



insight + inspiration



**Colmar  
Brunton**  
A Millward Brown Company

## Disability voter and non- voter satisfaction survey 2008

<b>PREPARED FOR</b>	The Chief Electoral Officer, Ministry of Justice
<b>ATTENTION</b>	Robert Peden
<b>ISSUE DATE</b>	1 April 2009
<b>CONTACT[S]</b>	Ian Binnie

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive summary</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Background and method .....	4
Summary of findings .....	4
<b>Background and objectives</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>9</b>
Data collection method .....	9
Questionnaire .....	9
Sample .....	9
Differences between 2005 and 2008 methodology .....	10
Notes on reading this report .....	11
2008 disability sample profile .....	12
<b>Previous voting behaviour</b> .....	<b>15</b>
Voting in 2005 election .....	15
<b>Voting</b> .....	<b>16</b>
Voting method .....	16
Help voting .....	16
Voting preference .....	16
<b>Knowledge of advance voting, voting by mail, and MMP</b> .....	<b>18</b>
Knowledge of advance voting .....	18
Would knowledge of advance voting lead to voting in advance? .....	18
Source of information about advance voting .....	19
Knowledge of voting by mail .....	19
Would knowledge of voting by mail lead to voting by mail? .....	20
Ease of understanding MMP .....	20
<b>Information for people with disabilities</b> .....	<b>22</b>
Disability information sources .....	22
Usefulness of DVD in NZ Sign Language .....	23
Usefulness of DVD featuring people with an intellectual disability .....	24
Usefulness of poster about what to do in polling place .....	24
Usefulness of booklet on enrolling and voting .....	24
Usefulness of brochure on what to do if cannot get to polling place .....	25
Usefulness of captions on advertisements .....	25
Usefulness of brochure in large print .....	25
Usefulness of elections website .....	26
Usefulness of disability newsletters .....	26
<b>Other information about voting (including EasyVote pack)</b> .....	<b>27</b>
Receiving EasyVote pack .....	27
Satisfaction with EasyVote pack .....	27
Other advertising about voting process .....	28
Where other advertising was seen or heard .....	29
Overall usefulness of information about voting process .....	30
Other information required .....	31
<b>Polling Place</b> .....	<b>32</b>
Proportion of disabled voters that went to the polling place .....	32
Who accompanied voters to polling place? .....	32
Time of day voted .....	32
Use of EasyVote card or CEO letter when voting .....	33
Time taken at polling place .....	33
Feelings on time taken at polling place .....	34

Colmar Brunton undertakes all research projects to the highest possible standards, and in accord with the principles detailed in the MRSNZ Code of Practice which is based on the ESOMAR Code of Conduct for Market Research.

All methodologies and techniques outlined in this report are provided solely for use by the client.

Copyright is reserved by Colmar Brunton.

Disability facilities at polling place .....	34
Happiness with voting facilities at the polling place .....	34
<b>The voting process .....</b>	<b>35</b>
Rating the clarity of instructions on how to cast vote .....	35
Rating the ease of finding name of person and party .....	35
Rating ability to answer questions .....	35
Rating pleasantness and politeness .....	36
Rating staff efficiency.....	36
Providing for needs of those with disabilities .....	36
Polling place problems .....	37
Description of polling place issues .....	37
<b>Election night results .....</b>	<b>38</b>
Watching results as they came in.....	38
How were results followed? .....	38
Timeliness of results .....	39
<b>Non-voters .....</b>	<b>40</b>
Possibility of voting in Election .....	40
When decided not to vote .....	40
Decision making process .....	40
Non-voters' awareness of a convenient polling place.....	40
Reasons for not voting .....	41
<b>Appendix A: Overview tables .....</b>	<b>43</b>

Colmar Brunton undertakes all research projects to the highest possible standards, and in accord with the principles detailed in the MRSNZ Code of Practice which is based on the ESOMAR Code of Conduct for Market Research.

