harrisdecima
A HARRIS INTERACTIVE COMPANY

Technical Report (revised)

Making Electoral Democracy Work

France National Elections –

Île-de-France and Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur

November 30, 2012

Proprietary Warning

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

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

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

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

Table of Contents

Introduction 3

About Making Electoral Democracy Work 3

France National Elections Surveys 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 7

Supplier Panel Information *7*

Sampling and Quota Control *8*

Invites and Reminders *9*

Incentives *12*

Passwords *12*

Sample Distribution and Response Rate 12

In-Survey Quality Assurance (ISQ) 15

Data Analysis 16

Data Validity and Integrity Checks *16*

Data Cleaning *16*

Additional Variables Created *17*

Weighting *19*

Appendix A: Pre-election Surveys Quota Completions by Date 23

Appendix B: Supplier Panel Information 25

Appendix C: Invitation E-mail and Information and Consent Screen 39

Appendix D: Weighting Reports 44

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.

France National Elections Surveys – Île-de-France and Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur

The MEDW Team sought the services of a public opinion research firm to collect online data from residents in Île-de-France and Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, France through surveys related to the National elections held on June 10 and 17, 2012. This study included a pre- and post election survey implemented through a return to sample methodology.

Harris/Decima completed 1007 and 1014 pre-election surveys and 792 and 754 post-election surveys online in Île-de-France and Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, 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
Île-de-France		
Pre-election survey	May 31 – June 9, 2012	1,007
Post-election survey	June 18 – July 3[1], 2012	792[2]
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur		
Pre-election survey	May 31 – June 9, 2012	1,014
Post-election survey	June 18 – July 3[1], 2012	754[2]

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 Assurance*.

[1] The survey was closed first thing on the morning of July 3rd.

[2] Those who were in ridings where one candidate was elected on the first round and had no elections the second round were removed for weighting purposes, but included in the total counts for the number of completed surveys.

Survey Methodology

Pre-launch

Questionnaire Design – CAWI

The MEDW team was responsible for providing the French version 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 French only and the survey instrument was 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 quota control. It also features adaptive questionnaire logic designed to provide many of the same methodological safeguards associated with traditional CATI telephone interviewing (i.e., randomized ordering of variables being tested in a battery, skip patterns based on responses given). The package allows the project manager to track non-responses to survey requests and provides estimates of non-response bias.

Survey Pre-Tests

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

Sample Design and Selection

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

Based on census statistics[3], the following demographic quotas were set for the pre-election surveys:

Île-de-France:

	Gender					
	Total – %	**Total – Quota**	**Male – % of population**	**Male – Quota**	**Female – % of Population**	**Female – Quota**
Total	100%	1000	48%	475	52%	525
Age						
18 - 34 years	32%	321	16%	157	16%	164
35 - 54 years	37%	368	18%	180	19%	188
55 - 99 years	31%	311	14%	138	17%	173

		% of Population	Quota
Education[4]	D'aucun diplôme	18%	179
	Du certificat d'études primaires	7%	73
	Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6%	61
	D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17%	172
	D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16%	164
	D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	13%	127
	D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22%	224

[3] Source: France's National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE)
IDF: http://www.insee.fr/fr/themes/tableau.asp?reg_id=20&ref_id=poptc02104
PACA: http://www.insee.fr/fr/themes/tableau.asp?reg_id=5&ref_id=poptc02104
[4] Education quotas were set as "soft quotas" and not nested with age and/or gender.

Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur[5]:

	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	25%	250	12%	122	13%	128
35 - 54 years	35%	349	17%	165	18%	184
55 - 99 years	40%	401	19%	193	21%	208

		% of Population	Quota
Education[4]	D'aucun diplôme	20%	197
	Du certificat d'études primaires	10%	101
	Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	8%	75
	D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	22%	219
	D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	17%	168
	D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11%	114
	D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	13%	126

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 France National election surveys contacted panel members from GMI and Harris/Decima's HPOL for the study in Île-de-France. For the study in Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, three suppliers were used in order to achieve the quotas: HPOL, GMI, and Toluna.

Supplier Panel Information

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

[5] The quotas shown are based on having to oversample males aged 55+ due to a lack of women aged 55+in panels from multiple suppliers.

region of Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur. For detailed descriptions of GMI's and Toluna'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.

For the Île-de-France study, sample was pulled:
By GMI on the following dates:

- 05/31/2012
- 06/01/2012

By HPOL on the following dates:

- 6/8/2012

For the Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur study, sample was pulled:
By GMI on the following dates:

- 05/31/2012
- 06/01/2012

By HPOL on the following dates:

- 5/31/2012
- 6/5/2012
- 6/8/2012

By Toluna on the following dates:

- 5/31/2012
- 6/1/2012
- 6/2/2012
- 6/3/2012
- 6/4/2012
- 6/5/2102
- 6/7/2012

Sample was pulled based on the following criteria:

- Age greater than 18
- Language set to French
- Area set to Île-de-France / Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur
- Education levels
- Gender
- French 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 directed 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 "next" on the survey they consented to participation.

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

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

Invites and reminders were sent as follows:

	Date	# Invites	# Reminders
Île-de-France			
Pre-election survey	May 31, 2012	4,241	
	June 1, 2012	9,672	
	June 2, 2012		8,797
	June 3, 2012		6,338
	June 4, 2012		1,412
	June 8, 2012	222	
Total		**14,135**	**16,547**
Post-election survey	June 18, 2012	988	
	June 20, 2012		4
	June 21, 2012		261
	June 25, 2012		73
	June 27, 2012		66
Total		**988**	**404**
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur			
Pre-election survey	May 31, 2012	5,017	
	June 1, 2012	3,972	
	June 2, 2012	1,000	5,963
	June 3, 2012	863	5,099
	June 4, 2012	1,000	1,412
	June 5, 2012	2,004	
	June 6, 2012		679
	June 7, 2012	178	1,162
	June 8, 2012	87	
Total		**14,121**	**14,315**

Post-election survey	June 18, 2012	798	
	June 20, 2012		69
	June 21, 2012	51	153
	June 25, 2012		81
	June 27, 2012	47	60
Total		**896**	**363**

GMI			
	Date	**# Invites**	**# Reminders**
Île-de-France			
Pre-election survey	May 31, 2012	4,241	
	June 1, 2012	9,672	
	June 2, 2012		8,797
	June 3, 2012		6,338
	June 4, 2012		1,412
Total		**13,913**	**16,547**
Post-election survey	June 18, 2012	982	
	June 21, 2012		261
	June 25, 2012		70
	June 27, 2012		66
Total		**982**	**397**
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur			
Pre-election survey	May 31, 2012	3,801	
	June 1, 2012	1,929	
	June 2, 2012		5,389
	June 3, 2012		5,099
	June 4, 2012		1,412
	June 6, 2012		635
	June 7, 2012		610
Total		**5,730**	**13,145**
Post-election survey	June 18, 2012	574	
	June 21, 2012		153
	June 25, 2012		35
	June 27, 2012		27
Total		**574**	**215**

HPOL			
	Date	# Invites	# Reminders
Île-de-France			
	June 8, 2012	222	
Total		**222**	**0**
Post-election survey	June 18, 2012	6	
	June 20, 2012		4
	June 25, 2012		3
Total		**6**	**7**
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur			
Pre-election survey	May 31, 2012	216	
	June 2, 2012		153
	June 5, 2012	647	
	June 7, 2012		552
	June 8, 2012	87	
Total		**950**	**705**
Post-election survey	June 18, 2012	188	
	June 20, 2012		69
	June 25, 2012		46
Total		**188**	**115**

Toluna			
	Date	# Invites	# Reminders
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur			
Pre-election survey	May 31, 2012	1,000	
	June 1, 2012	2,043	
	June 2, 2012	1,000	421
	June 3, 2012	863	
	June 4, 2012	1,000	
	June 5, 2012	1,357	
	June 6, 2012		44
	June 7, 2012	178	
Total		**7,441**	**465**
Post-election survey	June 18, 2012	36	
	June 21, 2012	51	
	June 27, 2012	47	33
Total		**134**	**33**

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 50 MarketPoints for completing the post-election survey.

Toluna:

Respondents from Toluna's panel were given 2000 points as an incentive for completing the pre-election survey, and another 1600 points for completing the post-election survey.

HPOL:

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

Passwords

Each respondent had a unique password which 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 for Île-de-France:

	Pre	Post
A: Total Invitations	14,135	1,007
B: Undeliverables	0	0
C: Net Usable invitations (A-B)	14,135	1,007
D: Total Completes	1,007	796
E: Qualified break offs	67	64
F: Disqualified (Disqualified and ISQ fails)	16	0
G: Not responded	12,715	147
H: Quota filled	332	0
Contact Rate (d+e+f+h)/c	10.06%	85.40%
Participation Rate (d+f+h)/c	9.59%	79.05%

and Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur:

	Pre	Post
A: Total Invitations	14,121	1,012
B: Undeliverables	0	0
C: Net Usable invitations (A-B)	14,121	1,012
D: Total Completes	1,012	757
E: Qualified break offs	84	82
F: Disqualified (Disqualified and ISQ fails)	278	0
G: Not responded	12,311	173
H: Quota filled	436	0
Contact Rate (d+e+f+h)/c	12.82%	82.91%
Participation Rate (d+f+h)/c	12.22%	74.80%

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:

- Île-de-France pre-election survey: 20 minutes
- Île-de-France post-election survey: 11 minutes
- Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur pre-election survey: 20 minutes
- Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur post-election survey: 12 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
Île-de-France		
Pre-election survey	May 31, 2012	171
	June 1, 2012	591
	June 2, 2012	165
	June 3, 2012	13
	June 4, 2012	5
	June 5, 2012	7
	June 6, 2012	7
	June 7, 2012	26
	June 8, 2012	9
	June 9, 2012	13

Post-election survey	June 18, 2012	487
	June 19, 2012	159
	June 20, 2012	31
	June 21, 2012	48
	June 22, 2012	18
	June 23, 2012	10
	June 24, 2012	4
	June 25, 2012	8
	June 26, 2012	7
	June 27, 2012	1
	June 28, 2012	2
	June 29, 2012	1
	June 30, 2012	1
	July 1, 2012	9
	July 2, 2012	5
	July 3, 2012[6]	1
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur		
Pre-election survey	May 31, 2012	209
	June 1, 2012	404
	June 2, 2012	156
	June 3, 2012	71
	June 4, 2012	23
	June 5, 2012	4
	June 6, 2012	106
	June 7, 2012	24
	June 8, 2012	15
	June 9, 2012	2
Post-election survey	June 18, 2012	354
	June 19, 2012	262
	June 20, 2012	29
	June 21, 2012	45
	June 22, 2012	23
	June 23, 2012	4
	June 24, 2012	2
	June 25, 2012	7
	June 26, 2012	9
	June 27, 2012	6
	June 28, 2012	5

[6] Since the survey was closed first thing on the morning of July 3rd, there was 1 additional complete on July 3rd.

