Technical Report (revised)

Making Electoral Democracy Work

Spain National Elections –

Madrid and Catalonia

December 4, 2012

Proprietary Warning

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

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

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

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

Table of Contents

Introduction 3

About Making Electoral Democracy Work 3

Spain National Elections Surveys – Catalonia and Madrid 3

Survey Methodology 5

Pre-launch 5

Questionnaire Design – CAWI *5*

Programming *5*

Survey Pre-Tests *5*

Sample Design and Selection *5*

Survey Administration 7

Supplier Panel Information *7*

Sampling and Quota Control *7*

Invites and Reminders *8*

Incentives *9*

Passwords *9*

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 *13*

Weighting *16*

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

Appendix B: Supplier Panel Information 21

Appendix C: Invitation E-mail and Information and Consent Screen 26

Appendix D: Weight Reports 31

Introduction

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

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

About Making Electoral Democracy Work

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

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

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

Spain National Elections Surveys – Madrid and Catalonia

The MEDW Team sought the services of a public opinion research firm to collect online data from residents in Madrid and Catalonia, Spain through surveys related to the National elections held on November 20, 2011. This study included a pre- and post election survey implemented through a return to sample methodology.

Harris/Decima completed 1047 and 1014 pre-election surveys and 899 and 886 post-election surveys online in Madrid and Catalonia, respectively.

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

Number of Completed Surveys

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

	Dates	Total # qualified completes
Madrid		
Pre-election survey	November 10 – 19, 2011	1047
Post-election survey	November 21 – December 4, 2011	899
Catalonia		
Pre-election survey	November 10 – 19, 2011	1014
Post-election survey	November 21 – December 4, 2011	886

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, Spanish and Catalan 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 Spanish and Catalan 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 supplied by GMI, the following demographic quotas were set for the pre-election surveys:

Madrid:

	Gender					
	Total - %	**Total - Quota**	**Male – % of population**	**Male – Quota**	**Female – % of Population**	**Female – Quota**
Total	100%	1000	48%	480	52%	520
Age						
18 - 34 years	30%	300	14.4%	144	15.6%	156
35 - 54 years	40%	400	19.2%	192	20.8%	208
55 - 99 years	30%	300	14.4%	144	15.6%	156

		% of Population	**Quota**
Education[1]	Some College Or Less (No formal education) Sin titulación formal + Secundaria + Bachillerato	59%	590
	College graduate with a 2 year degree: Aún cursa estudios; Estudios Universitarios no finalizados	25%	250
	College graduate with a 4 year degree: Diploma Universitario o Formación Profesional de grado alto, Licenciatura Universitaria	10%	100
	Higher education: Estudios de posgrado (máster/doctorado/PHD)	6%	60

Catalonia:

	Gender					
	Total - %	**Total - Quota**	**Male – % of population**	**Male – Quota**	**Female – % of Population**	**Female – Quota**
Total	100%	1001	49%	490	51%	511
Age						
18 - 34 years	28%	280	14%	137	14%	143

[1] Education quotas were set as “soft quotas” and not nested with age and/or gender.

35 - 54 years	37%	370	18%	181	19%	189
55 - 99 years	35%	351	17%	172	18%	179

		% of Population	Quota
Education[1]	Some College Or Less (No formal education) Sin titulación formal + Secundaria + Bachillerato	59%	590
	College graduate with a 2 year degree: Aún cursa estudios; Estudios Universitarios no finalizados	25%	250
	College graduate with a 4 year degree: Diploma Universitario o Formación Profesional de grado alto, Licenciatura Universitaria	10%	100
	Higher education: Estudios de posgrado (máster/doctorado/PHD)	6%	60

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

Survey Administration

Supplier Panel Information

Harris/Decima contracted Global Market Insite (GMI) (http://www.gmi-mr.com) as a sample provider for this study. For detailed descriptions of GMI'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 for the Madrid study:

- November 10, 2011
- November 11, 2011

- November 12, 2011
- November 13, 2011
- November 15, 2011
- November 16, 2011
- November 18, 2011

And for the Catalonia study:

- November 10, 2011
- November 11, 2011
- November 13, 2011
- November 15, 2011
- November 16, 2011
- November 17, 2011
- November 18, 2011

Sample was pulled based on the following criteria:

- Age greater than 18
- Language set to Spanish/Catalan
- Area set to Madrid/Catalonia
- Education levels
- Gender
- Spanish citizenship

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

Invites and Reminders

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

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

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

Invites and reminders were sent by GMI as follows:

	Date	# Invites	# Reminders
Madrid			
Pre-election survey	November 10, 2011	360	
	November 11, 2011	2160	

	November 12, 2011	1011	
	November 13, 2011	745	
	November 15, 2011	236	
	November 16, 2011	879	
	November 18, 2011	861	
Total		**6252**	**0**
Post-election survey	November 21, 2011	105	
	November 22, 2011	950	
	November 28, 2011		169
Total		**1055**	**169**
Catalonia			
Pre-election survey	November 10, 2011	375	
	November 11, 2011	2432	
	November 13, 2011	1045	
	November 15, 2011	655	
	November 16, 2011	1557	
	November 17, 2011		4718
	November 18, 2011		3497
Total		**6064**	**8215**
Post-election survey	November 21, 2011	102	
	November 22, 2011	917	
	November 23, 2011		293
	November 24, 2011		126
Total		**1019**	**419**

Incentives

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

Respondents were given 50 MarketPoints as an incentive for completing the pre-election survey, and another 50 MarketPoints 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:

	Madrid		Catalonia	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A: Total Invitations	6252	1055	6064	1019
B: Undeliverables	0	0	0	0
C: Net Usable invitations (A-B)	6252	1055	6064	1019
D: Total Completes	1065	913	1025	893
E: Qualified break offs	148	14	250	22
F: Disqualified (ISQ)	5	11	2	6
G: Not responded	5034	117	4787	98
H: Quota filled	0	0	0	0
Contact Rate (d+e+f+h)/c	19%	89%	21%	90%
Participation Rate (d+f+h)/c	17%	88%	17%	88%

As a point of reference, GMI experiences an average response rate of 20-25% in Spain across all projects. All surveys are different and response rates do vary from project to project. In general, political surveys tend to have a lower response rate because they may ask for sensitive information on voting habits. As well, interest in politics and the length of this particular survey may have played a role in lower response rates.

