can track and identify panelists with multiple panel memberships (self-reported).

Data Quality and Validation

22. What are likely start rates, drop-out and participation rates in connection with provided sample. How are these computed?

Amongst general panelists who are past 12-month active respondents, response rates can vary from 20% to 60% depending on the topic, incentive, population, subgroup, survey length, etc. Although response rates vary, a low response rate can still produce a representative sample. We employ a two-stage approach to ensure representativeness. In the first stage, we balance the outgoing sample demographically before survey invitations are delivered to panelists. In the second stage, we weight the results data we collect by a variety of factors, including, but not limited to, age, sex, education, income, and race, region of the country, Internet usage and shopping behaviour. These two stages combined with our statistical process known as propensity score weighting helps to ensure that the resulting survey data are representative of the populations of interest to clients. In addition, our adherence to a balanced sample methodology, best-in-class panel practices and superior survey design allow us to maintain low drop-out and suspend rates. Response rate is calculated as the number of responses (completes, suspend, terminate/non-qualified completion) divided by total number of invitations sent.

23. Do you maintain individual level data such as recent participation history, date of entry, source, etc. on your panelists? Are you able to supply your client with a per job analysis of such individual level data?

Yes, we maintain this level of data on our respondents. We use this data to ensure appropriate exclusions, frequency of contact, etc. For the panel we also routinely balance samples based on prior survey participation.

24. Do you use quality analysis and validation techniques to identify inattentive and fraudulent respondents? If yes, what techniques are used and at what point in the process are they applied?

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

The variety of methods we use focus on the entire range of touch points that we have with our panelists from recruitment to incentives redemption to interactions with Panel Member Services and during and across all surveys taken. There is no single foolproof method for stopping fraudulent respondents (e.g., cookies can be deleted, clever respondents can lie cleverly, private internet connections have

typically dynamic, non-IP addresses), but our multi-layered approach gives us the best possible defense against them. Our methods include: technology based solutions (e.g. CAPTCHA, cookies, digital fingerprinting), pattern recognition/data mining solutions, panelist accountability, survey design solutions, and panel management solutions. We continue to test and investigate survey design and technology solutions on a continual basis.

25. Do you measure respondent satisfaction?

We measure respondent satisfaction on each survey experience based on randomly assigned multiple indicators presented at the end of each survey. We also conduct an annual panel satisfaction survey of all panelists. The results of our most recent survey show that our panelists are very highly satisfied with their experience with us. This positive feedback is further reinforced by the panel comments we received through our Survey Help Desk. Available via phone, online, fax or mail, our Survey Help Desk manages a low complaint rate and quickly resolves questions from our panel members, insuring long-term satisfaction.

26. What information do you provide to debrief your client after the project is finished?

We typically provide our clients with daily updates that show the client; number of completes, incidence rate, response rate, sample outgo, etc. A final report detailed this information is provided to the client at field end.

For the expected response rates in Lower Saxony, we estimated approximately 28% response rate, based on response rate information we had from Germany in 2011-2012, which we adjusted slightly based on the panel activity we had seen over the previous 12 months.

Actual rates were 18.79% contact rate/7.5% completion rate (158 completes out of 2,113 invites sent). These were lower than estimated, again due in part to the difficulty with predicting response rates on relatively small amount of sample available to us in this region. It is also possible that the respondents we were unable to contact due to other panel reservations, were more active than the respondents we invited to the survey. In total, We sent 2,113 invitations out of a possible 2,540 Lower Saxony respondents on the panel.

GMI

Panel Information

1) What is the size of your panel in each of the following regions and countries:
   - ***This information is proprietary not only for GMI but also for our partners, we therefore cannot share actual counts with you and they are likely to change at the time of fielding.***

2) What panel recruitment techniques do you currently employ?
   a. Please describe your recruitment sources.
   - ***Recruitment techniques range from Web advertising and public relations, to partner-recruited panels and alliances with heavily trafficked portals.***

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

   - ***<u>Panelist Authentication</u>: GMI has implemented detailed quality procedures to ensure we deliver reliable and valid high-quality data sets. Our verification process includes the use of a physical address for all panelists and a redemption mechanism that includes mailing a physical check in the local currency to the address of record. We review the level of fraud required to create a separate identity to cash checks as a significant barrier to the pursuit of incentives for taking surveys. Additionally, third party databases like those here in the US are not available in the vast majority of international markets which makes this validation point all the more important for multi-country research.***
   - ***<u>Quality checks at registration to ensure valid, honest panelists</u>: The first step to ensuring valid responses for our clients is to protect the front door of our panel. Every prospective panelist must pass through fraud-detection screening before being admitted. Our quality controls include:***
     - ***Confirming the existence of a unique, working email address for each panelist using double opt-in registration***
     - ***CAPTCHA tests that prevent malicious sources from joining with "bots" and automated scripts***
     - ***Location-verification technology that detects registrants who falsify their country of residence***
     - ***Fraud screening that systematically blocks respondents who have suspicious domains or IP addresses, or who come from proxy servers that mask their true IP addresses and locations***
     - ***Barring respondents who have previously been ejected from the panel from rejoining***
   - ***<u>Ongoing review of recruitment sources</u>: GMI has invested heavily in tools and analytical models to identify quality recruitment sources to ensure that our respondents are as well-intentioned as possible. Each recruitment source is carefully screened and managed to ensure it is recruiting unique, valid respondents to take market research surveys. If a low-quality or fraudulent respondent is detected, an alert is sent to our recruitment***

database and the source is flagged for monitoring. Recruitment sources that fail to meet our high standards are eliminated.