	June 30, 2012	1
	July 1, 2012	3
	July 2, 2012	3
	July 3, 2012[6]	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 using three French panel sources (Harris/Decima, GMI, and Toluna), which have all been proven to be a very high-quality panel, we relied on our In-Survey Quality Assurance measures to ensure an extra "check" for bad respondents.

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

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

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

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

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

- Respondents giving the same answer for all questions in the Q28 (pre-election) and PQ26 (post-election) batteries were flagged as “straightliners.”

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

Data Analysis

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

Data Validity and Integrity Checks

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

Data Cleaning

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

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

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

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

Additional Variables Created

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

Time Stamps (Variables T_INT to T_PQ1_END2): The way that timing variables work in this study is that they each capture how long the survey has taken (in seconds) at the point the respondent crosses the variable. To analyze how long someone has taken between two timestamps, subtract the first time stamp variable from the second and this will represent how long it took the respondent to get from the first variable to the second. In order to convert to minutes, divide the outcome by 60.

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

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

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

Last question answered (last_q): 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 identifies those respondents are bolded in the table below.

Variable	Segment	Pre or post survey
pre_grid	Straight line grid isq fail.	Pre
pre_resp	Respondent instruction isq fail	Pre
pre_time	Minimum length of survey isq fail	Pre
pre_fail	**Failed two or more isq measures**	**Pre**
post_grid	Straight line grid isq fail.	Post
post_resp	Respondent instruction isq fail	Post
post_time	Minimum length of survey isq fail	Post
post_fail	**Failed two or more isq measures**	**Post**

Electoral Constituency (elec_con): In the final data set, Harris/Decima appended all the electoral constituency information, based on postal codes provided by the respondents (variable SD4A) and information provided by MEDW.

Q1 and PQ1 combined variables (Q1A, Q1B, Q1C, Q1D, and PQ1A, PQ1B, PQ1C, PQ1D): The Q1 and PQ1 batteries were split sample questions, meaning that half the sample received those questions at the beginning of the surveys and the other half at the end. These variables combine the answers from those two split samples for a base_all variable for each question in the battery.

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

Collapsed Education variable (QT3): This variable collapses the respondents' education level into seven categories based on the census (for details, please see section on quotas), and was 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 Q8a and Q8b ONLY IF respondents are coded as voters in the likelihood to vote variable. This variable had to be created to combine respondents' vote intention because the questionnaire had vote intent in Q8a and Q8b[7]. This variable was used for weighting purposes.

Pre_vote_col_1: Created from Pre_Vote. This variable is created to narrow the list of parties down to the top 5 vote getters from the actual election results. Respondents who intended to vote for a party other than the top 5 were recoded into "other" and those

[7] This was different from previous MEDW studies, because Q6a was not asking about whether they had already voted in the current election like past surveys did. In this survey, Q6a asked about a previous presidential election. Therefore, vote intention could only be based on Q8a/Q8b for the France survey.

classified as “non-voter” or “don’t know” were recoded into “don’t know”. This variable was used for weighting purposes.

Pre_vote_col_2: Created from Pre_Vote. This variable is identical to Pre_vote_col_1, except that it keeps the choice of “non voter” separate from “don’t know”. This variable was used for weighting purposes.

Collapsed vote variable (Post_vote): Created from PQ4_1, used to create weights[8].

Post_vote_col_1: Created from Post_Vote. This variable is created to narrow the list of parties down to the top 5 vote getters from the actual election results. Respondents who voted for a party other than the top 5 were recoded into “other” and those classified as “non-voter” or “don’t know” were recoded into “don’t know”. This variable was used for weighting purposes.

Post_vote_col_2: Created from Post_Vote. This variable is identical to Post_vote_col_1, except that it keeps the choice of “non voter” separate from “don’t know”. This variable was used for weighting purposes.

Likelihood to vote (Pre_int): Created from Q7 variable in order to identify who is likely to vote. If Q7 = 1, 2, or 3, it is coded “yes”. All other responses to Q7 were coded “no”.

Likelihood of having voted (Post_int): Created from PQ4_1 in order to identify who is likely to have voted in the 2nd round of the election. If PQ4_1 = 1, it is coded “yes”. All other responses to PQ4_1 were coded “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

[8] Due to the nature of the France election, this is different from past MEDW studies, where who respondents voted for in the 2nd round mattered, which came from PQ4_1.

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

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

The data used for the demographic weights were taken from the same sources as used for the quotas. The 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.

For more details, please see *Weighting Reports* in Appendix C.

The datafile includes the following weights for Île-de-France:

Name	Factors	Use for Pre/Post	# iterations – Île-de-France	# iterations – Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	Cap - low	Cap - high
PRE_WEIGHT1	AGE_GEND, EDUC	Pre	4	5	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT2	AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_INT (Likelihood to vote)	Pre	7	6	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT3	AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_VOTE_COL1 (Actual election results), PRE_INT (Likelihood to vote)	Pre	20	20	0.2	5

Name	Factors	Use for Pre/Post	# iterations – Île-de-France	# iterations – Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	Cap - low	Cap - high
PRE_WEIGHT3B[9]	AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_VOTE_COL2 (Actual election results)	Pre	7	7	0.2	5
PRE_WEIGHT4[10]	AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_VOTE_COL1 (Actual election results)	Pre	7	7	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT1	AGE_GEND, EDUC	Post	4	9	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT2	AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_INT (Likelihood to vote)	Post	5	10	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT3	AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_VOTE_COL1 (Actual election results),	Post	20	20	0.2	5

[9] 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.

[10] 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 – Île-de-France	# iterations – Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	Cap - low	Cap - high
	POST_INT (Likelihood to vote)					
POST_WEIGHT3B[9]	AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_VOTE_COL2 (Actual election results)	Post	6	11	0.2	5
POST_WEIGHT4[10]	AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_VOTE_COL1 (Actual election results)	Post	6	10	0.2	5

Please note, if a respondent was identified as an ISQ fail, failing 2 or more checks, the values of the variables that were used for weighting were set to 'sysmis'. This is required since these variables were used for weighting and ISQ failed respondents are not included in the weighting.

Appendix A: Pre-election Surveys Quota Completions by Date

Île-de-France:

		D'aucun diploma/ certificat d'études primaries	Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	D'un diplôme de niveau bac +2/ niveau supérieur à bac + 2
Education	Thursday, March 31, 2012	4	6	31	49	81
	Friday, June 1, 2012	14	19	91	177	292
	Saturday, June 2, 2012	5	16	33	68	43
	Sunday, June 3, 2012	1	0	2	5	5
	Monday, June 4, 2012	0	0	1	4	0
	Tuesday, June 5, 2012	1	2	4	0	0
	Wednesday, June 6, 2012	0	0	0	1	6
	Thursday, June 7, 2012	0	0	0	1	25
	Friday June 8, 2012	0	0	0	0	9
	Saturday June 9, 2012	0	0	1	0	12
	Total	**23**	**43**	**163**	**305**	**473**
		18-34	**35-54**	**55+**		
Age	Thursday, Mar 31, 2012	55	62	54		
	Friday, June 1, 2012	162	261	168		
	Saturday, June 2, 2012	44	55	66		
	Sunday, June 3, 2012	12	1	0		
	Monday, June 4, 2012	4	0	1		
	Tuesday, June 5, 2012	2	0	5		
	Wednesday, June 6, 2012	1	0	6		
	Thursday, June 7, 2012	14	0	12		
	Friday June 8, 2012	9	0	0		
	Saturday June 9, 2012	11	0	2		
	Total	**314**	**379**	**314**		
		Male	**Female**			
Gender	Thursday, Mar 31, 2012	91	80			
	Friday, June 1, 2012	235	356			
	Saturday, June 2, 2012	92	73			
	Sunday, June 3, 2012	12	1			
	Monday, June 4, 2012	4	1			
	Tuesday, June 5, 2012	2	5			
	Wednesday, June 6, 2012	1	6			
	Thursday, June 7, 2012	14	12			
	Friday June 8, 2012	9	0			
	Saturday June 9, 2012	11	2			
	Total	**471**	**536**			

Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur:

		D'aucun diploma/ certificat d'études primaries	Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	D'un diplôme de niveau bac +2/ niveau supérieur à bac + 2
Education	Thursday, Mar 31, 2012	8	11	43	49	102
	Friday, June 1, 2012	9	8	69	120	195
	Saturday, June 2, 2012	2	3	30	37	84
	Sunday, June 3, 2012	3	4	9	26	29
	Monday, June 4, 2012	0	3	5	3	12
	Tuesday, June 5, 2012	2	0	1	0	1
	Wednesday, June 6, 2012	3	3	16	24	60
	Thursday, June 7, 2012	0	0	1	4	19
	Friday June 8, 2012	1	2	2	2	8
	Saturday June 9, 2012	0	0	1	1	0
	Total	**27**	**34**	**177**	**266**	**510**
		18-34	**35-54**	**55+**		
Age	Thursday, Mar 31, 2012	34	74	101		
	Friday, June 1, 2012	86	203	115		
	Saturday, June 2, 2012	52	60	44		
	Sunday, June 3, 2012	23	17	31		
	Monday, June 4, 2012	9	2	12		
	Tuesday, June 5, 2012	1	0	3		
	Wednesday, June 6, 2012	25	0	81		
	Thursday, June 7, 2012	17	0	7		
	Friday June 8, 2012	7	0	8		
	Saturday June 9, 2012	0	0	2		
	Total	**254**	**356**	**404**		
		Male	**Female**			
Gender	Thursday, Mar 31, 2012	110	99			
	Friday, June 1, 2012	159	245			
	Saturday, June 2, 2012	67	89			
	Sunday, June 3, 2012	39	32			
	Monday, June 4, 2012	12	11			
	Tuesday, June 5, 2012	2	2			
	Wednesday, June 6, 2012	65	41			
	Thursday, June 7, 2012	19	5			
	Friday June 8, 2012	7	8			
	Saturday June 9, 2012	2	0			
	Total	**482**	**532**			

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.

