



Election Day Survey

Main Results

Report prepared for the
Central Election Commission of Georgia
by
CRRC-Georgia

Tbilisi
June, 2010

Election Day Survey

Main Results*

Introduction

CRRC carried out an election day survey on May 30, the day of the 2010 local elections in Georgia. The survey was conducted at the polling stations with cameras in the three main cities of Georgia: Tbilisi, Batumi and Kutaisi (For more detailed information about the survey methodology please see annex1).

In general, the people surveyed believed the elections were well organized, and few people indicated that they had had any problems with the voter lists. The main results from the survey can be summarized as follows:

- An overwhelming majority (97 percent) of those surveyed said the elections were well organized.
- A majority (93 percent) said that they had no problems with the voter lists.
- Many people (82 percent) said they obtained information on these elections from TV news.
- More than half (61 percent) were unaware of the presence of cameras in the polling stations.
- A majority (84 percent) supports the cameras in the polling stations.

To enable a basic comparison of the respondents' views, we looked at the differences between (i) genders, (ii) age groups and (iii) those who had voted in previous elections against first-time voters. While there were no major differences between the genders in terms of attitudes toward the elections, some (minor) differences between the age groups and those voting for the first time were noticed and include:

- There were more women voters (65 percent) in the 61 and over age group than in the youngest (18-25) group (54 percent).
- A majority (67 percent) of those voting for the first time were in the 18-25 age group.

* Report prepared by Tamar Khoshtaria, Giorgi Babunashvili and Jesse Tatum

- More people in the 18-25 and 36-45 age groups (88/89 percent) voted in ten minutes or less than those in other age groups (80 to 85 percent).
- A higher percentage (85/86 percent) of the respondents under 61 years old supported that there were cameras in all polling stations than did those in the 61 or over age group (77 percent).

In addition, respondents who knew that there was a camera in the polling station showed more support for it (92 percent).

Main findings

Almost 4,000 voters were surveyed on May 30 in Georgia, of which 62 percent were women and 38 percent were men (Table 1). As the results showed, all age groups attended the elections: 14 percent of the respondents were aged between 18 and 25, 17 percent were between 26 and 35 and 18 percent were between 36 and 45 years old. Almost one third (29 percent) of the respondents were between 46 and 60 years old. The remaining 21 percent of the voters were 61 years old and over. One percent refused to give an answer (Table 2). Furthermore, only 9 percent of the respondents were voting for the first time, while the majority (91 percent) of the voters claimed they did not vote for the first time (Table 3).

The survey results also showed that the majority of Georgians get information about the elections from television: 82 percent of the voters said they receive information about electoral process from TV news, while 4 percent named TV talk shows as source of information. Another 4 percent named Central Election Commission (CEC) advertisements as main source, while only 2 percent claimed they get information about electoral process from newspaper articles (Table 4).

According to the respondents, the elections were well organized, as 97 percent of the voters claimed that the voting process was calm and orderly, while only one percent denied this (Table 5). Furthermore, 93 percent of the respondents said that neither they nor anyone from their family had any problems with the voter's list, while 6 percent said they did have problems (Table 6). In addition, 85 percent of the voters voted in less than 10 minutes, while only 13 percent claimed it took them more than 10 minutes to vote (Table 7).

The question about the cameras in the polling stations revealed that the voters were largely unaware of their presence. As the results demonstrate, more than half of the respondents (61 percent) said they did not know whether there was a camera in the polling station or not. Only 18 percent of the voters knew that there was a camera, while 14 percent said there was no camera in the polling station. Furthermore, 6 percent of the respondents refused to give an answer to this question (Table 8).

After the interviewers told the respondents that there was a camera in polling station, they were asked to assess the purpose of the cameras. Half of the voters (51 percent) said the cameras served to prevent electoral fraud. Twenty-five percent said that they served to see if procedures were followed. Five percent stated that the cameras were to assist in resolving election disputes, while 2 percent thought cameras served to see who voted. Another 2 percent said cameras assist in “recording who you voted for”, whereas 12 percent claimed they did not know the purpose of the cameras (Table 9).

The survey findings showed that, apparently, the Georgian electorate approves the monitoring of the election procedure, as 84 percent of the respondents said they support the use of cameras in all polling stations, while only 8 percent does not support. In addition, 9 percent of the respondents could not decide if they supported the cameras (Table 10).

Comparison of voters' perceptions

The results revealed no significant differences between genders. Both Georgian men and women had similar opinions and attitudes toward the electoral process. However, 17 percent of the male voters were in the age group 18 to 25, in contrast to female voters, where the share of 18-25 year old respondents was only 12 percent (Table 11).

As for the age groups, the findings showed some differences, which were most noticeable between the youngest (18-25) and the eldest (61 or over) age groups.

The percentage of women respondents was lower (54 percent) among the age group 18-25, compared with the elder age groups, where the share of women voters was 60 to 65 percent (Table 12).

The age groups also had different opinions and attitudes toward the cameras in the polling stations. Slightly higher percent (21 percent) of the respondents aged 18-25 knew that there was a camera in the polling station compared with the elder respondents aged 61 or over (17 percent) (Table 13).