Average lengths, once outliers were removed, were:

- Madrid pre-election survey: 18 minutes
- Madrid post-election survey: 9 minutes
- Catalonia pre-election survey: 20 minutes
- Catalonia 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
Madrid		
Pre-election survey	November 10, 2011	52
	November 11, 2011	207
	November 12, 2011	190

	November 13, 2011	169
	November 14, 2011	161
	November 15, 2011	73
	November 16, 2011	111
	November 17, 2011	43
	November 18, 2011	41
Post-election survey	November 21, 2011	37
	November 22, 2011	468
	November 23, 2011	208
	November 24, 2011	50
	November 25, 2011	25
	November 26, 2011	18
	November 27, 2011	17
	November 28, 2011	26
	November 29, 2011	18
	November 30, 2011	14
	December 1, 2011	3
	December 2, 2011	9
	December 3, 2011	6
Catalonia		
Pre-election survey	November 10, 2011	57
	November 11, 2011	235
	November 12, 2011	92
	November 13, 2011	157
	November 14, 2011	116
	November 15, 2011	86
	November 16, 2011	145
	November 17, 2011	81
	November 18, 2011	45
Post-election survey	November 21, 2011	43
	November 22, 2011	521
	November 23, 2011	161
	November 24, 2011	58
	November 25, 2011	20
	November 26, 2011	18
	November 27, 2011	15
	November 28, 2011	17
	November 29, 2011	11
	November 30, 2011	4
	December 1, 2011	3
	December 2, 2011	6

	December 3, 2011	7
	December 4, 2011	1

In-Survey Quality Assurance (ISQ)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Data Analysis

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

Data Validity and Integrity Checks

Our custom system immediately identifies cases where the interview length is unrealistically short, contradicts established facts or presents patterns of response deserving attention. As a result, we can determine whether a case should be excluded from the final sample if necessary. All of these checks are preformed manually and cleaned out of the data in the back end of the project. Harris/Decima uses a checklist to ensure all data that is delivered to the client has gone through a rigorous quality control process. During this time Harris/Decima also cross referenced all IDs between the pre and post surveys to ensure all responses were valid. A few test cases were removed from the data.

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.

Flags: Two instances were found where respondents were possibly exposed to programming differences.

- **Flag1**: Flag1 denotes respondents who skipped PQ11 if they selected "no" or "don't know" at PQ10b. Upon doing a frequency check after the soft launch of the post-election survey, it was noticed this skip did not exist in previous studies in other cities and therefore removed.

- **Flag2**: Flag2 denotes respondents who skipped ISQ2 in the post-election survey. Upon completing a frequency check, it was identified that this question was not initially included in the programming. We have assumed these respondents as having passed this ISQ measure as most respondents typically do not fail.

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 Q6A1 and Q8A/Q8B. Q8A and Q8B were only used if they did not answer Q6A1 because they were non/unlikely voters, and was used for weighting purposes..

Collapsed vote variable (POST_VOTE): Created from PQ6, 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 – Madrid	# iterations – Catalonia	Cap - low	Cap - high
PRE_WEIGHT1	age, gender, education	Pre	3	3	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT2	age, gender, education and likelihood to vote (vote turnout)	Pre	3	4	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT3	age, gender, education, likelihood to vote (vote turnout) and vote intention (actual election results)	Pre	20	20	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT3B[2]	age, gender, education, and vote intention (actual election results)	Pre	3	4	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT4[3]	age, gender, education and vote intention (actual election results)	Pre	3	3	0.2	5

[2] 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.

[3] 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 – Madrid	# iterations – Catalonia	Cap - low	Cap - high
POST_WEIGHT1	age, gender, education	Post	3	3	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT2	age, gender, education and likelihood to vote (vote turnout)	Post	4	4	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT3	age, gender, education, likelihood to vote (vote turnout) and vote recall (actual election results)	Post	20	20	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT3B[2]	age, gender, education, and vote recall (actual election results)	Post	4	4	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT4[3]	age, gender, education and vote recall (actual election results)	Post	3	3	0.2	5

Appendix A: Pre-election Surveys Quota Completions by Date

Madrid:

		Some college or less	College graduate with a 2 year degree	College/ University graduate with a 4 year degree	Advanced degree
Education	Thursday, November 10, 2011	28	12	11	1
	Friday, November 11, 2011	76	57	54	20
	Saturday, November 12, 2011	69	45	60	16
	Sunday, November 13, 2011	57	45	47	20
	Monday, November 14, 2011	69	47	34	11
	Tuesday, November 15, 2011	22	15	31	5
	Wednesday, November 16, 2011	44	31	28	8
	Thursday, November 17, 2011	13	17	11	2
	Friday, November 18, 2011	13	9	13	6
	Total	**391**	**278**	**289**	**89**
		18-34	35-54	55+	
Age	Thursday, November 10, 2011	0	3	49	
	Friday, November 11, 2011	64	103	40	
	Saturday, November 12, 2011	80	98	12	
	Sunday, November 13, 2011	63	92	14	
	Monday, November 14, 2011	68	83	10	
	Tuesday, November 15, 2011	21	48	4	
	Wednesday, November 16, 2011	38	71	2	
	Thursday, November 17, 2011	14	26	3	
	Friday, November 18, 2011	19	20	2	
	Total	**367**	**544**	**136**	
		Male	Female		
Gender	Thursday, November 10, 2011	26	26		
	Friday, November 11, 2011	120	87		
	Saturday, November 12, 2011	91	99		
	Sunday, November 13, 2011	72	97		
	Monday, November 14, 2011	80	81		
	Tuesday, November 15, 2011	30	43		
	Wednesday, November 16, 2011	49	62		
	Thursday, November 17, 2011	20	23		
	Friday, November 18, 2011	27	14		
	Total	**515**	**532**		

Catalonia:

		Some college or less	College graduate with a 2 year degree	College/ University graduate with a 4 year degree	Advanced degree
Education	Thursday, November 10, 2011	23	16	17	1
	Friday, November 11, 2011	112	66	34	23
	Saturday, November 12, 2011	47	21	20	4
	Sunday, November 13, 2011	83	42	23	9
	Monday, November 14, 2011	42	41	24	9
	Tuesday, November 15, 2011	46	22	12	6
	Wednesday, November 16, 2011	55	44	33	13
	Thursday, November 17, 2011	38	15	22	6
	Friday, November 18, 2011	11	17	12	5
	Total	**457**	**284**	**197**	**76**
		18-34	**35-54**	**55+**	
Age	Thursday, November 10, 2011	0	4	53	
	Friday, November 11, 2011	60	109	66	
	Saturday, November 12, 2011	28	49	15	
	Sunday, November 13, 2011	67	67	23	
	Monday, November 14, 2011	46	56	14	
	Tuesday, November 15, 2011	33	47	6	
	Wednesday, November 16, 2011	93	49	3	
	Thursday, November 17, 2011	48	18	15	
	Friday, November 18, 2011	32	8	5	
	Total	**407**	**407**	**200**	
		Male	**Female**		
Gender	Thursday, November 10, 2011	33	24		
	Friday, November 11, 2011	135	100		
	Saturday, November 12, 2011	48	44		
	Sunday, November 13, 2011	76	81		
	Monday, November 14, 2011	54	62		
	Tuesday, November 15, 2011	45	41		
	Wednesday, November 16, 2011	66	79		
	Thursday, November 17, 2011	54	27		
	Friday, November 18, 2011	28	17		
	Total	**539**	**475**		

Appendix B: Supplier Panel Information

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.***

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

Invitation

Pre-election survey:

Subject Line: Encuesta

Invitation Text:
Harris/Decima, una empresa internacional de encuestas electorales, está realizando una encuesta sobre elecciones y democracia y nos gustaría conocer sus opiniones. La encuesta tiene una duración aproximada de unos 20 minutos. Si completa Ud. la encuesta será recompensado con [DETALLES].

