Appendix: Data files and procedure used for weighting R1-R6

SUMMARY: Procedures for weight calculations are technically documented here, together with links to all files involved, so that the weighting process can be fully reproduced. Details are elaborated in the following files[1]:

- *Post-stratification weighting of the ESS, Methodology development & data preparation* (DACE WP12): general methodological description.
- *Weighting for R1-R5* **(**DACE project, 3B, DACE WP12): implementation of weighting for R1-R5
- *Country-specific Quality Control Checks for ESS Weighting Procedures* (DACE WP12, additional task 3A): comments from national coordinators and corresponding modifications.
- *Sensitivity analysis*: *Weighting effects on work module variables R5* (DACE, additional task 3B, DACE WP12): specific sensitivity analyses for variables in R5 WORK module*).*

Below we summarize and illustrate the process by showing marginal distributions of control variables for Round 5. In Table 1 below Slovenia serves as an illustration (examples for Germany and Estonia are in the Appendix). The external control LFS/APP (LSF of or national Appendix for non-EU countries, presented in column A) are in column A. However, this may not fully match with finally weighted ESS data (column E). Reason are differences in distributions in columns A and B, which are due to preparations for weighting, where we use simple yet robust method of handling missing values in the LFS/APP margins to obtain corresponding ESS missing data structure. This LFS/APP structure (column B) was then used to weight the ESS data (raw data in column C; while base design weight in D). Slovenia has design weights equal to 1, so no differences between columns C and D. Results of weighting procedures (column E) are identical to modified LFS/APP source (column B). Still, after trimming of weights (at 4.0) negligible differences may appear in final officially weighted file (column F). Note that due to complex re-coding of the control variables (age, gender, age, region), which were used operationally in weighting process, their margins may not be always exactly the same as those in publically available ESS data files. Nevertheless, they are all included in working files discussed below.

Table 1: Marginal distributions of control variables in ESS R5 and LFS 2010, Slovenia; values in percentages (%).

	LFS		ESS			
	(A) Official (weighted)	(B) Prepared for weighting	(C) No weights	(D) Design weights	(E) Weighted, untrimmed	(F) Weighted trimmed
SLOVENIA						
Gender						
Male	49.2	49.2	46.4	46.4	49.2	49.2
Female	50.8	50.6	53.5	53.5	50.6	50.6
Missing	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Age						
15–34 years	31.0	30.8	29.4	29.4	30.8	30.8
35–54 years	34.6	34.2	31.8	31.8	34.2	34.2
55 years or more	34.4	33.8	37.5	37.5	33.8	33.8
Missing	0.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Education						
Low	24.7	24.8	23.9	23.9	24.8	24.8
Middle	56.8	56.3	55.0	55.0	56.3	56.3
High	18.8	18.7	20.9	20.9	18.7	18.7
Missing	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Region						
Eastern Slovenia	53.1	53.1	59.0	59.0	53.1	53.1
Western Slovenia	46.9	46.9	41.1	41.1	46.9	46.9
Missing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

[1] http://mi.ris.org//c/781/ESS_Weighting/

0. Introduction

The description below documents and illustrates the steps of the ESS weighting procedure. The methodological approach and various specifics were further described in detail in the above mentioned materials, which we also refer to whenever needed in the all corresponding steps below. As an example, the case of Slovenia Round 5 is used, while Germany and Estonia are in Appendix. The weights for R6 were calculated separately from R1-R5, but were following exactly the same procedures as for R1-R5. The exception is that there were no additional feedback from National coordinators for this task, but their previous comments were included.

1. Obtaining control data

In November 2011 we obtained the control LFS data for R1-R5, described also on the Eurostat website. Eurostat sent us only the data with corresponding weighing variables (age, gender, education, and region) and only in table (spreadsheet) format and not as microfile with data for individuals. Eurostat data are already weighted according to best national practice (usually this is age, gender and region). We have converted their data into CSV format (see LFS data file [.zip] for R1-R5 and LFS data file 2013 [.zip] for R6) to be used as population control for weight calculations in a majority of ESS countries. For other countries we used control data obtained by ESS from National Coordinators (Appendix A4, available on ESS website) or other national sources. Margins of official LFS data are presented in columns A of Tables 1, 4 and 5.