As for the purpose of the cameras, 54 percent of the respondents aged 18-25 said that they served to prevent the electoral fraud, in contrast to 48 percent of the respondents aged 61 or over, who named the same purpose. Moreover, 29 percent of the young voters aged 26-45, compared with 18 percent of voters aged 61 or over, claimed that cameras served to see if procedures were followed. The age group “61+” also had the highest percent of “don’t know” answers (20 percent compared with 9 and 11 percent in other age groups) (Table 14).

The results also show that higher percentage (85-86 percent) of the respondents in all young age groups supported the cameras in all polling stations, compared with the respondents who were 61 years old or over (77 percent) (Table 15).

Furthermore, 89 percent of the respondents aged 18-25 voted in less than 10 minutes, compared with 80 percent of the respondents who are 61 or over (Table 16).

There were some significant differences between the respondents who were voting for the first time and those who were not voting for the first time. Forty-six percent of the respondents voting for the first time were men, while the percent of male voters was lower (37 percent) among respondents who were not voting for the first time (Table 17).

As the results demonstrate, 83 percent of the respondents who did not vote for the first time said they receive information about the electoral process from TV news, compared with 78 percent of those respondents who did vote for the first time. A higher percentage of the respondents who voted the first time receive information from the CEC website (4 percent compared with 1 percent) (Table 18).

Moreover, 23 percent of the respondents first time voting knew that there was a camera in the polling station, in contrast to 18 percent of those respondents who were not voting for the first time (Table 19). This indicates that the younger generation might have had slightly more information about the electoral process compared with the elder generation, as 67 percent of those who were voting for the first time were aged 18 to 25 (Table 20).

As for the cameras in the polling stations, an overwhelming majority (92 percent) of those voters who knew that there was a camera said they support the cameras in all polling stations, while fewer respondents (74 percent) of those who were not aware of the cameras were supportive of the cameras (Table 21).

In addition, 58 percent of those respondents who knew that there was a camera in the polling station said that its purpose was to prevent electoral fraud, while fewer voters (41 percent) of those voters who said that there was no camera named the same purpose (Table 22).

Annex 1

Methodology

The target population was all voters voting at standard and no-address precincts (i.e. all precincts which were not special precincts) in the ten voting districts of Tbilisi, in the voting district of Kutaisi and in the voting district of Batumi. We utilized a complex survey design with (1) three strata: Tbilisi, Kutaisi and Batumi; (2) electoral precincts as primary sampling units; and (3) individuals as secondary sampling units.

We sampled 40 precincts, and the number of precincts sampled in each stratum was allocated in proportion to the total number of precincts in all of the districts in that stratum – 31 in Tbilisi, 5 in Kutaisi, and 4 in Batumi.

Selection of precincts

Precincts were selected within strata using a modified systematic sample. Systematic sampling means that, first, a “step size” is established based on the number of precincts we wish to sample; for example, if we sample every sixth precinct our step size is six. Then a starting point between one and the step size is randomly selected; in the case of our example we randomly chose to begin sampling with the first, second, third, fourth, fifth or sixth precinct on our list, and then sampled every sixth precinct after that. The benefit of systematic sampling is that we ensure that we do not exclude any region of the country due to chance, which can happen in a simple random sample. Moreover, systematic samples behave like simple random samples in the absence of periodicity (Lohr 1999), and since we have no reason to expect periodicity we can treat our sample of precincts as though it were a simple random sample for data analysis purposes.

Our systematic sample was slightly modified. Step sizes are established based on the population size and the desired sample size; for example, if the population size is 600 and the desired sample size is 100, then a step size of six is needed. However, in reality the population size is unlikely to be an exact multiple of the desired sample size. If the population size is 700 and the desired sample size is

200, then a step size of three will result in too large a sample and a step size of four will result in too small a sample. Thus, the systematic sample was adapted as follows: the step size was set to a non-integer value; the number of precincts in a given stratum divided by the desired sample size in that stratum. An algorithm took steps of that size, and each time a step was taken, the precinct whose index number the total was rounded to was selected. Effectively, the step size alternated between that of the integer above it and that of the integer below it.

Number of interviews

Interviewers were assigned to precincts in teams of two, and each interviewer was given four half-hour breaks during the 12-hour period in which the polling station was open, for a total of 10 working hours per person. Each interviewer was instructed to attempt one interview every ten minutes, for a planned target sample size of 40 precincts x 2 interviewers per precinct x 10 hours per interviewer x 6 interviews per hour = 4800 target interviews. In most precincts this method produced approximately 120 target interviews; however, in two precincts the voter turnout was so low that it produced significantly fewer (94 target interviews and 23 target interviews). Thus, the actual number of target interviews was 4,672.

The number of completed interviews was calculated as follows: interviews in which the respondent answered fewer than 50 percent of the questions applicable to him or her were discarded. Interviews in which the respondent answered more than 50 percent but not more than 80 percent of the applicable questions were categorized as 50 percent response, and interviews in which the respondent answered more than 80 percent of the applicable questions were categorized as full responses. A sum of 3,716 fully completed interviews and 232 partially completed interviews resulted in a total of 3,948 interviews or $3,716 + \frac{232}{2} = 3,832$ full interviews.