Survey Link:
Para acceder a la encuesta, por favor, pinche el enlace de abajo o péguelo en su navegador de internet.

Post-election survey:
Subject Line: Segunda parte de la encuesta

Invitation Text:
Harris/Decima, una empresa internacional de encuestas electorales, está realizando la segunda parte de una encuesta sobre elecciones y democracia que Ud. respondió hace unos días. Puesto que Ud. rellenó la primera parte del estudio, su participación hoy sería muy valiosa. La encuesta tiene una duración aproximada de unos 10 minutos. Si completa Ud. la encuesta será recompensado con [DETALLES].

Survey Link:
Para acceder a la encuesta, por favor, pinche el enlace de abajo o cópielo en su navegador de internet.

Landing Page:

Pre-election survey:

Muchas gracias por haber aceptado participar en la encuesta. Estamos realizando un estudio sobre elecciones y democracia y nos gustaría conocer sus opiniones. La participación en el estudio es voluntaria. Sus respuestas serán totalmente confidenciales y solo se utilizarán con finalidades de investigación académica. Para responder la encuesta debe tener 18 años o más, ser ciudadano de España y residente en [Madrid/Cataluña].

El estudio tiene dos partes. La primera de ellas, que le invitamos a responder hoy, es una encuesta que podrá responder en tan solo 20 minutos. La segunda parte es otra

encuesta de menor duración. Si hoy decide participar será contactado más adelante e invitado a participar en la segunda encuesta. La participación en este segundo momento también será voluntaria.

Si está Ud. interesado en leer información adicional sobre este estudio, clique AQUÍ.

Si está Ud. interesado en completar la encuesta ahora sin leer más información, por favor, clique SIGUIENTE para empezar. Rellenando esta encuesta Ud. acepta participar en el estudio.

Si en cualquier momento tiene alguna duda sobre el estudio, su desarrollo o sus derechos como participante en la investigación, por favor, contacte con alguna de las personas que aparecen en la pantalla de Información Adicional [INSERTAR ENLACE].

Post-election survey:

Muchas gracias por haber aceptado participar en la encuesta. Estamos realizando la segunda parte de un estudio sobre elecciones y democracia y nos gustaría conocer sus opiniones. Ud. ya completó la primera parte de la encuesta hace unos días. La participación en el estudio es voluntaria. La encuesta de hoy tiene una duración aproximada de unos 10 minutos. Sus respuestas serán totalmente confidenciales y solo se utilizaran con finalidades de investigación académica.

Para responder la encuesta debe tener 18 años o más, ser ciudadano de España y residente en [Madrid/Cataluña].

Si está Ud. interesado en leer información adicional sobre este estudio, clique AQUÍ.

Si está Ud. interesado en completar la encuesta ahora sin leer más información, por favor, clique SIGUIENTE para empezar. Rellenando esta encuesta Ud. acepta participar en el estudio.

Si en cualquier momento tiene alguna duda sobre el estudio, su desarrollo o sus derechos como participante en la investigación, por favor, contacte con alguna de las personas que aparecen en la pantalla de Información Adicional [INSERTAR ENLACE].

Additional Information:

Pre-election survey:
El propósito de esta pantalla es proporcionarle información sobre el estudio. Para rellenar la encuesta debe tener 18 años o más, ser ciudadano de España y residente en [Madrid/Cataluña].

El propósito del estudio es obtener información sobre sus opiniones acerca de las elecciones y la democracia. La participación es voluntaria. Puede rechazar participar o finalizar su participación en cualquier momento.

El estudio tiene dos partes. La primera de ellas se puede completar hoy. Le llevará aproximadamente unos 20 minutos. La segunda encuesta se enviará después de las elecciones de 20 de noviembre de 2011. Si completa hoy la encuesta también será contactado para participar en la segunda parte de la encuesta. La participación hoy no le compromete con la siguiente encuesta.

El beneficio de participar en este estudio es que sus respuestas nos van a ayudar a conocer más las elecciones en España. Ud. no se beneficiará personalmente con su participación. No se conocen riesgos asociados con la participación en este estudio.

Si hoy completa la encuesta Ud. será recompensado con [PANEL COMPENSATION]. Si completa la segunda encuesta, Ud. será recompensado con [INSERT DETAILS].

La confidencialidad de sus respuestas estará siempre garantizada.

Si en cualquier momento tiene alguna duda o cuestión sobre el estudio, contacte con:

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

Profesor Ignacio Lago
Departamento de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales
Universitat Pompeu Fabra
Barcelona, España
93 542 22 66
ignacio.lago@upf.edu

Si Ud. tiene alguna duda sobre el estudio, su desarrollo o sus derechos como participante en la investigació, puede contactar con:

Office of Research Ethics, University of West Ontario
00-1-519-661-3036

Rellenando esta encuesta Ud. acepta participar en el estudio.
Si desea participar en la primera parte del estudio, por favor, clique SIGUENTE para empezar la encuesta.

Post-election survey:
El propósito de esta pantalla es proporcionarle información sobre el estudio. Para rellenar la encuesta debe tener 18 años o más, ser ciudadano de España y residente en [Madrid/Cataluña].

El propósito del estudio es obtener información sobre sus opiniones acerca de las elecciones y la democracia. La participación es voluntaria. Puede rechazar participar o finalizar su participación en cualquier momento.

Ud. ya completó la primera parte de la encuesta hace unos días. Hoy le pedimos que participe en la segunda parte de la encuesta. La duración de la encuesta es de aproximadamente 10 minutos.

El beneficio de participar en este estudio es que sus respuestas nos van a ayudar a conocer más las elecciones en España. Ud. no se beneficiará personalmente con su participación. No se conocen riesgos asociados con la participación en este estudio.

Si hoy completa la encuesta será recompensado con [panel compensation].

La confidencialidad de sus respuestas estará siempre garantizada.

Si en cualquier momento tiene alguna duda o cuestión sobre el estudio, contacte con:

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

Profesor Ignacio Lago
Departamento de Ciencia Políticas y Sociales
Universitat Pompeu Fabra
Barcelona, España
93 542 22 66
Ignacio.lago@upf.edu

Si Ud. tiene alguna duda sobre el estudio, su desarrollo o sus derechos como participante en la investigación, puede contactar con:

Office of Research Ethics, University of West Ontario
00-1-519-661-3036

Rellenando esta encuesta Ud. acepta participar en el estudio.
Si desea participar en esta fase del estudio, por favor, clique SIGUENTE para empezar la encuesta.