- ***<u>Monitoring of incentive-redemption patterns</u>: While having a secure front door to the panel keeps low-quality respondents from joining, sometimes respondents still "go bad" for one reason or another. As a result, we've developed new technology that identifies fraudulent respondents who display suspicious incentive-redemption patterns, adding an extra layer of security to keep our clients' data quality high***
- ***<u>Screening for low-quality responses</u>: GMI survey technology can also employ in-line tests to identify low-quality responders and responses at the survey level and remove them from your data sets. GMI tests cover speeder-detection, straight-liners and suspicious open-end responses. Additionally, we can work with our clients to implement further trap questions to catch inattentive/fraudulent responses.***

HOW IT'S DONE:

1. Duplication screening at panel registration – Our clients were concerned about individuals taking the same survey more than once under different aliases, and potentially polluting their study results. So, GMI developed proprietary in-house duplicate-prevention algorithms to detect and block individuals who attempt to join our panel multiple times. Before a registrant is allowed to join the panel, GMI's algorithms comb the panel for panelists who have similar characteristics. If too many attributes are similar to another panelist in our panel, the individual is blocked from joining to preserve the integrity and uniqueness of the database.

2. Panel scrub to remove duplicates – In addition to implementing duplicate-blocking algorithms at registration, we periodically double check the panel as an extra layer of security to ensure that every panelist is unique. If duplicate panelist profiles are found, the panelists are removed, and blacklisted to prevent them from rejoining GMI's panel in the future.

- ***3. Digital fingerprinting to prevent duplication within a study – For some studies, more than one sample provider may be required to fill a certain quota. However, with GMI as your primary provider, you'll never need to worry that someone is participating in your study multiple times and skewing your results. To prevent this, GMI can employ real-time digital fingerprinting technology on your survey. When a respondent accepts a survey invitation, the respondent's computer is scanned and he/she is assigned a unique ID, or digital fingerprint. Digital fingerprinting identifies respondents using dozens of data points from their computer hardware and software, going far beyond cookies and IP addresses. If no one with the same digital fingerprint has taken the survey, the respondent is allowed to enter. But, in cases where a match is found, the respondent is politely screened out of the survey. This technique ensures that you'll receive unique responses from the studies managed by GMI. Digital fingerprinting is a standard feature offered where GMI is the main sample provider, regardless of whether or not GMI programs/hosts the study.***

4) What panel profiling information, demographic or otherwise, is available?
   - ***GMI's consumer and specialty panelists undergo extensive psycho-demographic profiling to ensure quality data. Upon registration, GMI collects the following from all its consumer panelists: age, gender, geography, language, marital status, education status and employment status. After registration, another 500 unique data points are collected under the following 10 key qualifying personal profiles that cover all aspects of the panelists' lifestyle:***
   - ***Basic***
   - ***Household***
   - ***Financial***
   - ***Medical***
   - ***ravel***
   - ***Technology***
   - ***Motor vehicle***
   - ***Employment***
   - ***Purchasing***
   - ***Special interest***

GMI asks its consumer panel members to update both their basic personal information as well as the above 10 personal profiles periodically throughout the year, and offers extra incentives (MarketPointsTM) to encourage them to do so more frequently. Panel members are also required to update their personal information when they redeem their MarketPointsTM in order to protect against missing reward checks. Additionally, as part of the New Year holiday message, panelists are encouraged to update their personal information once again. Finally, they are able to edit their account information and public profile at any time with their unique user name and password. This is reinforced at the login stage, whereby members are asked to maintain their profiling surveys in order to receive more accurately targeted surveys in the future.

5) How will you confirm geographic residency of participant?
   - ***Although we will send the invite to people who are profiled as living in this geography, we suggest that you include a screener in your survey to ensure correct geographic residency.***

6) What will your approach be should there be challenges in meeting the required quotas?
   - ***Please note that we are quoting on these projects on natural fall out and cannot guarantee regional representation. Note we also cannot guarantee return to sample and will be on best efforts.***

Sample

1) How is sample pulled?
   - ***For general population research studies, GMI draws a sample from its global consumer panelist base that is in proportion with the general population. Then, GMI sends an invitation to request panelist participation in the survey. For clients with specific criteria, GMI pulls the sample based***

on the filters set, and then distributes invitations on a random basis. A feature of GMI's sampling tool is the ability to deploy samples as batches. The sample is always randomized before deployment, except during re-contact studies. This process is controlled manually by the GMI service team as they are ready to deploy batches 24x7x365 to accommodate the needs of all clients or panelists in any geographic location.

1) What sample sources do you use?
   - ***For this study, GMI will utilize its own proprietary panel first and if needed, reach out to our network of approved panel partners.***

2) How is your sample composed?
   - ***All of GMI's global consumer and specialty panelists are double-opted in without exception. GMI has learned that consumers willingly double-opt in into panels that offer quality incentives. GMI's rigorous double opt-in process consists of two distinct steps:***
     - ***First step: panelists fill out a comprehensive online registration form.***
     - ***Second step: panelists activate their account by clicking a link sent to them via email immediately after registration.***

3) How will you ensure demographic quotas and representativeness is met to the aforementioned standards in this study?
   - ***At this time, GMI cannot guarantee representativeness of the sample for this project. The data will need to be weighted. Due to the limited geography and therefore limited availability of panelists available in those regions, we will have to allow for natural fallout on the demographics.***

Paradata

1) What para-data will be available for this study?
   - ***At this time, GMI cannot provide all of this data for all of its panelists. We suggest that you ask this information within the survey itself so you have data from all respondents.***

Passwords

1) How does your company typically employ passwords in internet surveys?
   - ***GMI's panelists are typically invited to take part in a survey via an email invitation. At the client's request, panel members can also be directed to a client portal to complete a study, and then be passed back into the GMI database to ensure MarketPoints™ are awarded directly to the panel member's individual account. This transfer is always encrypted to protect the respondent's personal information.***

2) Are you capable of embedding passwords in unique links provided by Harris/Decima to ensure controlled access to the survey?
   - ***Yes, we are able to do this.***

Non-Response Information

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

Response Rates

1) Please indicate the anticipated response rate for the following:
   a. The Pre Test – ***At this time, we anticipate an overall response rate of 10-15%.***
   b. The Post Test – ***We cannot guarantee the return to sample but anticipate about a 60% response rate.***