It should be noted that Eurostat later slightly changed the data for previous years for some countries, which we noticed only when obtaining data for ESS Round 6 in 2013. Typically, changes relate to the third age category. However, we estimate this has only negligible effect, so as for now, we did not perform recalculations. Still, this formally means another discrepancy between ESS and controls.

2. Preparing LFS data (column A)

Based on the original LFS data, we formed two pivot tables, included in the LFS preparation [.xlsx] file (see LFS preparation 2013 [.xlsx] for R6). The first pivot table (sheet *xtabs* in the linked Excel file) includes gender, age, and education. Each row in this file presents a combination of year (variable *YEAR*) and country (*COUNTRY*). Columns include all possible combinations of gender (*SEX*), three categories of age grouped from original 11 categories (*AGE2*), and education grouped in three categories (*HATLEVEL1D*). The values within the pivot table are calculated as the sum of *VALUE* variable and represent the weighted frequencies in table format. Because we received already weighted LFS data, it is not possible to retrieve the unweighted values. For region, we formed another pivot table (sheet *REGION*) where regions (variable *REGION*) are presented in rows, countries in columns (variable *COUNTRY*), and years (*YEAR*) in the Excel report filter. Weighted frequencies in table format are again represented by the variable *VALUE*. Column A in Table 1 thus presents the weighted margins of official LFS data.

In case of Appendix data was used (HR, IL, IS, NO, RF, and UA), the variables were manually recoded equivalently to how this was done for LFS.

3. ESS data and the corresponding recoding of variables (columns C and D)

The original ESS data file in SPSS format was retrieved from the ESS website. The weighting variables gender, age, and education (GAE) were first recoded to match the categories and values of the LFS data as documented in the ESS recoding syntax [.txt] file for SPSS.

As region is country-specific, recoding procedures for this variable were tailored separately for each country. In most cases the values in ESS file were recoded to match NUTS2 regions of the LFS file, but in some cases recoding of LFS or both data files was necessary to obtain the common denominator. The procedures are described in the *Recoding method* column of the Region recoding [.xlsx] file for each ESS round. The recoded values are included in the Recoded regions [.xlsx] file (for R6 see the draft file Recoded regions [.xlsx]), where values are presented on separate sheets for each country.

The following recoded categories were obtained:

- Gender: 0 - missing, 1 - Male, 2 - Female
- Age: 0 - missing, 1 - 15-34 years old, 2 - 35-54 years old, 3 - 55+ years old
- Education: 0 - missing, 1 - Low (ISCED 0, ISCED 1, ISCED 2), 2 - Medium (ISCED 3, ISCED 4), 3- High (ISCED 5, ISCED 6)
- Region: country-specific

Missing values in our working files are denoted by 0 (and not 99) for weighting purposes. No recodings or other changes were made in the official files.

The respondent IDs, design weights and other required variables (listed above) were copied from SPSS to another file and saved in CSV format (compressed in ESSdata [.rar]). Further details on recoding are provided in the document *Post-stratification weighting of the ESS, Methodology development & data preparation* at the documentation webpage.

Columns C and D of Table 1 show example of unweighted and design-weighted marginal distributions of recoded control variables in the original ESS data file. It is important to note that we initially used ESS values weighted using the design weight (*dweight*). However, as design weights for some countries (including Slovenia and Estonia in the example) equal 1 they thus have no effect on the frequency distribution of variables. Of course, as mentioned, the margins (column C, D) cannot be simply reproduced from official ESS data, but recoding of variables (as described above) is needed and can be easily reproduced using our syntax. In addition, for countries that have certain specifics (see the comments of National Coordinators in the TASK 3A Report[2]) additional recoding were sometimes needed, which will be documented and included as links in the next upgrade of this report.