Appendix D: Weight Reports

Madrid

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT1
- PRE_WEIGHT1 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 57.55%
Number of iterations performed: 3

Input count of respondents: 1047
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1047.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.40	150.77	173	16.52	0.87148182	150.77	14.40	1.31646235	0.33443137
Male - 35 to 54	15.60	163.33	263	25.12	0.62101176	163.33	15.60	0.96165362	0.24429649
Male - 55 plus	19.20	201.02	79	07.55	2.54466657	201.03	19.20	3.66698283	0.93155272
Female - 18 to 34	20.80	217.78	194	18.53	1.12253448	217.77	20.80	1.77922079	0.45198956
Female - 35 to 54	14.40	150.77	281	26.84	0.53653426	150.77	14.40	0.82129143	0.20863917
Female - 55 plus	15.60	163.33	57	05.44	2.86563292	163.34	15.60	3.71756619	0.94440281

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	617.73	391	37.34	1.57987212	617.73	59.00	3.71756619	0.82129143
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	261.75	278	26.55	0.94154676	261.75	25.00	2.34425931	0.51789800
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	104.70	289	27.60	0.36228374	104.70	10.00	0.94440281	0.20863917
Advanced degree	06.00	62.82	89	08.50	0.70584270	62.82	06.00	2.06220046	0.45558505

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT2
- PRE_WEIGHT2 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, pre_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 47.44%
Number of iterations performed: 3

Input count of respondents: 1047
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1047.00000000

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

Male - 18 to 34	14.40	150.77	173	16.52	0.87158380	150.78	14.40	3.31228340	0.28641496
Male - 35 to 54	15.60	163.33	263	25.12	0.62105468	163.34	15.60	2.35464505	0.20360745
Male - 55 plus	19.20	201.02	79	07.55	2.54407664	200.98	19.20	9.99412408	0.86419739
Female - 18 to 34	20.80	217.78	194	18.53	1.12267814	217.80	20.80	4.15352853	0.35915789
Female - 35 to 54	14.40	150.77	281	26.84	0.53653437	150.77	14.40	2.03750314	0.17618401
Female - 55 plus	15.60	163.33	57	05.44	2.86545352	163.33	15.60	8.82013927	0.76268228

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	617.73	391	37.34	1.57989899	617.74	59.00	9.99412408	0.67736009
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	261.75	278	26.55	0.94151293	261.74	25.00	6.67354555	0.45230511
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	104.70	289	27.60	0.36228123	104.70	10.00	2.59951086	0.17618401
Advanced degree	06.00	62.82	89	08.50	0.70583847	62.82	06.00	5.00429706	0.38431492

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	76.00	795.72	950	90.74	0.83760000	795.72	76.00	3.32250814	0.17618401
No, will not vote	24.00	251.28	97	09.26	2.59051546	251.28	24.00	9.99412408	0.52996256

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3
- PRE_WEIGHT3 –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1, pre_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 45.12%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1047
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1047.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.40	150.77	173	16.52	0.87149090	150.77	14.40	3.46394369	0.00002378
Male - 35 to 54	15.60	163.33	263	25.12	0.62103416	163.33	15.60	2.34935461	0.00001613
Male - 55 plus	19.20	201.02	79	07.55	2.54461136	201.02	19.20	9.04444223	0.00006210
Female - 18 to 34	20.80	217.78	194	18.53	1.12255687	217.78	20.80	4.21884037	0.00002897
Female - 35 to 54	14.40	150.77	281	26.84	0.53654002	150.77	14.40	2.11254158	0.00001450
Female - 55 plus	15.60	163.33	57	05.44	2.86547394	163.33	15.60	8.61872983	0.00005917

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

Some college or less	59.00	617.73	391	37.34	1.57987221	617.73	59.00	9.04444223	0.00005690
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	261.75	278	26.55	0.94154606	261.75	25.00	6.09938020	0.00003837
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	104.70	289	27.60	0.36228392	104.70	10.00	2.30535808	0.00001450
Advanced degree	06.00	62.82	89	08.50	0.70584390	62.82	06.00	4.75138819	0.00003137

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	21.80	228.25	194	18.53	1.07084364	207.74	19.84	3.53987839	0.21075041
PP	42.40	443.93	382	36.49	1.05772749	404.05	38.59	3.78196029	0.22516301
IU	06.70	70.15	82	07.83	0.77863200	63.85	06.10	3.00993511	0.17919967
UPyD	08.60	90.04	122	11.65	0.67175347	81.95	07.83	2.63207419	0.15670332
Other party	04.00	41.88	99	09.46	0.38503135	38.12	03.64	1.51873990	0.09041979
Unknown	16.50	172.76	168	16.05	1.49574157	251.28	24.00	9.04444223	0.00001450

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	76.00	795.72	950	90.74	0.83760000	795.72	76.00	3.78196029	0.00001450
No, will not vote	24.00	251.28	97	09.26	2.59051546	251.28	24.00	9.04444223	0.53847044

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3B
- PRE_WEIGHT3B –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 46.69%
Number of iterations performed: 3

Input count of respondents: 1047
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1047.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.40	150.77	173	16.52	0.87162758	150.79	14.40	3.43021505	0.13486494
Male - 35 to 54	15.60	163.33	263	25.12	0.62105049	163.34	15.60	2.35353518	0.09253337
Male - 55 plus	19.20	201.02	79	07.55	2.54407101	200.98	19.20	9.44250395	0.74601299
Female - 18 to 34	20.80	217.78	194	18.53	1.12266261	217.80	20.80	4.25196586	0.16717351
Female - 35 to 54	14.40	150.77	281	26.84	0.53653519	150.77	14.40	2.02796359	0.07973295
Female - 55 plus	15.60	163.33	57	05.44	2.86539655	163.33	15.60	8.65346193	0.34022607

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

Some college or less	59.00	617.73	391	37.34	1.57987993	617.73	59.00	9.44250395	0.30914309
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	261.75	278	26.55	0.94153541	261.75	25.00	6.25261725	0.20470772
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	104.70	289	27.60	0.36228067	104.70	10.00	2.43537296	0.07973295
Advanced degree	06.00	62.82	89	08.50	0.70585380	62.82	06.00	5.01945720	0.17931904

VOTE_COL2	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	18.00	188.46	194	18.53	0.97144330	188.46	18.00	3.33162457	0.18454715
PP	35.00	366.45	382	36.49	0.95929319	366.45	35.00	3.55518235	0.19693058
IU	05.60	58.63	82	07.83	0.71502439	58.63	05.60	2.89246484	0.16022097
UPyD	07.10	74.34	122	11.65	0.60931967	74.34	07.10	2.50013206	0.13848867
Other party	03.30	34.55	99	09.46	0.34900000	34.55	03.30	1.43941681	0.07973295
Non-voter	24.00	251.28	97	09.26	2.59051546	251.28	24.00	9.44250395	0.52304428
Unkown	07.00	73.29	71	06.78	1.03225352	73.29	07.00	4.09564020	0.22686791

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT4
- PRE_WEIGHT4 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 55.60%
Number of iterations performed: 3

Input count of respondents: 1047
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1047.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.40	150.77	173	16.52	0.87137155	150.75	14.40	1.59914096	0.15717817
Male - 35 to 54	15.60	163.33	263	25.12	0.62099021	163.32	15.60	1.11630985	0.10972112
Male - 55 plus	19.20	201.02	79	07.55	2.54526768	201.08	19.20	3.96507818	0.79071616
Female - 18 to 34	20.80	217.78	194	18.53	1.12239474	217.74	20.80	2.12504398	0.20886872
Female - 35 to 54	14.40	150.77	281	26.84	0.53647825	150.75	14.40	0.95998380	0.09435597
Female - 55 plus	15.60	163.33	57	05.44	2.86598565	163.36	15.60	4.20867695	0.41366720