2) If bidding on the project for Hesse, Germany, please indicate the anticipated attrition rates between waves.
   - ***Again, we cannot guarantee return to sample, but anticipate an approximate 40% attrition rate.***

Incentives

1) What is your standard incentive structure?
   - ***GMI awards MarketPoints for its studies but is investigating alternative incentives. At the time of these studies we would be happy to discuss other options that may be available. See answer 14 to the ESOMAR 26.***
     Because of the global nature of the market research studies that GMI helps corporations conduct, GlobalTestMarket consumer panelists earn MarketPoints_ for participating in surveys, which are redeemable for a check in their local currency.
     GMI's incentive system is a little different for specialty panelists. For example, GMI's IT panelists do not receive any incentive for joining the panel, but receive points worth a minimum of $10.00 for each completed survey. More points are awarded for longer surveys or more sophisticated respondents. Points can be redeemed for a check that is mailed directly to the panelist's address in local currency. GMI also rewards IT panelists with research reports, IT test vouchers, and other relevant incentives.

2) Can your incentive structure be customized for this project?
   - ***We can customize incentives for this project but this may affect pricing. Please call to discuss further.***

3) What incentive structure do you recommend for this project?
   - ***We are currently recommending MarketPoints for this study.***

Panel Usage

1) What is the average number of surveys sent to a panelist per month?
   - ***GMI aims at limiting the number of surveys its panelists complete in a month to four only, an equivalent to no more than one per week. The survey-taking average of the GMI global consumer panel at large is 1.7 completed surveys per month.***

2) What types of surveys (academic, commercial, government) do you usually send to your clients?
   - ***Our panelists are invited for a variety of studies including commercial, academic, and government. The vast majority are for commercial purposes.***

3) Do you have procedures for cleaning your panel of non-responsive panelists?
   - ***GMI defines an active panelist as one who has earned a MarketPointTM in the past six months. GMI uses that target group (6 months) for estimated feasibility. GMI continually engages its panelists by communicating with them via email, newsletters and its Web site. To maintain a healthy, active panel, GMI removes inactive members from its panel monthly, as well as those whose emails bounced back.***

Challenges

1) Please briefly describe any challenges you foresee in completing this research and your firms proposed solutions.
   - ***Currently, we do not foresee any problems with completing this survey. We have as mentioned above, assessed feasibility and pricing based on current conditions and have pointed out that some weighting will be required. We will be happy to reassess feasibility as fielding time approaches. Should anything change before then, we will keep you posted.***

SSI

Panel Information

1) What is the size of your panel in each of the following regions and countries:
   a. ***Germany: Hesse and Hamburg – 4798 Hesse, 2116 Hamburg***
   b. ***Switzerland: Lucerne and Zurich – 359 Lucerne, 1425 Zurich***
   c. ***Spain: Madrid and Catalonia – 11545 – Madrid, 12322 - Catalonia***
   d. ***France: IDF and PACA – we can target by region:***

Result	*Percent*	*Nielsen regions FR 5*
15308	*19%*	*Is Equal to Region parisienne*
18046	*23%*	*Is Equal to Nord et Nord Est*
14390	*18%*	*Is Equal to Nord Ouest et Centre Ouest*
13614	*17%*	*Is Equal to Centre et Centre Est*
18002	*23%*	*Is Equal to Sud*

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

- ***Panelists are recruited through thousands of web sites. SSI works with web sites directly as well as with data aggregators. The majority of the recruitment is contracted through aggregators to help ensure expansive reach to thousands of web properties and millions of visitors to those properties. This approach is designed to optimize the probability that the panel reflects the overall composition of that segment of the online population (close to 70%).***

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

- ***SSI has developed a proprietary monitoring system to help control fraud and satisficing behavior. Panelists in the following categories are monitored and removed according to algorithms developed for different types and severities of behavior:***
  - ***Panelists who have completed a survey in an unreasonably short time.***
  - ***Panelists who have responded to "trap" questions on our screener surveys by stating that they own non-existent credit cards or use non-existent brands; for example, panelists who say they use Gleam mouthwash or have stayed at the HomeAway Inn hotel chain.***
  - ***Panelists whose survey data appears suspect as reported by our clients and after investigation.***

- ***Panelists whose survey data appears suspect in our own screener surveys and after investigation.***

An SSI data quality team reviews all panelist data (join data and screener survey data) looking for inconsistent data patterns. If the inconsistency is an error, the data is corrected or removed. If it appears to be fraud, the panelist record is removed.

- ***Regular geographic and demographic updates are part of regular panel management. SSI has access to the most up-to-date information from primary sources. The panel is automatically part of the same Survey Sampling geographic and demographic updating as SSI telephone samples.***
- ***Custom data analysis is performed regularly. For example, pulling all panelists from one ZIP Code and examining the list by hand for evidence of duplication or false information. The combination of programmatic controls and human examination of the data is the same approach as has been used to ensure the quality of SSI's telephone databases for nearly 30 years. SSI Vice President Linda Piekarski supervises panel data quality for the SurveySpot panel.***
- ***The reward team checks the list of panelists claiming rewards for any evidence of fraud, such as duplicate memberships. Because SurveySpot uses a variety of rewards rather than paying for every survey taken, there is little incentive to join the panel multiple times with aliases.***
- ***Newsletters and panel communications discuss the compact of trust between researcher and respondent and the importance of honesty and good faith in survey responses.***

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

- ***Our panelists are profiled in real time. Due to our Dynamix platform we are continuously collecting up-to-date information on our respondents so that each respondent can be sent to the right survey at the right time- which makes for the most effective respondent experience. Panelists are also profiled through our registration process and are constantly reminded to update their profile information throughout their time as a member.***

   b. How often are your panelists profiled?