4. Preparation of GAE (gender-age-education) tables and missing values in LFS (column B)

The GAE values were first computed on design-weighted recoded ESS data using the following SPSS table generation syntax [.txt] file. The procedure assigned a coded value to each case, denoting the combination of gender (first digit: 0-2), age (second digit: 0-3) and education (third digit: 0-3). In total there are 48 different codes for cell values, as described in Table 2 in the Appendix. Blue rows represent missing values (a missing value for at least one of the three variables), while pink rows represent non-missing values. Coded values thus range from 0 (missing values on all three demographic variables) to 233 (denoting a female, aged 55 or more with completed higher education).

[2] **Country-specific Quality Control Checks for ESS Weighting Procedures,** DACE WP12, additional task **3A** *(comments from NC and corresponding modifications),* http://mi.ris.org//c/781/ESS_Weighting/

This recoding is an initial technical step needed to ease the comparison of values in ESS and control (LFS/APP) data.

Then, GAE values were computed with a pivot table for LFS data. Here additional manipulations were needed to deal adjust missing values structure according to the values in ESS. Depending on the presence of missing values in either sample data (ESS) or control data (LFS or other source), the following approaches for treatment of missing values in the LFS were used:

- If a missing value existed only in a sample cell (ESS), values in missing cells were copied to the corresponding cells in the control data and other cells were proportionally adjusted to preserve the ratio.
- If missing values existed only in the control data and they presented up to 1% of the population, we used *procedure I* (standard MCAR assumption). If there is more than 1% of missing values in the control data, we re-allocated missing values between known values using *procedure II* (assuming MAR).
- If a missing value existed in both, the sample and the control cell, and if the number of missing values on control data was lower than on sample data, we used the control cell in post-stratification normally. Otherwise, if the number of missing values in the control data was higher, we decreased it to the sample value and then (assuming MAR) equally re-allocated the difference among other values in control data according to *procedure III*.

A detailed description of these procedures is provided in section 2.3 of the report *Post-stratification weighting of the ESS, Methodology development & data preparation* available on the documentation webpage (examples of calculations using MCAR or MAR assumptions are elaborated in section 2.3.2 of the report). Similar procedures were used also for APP data.

After handling missing values in control data (LFS/APP) we obtained the adjusted control margins presented in column B of Table 1. The control dataset with artificially introduced missing values, obtained by the procedures described above, includes the same proportion of missing values as the sample dataset with design weights. This is evident comparing columns B and D of the table.

After implementing the procedures for treatment of missing values, we calculated the marginal distributions of adjusted LFS/APP data. The margins are provided in two files (specified in points below), depending on the source of control data for a specific country. The name of each sheet in these two files is composed of four parts: 1. Number of the ESS round; 2. Initials of control variables used for tabulations (e.g. GAE for gender-age-education or GA for gender-age); 3. Procedure used to handle missing values (I-III); and 4. Country code in case of country-specific procedures. Data for countries where procedure II or III was used to handle missing values are in most cases presented on separate sheets. Where marginal distributions are not explicitly given, they can be derived by summing the corresponding columns that are coded as presented above: the first digit in column name represents gender, the second age, and the third education, with 0 denoting a missing value.

1. The file Controls LFS [.xlsx] includes adjusted margins (variables *LFS_p*), calculated on the basis of control data. For countries presented in Table 1, the adjusted margins match column B of the table. Depending on data availability, different control variables were used. If the procedure II or III was used for handling missing values in any ESS round, this is explicitly noted in parentheses next to the corresponding country:
    - **Three-dimensional GAE table** for Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany (III in R1 and R2), Denmark (II in R1, III in R4 and R5), Estonia (II in R3 and R5, III in R2 and R4), Spain (II in R5), Finland, France, Greece, Hungary (II in R2, R4 and R5, III in R1 and R3), Italy, Luxemburg, Lithuania, Latvia (II in R4, III in R3), Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Sweden in R1–R4 (III in R1-R4), Slovenia (III in R1), Slovakia, and Turkey.

- **Two-dimensional table for gender and age** for Switzerland, Ireland, Poland, and United Kingdom.
- **Three two-dimensional tables between each GAE variable and region** (i.e. region/gender, region/age, and region/education) for Belgium.