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	617.73	391	37.34	1.57988229	617.73	59.00	4.20867695	0.37751781
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	261.75	278	26.55	0.94151595	261.74	25.00	2.63901406	0.23671924

College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	104.70	289	27.60	0.36229613	104.70	10.00	1.05190749	0.09435597
Advanced degree	06.00	62.82	89	08.50	0.70585403	62.82	06.00	2.22781992	0.21211226

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	21.80	228.25	194	18.53	1.17652577	228.25	21.80	3.93465021	0.22431401
PP	42.40	443.93	382	36.49	1.16211518	443.93	42.40	4.20867695	0.23993625
IU	06.70	70.15	82	07.83	0.85547561	70.15	06.70	3.35801395	0.19144004
UPyD	08.60	90.04	122	11.65	0.73804918	90.04	08.60	2.91635641	0.16626118
Other party	04.00	41.88	99	09.46	0.42303030	41.88	04.00	1.65508052	0.09435597
Unkown	16.50	172.76	168	16.05	1.02830357	172.76	16.50	3.70605414	0.21128177

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT1
- POST_WEIGHT1 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 56.42%
Number of iterations performed: 3

Input count of respondents: 899
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 899.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.40	129.46	155	17.24	0.83519485	129.46	14.40	1.24562012	0.29303546
Male - 35 to 54	15.60	140.24	238	26.47	0.58923586	140.24	15.60	0.91180399	0.21450433
Male - 55 plus	19.20	172.61	71	07.90	2.43110893	172.61	19.20	3.62317876	0.85236249
Female - 18 to 34	20.80	186.99	149	16.57	1.25495741	186.99	20.80	2.03486992	0.47870859
Female - 35 to 54	14.40	129.46	238	26.47	0.54392747	129.45	14.40	0.82852245	0.19491212
Female - 55 plus	15.60	140.24	48	05.34	2.92196951	140.25	15.60	3.79258311	0.89221531

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	530.41	338	37.60	1.56926036	530.41	59.00	3.79258311	0.82852245
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	224.75	229	25.47	0.98144105	224.75	25.00	2.46497523	0.53849507
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	89.90	260	28.92	0.34576923	89.90	10.00	0.89221531	0.19491212
Advanced degree	06.00	53.94	72	08.01	0.74916667	53.94	06.00	2.13813727	0.48893385

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT2

- POST_WEIGHT2 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, post_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 45.10%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 899
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 899.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.40	129.46	155	17.24	0.83525815	129.47	14.40	3.15315705	0.22023595
Male - 35 to 54	15.60	140.24	238	26.47	0.58927877	140.25	15.60	2.53316215	0.17693168
Male - 55 plus	19.20	172.61	71	07.90	2.43080220	172.59	19.20	3.56988440	0.87263282
Female - 18 to 34	20.80	186.99	149	16.57	1.25503847	187.00	20.80	5.43136777	0.37936025
Female - 35 to 54	14.40	129.46	238	26.47	0.54393160	129.46	14.40	2.39479746	0.16726744
Female - 55 plus	15.60	140.24	48	05.34	2.92173395	140.24	15.60	10.27199257	0.71745937

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	530.41	338	37.60	1.56927066	530.41	59.00	10.27199257	0.68428026
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	224.75	229	25.47	0.98143760	224.75	25.00	6.91342503	0.46054553
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	89.90	260	28.92	0.34576422	89.90	10.00	2.51091545	0.16726744
Advanced degree	06.00	53.94	72	08.01	0.74914736	53.94	06.00	2.22504046	0.42649876

POST_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, voted	76.00	683.24	818	90.99	0.83525672	683.24	76.00	3.56988440	0.16726744
No, did not vote	24.00	215.76	81	09.01	2.66370370	215.76	24.00	10.27199257	0.58539119

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT3
- POST_WEIGHT3 –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1, post_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 43.76%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 899
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 899.00000000

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

Male - 18 to 34	14.40	129.46	155	17.24	0.83519798	129.46	14.40	3.27213703	0.00002417
Male - 35 to 54	15.60	140.24	238	26.47	0.58925930	140.24	15.60	2.52705335	0.00001867
Male - 55 plus	19.20	172.61	71	07.90	2.43110311	172.61	19.20	4.05056247	0.00008260
Female - 18 to 34	20.80	186.99	149	16.57	1.25497953	186.99	20.80	5.42651552	0.00004009
Female - 35 to 54	14.40	129.46	238	26.47	0.54393274	129.46	14.40	2.36826463	0.00001749
Female - 55 plus	15.60	140.24	48	05.34	2.92175703	140.24	15.60	9.52441615	0.42546381

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	530.41	338	37.60	1.56926052	530.41	59.00	9.52441615	0.00006788
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	224.75	229	25.47	0.98144151	224.75	25.00	6.47673091	0.00004616
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	89.90	260	28.92	0.34576871	89.90	10.00	2.45487241	0.00001749
Advanced degree	06.00	53.94	72	08.01	0.74916630	53.94	06.00	2.57936248	0.00004322

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	21.80	195.98	162	18.02	1.10109759	178.38	19.84	3.68971132	0.20143408
PP	42.40	381.18	324	36.04	1.07079215	346.94	38.59	4.05056247	0.22113419
IU	06.70	60.23	78	08.68	0.70285305	54.82	06.10	2.76786250	0.15110717
UPyD	08.60	77.31	121	13.46	0.58156387	70.37	07.83	2.74583570	0.14990465
Other party	04.00	35.96	74	08.23	0.44229559	32.73	03.64	1.65071486	0.10579240
Unkown	16.50	148.34	140	15.57	1.54117067	215.76	24.00	9.52441615	0.00001749

POST_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, voted	76.00	683.24	818	90.99	0.83525672	683.24	76.00	4.05056247	0.00001749
No, did not vote	24.00	215.76	81	09.01	2.66370370	215.76	24.00	9.52441615	0.61040881

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT3B
- POST_WEIGHT3B -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 43.98%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 899
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 899.00000000

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

Male - 18 to 34	14.40	129.46	155	17.24	0.83532383	129.48	14.40	3.10991879	0.12092711
Male - 35 to 54	15.60	140.24	238	26.47	0.58928539	140.25	15.60	2.41564303	0.09393066
Male - 55 plus	19.20	172.61	71	07.90	2.43056451	172.57	19.20	5.56590586	0.46054157
Female - 18 to 34	20.80	186.99	149	16.57	1.25505827	187.00	20.80	5.45485226	0.21210828
Female - 35 to 54	14.40	129.46	238	26.47	0.54393537	129.46	14.40	2.38437720	0.09271491
Female - 55 plus	15.60	140.24	48	05.34	2.92176051	140.24	15.60	10.30783838	0.40081340

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	530.41	338	37.60	1.56924185	530.40	59.00	10.30783838	0.37347938
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	224.75	229	25.47	0.98146169	224.75	25.00	7.14611814	0.25892216
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	89.90	260	28.92	0.34577742	89.90	10.00	2.55888381	0.09271491
Advanced degree	06.00	53.94	72	08.01	0.74915831	53.94	06.00	2.44795224	0.23921372