- ***SSI updates profile data in real time. Due to our Dynamix platform we are continuously collecting up-to-date information on our respondents so that each respondent can be sent to the right survey at the right time. In addition, SSI offers clients the ability to create custom profiling questions and to gather profile data on participants in real time.***

   c. What information is included in your profiling surveys?

- ***SSI offers thousands of screening selects, providing information on multiple categories including ailments, hobbies and lifestyles, ownership, media consumption, auto ownership, travel, shopping habits, purchase intent by category, and business titles and responsibilities.***

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

- ***SSI has demographic and household data on 100% of participants in North America and works to achieve the highest possible rates in Europe and Asia Pacific, as well as for participants engaged outside of SSI's proprietary panels.***

5) How will you confirm geographic residency of participant?
We have full mailing address on all of our panelists and we also employ geo validation.

- ***SSI employs an advanced data validation service from Imperium® called Verity™. Verity compares respondent demographics to multiple databases and data vendors specializing in consumer information to confirm key identity data, including name, address and date of birth. By implementing Imperium's stringent validation process, SSI's respondent data is Verity certified for accuracy.***

  SSI also addresses the issue of participant authentication to avoid duplicates and misrepresentation in the online survey research process with SSI Verify. SSI Verify comprises a best-in-class digital fingerprinting capability from Imperium called RelevantID™ and SSI's unique set of proven quality checks which includes GEO IP.

6) What will your approach be should there be challenges in meeting the required quotas? ***We will run a full feasibility check and will include partners as needed before the project begins. If the survey specifications change while in field we may need to adjust feasibility, but will be able to bring in additional resources should we need them.***

Sample

1) How is sample pulled?
   - ***SSI's sampling procedure allows exclusion by a variety of factors. These include a previous invitation to a specific survey and the star t, screenout or completion of a specific survey. Sample can be batched, or limited, by a specified number per hour, day, week or other variables. SSI's general recommendation is that a survey remains in the field for 5 days.***
2) What sample sources do you use?
   - ***SSI actively manages panels in 27 countries. In addition to our proprietary communities, SSI manages affiliate communities. SSI can potentially access anyone online to give his or her opinion via a network of relationships with websites, panels, communities and social media groups. SSI provides access to people to give their opinions where they are and in the way that best suits the needs of the research project.***
3) How is your sample composed?
   - ***SSI's new dynamic sampling platform—SSI Dynamix™—goes beyond panels to integrate seamlessly survey participants from all areas of the Internet, including our own global panels, social media, websites, affiliate***

partnerships and more. This multi-faceted system delivers the widest reach, transforming the entire Internet into the panel; the most effective respondent experience, taking people to the right surveys at the right time; the highest data integrity, using multiple levels of randomness and built-in quality processes; and the deepest respondent engagement, providing participants with customized, motivating incentives.

4) How will you ensure demographic quotas and representativeness is met to the aforementioned standards in this study?
   - ***We have the ability to set quota by demographic and will send across our panel to ensure a representative sample.***

Paradata

1) What para-data will be available for this study?
   a. ***Census information? Demographic information is available***
   b. ***Electoral district? No***
   c. ***Age? Yes***
   d. ***Gender? Yes***
   e. ***Region? Yes***
   f. ***Sub-region? No***
   g. ***Education? Yes***
   h. ***Any other relevant information? Household size, employment, income, marital status, social class***

Passwords

1) How does your company typically employ passwords in internet surveys?
   If a password must be used we generally ask that it is included as part of the link forming a unique URL.
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: Response varies by project.
   a. ***The Pre Test - 10%***
   b. ***The Post Test – 10%***
2) If bidding on the project for Hesse, Germany, please indicate the anticipated attrition rates between waves.
   - ***We do not have information on particular regions but Attrition is a natural part of the ongoing health of a participant community. However, SSI works continually to maintain an acceptable level of attrition by streamlining response and communication processes, and by improving the participant experience.***

Incentives

1) What is your standard incentive structure?

   - ***SSI's philosophy is to offer a flexible reward system. Instead of a one-size-fits-all approach, SSI offers the reward which best suits a specific survey project and that is most likely to appeal to a diverse community of participants. For example, on behalf of participants, SSI has donated more than $1.6 million USD to more than 45 charities around the world since 2001. Other rewards include sweepstakes, points, gift cards, prizes such as digital cameras and music downloads, and cash payments.***

     In order not to introduce bias, SSI uses a reasonable level of reward based on how much effort is required to complete the study, the population being surveyed and the study topic. SSI conducts continuous research to understand which rewards are most effective in incenting participants while maintaining research data quality.

2) Can your incentive structure be customized for this project?

   - ***It's possible, please let us know what you have in mind.***

3) What incentive structure do you recommend for this project?

   - ***Using our points system in conjunction with our sweepstakes.***

Panel Usage

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

   - ***There is no data specific to this- However, SSI exercises careful management of the number of invites sent per day. Moreover, SSI does not rely solely on email invitations as a method of participation in surveys. Participants are encouraged to visit the panel community website and take surveys at their leisure. Full details are kept on participation. Also, on some of our panels respondents have the ability to control the amount of surveys they receive.***

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

   - ***We send a variety of different surveys to our clients. All surveys must be for research purposes only.***

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

   - ***Yes- Panelists are removed from SSI's panels depending on where they are located and how long it has been since they last took a survey. In North America, people who join the panel but do not respond to a survey invitation in 2 months are removed from the panel; those who have responded to a survey but have not responded to a survey within the past 6 months in North America, Europe, and Latin America, and 9 months in Asia Pacific, are removed from the panel. This stringent policy ensures that we***

continue to refine our communities so that an ever growing percentage of members are active participants.

Challenges

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

   - ***If we can discuss all of the project details before going to field including what's being controlled for and screened along with any other details that are important during data collection we should have no issues.***

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

Invitation

Pre-election survey:

Worum geht es bei dieser Umfrage?
Harris Interactive ist Durchführung eine Umfrage zum Thema Wahlen und Demokratie durch und würde Sie gerne um Ihre Meinung bitten.