2. The file with other controls [.xlsx] includes adjusted controls (APP_p) from other sources (section 2.1 of *Post-stratification weighting of the ESS, Methodology development & data preparation* at the documentation webpage). Here, cross-tabulations between control variables again depend on their availability:
   - **Three-dimensional GAE table** for Norway (III in R1, R4 and R5), Russia, and Sweden in R5 (because some age-related data were not available in LFS 2010 for Sweden).
   - **Two-dimensional table for gender and age with education in a separate table** for Israel and Iceland.
   - **Two-dimensional table for gender and age** for Croatia and Ukraine.

The procedures for each country are summarized in Table 3 and further described in the documents available at the documentation webpage: *Post-stratification weighting of the ESS, Methodology development & data preparation* (section 2.3, summarized in Table 7) and *Country-specific Quality Control Checks for ESS Weighting Procedures* (describes comments from national coordinators and corresponding modifications, summary is provided in Table 4 in chapter 4 of the document).

5. Calculation of weights (column E)

Labels and values of control variables from the above Excel files were copied into the Syntax generator [.xlsx] file (corresponding syntax is in columns, lines 7-22), which automatically generates syntax to be used in the R statistical package 'Survey'. Syntax is also discussed in *Post-stratification weighting of the ESS, Methodology development & data preparation* (DACE WP12): general methodological description, Section 2.4).

In most cases there are two tables to be copied, GAE or GA and Region. The multidimensional table (GAE or GA) is post-stratified and then raked to the second table (Region). The default maximal number of iterations (maxit) for this R function is 50. In countries with only 1 region (CY, IS, LU, LT, LV) only the first table is copied and only post-stratification was performed. Some manual adaptations were needed only for Belgium and Israel that have a third table; in the former because of separate weighting of region (GR, AR, ER) and in the latter due to education tabulated separately from gender and age (GA, E, R).

When the calculated weights were applied to the original ESS dataset, we obtained the marginal distribution illustrated by column E of Table 1, which of course matches the modified control data used for weighting (column B).

The syntaxes for all rounds and countries are also saved as a text file in SyntaxAll [.txt]. It should be noted that, as mentioned in point 3, there are some inconsistencies between CSV databases and the syntax for countries in Rounds 1-5, for which the weighting procedure was changed based on the recommendations of National Coordinators (see report for Task 3A). The syntaxes in this file have been updated, while the databases were not yet (except for Round 6) and are work in progress to be concluded shortly.

6. Weight trimming (column F)

Finally, weights were trimmed to avoid any of the unit in the dataset to have an excessively high weight. The weights were cut at the values 2 and 4, but only the latter were actually used for weighting

(example in column F of Table 1). The final untrimmed and trimmed weights for all countries in Rounds R1-R5 are provided in the file Weights [.rar] (compressed RAR file), on sheet *results*. For R6 see file Weights 2012 [xlsx]. In addition to weights themselves, a file for each round also contains the trimming procedures (sheet *trim*) and pivot tables with descriptive statistics of weights (sheet *pivot*). The weights from the *results* sheet can be matched with the original ESS data file using case (*idno*) and country (*cntry*) identifiers. Sensitivity analysis for weight trimming is reported in section 3.3 of the report *Weighting for R1-R5*, published on the documentation webpage.

APPENDIX:

Table 2: GAE cell codes

Gender	Age	Education	CellCode
Missing	Missing	Missing	0
Missing	Missing	Low	1
Missing	Missing	Medium	2
Missing	Missing	High	3
Missing	15-34	Missing	10
Missing	15-34	Low	11
Missing	15-34	Medium	12
Missing	15-34	High	13
Missing	35-54	Missing	20
Missing	35-54	Low	21
Missing	35-54	Medium	22
Missing	35-54	High	23
Missing	55+	Missing	30
Missing	55+	Low	31
Missing	55+	Medium	32
Missing	55+	High	33
Male	Missing	Missing	100
Male	Missing	Low	101
Male	Missing	Medium	102
Male	Missing	High	103
Male	15-34	Missing	110
Male	15-34	Low	111
Male	15-34	Medium	112
Male	15-34	High	113
Male	35-54	Missing	120
Male	35-54	Low	121
Male	35-54	Medium	122
Male	35-54	High	123
Male	55+	Missing	130
Male	55+	Low	131
Male	55+	Medium	132
Male	55+	High	133
Female	Missing	Missing	200
Female	Missing	Low	201
Female	Missing	Medium	202
Female	Missing	High	203
Female	15-34	Missing	210
Female	15-34	Low	211
Female	15-34	Medium	212
Female	15-34	High	213
Female	35-54	Missing	220
Female	35-54	Low	221
Female	35-54	Medium	222
Female	35-54	High	223
Female	55+	Missing	230
Female	55+	Low	231
Female	55+	Medium	232
Female	55+	High	233