- ***Monitoring of incentive-redemption patterns: 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***
- ***Screening for low-quality responses: 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.***

Toluna

Panel Information

1) What is the size of your panel in each of the following regions and countries:
   - ***This is proprietary information, therefore, we are not be able to share this.***

2) What panel recruitment techniques do you currently employ?
   a. Please describe your recruitment sources.
   - ***Our attrition rate is 25% to 35%, depending upon country, per year. This is calculated on the number of members who have left the panel during one year versus the average panel size for the same period. We define members who have left the panel as those who stopped responding to panel communications and survey invitations, unsubscribe, whose emails 'hard bounce' and members who otherwise have no survey, profiling, or other activity for a maximum of 12 months. We will discuss attrition with our clients in the project planning stage if there is potential for attrition to affect a particular project, such as a longitudinal study.***

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

   - ***Toluna has a dedicated in-house team dedicated to quality management. This group defines, trains staff and measures against our quality processes. Each year the team reviews thousands of survey invitations, questionnaires, samples and data files to make sure that our clients receive nothing short of a flawless online survey project. Additionally, Toluna makes extensive use of client satisfaction surveys to gain important feedback on levels of satisfaction to continuously monitor and improve quality as defined by our clients.***
     Our quality management procedures are detailed below for both providing sample and for programming client's questionnaires. Our company operations are governed by documented processes, including those for project management, survey programming, quality control, sampling, panel management, and confidentiality and security of information provided by clients, panelists, and other proprietary records. These processes are reviewed and updated on a continuous basis. We have reviewed the proposed ISO standards for market research access panels and have found our processes to be substantially in compliance.
     As it relates to specific tasks:
     <u>1: Project Feasibility</u>
     A Project/Quality Control Manager will check that client's request is compliant with the original order to confirm that the project is feasible, i.e. we can deliver the desired number of responses, within the required time and budget. If the specifications are different, a project manager will reassess feasibility to complete the project and within the time frames. This ensures that we deliver according to our clients' needs, but also to our actual capacity. This avoids over-promising to our clients and ensures Toluna's clients are never misled.

2: Quality Checking

Questionnaire programming (hosted projects). The client's questionnaire is read and the logic (filters, loops, rotation, quotas, etc.) is double checked by our dedicated team of experienced survey programmers. Any question/query/doubt is validated with the client. We also advise on questionnaire design if we feel it is not really compliant with the nuances and legal requirements for online data collection.In cases where we feel the way of addressing the panelists or asking the question may lead to unreliable data, we also advise the client to change/rephrase their questions. All translations are double checked by native speakers so as to ensure data reliability. Once the questionnaire has been programmed and the first link to the survey is available, a project or quality control manager will test all questions, logic, media, data collection and display considerations. All the changes are kept in one single document for an easy follow up and the questionnaire amended with the final changes. Each change is checked by the Toluna quality control team and the project manager in charge. The questionnaire will go live only after the client's final approval has been received. We run Random Data Generation on the questionnaire and analyse the results before sending the first batch of ample. This is to ensure complete analysis of all eventualities and logic flows particularly for complex cell and quota allocation.

3: Sampling and Field Work

The online sample is drawn from our panels according to client's specification (either nationally representative, or targeted) and randomly selected within our database, according to the quotas set in the questionnaire, and the anticipated response rate per quota group. This process applies to 'sample only' and 'questionnaire hosted' projects. The survey email invitation is designed based on templates written by native speakers in the panel team. Specific invitations can be designed on request.

Note: our invitations do not contain any information on the subject of the survey that may lead to guiding the respondent's answers. These email invitations are double checked by assigned project managers (sent to themselves in different accounts). This check focuses on ensuring the

link to the survey is working, the invitation is in the right language, the HTML displays correctly, the email is delivered, etc. Once the email invitation has been thoroughly checked, we always start with a soft launch, aiming at getting about 10% of the required number of completed questionnaires.

This allows us to check the anticipated incidence rate, actual response rate, and design of the sampling plan. The sampling plan enables us to maximize the time we have to complete a project and ensures client quotas are met.

For Questionnaire Hosted projects, we double check all filters and logic based on real time data before proceeding to a full launch. Once the project is in field, we send email invitations every day or several times a day as needed to complete a project. The number of responses achieved is

monitored in real time and more email invitations sent as and when required to achieve the target.

<u>4: Data processing</u>

Once the project quota is completed, data quality is checked and the data processing team starts to prepare the reporting files for clients. We may over-recruit by up to 10% in order to provide a margin to eliminate speeders (people that went too fast through a questionnaire), straight liners, incoherent answers, and any other questionable or unreliable data.

4) What panel profiling information, demographic or otherwise, is available?

- ***Toluna collects up to 1,700 current attributes through a number of specialist screeners, plus an additional large number of data points from 'Polls' and 'Quick Votes' live on the community sites to add more depth as required for areas identified as being of value to Toluna's clients. The current maximum number of data points per panelist is approaching 15,000. The 1,700 are the key profile attributes, for which we have an average of approximately 750 completed per panelist. Toluna's 'specialist panels', whose profiling is optimized for a specific market sector, are as follows:***
- ***Automotive***
- ***B2B***
- ***Cosmetics***
- ***Finance***
- ***Food & Drink***
- ***Green-Consumer***
- ***Health***
- ***Hobbies and Leisure***
- ***Home (and shopping)***
- ***Media (and communications)***
- ***Mobile***
- ***Sports***
- ***Teens***
- ***Travel***
- ***Web User (including online shopping and technology)***
- ***Video Gamers***

<u>Registration</u>

Toluna's registration and profile process is continuous through the life of a Toluna panelist — the objective being to have broad and current attributes on each member. Each member has a personal dashboard and administration area, where they have a dashboard indicator to help them manage their personal profile. Members earn points by completing and updating their profile. This dashboard also includes points and fulfillment. The management dashboard makes it easy for them to complete a task. This system ensures that Toluna's panelists are rewarded, motivated and enabled to continually monitor the depth and accuracy of their profiling information. As a result, Toluna can target its survey invitations extremely

accurately and our clients enjoy consistently impressive response and completion rates.

Regarding specialist profilers, across all countries and members, the average Toluna panelist completes above 50% of additional profile information for that country.

<u>Polls</u>

If a target profile of respondents is required, which is not profiled as part of the standard registration or additional profile management process, Toluna can launch a QuickPoll within minutes. This QuickPoll can generate thousands of responses per day and each response is recorded against the profile of a registered member. Given that nearly 100% of all poll responses are from registered members and not random web traffic, Toluna can provide extremely accurate feasibility assessments of the panel for even the most challenging of target profiles.

In addition to the in-house demographic, consumer usage/ownership/interests, B2B, medical, and lifestyle profiling, we can also apply ESRI's Community Tapestry Segmentation in the USA to enhance the lifestyle portrait of our panel segments.

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?
   - ***Quotas would need to fall naturally on best efforts.***

Sample

1) How is sample pulled?
   - ***We take pride in our research sampling expertise, which requires investment not only in processes and systems, but in the skills of the team responsible for sampling. For our panel, email address selection is made***
   - ***randomly using the profile criteria specified in client quotas, taking account of predicted response rates by target demographic and country to avoid over-contacting panelists and to ensure that we do not introduce a bias in the responses. Please note that historical propensity to answer surveys is not used to select a sample. The sample itself is then automatically randomised for potentially-qualifying individuals. We can exclude any panelist from a client's survey by topic of survey recently taken, frequency taken, or for tracking study waves. In some countries, such as the USA, category exclusions are particularly requested and so are supported on those panels. Our sample can be deployed by batches, time, geography, and is programmed in advance. To aid in quickly getting into the field, a preprogrammed general population automated sampling process may be used. The sample provides for both early and late responders depending upon the data collection time allowed.***

Toluna's normal process is to have a soft launch to achieve approximately 10% of the total number of required completes. This enables tuning of the sample selected based on project specific response characteristics. The sample composition and size is adjusted if needed and mailed in batches in line with project requirements for target audience and timing. Sending sample in batches has the added advantage of not overwhelming the servers in the case of a survey hosted by a client.
As noted earlier, if we need to reach a particular audience that cannot be accessed using only our panels we use Real Time Sampling®. This application enables us to intercept potential respondents in real-time while they are online, asking them a series of brief profiling questions which then randomly directs them to participate in a survey.

2) What sample sources do you use?
   - ***We'll be using our proprietary panel for this project.***

3) How is your sample composed?
   - ***New panelists are required to double opt-in.***
     The process is as follows:
     <u>Step 1 -</u> A prospective panelist completes a panel registration form, which includes contact and demographic information (first opt-in).
     <u>Step 2 -</u> An automatic email is sent to the prospect, requesting verification of their panel registration by clicking a link that confirms their log in details.
     <u>Step 3 -</u> Once the prospect has clicked the link (second option), he or she is officially a panelist and is presented with an opportunity to complete additional profiling. Another automatic email is sent that includes the panelist's account login information for future reference by the panelist.

4) How will you ensure demographic quotas and representativeness is met to the aforementioned standards in this study?
   - ***Demographic quotas and representativeness would need to be on best efforts.***

Paradata

1) What para-data will be available for this study?
   - ***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?
   - ***Toluna panelists are invited by an email and can be directed to clients' portal to complete a study upon request. They'd be passed back to Toluna database after they finish via an encrypted transfer to protect panelist'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 can do this.***

Non-Response Information

1) Please indicate if your firm is capable of providing the non-response information on page 4.
   - ***Toluna 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 approximately 10%.***
   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.
   - ***Not applicable***

Incentives

1) What is your standard incentive structure?
   - ***Toluna aims to offer a truly balanced survey reward and overall membership value for our panelists. The primary factor influencing incentive values for each project is the length of survey, which is generally converted into a number of points of financial value.***
     Normally, additional incentives are not offered for short turnaround projects and never linked to incidence expected from the study.
     Non-monetary rewards are offered by providing members with an opportunity to create their own polls/opinions, as well as contributing to polls/opinions of other members. Further, community features such as opinion authority ratings and showcasing members profiles on the home page provide a social value, a value of social voting, and a feeling of community.
     <u>Points</u>
     Points are earned for completing a survey. Points are also rewarded for answering a 'sponsored poll'. These polls differ from user-generated polls, as they are created by Toluna on behalf of clients wishing to gain instant top-line research data or to assess project feasibility on a particularly niche target profile. Points are also accumulated by members for completing their profiling questionnaires, and for regularly updating them.
     <u>Reward</u>
     Our points-based incentive system enables members to use their points to exchange for vouchers and gifts from our reward partner network which is clearly highlighted to all members. Panelists can manage their account

within their own personal dashboard area. Here their entire reward history can be viewed and points automatically exchanged for vouchers.

<u>Prize draws</u>

Members can also enter into multiple prize draws for cash and products. Points earned can be exchanged for prize draw tickets.

<u>Product tests</u>

In Europe, Toluna also offers in home product tests of new products coming to market ranging from chocolate bars to computer and entertainment equipment, all funded and managed by Toluna.

2) Can your incentive structure be customized for this project?
   - ***It is possible and may affect pricing.***

3) What incentive structure do you recommend for this project?
   - ***We would recommend Toluna Points.***

Panel Usage

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

   <u>Frequency of contact</u>

   The system normally will not allow invitations to be sent to a panelist any more than once a day.

   <u>Participation in surveys</u>

   Panelists are normally limited to a maximum of 2 surveys completed per month (plus one tracker), though in periods of particular demand and for some demographics, we may allow up to four completed surveys per month. Please note that we do not count an internal survey, Community Poll, incidence check or profiler survey, nor do we count reminder emails. The average number of completed surveys per panelist per month is 2.