Durchschnittliche Dauer der Umfrage:
Bis zu 20 Minuten, abhängig von Ihren Antworten.

Was bekomme ich?
Sie bekommen Hipoints auf Ihr Konto gutgeschrieben.

Link zur Umfrage:
[SURVEY LINK]

Post-election survey:

Worum geht es bei dieser Umfrage?
Harris Interactive ist Durchführung eine Umfrage zum Thema Wahlen und Demokratie durch und würde Sie gerne um Ihre Meinung bitten.

Durchschnittliche Dauer der Umfrage:
Bis zu 10 Minuten, abhängig von Ihren Antworten.

Was bekomme ich?
Sie bekommen Hipoints auf Ihr Konto gutgeschrieben.

Link zur Umfrage:
[SURVEY LINK]

Landing Page

Pre-election survey:

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, Deutscher Staatsbürger und im Bundesland Niedersachsen 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 [SURVEY LINK] aufgeführt sind.

Post-election survey:

Vielen Dank, dass Sie sich entschlossen haben, an unserer Umfrage teilzunehmen. Heute führen wir den zweiten Teil einer Forschungsstudie zum Thema Wahlen und Demokratie durch und würden gerne Ihre Meinung erfahren. Vor einigen Tagen haben Sie bereits den ersten Teil ausgefüllt. Die Teilnahme an der Studie ist freiwillig und dauert ca. 10 Minuten. Ihre Angaben werden absolut vertraulich behandelt und nur zu wissenschaftlichen Forschungszwecken eingesetzt.

Sie müssen 18 Jahre alt, Deutscher Staatsbürger und im Bundesland Niedersachsen stimmberechtigt sein um teilnehmen zu können.

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, der Durchführung oder Ihren Rechten als Forschungsteilnehmer haben, kontaktieren Sie bitte eine der Personen, die in der [SURVEY LINK] aufgeführt sind.

Additional Information

Pre-election survey:
Der Zweck dieser Seite ist es, Sie über die Einzelheiten unserer Studie zu informieren. Sie müssen 18 Jahre alt, Deutscher Staatsbürger und im Bundesland Niedersachsen 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 20. Januar 2013 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 Deutschland zu verbessern.

Wenn Sie die heutige Umfrage abschließen, werden Sie mit [COMPENSATION DETAILS] entschädigt. Sollten Sie auch die zweite Umfrage abschließen, werden sie mit [COMPENSATION DETAILS] entschädigt.

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
lstephe8@uwo.ca

Steffen Zittlau, M.A./Prof. Thomas Gschwend
Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung
D 7,27
68159 Mannheim
Tel: 0049 621 1813775
E-Mail: zittlau@uni-mannheim.de

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
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.

Post-election survey:
Der Zweck dieser Seite ist es, Sie über die Einzelheiten unserer Studie zu informieren. Sie müssen 18 Jahre alt, Deutscher Staatsbürger und im Bundesland Niedersachsen 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 teilzunehmen und können die Befragung auch jederzeit abbrechen.

Vor ein paar Tagen haben Sie den ersten Teil dieser Studie bereits abgeschlossen. Heute möchten wir Sie um die Teilnahme am zweiten Teil der Studie bitten, einer weiteren, aber kürzeren Umfrage (ca. 10 Minuten).

Der Nutzen dieser Studie liegt darin, dass Ihre Antworten helfen werden, unser Verständnis von Wahlen in Deutschland zu verbessern.

Wenn Sie die heutige Umfrage abschließen, werden Sie mit [COMPENSATION DETAILS] entschädigt.

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
lstephe8@uwo.ca

Steffen Zittlau, M.A./Prof. Thomas Gschwend
Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung
D 7,27
68159 Mannheim
Tel: 0049 621 1813775
E-Mail: zittlau@uni-mannheim.de

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
00-1-519-661-3036

Mit Beendigung der Umfrage erklären Sie Ihre Zustimmung zur Teilnahme an der Studie. Wenn Sie mit der heutigen Umfrage beginnen möchten, klicken Sie bitte WEITER.

Appendix D: Weight Reports

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT1
- PRE_WEIGHT1 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 40.11%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 1023
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1023.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	11.80	120.71	124	12.12	0.97370852	120.74	11.80	1.75835282	0.11508157
Male - 35 to 54	18.59	190.18	186	18.18	1.02250408	190.19	18.59	2.93118401	0.19184162
Male - 55 plus	18.33	187.52	193	18.87	0.97144457	187.49	18.33	3.53057929	0.23107115
Female - 18 to 34	11.32	115.80	123	12.02	0.94160748	115.82	11.32	5.88497554	0.11954271
Female - 35 to 54	18.17	185.88	192	18.77	0.96817277	185.89	18.17	9.63706428	0.19575965
Female - 55 plus	21.79	222.91	205	20.04	1.08721312	222.88	21.79	15.16796018	0.30810987

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Lower secondary incomplete	03.00	30.69	3	00.29	10.23000000	30.69	03.00	15.16796018	5.88497554
Lower secondary/ secondary	12.00	122.76	562	54.94	0.21843416	122.76	12.00	0.30810987	0.11508157
Technical/high secondary/post	62.00	634.26	238	23.26	2.66495798	634.26	62.00	4.70766832	1.75835282
Tertiary degree incomplete/ complete	23.00	235.29	220	21.51	1.06950000	235.29	23.00	1.60719180	0.60029935

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT2
- PRE_WEIGHT2 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, pre_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 17.70%
Number of iterations performed: 5

Input count of respondents: 1023
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1023.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	11.80	120.71	124	12.12	0.97371468	120.74	11.80	9.29750030	0.05446612
Male - 35 to 54	18.59	190.18	186	18.18	1.02249926	190.18	18.59	19.17131153	0.11230836