VOTE_COL2	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	18.00	161.82	162	18.02	0.99888889	161.82	18.00	3.45427402	0.17263169
PP	35.00	314.65	324	36.04	0.97114198	314.65	35.00	3.82193670	0.19100609
IU	05.60	50.34	78	08.68	0.64543590	50.34	05.60	2.63957348	0.13191600
UPyD	07.10	63.83	121	13.46	0.52751240	63.83	07.10	2.63093229	0.13148415
Other party	03.30	29.67	74	08.23	0.40090541	29.67	03.30	1.61457889	0.09271491
Non-voter	24.00	215.76	81	09.01	2.66370370	215.76	24.00	10.30783838	0.59191307
Unkown	07.00	62.93	59	06.56	1.06661017	62.93	07.00	5.56590586	0.27816314

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT4
- POST_WEIGHT4 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 54.42%
Number of iterations performed: 3

Input count of respondents: 899
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 899.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	14.40	129.46	155	17.24	0.83500447	129.43	14.40	1.45241514	0.16178355
Male - 35 to 54	15.60	140.24	238	26.47	0.58923645	140.24	15.60	1.02448979	0.11411723
Male - 55 plus	19.20	172.61	71	07.90	2.43165563	172.65	19.20	4.01397148	0.44711359
Female - 18 to 34	20.80	186.99	149	16.57	1.25500078	187.00	20.80	2.38930124	0.26614266

Female - 35 to 54	14.40	129.46	238	26.47	0.54393347	129.46	14.40	0.96902017	0.10793851
Female - 55 plus	15.60	140.24	48	05.34	2.92160830	140.24	15.60	4.32990389	0.48230509

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	530.41	338	37.60	1.56934142	530.44	59.00	4.32990389	0.44143882
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	224.75	229	25.47	0.98136772	224.73	25.00	2.91360933	0.29704592
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	89.90	260	28.92	0.34573436	89.89	10.00	1.05872737	0.10793851
Advanced degree	06.00	53.94	72	08.01	0.74914525	53.94	06.00	2.40487595	0.27030043

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	21.80	195.98	162	18.02	1.20976543	195.98	21.80	3.88531263	0.21261133
PP	42.40	381.18	324	36.04	1.17646914	381.18	42.40	4.23662905	0.23183600
IU	06.70	60.23	78	08.68	0.77221795	60.23	06.70	2.83899468	0.15535492
UPyD	08.60	77.31	121	13.46	0.63895868	77.31	08.60	2.80771120	0.15364303
Other party	04.00	35.96	74	08.23	0.48594595	35.96	04.00	1.97249524	0.10793851
Unkown	16.50	148.34	140	15.57	1.05953571	148.34	16.50	4.32990389	0.23694017

Catalonia

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT1
- PRE_WEIGHT1 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 77.48%
Number of iterations performed: 3

Input count of respondents: 1014
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1014.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	13.70	138.92	202	19.92	0.68765527	138.91	13.70	0.91407959	0.38684800
Male - 35 to 54	18.00	182.52	212	20.91	0.86098430	182.53	18.00	1.03335640	0.43732719
Male - 55 plus	17.20	174.41	125	12.33	1.39524669	174.41	17.20	1.79771610	0.76081217
Female - 18 to 34	14.30	145.00	205	20.22	0.70723789	144.98	14.30	0.94702581	0.40079118
Female - 35 to 54	19.00	192.66	195	19.23	0.98803308	192.67	19.00	1.21214652	0.51299303
Female - 55 plus	17.80	180.49	75	07.40	2.40678548	180.51	17.80	2.83143573	1.19829307

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	598.26	457	45.07	1.30910284	598.26	59.00	2.83143573	0.91407959
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	253.50	284	28.01	0.89260563	253.50	25.00	2.05782369	0.66433245
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	101.40	197	19.43	0.51472081	101.40	10.00	1.19829307	0.38684800
Advanced degree	06.00	60.84	76	07.50	0.80052632	60.84	06.00	2.03527293	0.65705233

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT2
- PRE_WEIGHT2 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, pre_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 55.83%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 1014
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1014.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	13.70	138.92	202	19.92	0.68772903	138.92	13.70	2.33407941	0.28688043
Male - 35 to 54	18.00	182.52	212	20.91	0.86093017	182.52	18.00	3.08273010	0.37889668

Male - 55 plus	17.20	174.41	125	12.33	1.39525225	174.41	17.20	5.22427763	0.64211312
Female - 18 to 34	14.30	145.00	205	20.22	0.70736439	145.01	14.30	2.42743564	0.29835480
Female - 35 to 54	19.00	192.66	195	19.23	0.98799285	192.66	19.00	3.24548667	0.39890100
Female - 55 plus	17.80	180.49	75	07.40	2.40648935	180.49	17.80	8.71600516	1.07127945

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	598.26	457	45.07	1.30910186	598.26	59.00	8.71600516	0.62738326
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	253.50	284	28.01	0.89261329	253.50	25.00	5.94979350	0.42826969
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	101.40	197	19.43	0.51471693	101.40	10.00	3.98552447	0.28688043
Advanced degree	06.00	60.84	76	07.50	0.80051369	60.84	06.00	2.03848755	0.52685762

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	66.80	677.35	887	87.48	0.76364374	677.35	66.80	2.34279762	0.28688043
No, will not vote	33.20	336.65	127	12.52	2.65077165	336.65	33.20	8.71600516	1.06729292

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3
- PRE_WEIGHT3 –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1, pre_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 53.10%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1014
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1014.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	13.70	138.92	202	19.92	0.68771288	138.92	13.70	2.34265421	0.00000008
Male - 35 to 54	18.00	182.52	212	20.91	0.86094339	182.52	18.00	3.05240574	0.00000011
Male - 55 plus	17.20	174.41	125	12.33	1.39526400	174.41	17.20	5.13671050	0.00000027
Female - 18 to 34	14.30	145.00	205	20.22	0.70732683	145.00	14.30	2.34971394	0.00000008
Female - 35 to 54	19.00	192.66	195	19.23	0.98799999	192.66	19.00	3.23484715	0.00000011
Female - 55 plus	17.80	180.49	75	07.40	2.40656003	180.49	17.80	8.40363316	0.00000030

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	598.26	457	45.07	1.30910284	598.26	59.00	8.40363316	0.00000018

College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	253.50	284	28.01	0.89260563	253.50	25.00	5.94211146	0.00000012
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	101.40	197	19.43	0.51472081	101.40	10.00	3.92799814	0.00000008
Advanced degree	06.00	60.84	76	07.50	0.80052632	60.84	06.00	2.92016062	0.00000016