Sampling weights

Weights were calculated in an integrated manner, so that $w_{hi} = \frac{N_h}{n_h} \frac{M_{hi}}{m_{hi}}$

where N_h is the total number of precincts in stratum h , n_h is the number of precincts sampled in stratum h , M_{hi} is the number of voters who voted in precinct i of stratum h (this data was collected from the CEC's website), and m_{hi} is the number of voters who answered at least 50% of the applicable interview questions in precinct i of stratum h . Non-respondents were excluded from the sample sizes in the above equation so that separate non-response weights need not be calculated separately.

Reference

Lohr, S. L. 1999. *Sampling: Design and Analysis*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., Pacific Grove, California, USA.

Annex 2

Tables

Table 1

Gender (%)	
Male	38
Female	62

Table 2

Age groups (%)	
18-25	14
26-35	17
36-45	18
46-60	29
61+	21
RA	1

Table 3

Is this your first time voting? (%)	
Yes	9
No	91

Table 4

From where do you receive information about the electoral process? (%)	
From TV News	82
From radio News	1
From TV talk shows	4
From CEC advertisements	4
From CEC website	1
From news paper articles	2
Attended open hours session organized by CEC	1
From CEC On-line operator	1
DK	3

Table 5

Was the voting process calm and orderly? (%)	
Yes	97
No	1
DK	2

Table 6

Did you or anyone from your family have any problems with the voter's list? (%)	
Yes	6
No	93
DK	1

Table 7

Did it take less than 10 minutes to vote? (%)	
Yes	85
No	13
DK	2

Table 8

Was there a camera in the polling station? (%)	
Yes	18
No	14
DK	61
RA	6

Table 9

What purpose do you think the camera at the polling station serves? (%)	
Prevent electoral fraud	51
See if procedures were followed	25
Assist in resolving election disputes	5
See who voted	2
Record who you voted for	2
Intimidate voters	1
Other	2
DK	12

Table 10

Do you support the use of cameras in all polling stations? (%)	
Yes	84
No	8
DK	9

Table 11

Age groups BY Gender (%)						
	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-60	61+	RA
Male	17	17	17	28	20	0
Female	12	16	19	29	22	1

Table 12

Gender BY Age groups (%)		
	Male	Female
18-25	46	54
26-35	40	60
36-45	35	65
46-60	37	63
61+	35	65

Table 13

Was there a camera in the polling station? BY Age groups (%)				
	Yes	No	DK	RA
18-25	21	12	61	5
26-35	20	16	58	7
36-45	18	12	64	6
46-60	18	15	61	7
61+	17	15	61	7

Table 14

Purpose of the camera at the polling station BY Age groups (%)					
	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-60	61+
Prevent electoral fraud	54	53	51	51	48
See if procedures were followed	25	29	27	26	18
Assist in resolving election disputes	5	3	6	6	4
See who voted	2	2	2	3	4
Record who you voted for	2	1	2	2	3
Intimidate voters	0	1	0	0	1
Other	1	2	2	2	2
DK	11	9	9	9	20

Table 15

Do you support the use of cameras in all polling stations? BY Age groups (%)			
	Yes	No	DK
18-25	85	6	9
26-35	86	8	5
36-45	86	6	8
46-60	85	7	7
61+	77	10	13

Table 16

Did it take less than 10 minutes to vote? BY Age groups (%)			
	Yes	No	DK
18-25	89	9	2
26-35	83	14	3
36-45	88	10	3
46-60	85	13	2
61+	80	16	3

Table 17

Gender BY Is this your first time voting? (%)		
	Male	Female
Yes	46	54
No	37	63

Table 18

From where do you receive information about electoral process? BY Is this your first time voting? (%)		
	Yes	No
From TV News	78	83
From radio News	1	2
From TV talk shows	4	4
From CEC advertisements	5	4
From CEC website	4	1
From news paper articles	1	2
From CEC hotline	0	0
Attended open hours session organized by CEC	1	1
From CEC On-line operator	2	1
DK	3	3

Table 19

Was there a camera in the polling station? BY Is this your first time voting? (%)				
	Camera	No camera	DK	RA
Yes	23	13	58	5
No	18	14	61	7

Table 20

Age groups BY Is this your first time voting? (%)					
	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-60	61+
Yes	67	11	6	9	6
No	8	17	20	31	23

Table 21

Do you support the use of cameras in all polling stations?			
BY Was there a camera in the polling station? (%)			
	Support	Don't support	<i>DK/RA</i>
Yes	92	5	3
No	74	13	13
<i>DK</i>	83	7	9

Table 22

Purpose of the camera at the polling station			
BY Was there a camera at the polling station? (%)			
	Yes	No	<i>DK</i>
Prevent electoral fraud	58	41	51
See if procedures were followed	24	25	25
Assist in resolving election disputes	6	6	5
See who voted	3	2	3
Record who you voted for	2	2	2
Intimidate voters	0	1	0
Other	1	3	2
<i>DK/RA</i>	6	20	12