   <u>Email reminders</u>

   The total number of email reminders a panelist can receive depends on available field time. For each 3 days in field, a panelist may receive one reminder.

   <u>History</u>

   Our proprietary panel management platform, PanelPortal, automatically records all panelist interaction history including emails sent, emails opened, links clicked, screen-outs / quota-full, survey completion , survey topic, incentive given, and the inventive redeemed.

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.***

4) Do you have procedures for cleaning your panel of non-responsive panelists?
   - ***Toluna's dedicated quality management team use a variety of different techniques for monitoring and limiting fraudulent respondents through***

active cleaning and exclusion of observed offenders from the panel. Inactive, unresponsive, inattentive and fraudulent panelists are regularly eliminated from the panel. Fraudulent panelists are put in a blacklist (to avoid any possible re-registration) and are automatically and instantly removed from the panel. Under no circumstance will these members be sent an invitation email to complete a survey or are included in the size of our panels.

During a project our team will run systematic checks to ensure the quality of data generated for our client is of the highest standard.

- ***Our profiling screeners include questions to help flag in consistencies in data***
- ***Multiple survey completions: Every questionnaire has a unique URL which is sent to a panelist with a unique I.D. This eliminates the possibility of duplicate questionnaire completion by the same individual. Machine ID may also be used to guard against this occurrence.***
- ***And when Toluna has programmed a questionnaire we can execute both "during survey" and "post field" quality controls:***
    - ***Compare the coherence of responses given in a survey with the profiling data we have gathered on a specific panelist***
    - ***Straight lining: We can incorporate controls such as algorithms on straight-line responses within a questionnaire***
    - ***Open ended: Our team can flag those who do not respond to open questions***
    - ***Dummy/Trap questions: We can include dummy/trap questions within a survey***
    - ***Speeding: Project Managers will look for overly fast completions, in North America, we proactively remove all respondents that complete surveys in less than 1/3 of the average survey completion time.***

Challenges

1) Please briefly describe any challenges you foresee in completing this research and your firms proposed solutions.
    - ***We'll be able to assist with all requested completes on this project assuming 80% IR among geo and education holds. Hard quotas would need to be on best efforts.***

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

Invitation

Pre-election survey:

Un nouveau sondage vous attend!

Quel est le thème de cette étude ?

Nous mènons une étude sur les élections et la démocratie. Dans ce cadre nous aimerions connaître votre opinion.

Durée moyenne de l'enquête :

20 minutes maximum, selon vos réponses

Qu'est-ce que je recevrai pour ma participation ?

Vous pourrez participer à notre tirage au sort avec à la clé la somme de 7 000 € environ. Vous recevrez des Hipoints.

Lien de l'enquête :

[INSERT HYPERLINK]

Post-election survey:

Bref sondage de suivi vous attend!

Quel est le thème de cette étude ?

Vous avez récemment participé au une étude sur les élections et la démocratie. Nous vous saurions gré de prendre quelques minutes pour répondre au bref sondage de suivi.

Durée moyenne de l'enquête :

10 minutes maximum, selon vos réponses

Qu'est-ce que je recevrai pour ma participation ?

Vous pourrez participer à notre tirage au sort avec à la clé la somme de 7 000 € environ. Vous recevrez des Hipoints.

Lien de l'enquête :

INSERT HYPERLINK]

Landing Page

Pre-election survey:

Merci de prendre le temps de répondre à notre sondage. Nous réalisons une étude sur les élections et la démocratie. Dans ce cadre, nous souhaiterions connaître votre opinion. La participation à cette recherche est libre et basée sur le volontariat. Vos réponses resteront complètement confidentielles et ne seront utilisées que dans un cadre de recherche. Vous devez avoir plus de 18 ans, avoir la nationalité française et résider en Ile de France/ Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur pour participer à l'étude.

Le sondage est en deux parties. La première, que vous êtes invité à compléter aujourd'hui, est un questionnaire qui ne prend qu'une vingtaine de minutes à compléter. La seconde partie est un autre questionnaire, plus court. Si vous participez aujourd'hui, nous vous recontacterons par la suite pour vous inviter à compléter le second sondage. La participation sera aussi libre et fondée sur le volontariat.

Si vous souhaitez plus d'informations sur notre étude, cliquez ici.

Pour répondre au sondage maintenant, sans lire plus d'informations, cliquez sur la flèche pour débuter. En répondant au sondage, vous acceptez de participer à l'étude.

Si vous avez des questions à propos de l'étude, de la poursuite de cette recherche ou de vos droits en tant que participant à notre étude, vous pouvez contacter à tout moment les personnes indiquées dans la rubrique Informations Complémentaires [INSERT HYPERLINK].

Post-election survey:

Merci de prendre le temps de répondre à notre sondage. Aujourd'hui nous entamons la seconde partie d'un projet de recherche sur les élections et la démocratie. Dans ce cadre nous aimerions connaître votre opinion. Vous avez complété la première partie du sondage il y a quelques jours. La participation à cette seconde partie est libre et basée sur le volontariat. Le questionnaire ne prend qu'une dizaine de minutes à compléter. Vos réponses resteront complètement confidentielles et ne seront utilisées que dans un cadre de recherche.

Vous devez avoir au moins 18 ans, avoir la nationalité française et résider en Ile-de-France pour participer à l'étude.

Si vous souhaitez plus d'informations sur notre étude, cliquez ici.

Pour répondre au sondage maintenant, sans lire plus d'informations, cliquez sur SUIVANT. En répondant au sondage, vous acceptez de participer à l'étude.

Si vous avez des questions à propos de l'étude, de la poursuite de cette recherche ou de vos droits en tant que participant à notre étude, vous pouvez contacter à tout moment les personnes indiquées dans la rubrique Informations Complémentaires [INSERT HYPERLINK].

Additional Information

Pre-election survey:

Vous trouverez ici des informations concernant l'étude. Vous devez avoir au moins 18 ans, avoir la nationalité française et résider en Ile-de-France**/**Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur pour y participer.

L'objectif de l'étude est d'en savoir plus sur vos opinions concernant les élections et la démocratie. La participation à l'étude est libre et basée sur le volontariat. Vous pouvez refuser de participer ou mettre fin à votre participation à tout moment.

L'étude est constituée de deux sondages. Le premier peut être complété dès aujourd'hui. Il prend une vingtaine de minutes. Le second sera disponible le [INSERT DATE HERE]. Si vous participez aujourd'hui, vous serez recontacté par la suite et invité à compléter le second sondage. Votre participation aujourd'hui ne vous force pas à répondre au second sondage.

En participant à cette étude, vous nous aidez à mieux comprendre les élections législatives en Ile de France.En participant à cette étude, vous nous aidez à mieux comprendre les élections législatives de Juin 2012. Vous pourriez ne pas tirer de profit personnel de votre participation. Il n'y a aucun risque connu à participer à cette étude.

Si vous répondez au sondage aujourd'hui, vous gagnerez 50 points. Si vous répondez aussi au second sondage vous gagnerez 50 points.

La confidentialité des données vous concernant sera assurée à tout moment.

Si vous avez des questions à propos de l'étude, vous pouvez contacter à tout moment :

Dr. Martial Foucault
Université de Montréal
Département de Science Politique
Montréal, Qc, Canada
T : +1.514.343.6111 poste 3701
martial.foucault@umontreal.ca

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

Si vous avez des questions à propos de la poursuite de l'étude ou sur vos droits en tant que participant à la recherche, vous pouvez contacter :

Office of Research Ethics, UWO
00-1-519-661-3036

En répondant au sondage, vous acceptez de participer à l'étude.

Pour participer à la première phase de l'étude, veuillez cliquer sur SUIVANT pour débuter le sondage.

Post-election survey:

Vous trouverez ici des informations concernant l'étude. Vous devez avoir au moins 18 ans, avoir la nationalité française et résider en Ile-de-France**/**Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur pour y participer. L'objectif de l'étude est d'en savoir plus sur vos opinions concernant les élections et la démocratie. La participation à l'étude est libre et basée sur le volontariat. Vous pouvez refuser de participer ou mettre fin à votre participation à tout moment.

Vous avez complété la première partie du sondage il y a quelques jours. Aujourd'hui, nous vous demandons de participer à un autre sondage qui constitue la seconde partie de l'étude. Le questionnaire à compléter ne vous prendra qu'une dizaine de minutes.

En participant à cette étude, vous nous aidez à mieux comprendre les élections législatives en Ile de France. Vous pourriez ne pas tirer de profit personnel de votre participation. Il n'y a aucun risque connu à participer à cette étude.

Si vous répondez au sondage aujourd'hui, vous gagnerez 50 points.

La confidentialité des données vous concernant sera assurée à tout moment.

Si vous avez des questions à propos de l'étude, vous pouvez contacter à tout moment :

Dr. Martial Foucault
Université de Montréal
Département de Science Politique
Montréal, Qc, Canada
T : +1.514.343.6111 poste 3701
martial.foucault@umontreal.ca

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

Si vous avez des questions à propos de la poursuite de l'étude ou sur vos droits en tant que participant à la recherche, vous pouvez contacter :

Office of Research Ethics, UWO
00-1-519-661-3036

En répondant au sondage, vous acceptez de participer à l'étude.

Pour participer à cette phase de l'étude, veuillez cliquer sur SUIVANT pour débuter le sondage.