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	21.70	220.04	160	15.78	1.12718851	180.35	17.79	3.29746532	0.42966060
PP	16.90	171.37	122	12.03	1.15128720	140.46	13.85	3.38622812	0.44122641
ICV/IU	06.60	66.92	90	08.88	0.60947827	54.85	05.41	2.15563009	0.28087917
CiU	23.90	242.35	234	23.08	0.84886542	198.63	19.59	2.21742722	0.28893135
ERC	05.80	58.81	93	09.17	0.51832463	48.20	04.75	1.57602010	0.20535583
Other	06.60	66.92	129	12.72	0.42521740	54.85	05.41	1.43483851	0.18695983
Unkown	18.50	187.59	186	18.34	1.80993555	336.65	33.20	8.40363316	0.00000008

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	66.80	677.35	887	87.48	0.76364374	677.35	66.80	3.38622812	0.00000008
No, will not vote	33.20	336.65	127	12.52	2.65077165	336.65	33.20	8.40363316	1.09499560

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3B
- PRE_WEIGHT3B –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 42.85%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 1014
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1014.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	13.70	138.92	202	19.92	0.68776432	138.93	13.70	2.58004669	0.14412182
Male - 35 to 54	18.00	182.52	212	20.91	0.86090882	182.51	18.00	3.52647781	0.16288566
Male - 55 plus	17.20	174.41	125	12.33	1.39519835	174.40	17.20	5.95900011	0.27524225
Female - 18 to 34	14.30	145.00	205	20.22	0.70741817	145.02	14.30	2.81810941	0.13016660
Female - 35 to 54	19.00	192.66	195	19.23	0.98800577	192.66	19.00	3.43417264	0.15862215
Female - 55 plus	17.80	180.49	75	07.40	2.40636389	180.48	17.80	11.71790662	0.54124230

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

Some college or less	59.00	598.26	457	45.07	1.30909444	598.26	59.00	11.71790662	0.28157049
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	253.50	284	28.01	0.89262538	253.51	25.00	6.92850407	0.20134324
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	101.40	197	19.43	0.51471823	101.40	10.00	5.41704503	0.13016660
Advanced degree	06.00	60.84	76	07.50	0.80050974	60.84	06.00	3.16648753	0.25962278

VOTE_COL2	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	12.90	130.81	160	15.78	0.81753750	130.81	12.90	2.74074247	0.30471123
PP	10.00	101.40	122	12.03	0.83114754	101.40	10.00	2.84795044	0.31663043
ICV/IU	03.90	39.55	90	08.88	0.43940000	39.55	03.90	1.76007765	0.19568253
CiU	14.20	143.99	234	23.08	0.61533333	143.99	14.20	1.82057751	0.20240881
ERC	03.40	34.48	93	09.17	0.37070968	34.48	03.40	1.28052222	0.14236635
Other	03.90	39.55	129	12.72	0.30655814	39.55	03.90	1.17079084	0.13016660
Non-voter	33.20	336.65	127	12.52	2.65077165	336.65	33.20	9.68923649	1.07723334
Unkown	18.50	187.59	59	05.82	3.17949153	187.59	18.50	11.71790662	1.30277754

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT4
- PRE_WEIGHT4 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 72.58%
Number of iterations performed: 3

Input count of respondents: 1014
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1014.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	13.70	138.92	202	19.92	0.68783620	138.94	13.70	1.32572645	0.23940867
Male - 35 to 54	18.00	182.52	212	20.91	0.86081331	182.49	18.00	1.40415497	0.25357182
Male - 55 plus	17.20	174.41	125	12.33	1.39546921	174.43	17.20	2.41714911	0.43650517
Female - 18 to 34	14.30	145.00	205	20.22	0.70757550	145.05	14.31	1.26017117	0.22757025
Female - 35 to 54	19.00	192.66	195	19.23	0.98787636	192.64	19.00	1.61143144	0.29100321
Female - 55 plus	17.80	180.49	75	07.40	2.40589530	180.44	17.80	3.92363023	0.70855574

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	598.26	457	45.07	1.30912953	598.27	59.00	3.92363023	0.52023366
College graduate with a 2 year	25.00	253.50	284	28.01	0.89259080	253.50	25.00	3.01074918	0.39919487

degree									
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	101.40	197	19.43	0.51470409	101.40	10.00	1.66053899	0.22757025
Advanced degree	06.00	60.84	76	07.50	0.80046464	60.84	06.00	2.95090135	0.40440927

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	21.70	220.04	160	15.78	1.37523750	220.04	21.70	3.79605094	0.53332328
PP	16.90	171.37	122	12.03	1.40463934	171.37	16.90	3.92363023	0.55124744
ICV/IU	06.60	66.92	90	08.88	0.74360000	66.92	06.60	2.44470164	0.34346649
CiU	23.90	242.35	234	23.08	1.03566667	242.35	23.90	2.59479099	0.36455318
ERC	05.80	58.81	93	09.17	0.63238710	58.81	05.80	1.80314766	0.25333186
Other	06.60	66.92	129	12.72	0.51879070	66.92	06.60	1.61978352	0.22757025
Unkown	18.50	187.59	186	18.34	1.00854839	187.59	18.50	2.93065591	0.41174027

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT1
- POST_WEIGHT1 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 78.15%
Number of iterations performed: 3

Input count of respondents: 886
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 886.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	13.70	121.38	175	19.75	0.69353992	121.37	13.70	0.91604133	0.39307338
Male - 35 to 54	18.00	159.48	192	21.67	0.83068218	159.49	18.00	0.98903271	0.42439398
Male - 55 plus	17.20	152.39	103	11.63	1.47952561	152.39	17.20	1.87216313	0.80334529
Female - 18 to 34	14.30	126.70	173	19.53	0.73223463	126.68	14.30	0.98615660	0.42315984
Female - 35 to 54	19.00	168.34	175	19.75	0.96197763	168.35	19.00	1.17530835	0.50432487
Female - 55 plus	17.80	157.71	68	07.67	2.31949591	157.73	17.80	2.71385016	1.16451323

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	522.74	403	45.49	1.29712159	522.74	59.00	2.71385016	0.91604133
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	221.50	245	27.65	0.90408163	221.50	25.00	2.00994236	0.67844213
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	88.60	171	19.30	0.51812865	88.60	10.00	1.16451323	0.39307338
Advanced degree	06.00	53.16	67	07.56	0.79343284	53.16	06.00	1.90908421	0.64439816

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT2
- POST_WEIGHT2 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, post_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 58.29%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 886
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 886.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	13.70	121.38	175	19.75	0.69366840	121.39	13.70	2.03655303	0.26256775
Male - 35 to 54	18.00	159.48	192	21.67	0.83059085	159.47	18.00	2.36558111	0.30498852
Male - 55 plus	17.20	152.39	103	11.63	1.47950466	152.39	17.20	5.30013625	0.68333346
Female - 18 to 34	14.30	126.70	173	19.53	0.73245591	126.71	14.30	2.37804961	0.30659606
Female - 35 to 54	19.00	168.34	175	19.75	0.96192934	168.34	19.00	2.86442353	0.36930304
Female - 55 plus	17.80	157.71	68	07.67	2.31901618	157.69	17.80	7.26481858	0.93663510