Male - 55 plus	18.33	187.52	193	18.87	0.97157567	187.51	18.33	20.32927215	0.11909187
Female - 18 to 34	11.32	115.80	123	12.02	0.94160854	115.82	11.32	10.14852193	0.05945153
Female - 35 to 54	18.17	185.88	192	18.77	0.96812794	185.88	18.17	21.94249276	0.07582847
Female - 55 plus	21.79	222.91	205	20.04	1.08713169	222.86	21.79	12.78100713	0.21571948

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Lower secondary incomplete	03.00	30.69	3	00.29	10.23113379	30.69	03.00	21.94249276	1.89066041
Lower secondary/ secondary	12.00	122.76	562	54.94	0.21844054	122.76	12.00	1.96287456	0.05446612
Technical/high secondary/post	62.00	634.26	238	23.26	2.66495096	634.26	62.00	20.32927215	1.02179322
Tertiary degree incomplete/ complete	23.00	235.29	220	21.51	1.06947584	235.28	23.00	12.78100713	0.35464921

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	59.37	607.36	931	91.01	0.65236853	607.36	59.37	6.86024820	0.05446612
No, will not vote	40.63	415.64	92	08.99	4.51787935	415.64	40.63	21.94249276	0.49559813

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3
- PRE_WEIGHT3 –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1, pre_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 16.80%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1023
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1023.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	11.80	120.71	124	12.12	0.97350000	120.71	11.80	9.18762329	0.00000000
Male - 35 to 54	18.59	190.18	186	18.18	1.02245000	190.18	18.59	19.31039988	0.00000000
Male - 55 plus	18.33	187.52	193	18.87	0.97158498	187.52	18.33	18.44298489	0.00000000
Female - 18 to 34	11.32	115.80	123	12.02	0.94149268	115.80	11.32	11.31976948	0.00000000
Female - 35 to 54	18.17	185.88	192	18.77	0.96812031	185.88	18.17	24.29257044	0.00000000
Female - 55 plus	21.79	222.91	205	20.04	1.08737415	222.91	21.79	12.27656950	0.00000000

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Lower secondary incomplete	03.00	30.69	3	0.29	10.23000000	30.69	03.00	24.29257044	0.90531408
Lower secondary/	12.00	122.76	562	54.94	0.21843416	122.76	12.00	1.96314251	0.00000000

secondary									
Technical/high secondary/post	62.00	634.26	238	23.26	2.66495798	634.26	62.00	19.31039988	0.00000001
Tertiary degree incomplete/ complete	23.00	235.29	220	21.51	1.06950000	235.29	23.00	12.27656950	0.00000000

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CDU	28.53	291.86	186	18.18	1.17626812	218.79	21.39	6.71999514	0.09511027
SPD	25.82	264.14	231	22.58	0.85715973	198.00	19.36	5.66183939	0.08013385
Greens	10.84	110.89	171	16.72	0.48612804	83.13	08.13	5.49211548	0.04119872
FDP	07.86	80.41	57	05.57	1.05746302	60.28	05.89	4.75859406	0.08297963
Left	02.49	25.47	56	05.47	0.34097993	19.09	01.87	2.05504338	0.03583553
Other	03.66	37.44	109	10.65	0.25749695	28.07	02.74	1.51319747	0.02141677
Unkown	20.80	212.78	213	20.82	1.95138451	415.64	40.63	24.29257044	0.00000000

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	59.37	607.36	931	91.01	0.65236853	607.36	59.37	6.71999514	0.00000000
No, will not vote	40.63	415.64	92	08.99	4.51787935	415.64	40.63	24.29257044	0.50525048

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3B
- PRE_WEIGHT3B –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 18.20%
Number of iterations performed: 5

Input count of respondents: 1023
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1023.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	11.80	120.71	124	12.12	0.97383317	120.76	11.80	8.02877240	0.01673405
Male - 35 to 54	18.59	190.18	186	18.18	1.02254386	190.19	18.59	18.08757563	0.03769921
Male - 55 plus	18.33	187.52	193	18.87	0.97154475	187.51	18.33	18.93569111	0.03946691
Female - 18 to 34	11.32	115.8	123	12.02	0.94177532	115.84	11.32	8.06059870	0.01680039
Female - 35 to 54	18.17	185.88	192	18.77	0.96798913	185.85	18.17	25.06244920	0.02426927
Female - 55 plus	21.79	222.91	205	20.04	1.08707861	222.85	21.78	10.58890997	0.06308021

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Lower secondary	03.00	30.69	3	00.29	10.23251067	30.70	3.00	25.06244920	0.68261410

incomplete									
Lower secondary/ secondary	12.00	122.76	562	54.94	0.21844319	122.77	12.00	1.60326013	0.01673405
Technical/high secondary/post	62.00	634.26	238	23.26	2.66492965	634.25	62.00	18.93569111	0.31589175
Tertiary degree incomplete/ complete	23.00	235.29	220	21.51	1.06947335	235.28	23.00	10.58890997	0.11052190

VOTE_COL2	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CDU	17.57	179.74	186	18.18	0.96635000	179.74	17.57	5.21911532	0.07334452
SPD	15.90	162.66	231	22.58	0.70414286	162.66	15.90	4.37204840	0.06144064
Greens	6.68	68.34	171	16.72	0.39962807	68.34	6.68	4.95246869	0.03233506
FDP	4.84	49.51	57	5.57	0.86865263	49.51	4.84	3.62379806	0.05112731
Left	1.53	15.65	56	5.47	0.27949821	15.65	1.53	1.52022008	0.02144842
Other	2.25	23.02	109	10.65	0.21116972	23.02	2.25	1.19077667	0.01673405
Non-voter	40.63	415.64	105	10.26	3.95852286	415.64	40.63	25.06244920	0.42531623
Unkown	10.60	108.44	108	10.56	1.00405556	108.44	10.60	7.21696775	0.10142045

