



**HAL**  
open science

# YouTube Recommendations Do Predict Polls: A note on the 2022 French presidential election

Erwan Le Merrer, Gilles Trédan, Ali Yesilkanat

## ► To cite this version:

Erwan Le Merrer, Gilles Trédan, Ali Yesilkanat. YouTube Recommendations Do Predict Polls: A note on the 2022 French presidential election. [Research Report] Rapport LAAS n° 22136, Inria. 2022. hal-03655608

**HAL Id: hal-03655608**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-03655608v1>**

Submitted on 29 Apr 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# YouTube Recommendations Do Predict Polls:

## A note on the 2022 French presidential election

Erwan Le Merrer (Inria), Gilles Trédan (LAAS/CNRS) and Ali Yesilkanat (Inria)

### Abstract

We ask if YouTube political recommendations follow the polls performed during the 2022 presidential campaign in France. We find that these recommendations to users, particularly the exposure time in recommended videos, allow for a good prediction of polls, with a daily Mean Absolute Error of solely 3.24% over all candidates. Compared to final election results, polls were 1.11% accurate, whereas our approach was 1.93% accurate.

Close to 50M people were accessing YouTube every month in France in 2021 (statistics by BDM). We wonder if this mass access constitutes a sufficient signal to estimate another signal captured from the public at the same period: polls.


**Methodology** We consider the twelve candidates able to run for the presidency officially. We set up automated scripts that simulate users watching videos on YouTube. At every simulation, a cookie-free fresh bot goes on the French "National News" category, watches a random video, and the 4 following autoplay videos.. This action is performed around 180 times per day, from January 17th to April 10th (first-round election day). In this experiment, we extract the transcripts of the 5 video sequences and search for candidate names within each transcript. The time duration of a sentence in which a candidate is mentioned is counted as exposure time to her credit. We aggregate the total exposure time of each candidate over the course of a day and normalize this value by the total exposure time of all candidates: this yields a ratio representing each candidate's exposure timeshare (ETS). This value is directly compared the polls collected and made available by the Pollotron website (please refer to the Appendix).

**Results** Figure (a) presents both polls (solid curve,  $y$ -axis) and measured ETS (dashed curve,  $y$ -axis) for the top-5 highest candidates over 3 months preceding the first election round ( $x$ -axis); both are smoothed (7-day rolling window).

While ETS values are less stable than polls, both generally exhibit a close match throughout the period. For instance, this statement should be nuanced for some candidates, with Zemmour being systematically over-rated by ETS and Le Pen conversely under-rated. Interestingly, both polls and ETS provide a good estimation of candidates' actual results during the first election round (represented as dots), respectively exhibiting average errors of 1.11% and 1.93%.

Table (b) presents the Mean Absolute Error between ETS and polls for the 12 candidates over the whole monitored period. We also report the average exposure time per candidate that our scripts encountered for relative comparison.

We find this 3.24% prediction to be very significant, with the notable remark that ETS ends up with less than 1% error more than the last polls before the results. As polls rely on considerably fewer people than the scale at which people impact recommendations, this is certainly an interesting research track for future events.



(a) Evolution of polls and of the ETS metric over the campaign, for the top-5 highest-scored candidates.

Candidates	MAE (%)	Avg ETS / day (s)	Election Results (%)
Arthaud	0.30	9.48	0.56
Dupont-Aignan	1.51	3.41	2.06
Hidalgo	1.01	63.92	1.74
Jadot	3.14	71.57	4.63
Lassalle	1.00	23.74	3.13
Le Pen	8.70	544.08	23.15
Macron	3.26	773.99	27.85
Mélenchon	3.79	378.47	21.95
Poutou	0.53	15.81	0.76
Pécresse	8.02	213.76	4.78
Roussel	2.26	65.42	2.28
Zemmour	5.34	424.57	7.07
<b>Avg</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>215.68</b>	N/A

(b) Mean Absolute Error (MAE) between polls and our Exposure Time Share (ETS) measure on first column. Average exposure time witnessed by our scripts in a day.

## Appendix: recommendations as a predictor

**Extracting exposure time from videos** Let  $V$  a set of videos. Given  $v \in V$ , by parsing its transcript, we extract (an approximation of) each candidate's exposure time by counting the duration (in seconds) of sentences in which this candidate's name appears. Let  $t_{v,c}$  this value.

**Runs collecting videos** We did perform an average of 180 script runs per day. Let  $t$  be the day, let  $W_t$  the set of runs of that day. A run  $w \in W_t$  consists of a random click on a video  $v_1$  of the National news page, followed by the autplayed (first suggested video played by default after current video is over)  $v_2 = a(v_1)$ , followed by the autplayed  $v_3 = a(v_2)$ , and so on and so forth, until  $v_5$ . We conveniently write  $v(w) = \{v_1, \dots, v_5\}$  to designate the set of videos returned by a run  $w$ . Similarly, we define  $v(W_t) = \cup_{w \in W_t} v(w)$  to be the videos returned by runs over day  $t$ .

**Candidate Daily Exposure Time** Let  $s_c(t)$  be the total exposure time of candidate  $c$  found in videos fetched on day  $t$ , which we define as  $et_c(t) = \sum_{v \in v(W_t)} t_{v,c}$ . From there, we define the *Exposure Time Share (ETS)* of candidate  $c$  on day  $t$  as:  $r_c(t) = \frac{et_c(t)}{\sum_c et_c(t)}$ .

**Polls and matching metric** Over the measurement period, we collect the aggregated poll values from Pollotron<sup>1</sup>. Let  $pol_c(t)$  be the poll score of candidate  $c$  on day  $t$ .

To measure the agreement of polls and ETS, we rely on standard Mean Average Error. Given a candidate  $c$ , we define it as the absolute difference between predicted (ETS) value and poll value, averaged over all days of the measurement period  $T$ . Formally:  $MAE_c = \frac{1}{T} \sum_t |r_c(t) - pol_c(t)|$ .

This MAE approach is also used to compare ETS and polls against the actual results obtained by each candidate at the election first round. First, let  $res_c$  be the result (i.e. the fraction of valid expressed votes) obtained by candidate  $c$ . Let  $t_f$  be the election day, and  $t'_f$  be the last polling day<sup>2</sup>. The average error between ETS (resp. polls) and results is computed as:  $err_{ETS} = \frac{1}{12} \sum_c |r_c(t_f) - res_c|$ , resp.  $err_{POL} = \frac{1}{12} \sum_c |pol_c(t'_f) - res_c|$ . A value of 0.012 can be interpreted as: "on average, predictions were 1.2% off the actual result".

---

<sup>1</sup><https://datapolitics.fr/agregateur-sondages-presidentielle2022/>

<sup>2</sup>French legislation imposes polls to stop 24 hours before the vote day.