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	522.74	403	45.49	1.29713105	522.74	59.00	7.26481858	0.59902899
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	221.50	245	27.65	0.90406954	221.50	25.00	4.33895860	0.49039532
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	88.60	171	19.30	0.51813117	88.60	10.00	3.18433176	0.26256775
Advanced degree	06.00	53.16	67	07.56	0.79341373	53.16	06.00	1.96269931	0.49440255

POST_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, voted	66.80	591.85	762	86.00	0.77670341	591.85	66.80	2.13686406	0.26256775
No, did not vote	33.20	294.15	124	14.00	2.37219355	294.15	33.20	7.26481858	0.89266654

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT3
- POST_WEIGHT3 –

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1, post_int

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 54.91%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 886
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 886.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	13.70	121.38	175	19.75	0.69361144	121.38	13.70	2.05431751	0.00000008
Male - 35 to 54	18.00	159.48	192	21.67	0.83062499	159.48	18.00	2.33270836	0.00000009
Male - 55 plus	17.20	152.39	103	11.63	1.47953400	152.39	17.20	4.97741495	0.00000018
Female - 18 to 34	14.30	126.70	173	19.53	0.73235839	126.70	14.30	2.31839802	0.00000009
Female - 35 to 54	19.00	168.34	175	19.75	0.96194285	168.34	19.00	2.81348431	0.00000010
Female - 55 plus	17.80	157.71	68	07.67	2.31923526	157.71	17.80	7.31897821	0.00000027

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	522.74	403	45.49	1.29712159	522.74	59.00	7.31897821	0.00000019
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	221.50	245	27.65	0.90408163	221.50	25.00	4.16335903	0.00000014
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	88.60	171	19.30	0.51812865	88.60	10.00	3.33034026	0.00000008
Advanced degree	06.00	53.16	67	07.56	0.79343282	53.16	06.00	2.20193488	0.00000018

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	21.70	192.26	145	16.37	1.08678666	157.58	17.79	2.87431520	0.36710446
PP	16.90	149.73	98	11.06	1.25231389	122.73	13.85	3.58731748	0.45816834
ICV/IU	06.60	58.48	83	09.37	0.57745535	47.93	05.41	1.81516357	0.23183075
CiU	23.90	211.75	197	22.23	0.88101691	173.56	19.59	2.23043738	0.28486907
ERC	05.80	51.39	78	08.80	0.53999030	42.12	04.75	1.51082663	0.19296116
Other	06.60	58.48	113	12.75	0.42414862	47.93	05.41	1.29575924	0.16549298
Unkown	18.50	163.91	172	19.41	1.71018610	294.15	33.20	7.31897821	0.00000008

POST_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, voted	66.80	591.85	762	86.00	0.77670341	591.85	66.80	3.58731748	0.00000008
No, did not vote	33.20	294.15	124	14.00	2.37219355	294.15	33.20	7.31897821	0.93477205

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT3B
- POST_WEIGHT3B -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 43.20%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 886
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 886.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	13.70	121.38	175	19.75	0.69341128	121.35	13.70	2.69235497	0.11389117
Male - 35 to 54	18.00	159.48	192	21.67	0.83082132	159.52	18.00	3.36412346	0.10588595
Male - 55 plus	17.20	152.39	103	11.63	1.47924045	152.36	17.20	6.89848222	0.29181747
Female - 18 to 34	14.30	126.70	173	19.53	0.73217741	126.67	14.30	3.89656177	0.12264447
Female - 35 to 54	19.00	168.34	175	19.75	0.96206038	168.36	19.00	3.99349484	0.12569544
Female - 55 plus	17.80	157.71	68	07.67	2.31979867	157.75	17.80	9.97450067	0.43751105

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	522.74	403	45.49	1.29704980	522.71	59.00	9.97450067	0.29105716
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	221.50	245	27.65	0.90412845	221.51	25.00	7.42163889	0.21656434
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	88.60	171	19.30	0.51818140	88.61	10.00	3.62870113	0.10588595
Advanced degree	06.00	53.16	67	07.56	0.79355879	53.17	06.00	7.01582414	0.20472261

VOTE_COL2	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	12.90	114.29	145	16.37	0.78823448	114.29	12.90	1.92086062	0.23568755
PP	10.00	88.60	98	11.06	0.90408163	88.60	10.00	2.41164979	0.31827811
ICV/IU	03.90	34.55	83	09.37	0.41631325	34.55	03.90	1.20262158	0.14756039
CiU	14.20	125.81	197	22.23	0.63863959	125.81	14.20	1.50796496	0.18502570
ERC	03.40	30.12	78	08.80	0.38620513	30.12	03.40	0.98745481	0.12115966
Other	03.90	34.55	113	12.75	0.30578761	34.55	03.90	0.86297363	0.10588595
Non-voter	33.20	294.15	124	14.00	2.37219355	294.15	33.20	6.77306204	0.83104751
Unkown	18.50	163.91	48	05.42	3.41479167	163.91	18.50	9.97450067	1.22386062

WEIGHTING REPORT - PSTWGT4
- POST_WEIGHT4 -

RIM weighting: age_gend, educ, vote_col1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 72.77%
Number of iterations performed: 3

Input count of respondents: 886
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 886.00000000

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

Male - 18 to 34	13.70	121.38	175	19.75	0.69355709	121.37	13.70	1.52266705	0.22986093
Male - 35 to 54	18.00	159.48	192	21.67	0.83061153	159.48	18.00	1.49919944	0.22631827
Male - 55 plus	17.20	152.39	103	11.63	1.47957906	152.40	17.20	2.84586698	0.42961042
Female - 18 to 34	14.30	126.70	173	19.53	0.73237158	126.70	14.30	1.54712713	0.23355341
Female - 35 to 54	19.00	168.34	175	19.75	0.96194744	168.34	19.00	1.75559772	0.26502401
Female - 55 plus	17.80	157.71	68	07.67	2.31929952	157.71	17.80	4.13706773	0.87192835

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Some college or less	59.00	522.74	403	45.49	1.29712710	522.74	59.00	4.13706773	0.53229831
College graduate with a 2 year degree	25.00	221.50	245	27.65	0.90408295	221.50	25.00	3.07000556	0.39500412
College/University graduate with a 4 year degree	10.00	88.60	171	19.30	0.51812879	88.60	10.00	1.42814243	0.22631827
Advanced degree	06.00	53.16	67	07.56	0.79339450	53.16	06.00	2.03230449	0.40227238

VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
PSOE	21.70	192.26	145	16.37	1.32594483	192.26	21.70	3.35897669	0.51753330
PP	16.90	149.73	98	11.06	1.52789796	149.73	16.90	4.13706773	0.64739521
ICV/IU	06.60	58.48	83	09.37	0.70453012	58.48	06.60	2.05076674	0.31597126
CiU	23.90	211.75	197	22.23	1.07489340	211.75	23.90	2.65288633	0.40874265
ERC	05.80	51.39	78	08.80	0.65882051	51.39	05.80	1.77470018	0.27343639
Other	06.60	58.48	113	12.75	0.51748673	58.48	06.60	1.46888674	0.22631827
Unkown	18.50	163.91	172	19.41	0.95296512	163.91	18.50	2.68920338	0.41433819