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT4
- PRE_WEIGHT4 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 34.83%
Number of iterations performed: 5

Input count of respondents: 1023
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1023.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	11.80	120.71	124	12.12	0.97357382	120.72	11.80	2.58932522	0.03547416
Male - 35 to 54	18.59	190.18	186	18.18	1.02249537	190.18	18.59	4.63053074	0.06343899
Male - 55 plus	18.33	187.52	193	18.87	0.97156410	187.51	18.33	5.04438535	0.06910886
Female - 18 to 34	11.32	115.80	123	12.02	0.94157588	115.81	11.32	2.88721561	0.03955530
Female - 35 to 54	18.17	185.88	192	18.77	0.96808240	185.87	18.17	15.06902974	0.05873125
Female - 55 plus	21.79	222.91	205	20.04	1.08729357	222.90	21.79	12.84949315	0.09336601

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Lower secondary incomplete	03.00	30.69	3	00.29	10.23141330	30.69	03.00	15.06902974	2.77571701
Lower secondary/ secondary	12.00	122.76	562	54.94	0.21843609	122.76	12.00	0.44873794	0.03547416
Technical/high	62.00	634.26	238	23.26	2.66494748	634.26	62.00	6.81496002	0.53874421

secondary/post									
Tertiary degree incomplete/ complete	23.00	235.29	220	21.51	1.06948716	235.29	23.00	2.39738356	0.18952077

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CDU	28.53	291.86	186	18.18	1.56915000	291.86	28.53	6.81496002	0.17049674
SPD	25.82	264.14	231	22.58	1.14345714	264.14	25.82	5.52617459	0.13825389
Greens	10.84	110.89	171	16.72	0.64849825	110.89	10.84	12.84949315	0.06957269
FDP	07.86	80.41	57	5.57	1.41066316	80.41	07.86	4.76720709	0.13298707
Left	02.49	25.47	56	5.47	0.45486964	25.47	02.49	2.02969474	0.05662081
Other	03.66	37.44	109	10.65	0.34350275	37.44	03.66	2.77571701	0.03547416
Unkown	20.80	212.78	213	20.82	0.99898592	212.78	20.80	15.06902974	0.12970528

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT1
- POST_WEIGHT1 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 41.36%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 855
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 855.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	11.80	100.89	103	12.05	0.97964528	100.90	11.80	1.76990837	0.11570883
Male - 35 to 54	18.59	158.94	157	18.36	1.01241569	158.95	18.59	2.89932259	0.18954496
Male - 55 plus	18.33	156.72	166	19.42	0.94398944	156.70	18.33	3.36961814	0.22029082
Female - 18 to 34	11.32	96.79	92	10.76	1.05211527	96.79	11.32	5.14041601	0.12298363
Female - 35 to 54	18.17	155.35	162	18.95	0.95901013	155.36	18.17	8.36010509	0.20001418
Female - 55 plus	21.79	186.30	175	20.47	1.06451874	186.29	21.79	12.14947891	0.29067434

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Lower secondary incomplete	03.00	25.65	3	00.35	8.55000000	25.65	03.00	12.14947891	5.14041601
Lower secondary/ secondary	12.00	102.60	477	55.79	0.21509434	102.60	12.00	0.29067434	0.11570883
Technical/high secondary/post	62.00	530.10	198	23.16	2.67727273	530.10	62.00	4.44622049	1.76990837
Tertiary degree incomplete/ complete	23.00	196.65	177	20.70	1.11101695	196.65	23.00	1.63502606	0.65085533

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT2
- POST_WEIGHT2 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, post_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 31.67%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 855
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 855.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	11.80	100.89	103	12.05	0.97954168	100.89	11.80	3.74138152	0.07452298
Male - 35 to 54	18.59	158.94	157	18.36	1.01239451	158.95	18.59	6.99433029	0.13931707
Male - 55 plus	18.33	156.72	166	19.42	0.94426252	156.75	18.33	8.27562489	0.16483863
Female - 18 to 34	11.32	96.79	92	10.76	1.05205863	96.79	11.32	3.95633209	0.07880449
Female - 35 to 54	18.17	155.35	162	18.95	0.95891173	155.34	18.17	13.85556668	0.11103939
Female - 55 plus	21.79	186.30	175	20.47	1.06446055	186.28	21.79	11.28023320	0.22468614

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Lower secondary incomplete	03.00	25.65	3	00.35	8.55086884	25.65	03.00	13.85556668	3.06322366
Lower secondary/ secondary	12.00	102.60	477	55.79	0.21509762	102.60	12.00	0.72126651	0.07452298
Technical/high secondary/post	62.00	530.10	198	23.16	2.67734302	530.11	62.00	11.28023320	1.16550064
Tertiary degree incomplete/ complete	23.00	196.65	177	20.70	1.11091476	196.63	23.00	4.56538190	0.47170617

POST_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, voted	59.37	507.61	692	80.94	0.73354552	507.61	59.37	8.73381616	0.07452298
No, did not vote	40.63	347.39	163	19.06	2.13120552	347.39	40.63	13.85556668	0.23922672

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT3
- POST_WEIGHT3 –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1, post_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 27.50%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 855
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 855.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	11.80	100.89	103	12.05	0.97951455	100.89	11.80	3.62755869	0.00000003
Male - 35 to 54	18.59	158.94	157	18.36	1.01238534	158.94	18.59	6.76921613	0.00000006
Male - 55 plus	18.33	156.72	166	19.42	0.94410541	156.72	18.33	7.49107529	0.00000046
Female - 18 to 34	11.32	96.79	92	10.76	1.05202173	96.79	11.32	4.16298025	0.00000004
Female - 35 to 54	18.17	155.35	162	18.95	0.95897236	155.35	18.17	22.78213048	0.00000005
Female - 55 plus	21.79	186.30	175	20.47	1.06459705	186.30	21.79	11.53866798	0.00000011