Appendix D: Weighting Reports

Île-de-France

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT1
- PREWGT1 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 19.54%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 1007
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1007.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15.69	158	149	14.8	1.06036596	157.99	15.69	28.41284411	0.58992741
Male - 35 to 54	17.97	180.96	184	18.27	0.98375691	181.01	17.98	20.5957839	0.42762412
Male - 55 plus	13.81	139.07	138	13.7	1.00795138	139.1	13.81	20.59216195	0.42754892
Female - 18 to 34	16.42	165.35	165	16.39	1.00231013	165.38	16.42	24.43424014	0.50732084
Female - 35 to 54	18.77	189.01	195	19.36	0.96898185	188.95	18.76	1.93519954	0.68977945
Female - 55 plus	17.34	174.61	176	17.48	0.99184249	174.56	17.34	5.18945233	0.52472016

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	17.9	180.25	8	0.79	22.531625	180.25	17.9	28.41284411	20.59216195
Du certificat d''études primaires	7.3	73.51	15	1.49	4.90073333	73.51	7.3	5.83434829	4.22843431
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6.1	61.43	43	4.27	1.42853488	61.43	6.1	1.93519954	1.19950293
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17.2	173.2	163	16.19	1.06260123	173.2	17.2	1.4081046	0.87279144
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.4	165.15	305	30.29	0.54146885	165.15	16.4	0.69558942	0.43115013
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	12.7	127.89	241	23.93	0.53065975	127.89	12.7	0.68977945	0.42754892
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22.4	225.57	232	23.04	0.97227586	225.57	22.4	1.22924776	0.76192984

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT2
- PREWGT2 –

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_INT

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 13.68%
Number of iterations performed: 7

Input count of respondents: 1007
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1007.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15.69	158	149	14.8	1.06046761	158.01	15.69	13.52620739	0.39111752
Male - 35 to 54	17.97	180.96	184	18.27	0.983332	180.93	17.97	33.64619681	0.26668411
Male - 55 plus	13.81	139.07	138	13.7	1.00762907	139.05	13.81	42.37634929	0.33588043
Female - 18 to 34	16.42	165.35	165	16.39	1.00205949	165.34	16.42	35.36002609	0.28026814
Female - 35 to 54	18.77	189.01	195	19.36	0.96936637	189.03	18.77	6.66854608	0.46493816
Female - 55 plus	17.34	174.61	176	17.48	0.99226232	174.64	17.34	13.93147335	0.402836

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	17.9	180.25	8	0.79	22.53151303	180.25	17.9	42.37634929	7.37352514
Du certificat d''études primaires	7.3	73.51	15	1.49	4.90072598	73.51	7.3	13.93147335	2.0211805
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6.1	61.43	43	4.27	1.42853885	61.43	6.1	6.66854608	0.83824753
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17.2	173.2	163	16.19	1.06260143	173.2	17.2	4.13038826	0.5191968
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.4	165.15	305	30.29	0.54146936	165.15	16.4	2.21964225	0.27901279
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	12.7	127.89	241	23.93	0.53066006	127.89	12.7	2.12156339	0.26668411
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22.4	225.57	232	23.04	0.97227833	225.57	22.4	4.41321191	0.55474821

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	54.15	545.29	879	87.29	0.62035324	545.29	54.15	10.81397326	0.26668411
No, will not vote	45.85	461.71	128	12.71	3.60710547	461.71	45.85	42.37634929	1.21690859

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3
- PREWGT3 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_VOTE_COL1, PRE_INT

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 12.76%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 1007
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1007.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15.69	158	149	14.8	1.06039127	158	15.69	12.89635086	0.00000000
Male - 35 to 54	17.97	180.96	184	18.27	0.98346685	180.96	17.97	34.40221453	0.00000000
Male - 55 plus	13.81	139.07	138	13.7	1.00772971	139.07	13.81	42.13551305	0.00000000
Female - 18 to 34	16.42	165.35	165	16.39	1.00211758	165.35	16.42	39.94276799	0.00000000
Female - 35 to 54	18.77	189.01	195	19.36	0.96930205	189.01	18.77	7.57177165	0.00000000
Female - 55 plus	17.34	174.61	176	17.48	0.99212386	174.61	17.34	14.51688013	0.00000000

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	17.9	180.25	8	0.79	22.53162499	180.25	17.9	42.13551305	0.00000000
Du certificat d''études primaires	7.3	73.51	15	1.49	4.90073333	73.51	7.3	14.51688013	0.00000000
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6.1	61.43	43	4.27	1.42853488	61.43	6.1	7.57177165	0.00000000
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17.2	173.2	163	16.19	1.06260123	173.2	17.2	4.52537521	0.00000000
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.4	165.15	305	30.29	0.54146885	165.15	16.4	2.20069247	0.00000000
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	12.7	127.89	241	23.93	0.53065975	127.89	12.7	2.23642228	0.00000000
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22.4	225.57	232	23.04	0.97227586	225.57	22.4	4.0902052	0.00000000

PRE_VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	22.7	228.59	277	27.51	0.57659692	159.72	15.86	7.48673146	0.24284257
UMP	22.8	229.6	223	22.14	0.71937644	160.42	15.93	11.0050395	0.29144881
Rassemblement Bleu Marine	7.9	79.55	124	12.31	0.4482617	55.58	5.52	2.43668586	0.18730321

(Front National)									
Front de Gauche	6.6	66.46	65	6.45	0.71442527	46.44	4.61	10.87851887	0.23441833
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	5.4	54.38	27	2.68	1.40720129	37.99	3.77	2.77694107	0.757601
Autre	12.1	121.85	65	6.45	1.30977966	85.14	8.45	5.82334393	0.61926061
Ne sait pas	22.5	226.58	226	22.44	2.04296239	461.71	45.85	7.48673146	0.00000000

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	54.15	545.29	879	87.29	0.62035324	545.29	54.15	11.0050395	0.00000000
No, will not vote	45.85	461.71	128	12.71	3.60710547	461.71	45.85	42.13551305	1.1158838

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3B
- PREWGT3 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_VOTE_COL2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 13.37%
Number of iterations performed: 7

Input count of respondents: 1007
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1007.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15.69	158	149	14.8	1.06055746	158.02	15.69	13.40856305	0.23988058
Male - 35 to 54	17.97	180.96	184	18.27	0.98319466	180.91	17.97	35.00239702	0.16858197
Male - 55 plus	13.81	139.07	138	13.7	1.00752084	139.04	13.81	42.58262833	0.20509062
Female - 18 to 34	16.42	165.35	165	16.39	1.00202824	165.33	16.42	33.5495183	0.16158447
Female - 35 to 54	18.77	189.01	195	19.36	0.96945165	189.04	18.77	7.2490312	0.28682182
Female - 55 plus	17.34	174.61	176	17.48	0.99234951	174.65	17.34	14.70134959	0.26300867

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	17.9	180.25	8	0.79	22.53258563	180.26	17.9	42.58262833	5.98067609
Du certificat d''études primaires	7.3	73.51	15	1.49	4.90078041	73.51	7.3	14.70134959	1.54326056
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6.1	61.43	43	4.27	1.42854796	61.43	6.1	7.2490312	0.54022583
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17.2	173.2	163	16.19	1.06261361	173.21	17.2	4.25160363	0.31684594
D'un baccalauréat ou	16.4	165.15	305	30.29	0.54146007	165.15	16.4	2.16822446	0.16158447

d'un brevet professionnel									
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	12.7	127.89	241	23.93	0.53066074	127.89	12.7	2.18365095	0.16273411
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22.4	225.57	232	23.04	0.97223907	225.56	22.4	4.19131116	0.31235271

PRE_VOTE_COL2	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	13	130.91	277	27.51	0.47259928	130.91	13	5.98067609	0.20871043
UMP	13	130.91	223	22.14	0.58704036	130.91	13	8.61001484	0.24698074
Rassemblement Bleu Marine (Front National)	4.5	45.32	124	12.31	0.36544355	45.32	4.5	1.94475618	0.16158447
Front de Gauche	3.8	38.27	65	6.45	0.58870769	38.27	3.8	8.34463135	0.2046525
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	3.1	31.22	27	2.68	1.15618519	31.22	3.1	2.21690989	0.64608521
Autre	7	70.49	65	6.45	1.08446154	70.49	7	4.94096342	0.52646604
Non-votant	45.9	462.21	128	12.71	3.61103906	462.21	45.9	42.58262833	1.2214949
Ne sait pas	9.7	97.68	98	9.73	0.99672449	97.68	9.7	11.18842208	0.40735609

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT4
- PREWGT4 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_VOTE_COL1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 18.49%
Number of iterations performed: 7

Input count of respondents: 1007
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 1007.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15.69	158	149	14.8	1.06028333	157.98	15.69	27.36078934	0.35678652
Male - 35 to 54	17.97	180.96	184	18.27	0.9836536	180.99	17.97	25.16356957	0.25641599
Male - 55 plus	13.81	139.07	138	13.7	1.00798287	139.1	13.81	28.47400188	0.22246118
Female - 18 to 34	16.42	165.35	165	16.39	1.00213988	165.35	16.42	23.27662642	0.3249639
Female - 35 to 54	18.77	189.01	195	19.36	0.96909629	188.97	18.77	4.18559289	0.44889562
Female - 55 plus	17.34	174.61	176	17.48	0.99202857	174.6	17.34	7.08352045	0.33321168

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	17.9	180.25	8	0.79	22.5274308	180.22	17.9	28.47400188	15.93452643

					5				
Du certificat d''études primaires	7.3	73.51	15	1.49	4.90065307	73.51	7.3	10.31923584	2.83340783
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6.1	61.43	43	4.27	1.42853696	61.43	6.1	2.96873871	0.76137438
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17.2	173.2	163	16.19	1.06259601	173.2	17.2	4.18559289	0.53197614
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.4	165.15	305	30.29	0.54150321	165.16	16.4	2.07781373	0.22246118
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	12.7	127.89	241	23.93	0.53067346	127.89	12.7	1.93277052	0.24564926
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22.4	225.57	232	23.04	0.97236954	225.59	22.4	3.36629391	0.36041235

PRE_VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	22.7	228.59	277	27.51	0.82523105	228.59	22.7	25.16356957	0.30478702
UMP	22.8	229.6	223	22.14	1.02957848	229.6	22.8	28.47400188	0.39752422
Rassemblement Bleu Marine (Front National)	7.9	79.55	124	12.31	0.64155645	79.55	7.9	4.4019676	0.24703659
Front de Gauche	6.6	66.46	65	6.45	1.02249231	66.46	6.6	27.36078934	0.23817135
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	5.4	54.38	27	2.68	2.014	54.38	5.4	3.36629391	1.02971133
Autre	12.1	121.85	65	6.45	1.87456923	121.85	12.1	10.31923584	0.86741706
Ne sait pas	22.5	226.58	226	22.44	1.00254425	226.58	22.5	23.27662642	0.22246118

WEIGHTING REPORT - POSTWGT1
- POSTWGT1 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 18.43%
Number of iterations performed: 4

Input count of respondents: 784
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 784.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15.69	123.01	115	14.67	1.06966929	123.01	15.69	30.46411605	0.5537084
Male - 35 to 54	17.97	140.88	153	19.52	0.92101828	140.92	17.97	20.83509456	0.37869363
Male - 55 plus	13.81	108.27	106	13.52	1.02183875	108.31	13.82	19.22597142	0.3494466

Female - 18 to 34	16.42	128.73	119	15.18	1.08183496	128.74	16.42	29.74975198	0.54072429
Female - 35 to 54	18.77	147.16	152	19.39	0.96769366	147.09	18.76	1.96041687	0.63911272
Female - 55 plus	17.34	135.95	139	17.73	0.9779103	135.93	17.34	5.73567614	0.47134078

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	17.9	140.34	6	0.77	23.38933333	140.34	17.9	30.46411605	19.22597142
Du certificat d''études primaires	7.3	57.23	11	1.4	5.20290909	57.23	7.3	6.57999383	4.25236397
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6.1	47.82	34	4.34	1.40658824	47.82	6.1	1.96041687	1.07189388
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17.2	134.85	118	15.05	1.14277966	134.85	17.2	1.55268348	0.84895817
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.4	128.58	223	28.44	0.57657399	128.58	16.4	0.73655627	0.40272565
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	12.7	99.57	202	25.77	0.49291089	99.57	12.7	0.63911272	0.3494466
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22.4	175.62	190	24.23	0.92429474	175.62	22.4	1.16695071	0.6380517