Table 3: Overview of missing data procedures

		Weighting tables format			Structure of missing values in GAE table						Handling missing values					
	File	p1	p2, p3*	Reg	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R5	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R5
AT	LFS	GAE	R	9	S	S+(P)	S	-	-	-	I	I	I	-	-	-
BE	LFS	GR	AR, ER*	3	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	I	I	I	I	I	I
BG	LFS	GAE	-	6	-	-	S	N	S	S	-	-	I	I	I	I
CH	LFS	GA	R	7	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	I	I	I	I	I	I
CY	LFS	GAE	-	1	-	-	S	S	S	S	-	-	I	I	I	I
CZ	LFS	GAE	R	8	S+(P)	S	-	(P)	(P)	(P)	I	I	-	I	I	I
DE	LFS	GAE	R	16	S+P *	S+P *	S	S+(P)	S+(P)	S+(P)	III	III	I	I	I	I
DK	LFS	GAE	R	5	S+P	S+(P)	N	(P) *	P *	P *	II	I	I	III	III	III
EE	LFS	GAE	R	7	-	P	S+P	S+P *	S+P *	S+P *	-	III	II	III	II	II
ES	LFS	GAE	R	16	S+(P)	S	S+(P)	S+(P)	S+P	S+P	I	I	I	I	II	II
FI	LFS	GAE	R	4	S	S	S	S	S	S	I	I	I	I	I	I
FR	LFS	GAE	R	9	S+(P)	S	N	S	S+(P)	S+(P)	I	I	I	I	I	I
GR	LFS	GAE	R	10	S	S	-	S	S	S	I	I	-	I	I	I
HR	APP	GA	R	3	-	-	-	NoE	NoE	NoE	-	-	-	I	I	I
HU	LFS	GAE	R	7	S *	S+P *	S+P	S+P	S+P	S+P	III	II	III	II	II	II
IE	LFS	GA	R	2	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	I	I	I	I	I	I
IL	APP	GA	E, R*	7	NoE	-	-	NoE	NoE	NoE	I	-	-	I	I	I
IS	APP	GA	E	1	-	NoE	-	-	-	-	-	I	-	-	-	-
IT	LFS	GAE	R	5	S	S	-	-	-	-	I	I	-	-	-	-
LU	LFS	GAE	-	1	S	S+(P)	-	-	-	-	I	I	-	-	-	-
LT	LFS	GAE	-	1	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	I	-	-
LV	LFS	GAE	-	1	-	-	S+(P) *	P	-	-	-	-	III	II	-	-
NL	LFS	GAE	R	12	S+(P)	S+(P)	(P)	(P)	(P)	(P)	I	I	I	I	I	I
NO	APP/LFS	GAE	R	7	N	S+(P)	S	P *	P *	P *	III	I	I	III	III	III
PL	LFS	GA	R	16	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	I	I	I	I	I	I
PT	LFS	GAE	R	5	N	S	S	S	S	S	I	I	I	I	I	I
RO	LFS	GAE	R	8	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	-	I	I	I	I
RF	APP	GAE	R	10	-	-	S+P	S+P	S+P	S+P	-	-	I	I	I	I
SE	LFS/APP	GAE	R	8	S+P *	P *	S+P *	P *	(P) *	(P) *	III	III	III	III	I	I
SI	LFS	GAE	R	2	S *	S+(P)	S	S	S	S	III	I	I	I	I	I
SK	LFS	GAE	R	4	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	I	I	I	I	I
TR	LFS	GAE	R	12	-	S	-	S+(P)	-	-	-	I	-	I	-	-
UA	APP	GA	R	11	-	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	-	I	I	I	I	I
UK	LFS	GA	R	12	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	NoE	I	I	I	I	I	I