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Lower secondary incomplete	03.00	25.65	3	00.35	8.54999710	25.65	03.00	22.78213048	0.00000757
Lower secondary/ secondary	12.00	102.60	477	55.79	0.21509434	102.60	12.00	0.75190218	0.00000003
Technical/high secondary/post	62.00	530.10	198	23.16	2.67727276	530.10	62.00	11.53866798	0.00000053
Tertiary degree incomplete/ complete	23.00	196.65	177	20.70	1.11101696	196.65	23.00	4.85949806	0.00000025

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CDU	27.27	233.16	140	16.37	1.30615395	182.86	21.39	6.58788861	0.13496175
SPD	24.68	211.01	199	23.27	0.83162846	165.49	19.36	4.24249828	0.08691327
Greens	10.36	88.58	143	16.73	0.48580389	69.47	8.13	2.38853957	0.04893244
FDP	07.52	64.30	52	06.08	0.96973208	50.43	05.90	3.75287506	0.08823044
Left	02.37	20.26	35	04.09	0.45406452	15.89	01.86	1.69355932	0.06132905
Other	03.50	29.93	78	09.12	0.30089205	23.47	02.74	2.86785325	0.03600131
Unkown	24.30	207.77	208	24.33	1.67012751	347.39	40.63	22.78213048	0.00000003

POST_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, voted	59.37	507.61	692	80.94	0.73354552	507.61	59.37	6.58788861	0.00000003
No, did not vote	40.63	347.39	163	19.06	2.13120552	347.39	40.63	22.78213048	0.23638511

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT3B
- POST_WEIGHT3B -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 32.20%
Number of iterations performed: 5

Input count of respondents: 855

Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 855.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	11.80	100.89	103	12.05	0.97958032	100.90	11.80	3.25426334	0.03877654
Male - 35 to 54	18.59	158.94	157	18.36	1.01241775	158.95	18.59	6.00005493	0.07149432
Male - 55 plus	18.33	156.72	166	19.42	0.94411584	156.72	18.33	6.79136402	0.08092325
Female - 18 to 34	11.32	96.79	92	10.76	1.05208386	96.79	11.32	3.44667355	0.04106922
Female - 35 to 54	18.17	155.35	162	18.95	0.95894638	155.35	18.17	9.44847442	0.06258975
Female - 55 plus	21.79	186.30	175	20.47	1.06451075	186.29	21.79	15.10076665	0.10003236

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Lower secondary incomplete	03.00	25.65	3	00.35	8.55013365	25.65	03.00	15.10076665	1.10115986
Lower secondary/ secondary	12.00	102.60	477	55.79	0.21509589	102.60	12.00	0.56320316	0.03877654
Technical/high secondary/post	62.00	530.10	198	23.16	2.67726852	530.10	62.00	8.39506762	0.57800037
Tertiary degree incomplete/ complete	23.00	196.65	177	20.70	1.11101521	196.65	23.00	3.48923431	0.24023377

VOTE_COL2	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CDU	20.09	171.77	140	16.37	1.22692500	171.77	20.09	5.24049008	0.13628287
SPD	18.18	155.44	199	23.27	0.78110050	155.44	18.18	3.30457425	0.08593793
Greens	07.63	65.24	143	16.73	0.45619930	65.24	07.63	1.92467261	0.05005255
FDP	05.54	47.37	52	06.08	0.91090385	47.37	05.54	3.08050950	0.08484757
Left	01.75	14.96	35	04.09	0.42750000	14.96	01.75	1.55847163	0.05306192
Other	02.58	22.06	78	09.12	0.28280769	22.06	02.58	1.49107546	0.03877654
Non-voter	40.63	347.39	177	20.70	1.96263559	347.39	40.63	15.10076665	0.21832003
Unkown	03.60	30.78	31	03.63	0.99290323	30.78	03.60	4.16047145	0.15138432

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT4
- POST_WEIGHT4 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 36.79%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 855
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 855.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	11.80	100.89	103	12.05	0.97994802	100.93	11.81	2.96151495	0.05408064

Male - 35 to 54	18.59	158.94	157	18.36	1.01255005	158.97	18.59	4.85704637	0.08869521
Male - 55 plus	18.33	156.72	166	19.42	0.94406968	156.72	18.33	5.26210914	0.09609211
Female - 18 to 34	11.32	96.79	92	10.76	1.05238617	96.82	11.32	3.35123973	0.06119746
Female - 35 to 54	18.17	155.35	162	18.95	0.95888030	155.34	18.17	9.52302617	0.09372912
Female - 55 plus	21.79	186.30	175	20.47	1.06412167	186.22	21.78	13.23618731	0.13027542

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Lower secondary incomplete	03.00	25.65	3	00.35	8.55820009	25.67	03.00	13.23618731	2.91538680
Lower secondary/ secondary	12.00	102.60	477	55.79	0.21510146	102.60	12.00	0.48557462	0.05408064
Technical/high secondary/post	62.00	530.10	198	23.16	2.67725719	530.10	62.00	7.13402436	0.79454855
Tertiary degree incomplete/ complete	23.00	196.65	177	20.70	1.11087616	196.63	23.00	2.76174206	0.30758770

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
CDU	27.27	233.16	140	16.37	1.66541786	233.16	27.27	7.13402436	0.20157437
SPD	24.68	211.01	199	23.27	1.06037186	211.01	24.68	4.52720517	0.12791778
Greens	10.36	88.58	143	16.73	0.61942657	88.58	10.36	2.58254277	0.07297066
FDP	07.52	64.3	52	06.08	1.23646154	64.30	07.52	4.38001313	0.14004503
Left	02.37	20.26	35	04.09	0.57895714	20.26	02.37	1.98069047	0.08585857
Other	03.50	29.93	78	09.12	0.38365385	29.93	03.50	2.91538680	0.05408064
Unkown	24.30	207.77	208	24.33	0.99887019	207.77	24.30	13.23618731	0.11533987