WEIGHTING REPORT - POSTWGT2
- POSTWGT2 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_INT

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 15.62%
Number of iterations performed: 5

Input count of respondents: 784
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 784.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15.69	123.01	115	14.67	1.06972449	123.02	15.69	21.00921932	0.42155372
Male - 35 to 54	17.97	140.88	153	19.52	0.92081197	140.88	17.97	15.61525489	0.31332287
Male - 55 plus	13.81	108.27	106	13.52	1.02146928	108.28	13.81	33.58056484	0.25528857
Female - 18 to 34	16.42	128.73	119	15.18	1.08190608	128.75	16.42	41.79381639	0.31772794
Female - 35 to 54	18.77	147.16	152	19.39	0.96812442	147.15	18.77	3.74097796	0.45943692
Female - 55 plus	17.34	135.95	139	17.73	0.97784153	135.92	17.34	9.68666576	0.37501439

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	17.9	140.34	6	0.77	23.3895127	140.34	17.9	41.79381639	12.72296587
Du certificat d''études primaires	7.3	57.23	11	1.4	5.20301198	57.23	7.3	9.68666576	2.49837789
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6.1	47.82	34	4.34	1.40656755	47.82	6.1	3.74097796	0.78757333
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17.2	134.85	118	15.05	1.14278394	134.85	17.2	2.70044983	0.56851505
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.4	128.58	223	28.44	0.57657458	128.58	16.4	1.342463	0.28262344
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	12.7	99.57	202	25.77	0.49290695	99.57	12.7	1.21262223	0.25528857
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22.4	175.62	190	24.23	0.92428766	175.61	22.4	2.21657517	0.46664682

POST_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	51.73	405.56	595	75.89	0.68161882	405.56	51.73	21.00921932	0.25528857
No, will not vote	48.27	378.44	189	24.11	2.00231111	378.44	48.27	41.79381639	0.67380001

WEIGHTING REPORT - POSTWGT3
- POSTWGT3 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_VOTE_COL1, POST_INT

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 15.03%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 784
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 784.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15.69	123.01	115	14.67	1.0696487	123.01	15.69	18.6803308	0.00000004
Male - 35 to 54	17.97	140.88	153	19.52	0.92081569	140.88	17.97	14.33175023	0.00000002
Male - 55 plus	13.81	108.27	106	13.52	1.02141887	108.27	13.81	33.4286634	0.00000002
Female - 18 to 34	16.42	128.73	119	15.18	1.08178823	128.73	16.42	44.0046684	0.00000002
Female - 35 to 54	18.77	147.16	152	19.39	0.96813684	147.16	18.77	4.12034529	0.00000004
Female - 55 plus	17.34	135.95	139	17.73	0.9780259	135.95	17.34	10.62410573	0.00000003

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	17.9	140.34	6	0.77	23.38933339	140.34	17.9	44.0046684	14.33175023
Du certificat d''études primaires	7.3	57.23	11	1.4	5.2029091	57.23	7.3	10.62410573	0.28871101
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6.1	47.82	34	4.34	1.40658824	47.82	6.1	4.12034529	0.08541967
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17.2	134.85	118	15.05	1.14277966	134.85	17.2	2.83620815	0.00000004
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.4	128.58	223	28.44	0.57657399	128.58	16.4	1.42071263	0.00000002
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	12.7	99.57	202	25.77	0.49291089	99.57	12.7	1.6021984	0.00000002
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22.4	175.62	190	24.23	0.92429474	175.62	22.4	2.38035097	0.00000003

POST_VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	30.4	238.34	271	34.57	0.6354038	172.19	21.96	18.6803308	0.18484779
UMP	29.8	233.63	227	28.95	0.74359408	168.8	21.53	15.55883726	0.27862762
Rassemblement Bleu Marine (Front National)	0.2	1.57	21	2.68	0.05394562	1.13	0.14	0.28871101	0.02258754
Front de Gauche	1.3	10.19	7	0.89	1.05193966	7.36	0.94	1.96238909	0.46759276
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	3.9	30.58	13	1.66	1.69928715	22.09	2.82	2.38478596	1.00325321
Autre	6	47.04	28	3.57	1.21377653	33.99	4.33	2.44983193	0.51708773
Ne sait pas	28.4	222.66	217	27.68	1.74394839	378.44	48.27	44.0046684	0.00000002

POST_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, voted	51.73	405.56	595	75.89	0.68161882	405.56	51.73	18.6803308	0.00000002
No, did not vote	48.27	378.44	189	24.11	2.00231111	378.44	48.27	44.0046684	0.59864043

WEIGHTING REPORT - POSTWGT3B
- POSTWGT3 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_VOTE_COL2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 14.85%
Number of iterations performed: 6

Input count of respondents: 784
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 784.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15.69	123.01	115	14.67	1.06960096	123	15.69	18.15450661	0.0231316
Male - 35 to 54	17.97	140.88	153	19.52	0.92078565	140.88	17.97	14.11640389	0.01565484
Male - 55 plus	13.81	108.27	106	13.52	1.02165668	108.3	13.81	34.60453102	0.16552776
Female - 18 to 34	16.42	128.73	119	15.18	1.08193012	128.75	16.42	44.38780391	0.01594091
Female - 35 to 54	18.77	147.16	152	19.39	0.96800138	147.14	18.77	4.10630791	0.02487477
Female - 55 plus	17.34	135.95	139	17.73	0.97794376	135.93	17.34	10.9566451	0.01763897

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	17.9	140.34	6	0.77	23.38850179	140.33	17.9	44.38780391	14.11640389
Du certificat d''études primaires	7.3	57.23	11	1.4	5.20290157	57.23	7.3	10.9566451	0.2017997
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6.1	47.82	34	4.34	1.40657058	47.82	6.1	4.10630791	0.06161764
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17.2	134.85	118	15.05	1.14278888	134.85	17.2	2.55125829	0.35925734
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.4	128.58	223	28.44	0.57657733	128.58	16.4	1.35056727	0.01594091
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	12.7	99.57	202	25.77	0.4929136	99.57	12.7	1.36059811	0.01565484
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22.4	175.62	190	24.23	0.92431207	175.62	22.4	2.29438818	0.02515978

POST_VOTE_COL2	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	20.5	160.72	271	34.57	0.59306273	160.72	20.5	18.15450661	0.16552776
UMP	20.1	157.58	227	28.95	0.69420264	157.58	20.1	14.95136143	0.25374093
Rassemblement Bleu Marine (Front National)	0.1	0.78	21	2.68	0.03733333	0.78	0.1	0.2017997	0.01565484
Front de Gauche	0.8	6.27	7	0.89	0.896	6.27	0.8	1.52262919	0.40269765
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	2.6	20.38	13	1.66	1.568	20.38	2.6	2.29438818	0.87193419
Autre	4.1	32.14	28	3.57	1.148	32.14	4.1	2.08310061	0.479511
Non-votant	48.3	378.67	189	24.11	2.00355556	378.67	48.3	44.38780391	0.58727668
Ne sait pas	3.5	27.44	28	3.57	0.98000000	27.44	3.5	1.84414082	0.4877295

WEIGHTING REPORT - POSTWGT4
- POSTWGT4 –

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_VOTE_COL1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 17.93%
Number of iterations performed: 6

Input count of respondents: 784
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 784.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	15.69	123.01	115	14.67	1.06956496	123	15.69	28.04532091	0.04363447
Male - 35 to 54	17.97	140.88	153	19.52	0.92085475	140.89	17.97	19.87181671	0.02566963
Male - 55 plus	13.81	108.27	106	13.52	1.02167807	108.3	13.81	23.88800554	0.23160887
Female - 18 to 34	16.42	128.73	119	15.18	1.08177126	128.73	16.42	30.53865615	0.0404857
Female - 35 to 54	18.77	147.16	152	19.39	0.96796299	147.13	18.77	3.57110902	0.05257615
Female - 55 plus	17.34	135.95	139	17.73	0.97805915	135.95	17.34	8.53797977	0.03048198

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	17.9	140.34	6	0.77	23.38783062	140.33	17.9	30.53865615	18.11136773
Du certificat d''études primaires	7.3	57.23	11	1.4	5.20269967	57.23	7.3	8.53797977	0.47475487
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	6.1	47.82	34	4.34	1.40660154	47.82	6.1	2.33960514	0.10661177
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	17.2	134.85	118	15.05	1.14278653	134.85	17.2	3.57110902	0.56466647
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.4	128.58	223	28.44	0.57657967	128.58	16.4	1.93855053	0.03091768
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	12.7	99.57	202	25.77	0.49292194	99.57	12.7	2.09014744	0.02566963
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	22.4	175.62	190	24.23	0.92432925	175.62	22.4	3.02129617	0.05309071

POST_VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	30.4	238.34	271	34.57	0.87946863	238.34	30.4	28.04532091	0.23160887
UMP	29.8	233.63	227	28.95	1.02921586	233.63	29.8	23.88800554	0.35851011
Rassemblement	0.2	1.57	21	2.68	0.07466667	1.57	0.2	0.47475487	0.02566963

Bleu Marine (Front National)									
Front de Gauche	1.3	10.19	7	0.89	1.456	10.19	1.3	2.90550212	0.65551995
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	3.9	30.58	13	1.66	2.352	30.58	3.9	3.02129617	1.22912216
Autre	6	47.04	28	3.57	1.68	47.04	6	3.57110902	0.66892977
Ne sait pas	28.4	222.66	217	27.68	1.02606452	222.66	28.4	30.53865615	0.27181459

Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT1
- PREWGT1 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 15.48%
Number of iterations performed: 5

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	12.24	124.11	122	12.03	1.01740332	124.12	12.24	36.16425599	0.54562798
Male - 35 to 54	16.53	167.61	165	16.27	1.01574938	167.6	16.53	7.41275658	0.60117211
Male - 55 plus	18.14	183.94	195	19.23	0.9433302	183.95	18.14	20.58933958	0.31064153
Female - 18 to 34	12.34	125.13	132	13.02	0.94799455	125.14	12.34	32.9647144	0.49735492
Female - 35 to 54	17.75	179.99	191	18.84	0.94242243	180	17.75	22.95367029	0.34631335
Female - 55 plus	23.00	233.22	209	20.61	1.11574542	233.19	23	6.52943459	0.52953498