Structure of missing values:
NoE = no 3-dimensional GAE table (education is in a separated table);
N = no issues (correspondence between missing value cells on sample and control data);
S = there are missing value cells on sample that do not exist in control data;
P = there are missing value cells on control data that do not exist in sample data;
() = missing values do not exceed 1%;
* = missing value on control data for at least 1 point higher than on sample;

Handling missing values:
I (MCAR) = Standard procedure for handling missing values used in most countries;
II (MAR) = Re-allocation procedure for handling missings for countries with more than 1% of missings in LFS data;
III (MAR)= Re-allocation procedure for handling missings for countries with more than 1% of missings in LFS data and large discrepancy from the ESS missing structure

Table 4: Marginal distributions of control variables in ESS Round 5 and LFS 2010 data files for Germany Values are presented in percentages (%).

	LFS		ESS			
	(A) Official (weighted)	(B) Prepared for weighting	(C) No weights	(D) Design weights	(E) Weighted, untrimmed	(F) Weighted trimmed
Gender						
Male	48.8	48.8	51.3	51.5	48.8	48.9
Female	51.3	51.2	48.7	48.5	51.2	51.1
Missing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Age						
15–34 years	26.8	26.8	27.4	28.4	26.8	26.8
35–54 years	35.4	35.3	36.0	36.2	35.3	35.3
55 years or more	37.8	37.7	36.4	35.2	37.7	37.7
Missing	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Education						
Low	23.3	23.3	17.7	19.2	23.3	23.2
Middle	55.3	55.4	56.9	56.2	55.3	55.4
High	21.3	21.3	25.2	24.4	21.3	21.3
Missing	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Region						
Baden-W.	13.0	13.0	9.5	11.9	13.0	13.0
Bayern	15.2	15.2	14.2	18.0	15.2	15.2
Berlin	4.3	4.3	3.4	3.0	4.3	4.3
Brandenburg	3.2	3.2	7.5	3.9	3.2	3.2
Bremen	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8
Hamburg	2.2	2.2	0.9	1.1	2.2	2.2
Hessen	7.3	7.3	6.4	7.8	7.3	7.3
Mecklenburg-V.	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Niedersachsen	9.8	9.8	6.1	7.8	9.8	9.8
Nordrhein-W.	21.7	21.7	18.7	23.1	21.7	21.7
Rheinland-Pfalz	4.9	4.9	4.3	5.4	4.9	4.9
Saarland	1.2	1.2	0.7	0.8	1.2	1.2
Sachsen	5.2	5.2	8.5	4.5	5.2	5.2
Sachsen-Anhalt	3.0	3.0	6.0	3.2	3.0	3.0
Schleswig-H.	3.4	3.4	2.7	3.2	3.4	3.4
Thüringen	2.8	2.8	6.5	3.5	2.8	2.8
Missing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 5: Marginal distributions of control variables in ESS Round 5 and LFS 2010 data files for Estonia. Values are presented in percentages (%).

	LFS		ESS			
	(A) Official (weighted)	(B) Prepared for weighting	(C) No weights	(D) Design weights	(E) Weighted, untrimmed	(F) Weighted trimmed
Gender						
Male	45.0	45.0	40.3	40.3	45.0	45.0
Female	55.0	55.0	59.7	59.7	55.0	55.0
Missing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Age						
15–34 years	33.5	33.5	27.9	27.9	33.5	33.5
35–54 years	32.3	32.3	31.3	31.3	32.3	32.3
55 years or more	34.2	34.2	40.7	40.7	34.2	34.2
Missing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Education						
Low	17.8	19.6	22.7	22.7	19.6	19.6
Middle	46.4	50.9	50.3	50.3	50.9	50.9
High	26.7	29.5	27.0	27.0	29.5	29.5
Missing	9.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Region	Not used for weighting					