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	19.7	199.76	8	0.79	24.96975	199.76	19.7	36.16425599	20.58933958
Du certificat d''études primaires	10.1	102.41	19	1.87	5.39021053	102.41	10.1	7.41275658	3.83036742
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	7.5	76.05	34	3.35	2.23676471	76.05	7.5	3.00679242	1.55368919
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	21.9	222.07	177	17.46	1.25461017	222.07	21.9	1.64800313	0.85156681
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.8	170.35	266	26.23	0.64042105	170.35	16.8	0.8402284	0.43416824
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11.4	115.6	242	23.87	0.47766942	115.6	11.4	0.62256335	0.32169495
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	12.6	127.76	268	26.43	0.47673134	127.76	12.6	0.60117211	0.31064153

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT2
- PREWGT2 –

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_INT

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 10.86%
Number of iterations performed: 6

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	12.24	124.11	122	12.03	1.01761005	124.15	12.24	16.51793859	0.43358955
Male - 35 to 54	16.53	167.61	165	16.27	1.01615173	167.67	16.54	13.2742007	0.47658793
Male - 55 plus	18.14	183.94	195	19.23	0.94294972	183.88	18.13	50.21451798	0.29823069
Female - 18 to 34	12.34	125.13	132	13.02	0.94794703	125.13	12.34	43.75294711	0.25985456
Female - 35 to 54	17.75	179.99	191	18.84	0.94212681	179.95	17.75	45.83521854	0.27222145
Female - 55 plus	23	233.22	209	20.61	1.11596227	233.24	23	13.86229627	0.49770252

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	19.7	199.76	8	0.79	24.97303476	199.78	19.7	50.21451798	10.3704926
Du certificat d''études primaires	10.1	102.41	19	1.87	5.39089501	102.43	10.1	13.86229627	1.71548831
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	7.5	76.05	34	3.35	2.23673188	76.05	7.5	7.64058865	1.08535157
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	21.9	222.07	177	17.46	1.25454798	222.05	21.9	5.32884398	0.6294969
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.8	170.35	266	26.23	0.64040918	170.35	16.8	2.6590035	0.31410836
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11.4	115.6	242	23.87	0.47763069	115.59	11.4	2.10641025	0.25985456
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	12.6	127.76	268	26.43	0.47667676	127.75	12.6	2.2086173	0.2724632

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	56.08	568.65	907	89.45	0.62695832	568.65	56.08	16.51793859	0.25985456
No, will not vote	43.92	445.35	107	10.55	4.16213832	445.35	43.92	50.21451798	1.14849807

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3
- PREWGT3 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_VOTE_COL1, PRE_INT

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 10.53%
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	12.24	124.11	122	12.03	1.01732459	124.11	12.24	14.41036768	0.00000000
Male - 35 to 54	16.53	167.61	165	16.27	1.01584364	167.61	16.53	13.49301848	0.00000000
Male - 55 plus	18.14	183.94	195	19.23	0.94328	183.94	18.14	45.891478	0.00000000
Female - 18 to 34	12.34	125.13	132	13.02	0.94793636	125.13	12.34	45.72302014	0.00000000
Female - 35 to 54	17.75	179.99	191	18.84	0.94232984	179.99	17.75	49.93327704	0.00000000
Female - 55 plus	23.00	233.22	209	20.61	1.11588517	233.22	23.00	14.24786308	0.00000000

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	19.7	199.76	8	0.79	24.96975	199.76	19.7	49.93327704	9.20423511
Du certificat d''études primaires	10.1	102.41	19	1.87	5.39021053	102.41	10.1	14.24786308	0.00000000
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	7.5	76.05	34	3.35	2.23676471	76.05	7.5	7.54358473	0.00000000
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	21.9	222.07	177	17.46	1.25461017	222.07	21.9	5.40234115	0.00000000
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.8	170.35	266	26.23	0.64042105	170.35	16.8	2.4337331	0.00000000
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11.4	115.6	242	23.87	0.47766942	115.6	11.4	1.88841005	0.00000000
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	12.6	127.76	268	26.43	0.47673134	127.76	12.6	1.91937932	0.00000000

PRE_VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	15.4	156.16	233	22.98	0.46747104	108.92	10.74	3.00177185	0.23269215
UMP	25.6	259.58	249	24.56	0.72716092	181.06	17.86	13.23015637	0.31841001
Rassemblement Bleu Marine	17.3	175.42	179	17.65	0.68356998	122.36	12.07	14.41036768	0.20358765

(Front National)									
Front de Gauche	5.8	58.81	63	6.21	0.65114447	41.02	4.05	2.42377839	0.33782627
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	5	50.7	43	4.24	0.82241583	35.36	3.49	12.16123053	0.29376253
Autre	11.3	114.58	48	4.73	1.66504938	79.92	7.88	6.18528031	0.86528073
Ne sait pas	19.6	198.74	199	19.63	2.23793367	445.35	43.92	49.93327704	0.00000000

PRE_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	56.08	568.65	907	89.45	0.62695832	568.65	56.08	14.41036768	0.00000000
No, will not vote	43.92	445.35	107	10.55	4.16213832	445.35	43.92	49.93327704	1.10446964

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT3B
- PREWGT3 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_VOTE_COL2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 10.11%
Number of iterations performed: 7

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	12.24	124.11	122	12.03	1.01763529	124.15	12.24	12.80814313	0.28844494
Male - 35 to 54	16.53	167.61	165	16.27	1.01607026	167.65	16.53	13.27604846	0.29538686
Male - 55 plus	18.14	183.94	195	19.23	0.94296578	183.88	18.13	51.80028584	0.17932202
Female - 18 to 34	12.34	125.13	132	13.02	0.94787878	125.12	12.34	46.33275812	0.16039455
Female - 35 to 54	17.75	179.99	191	18.84	0.94219587	179.96	17.75	50.13396883	0.17355357
Female - 55 plus	23.00	233.22	209	20.61	1.11597687	233.24	23	14.12742659	0.31432969

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	19.7	199.76	8	0.79	24.97374667	199.79	19.7	51.80028584	7.70649292
Du certificat d''études primaires	10.1	102.41	19	1.87	5.39077316	102.42	10.1	14.12742659	1.41400887
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	7.5	76.05	34	3.35	2.23670618	76.05	7.5	7.65226356	0.70775872
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	21.9	222.07	177	17.46	1.25456706	222.06	21.9	5.21595083	0.40913101
D'un baccalauréat ou	16.8	170.35	266	26.23	0.64040042	170.35	16.8	2.53751341	0.19903858

d'un brevet professionnel									
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11.4	115.6	242	23.87	0.47762673	115.59	11.4	1.9216154	0.16039455
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	12.6	127.76	268	26.43	0.47666708	127.75	12.6	2.04457741	0.17065802

PRE_VOTE_COL2	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	9	91.26	233	22.98	0.39167382	91.26	9	2.47858558	0.18306519
UMP	15	152.1	249	24.56	0.61084337	152.1	15	12.38289411	0.24943358
Rassemblement Bleu Marine (Front National)	10.1	102.41	179	17.65	0.57214525	102.41	10.1	12.80814313	0.16039455
Front de Gauche	3.4	34.48	63	6.21	0.5472381	34.48	3.4	2.1483676	0.26881972
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	2.9	29.41	43	4.24	0.68386047	29.41	2.9	10.91893751	0.23401852
Autre	6.6	66.92	48	4.73	1.39425	66.92	6.6	5.30092992	0.70573504
Non-votant	43.9	445.15	107	10.55	4.16024299	445.15	43.9	51.80028584	1.04343383
Ne sait pas	9.1	92.27	92	9.07	1.00297826	92.27	9.1	3.40153882	0.42562581

WEIGHTING REPORT - PREWGT4
- PREWGT4 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, PRE_VOTE_COL1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 14.65%
Number of iterations performed: 7

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	12.24	124.11	122	12.03	1.01720266	124.1	12.24	34.30895094	0.31686579
Male - 35 to 54	16.53	167.61	165	16.27	1.01561739	167.58	16.53	11.40098323	0.29373987
Male - 55 plus	18.14	183.94	195	19.23	0.94372616	184.03	18.15	28.45315514	0.12955407
Female - 18 to 34	12.34	125.13	132	13.02	0.94789013	125.12	12.34	32.47932633	0.29616006
Female - 35 to 54	17.75	179.99	191	18.84	0.94241594	180	17.75	22.54394827	0.20556513
Female - 55 plus	23.00	233.22	209	20.61	1.11566921	233.17	23	10.35413092	0.26676831

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	19.7	199.76	8	0.79	24.96278383	199.7	19.69	34.30895094	14.20795575

Du certificat d''études primaires	10.1	102.41	19	1.87	5.38979182	102.41	10.1	11.40098323	2.51091292
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	7.5	76.05	34	3.35	2.23692495	76.06	7.5	10.04890639	0.74376037
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	21.9	222.07	177	17.46	1.25465121	222.07	21.9	6.61757984	0.44482047
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.8	170.35	266	26.23	0.64047567	170.37	16.8	3.20536067	0.19973309
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11.4	115.6	242	23.87	0.47772587	115.61	11.4	2.27849869	0.14197827
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	12.6	127.76	268	26.43	0.47681635	127.79	12.6	2.07911236	0.12955407

PRE_VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	15.4	156.16	233	22.98	0.67019742	156.16	15.4	8.04968119	0.20429765
UMP	25.6	259.58	249	24.56	1.04250602	259.58	25.6	28.45315514	0.26278366
Rassemblement Bleu Marine (Front National)	17.3	175.42	179	17.65	0.98001117	175.42	17.3	34.30895094	0.12955407
Front de Gauche	5.8	58.81	63	6.21	0.93352381	58.81	5.8	3.85649576	0.29627778
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	5	50.7	43	4.24	1.17906977	50.7	5	23.19340585	0.2142064
Autre	11.3	114.58	48	4.73	2.387125	114.58	11.3	10.04890639	0.85006801
Ne sait pas	19.6	198.74	199	19.63	0.99871357	198.74	19.6	32.47932633	0.13121984

WEIGHTING REPORT - POSTWGT1
- POSTWGT1 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 16.27%
Number of iterations performed: 9

Input count of respondents: 733
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 733.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	12.24	89.72	92	12.55	0.97497221	89.7	12.24	3.76711199	0.65746669
Male - 35 to 54	16.53	121.16	125	17.05	0.9691236	121.14	16.53	6.55032768	0.50502797
Male - 55 plus	18.14	132.97	155	21.15	0.85813736	133.01	18.15	22.68691124	0.17960604
Female - 18 to 34	12.34	90.45	80	10.91	1.13038374	90.43	12.34	4.26751459	0.74480098

Female - 35 to 54	17.75	130.11	131	17.87	0.99359409	130.16	17.76	25.44675543	0.20145497
Female - 55 plus	23.00	168.59	150	20.46	1.12372861	168.56	23	5.96133196	0.45961661

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	19.7	144.4	6	0.82	24.06683333	144.4	19.7	25.44675543	22.68691124
Du certificat d''études primaires	10.1	74.03	17	2.32	4.35488235	74.03	10.1	6.55032768	2.32953122
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	7.5	54.98	24	3.27	2.290625	54.98	7.5	4.26751459	1.02909559
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	21.9	160.53	113	15.42	1.42059292	160.53	21.9	2.90558089	0.70067024
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.8	123.14	189	25.78	0.65155556	123.14	16.8	1.17527168	0.28341248
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11.4	83.56	184	25.1	0.4541413	83.56	11.4	0.7940477	0.19148171
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	12.6	92.36	200	27.29	0.46179	92.36	12.6	0.74480098	0.17960604

WEIGHTING REPORT - POSTWGT2
- POSTWGT2 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_INT

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 14.59%
Number of iterations performed: 10

Input count of respondents: 733
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 733.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	12.24	89.72	92	12.55	0.9750147	89.7	12.24	9.08977541	0.31009619
Male - 35 to 54	16.53	121.16	125	17.05	0.96916007	121.15	16.53	12.89086178	0.30599869
Male - 55 plus	18.14	132.97	155	21.15	0.858092	133	18.15	23.26464719	0.12052
Female - 18 to 34	12.34	90.45	80	10.91	1.13041675	90.43	12.34	5.88819856	0.40306919
Female - 35 to 54	17.75	130.11	131	17.87	0.9934993	130.15	17.76	24.87056124	0.12883927
Female - 55 plus	23.00	168.59	150	20.46	1.1237842	168.57	23	13.97353496	0.3316988

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	19.7	144.4	6	0.82	24.0676042	144.41	19.7	24.87056124	23.26464719

					2				
Du certificat d''études primaires	10.1	74.03	17	2.32	4.35482982	74.03	10.1	13.97353496	1.14649527
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	7.5	54.98	24	3.27	2.29063993	54.98	7.5	9.08977541	0.79774961
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	21.9	160.53	113	15.42	1.42057978	160.53	21.9	5.88819856	0.39756919
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.8	123.14	189	25.78	0.65154703	123.14	16.8	2.2887675	0.15453681
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11.4	83.56	184	25.1	0.45413808	83.56	11.4	1.78496148	0.12052
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	12.6	92.36	200	27.29	0.461788	92.36	12.6	1.8073869	0.12203416

POST_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, will vote	53.37	391.2	570	77.76	0.68631947	391.2	53.37	24.87056124	0.12052
No, will not vote	46.63	341.8	163	22.24	2.09691963	341.8	46.63	13.97353496	0.53371373

WEIGHTING REPORT - POSTWGT3
- POSTWGT3 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_VOTE_COL1, POST_INT

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 12.13%
Number of iterations performed: 20

Input count of respondents: 733
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 733.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	12.24	89.72	92	12.55	0.97520805	89.72	12.24	10.56640291	0.00000001
Male - 35 to 54	16.53	121.16	125	17.05	0.96931861	121.16	16.53	13.35223092	0.00000001
Male - 55 plus	18.14	132.97	155	21.15	0.85784727	132.97	18.14	34.34703022	0
Female - 18 to 34	12.34	90.45	80	10.91	1.13065168	90.45	12.34	5.85870964	0.00000007
Female - 35 to 54	17.75	130.11	131	17.87	0.99318825	130.11	17.75	34.56118149	0
Female - 55 plus	23	168.59	150	20.46	1.12393273	168.59	23	15.08829133	0.00000001

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	19.7	144.4	6	0.82	24.06683271	144.4	19.7	34.56118149	0.00000078
Du certificat d''études primaires	10.1	74.03	17	2.32	4.35488228	74.03	10.1	15.08829133	0.00000003
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	7.5	54.98	24	3.27	2.29062497	54.97	7.5	10.56640291	0.00000002
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	21.9	160.53	113	15.42	1.42059298	160.53	21.9	5.85870964	0.00000001
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.8	123.14	189	25.78	0.65155556	123.14	16.8	3.27000464	0.00000000
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11.4	83.56	184	25.1	0.4541413	83.56	11.4	3.11323146	0.00000000
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	12.6	92.36	200	27.29	0.46179	92.36	12.6	2.34800818	0.00000000

POST_VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	20.4	149.53	190	25.92	0.56607482	107.55	14.67	34.34703022	0.11902475
UMP	30.2	221.37	207	28.24	0.76919042	159.22	21.72	34.56118149	0.11458311
Rassemblement Bleu Marine (Front National)	14.1	103.35	91	12.41	0.81691147	74.34	10.14	21.21374042	0.0703314
Front de Gauche	1.3	9.53	16	2.18	0.42837157	6.85	0.94	1.39512545	0.16539143
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	2.6	19.06	5	0.68	2.74157805	13.71	1.87	3.27000464	2.34800818
Autre	5.6	41.05	35	4.77	0.84356248	29.52	4.03	3.21848336	0.28509141
Ne sait pas	25.8	189.11	189	25.78	1.8084545	341.8	46.63	15.08829133	0.00000000

POST_INT	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Yes, voted	53.37	391.2	570	77.76	0.68631947	391.2	53.37	34.56118149	0.000000000
No, did not vote	46.63	341.8	163	22.24	2.09691963	341.8	46.63	15.08829133	0.51896113

WEIGHTING REPORT - POSTWGT3B
- POSTWGT3 -

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_VOTE_COL2

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 13.81%
Number of iterations performed: 11

Input count of respondents: 733
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 733.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	12.24	89.72	92	12.55	0.97500587	89.7	12.24	10.01734853	0.17068398
Male - 35 to 54	16.53	121.16	125	17.05	0.96914442	121.14	16.53	13.56673499	0.16408363
Male - 55 plus	18.14	132.97	155	21.15	0.85814508	133.01	18.15	28.09615589	0.06203037
Female - 18 to 34	12.34	90.45	80	10.91	1.13040783	90.43	12.34	5.78254625	0.21502276
Female - 35 to 54	17.75	130.11	131	17.87	0.99349258	130.15	17.76	32.55823458	0.07559023
Female - 55 plus	23	168.59	150	20.46	1.12375844	168.56	23	15.35644548	0.18869189

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	19.7	144.4	6	0.82	24.06692526	144.4	19.7	32.55823458	17.94424432
Du certificat d''études primaires	10.1	74.03	17	2.32	4.35481677	74.03	10.1	15.35644548	0.9113068
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	7.5	54.98	24	3.27	2.29062463	54.97	7.5	10.01734853	0.47440465
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	21.9	160.53	113	15.42	1.42060504	160.53	21.9	5.78254625	0.21738202
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.8	123.14	189	25.78	0.65155255	123.14	16.8	2.94305733	0.08250007
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11.4	83.56	184	25.1	0.45413887	83.56	11.4	2.78766388	0.06203037
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	12.6	92.36	200	27.29	0.4617911	92.36	12.6	2.16119454	0.06301979

POST_VOTE_COL2	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	13.7	100.42	190	25.92	0.52853158	100.42	13.7	28.09615589	0.10867518
UMP	20.3	148.8	207	28.24	0.71883575	148.8	20.3	32.55823458	0.10334346
Rassemblement Bleu Marine (Front National)	9.5	69.64	91	12.41	0.76521978	69.64	9.5	19.54259416	0.06203037
Front de Gauche	0.9	6.6	16	2.18	0.4123125	6.6	0.9	1.34286522	0.14486126
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	1.7	12.46	5	0.68	2.4922	12.46	1.7	2.94305733	2.16119454
Autre	3.8	27.85	35	4.77	0.79582857	27.85	3.8	3.00879473	0.2476813
Non-votant	46.6	341.58	163	22.24	2.09557055	341.58	46.6	15.35644548	0.47601406
Ne sait pas	3.5	25.66	26	3.55	0.98673077	25.66	3.5	17.94424432	0.06940786

WEIGHTING REPORT - POSTWGT4
- POSTWGT4 –

RIM weighting: AGE_GEND, EDUC, POST_VOTE_COL1

Overall RIM Weighting Efficiency: 15.69%
Number of iterations performed: 10

Input count of respondents: 733
Respondent weight limits specified for this group: min. 0.00000000 - max. 733.00000000

AGE_GEND	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Male - 18 to 34	12.24	89.72	92	12.55	0.97503538	89.7	12.24	6.12981056	0.40701061
Male - 35 to 54	16.53	121.16	125	17.05	0.96918072	121.15	16.53	6.92496106	0.31077525
Male - 55 plus	18.14	132.97	155	21.15	0.85807603	133	18.14	24.16873449	0.10384101
Female - 18 to 34	12.34	90.45	80	10.91	1.13046494	90.44	12.34	5.12578064	0.4390254
Female - 35 to 54	17.75	130.11	131	17.87	0.99344778	130.14	17.75	31.73760355	0.13636067
Female - 55 plus	23.00	168.59	150	20.46	1.12379011	168.57	23	6.73831534	0.28974387

EDUC	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
D'aucun diplôme	19.7	144.4	6	0.82	24.0666165	144.4	19.7	31.73760355	20.60882212
Du certificat d''études primaires	10.1	74.03	17	2.32	4.35483076	74.03	10.1	6.92496106	2.31387458
Du BEPC, brevet des collèges	7.5	54.98	24	3.27	2.29062521	54.98	7.5	4.48136188	0.68828501
D'un CAP ou d'un BEP	21.9	160.53	113	15.42	1.42061281	160.53	21.9	5.12578064	0.43598595
D'un baccalauréat ou d'un brevet professionnel	16.8	123.14	189	25.78	0.65155484	123.14	16.8	6.12981056	0.16892357
D'un diplôme de niveau bac + 2	11.4	83.56	184	25.1	0.45413967	83.56	11.4	4.32166553	0.11041051
D'un diplôme de niveau supérieur à bac + 2	12.6	92.36	200	27.29	0.46179181	92.36	12.6	2.8771758	0.10384101

POST_VOTE_COL1	PROJECTED		INPUT		WEIGHT	OUTPUT		MAX. RESP. RIM WEIGHT	MIN. RESP. RIM WEIGHT
	%	#	#	%		#	%		
Parti Socialiste	20.4	149.53	190	25.92	0.78701053	149.53	20.4	24.11842618	0.15958237
UMP	30.2	221.37	207	28.24	1.06940097	221.37	30.2	31.73760355	0.15991524

Rassemblement Bleu Marine (Front National)	14.1	103.35	91	12.41	1.13574725	103.35	14.1	20.60882212	0.10384101
Front de Gauche	1.3	9.53	16	2.18	0.5955625	9.53	1.3	2.131274	0.18034317
Europe-Écologie Les Verts	2.6	19.06	5	0.68	3.8116	19.06	2.6	6.12981056	2.85217231
Autre	5.6	41.05	35	4.77	1.1728	41.05	5.6	5.12578064	0.2887591
Ne sait pas	25.8	189.11	189	25.78	1.00060317	189.11	25.8	23.15729052	0.15322291