All methodologies and techniques outlined in this report are provided solely for use by the client.

insight + inspiration

**Auckland**

Colmar Brunton House  
1-7 The Strand  
PO Box 33-690  
Takapuna, Auckland 0622  
P +64 9 919 9200  
F +64 9 919 9201

**Wellington**

Level 9  
101 Lambton Quay  
PO Box 3622  
Wellington 6011  
P +64 4 913 3000  
F +64 9 913 3001

**E** info@cbrak.co.nz  
**W** www.colmarbrunton.co.nz

# Executive summary

## Background and method

The Chief Electoral Office (CEO) commissioned Colmar Brunton to conduct a survey with voters and non-voters in 2008. The primary objectives of the survey are to:

- ascertain voter satisfaction with the services the CEO provides, and to
- understand what the barriers to voting are, and how to address these for each identified population group.

Colmar Brunton were commissioned to undertake the 2008 voter and non-voter survey with a booster survey of those with a disability. This report is based on the data obtained from disabled respondents. The results from the main survey are contained within another report.

A number of disability organisations assisted with this research by providing a random sample of disabled people from their contact lists ('the booster survey'). This was also the case in the 2005 survey, although different disability organisations were involved three years ago. As such the sample gathered reflects the type of organisations involved, it is not intended to be a random sample of *all* disabled people in New Zealand. Because different disability organisations were involved in 2005 and 2008, caution should be exercised when comparing 2008 results with 2005 results.

The term 'voters with a disability' when used in this report refers to all voters with a disability we interviewed, including all those identified in the main telephone survey and those interviewed in the booster survey. Likewise the term 'non-voters with a disability' refers to all non-voters with a disability interviewed through the same process.

122 disabled respondents were interviewed in the main telephone survey, and 128 were interviewed in the booster survey. Overall, 207 voters with a disability and 43 non-voters with a disability were interviewed.

Significant differences from the general population of voters and non-voters, are highlighted in this summary and the main report where relevant.

## Summary of findings

### Previous voting behaviour

- 96% of voters with a disability and 68% of non-voters with a disability (who were eligible to vote in 2005) voted in the 2005 General Election.

### Voting

- Most voters with a disability (86%) went to a polling place on Election Day. 7% went to an advance voting place, 3% voted from a hospital or a care home, and 3% voted using papers delivered by mail.
- 86% of voters with a disability voted at a polling place, 7% voted in advance.
- 57% of voters with a disability did not require help with voting.
- 63% of voters with a disability and 40% of non-voters with a disability would prefer to vote in person at a polling place or advance voting place.

- 19% of voters with a disability and 17% of non-voters with a disability would prefer to vote online (this is lower than the equivalent proportions for voters and non-voters in the general population).
- 11% of voters with a disability and 19% of non-voters with a disability would prefer postal voting (this is higher than the equivalent proportions for voters and non-voters in the general population).
- 62% of non-voters with a disability knew they could vote before Election Day (this is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters). 53% of those who did not know said they would have voted in advance if they had known about this option.
- 43% of voters with a disability and 73% of non-voters with a disability said they knew you could vote by post.
- 35% of voters with a disability and 26% of non-voters with a disability said they found MMP either 'easy' or 'very easy' to understand. Compared with voters in the general population, voters with a disability were less likely to feel they understood MMP. Differences between non-voters with a disability and non-voters in the general population were not statistically significant (mainly because of the small number of interviews conducted among non-voters with a disability).

### Disability information

- 81% of voters with a disability recall seeing electoral information specifically produced for people with a disability. The most commonly recalled sources were the booklet on enrolling and voting (45% of all voters with a disability recall this source) and the poster about what to do in a polling place (43%). 21% of voters with a disability also recall captions on advertisements.
- 64% of non-voters with a disability recall seeing electoral information specifically produced for people with a disability. The most commonly recalled sources were the DVD in NZ sign language (27% of all non-voters with a disability recall this source), captions on advertisements (23%), and the booklet on enrolling and voting (23%).
- More voters with disabilities found the disability information sources useful than not useful. The following figures show the proportion of voters with a disability that rated either a 4 or 5 out of 5 for usefulness.
  - Booklet on enrolling and voting – 73%.
  - Poster on what to do in a polling place – 70%.
  - Captions on advertisements – 70%.
  - Sign language DVD – 61%.
  - Articles and information in disability newsletters – 61%.
  - Brochure on what to do if you can't get to a polling place – 60%.
  - [www.elections.org.nz](http://www.elections.org.nz) – 48%.
  - Brochure in large print – 47%.
  - Other disability resources were not used by survey respondents.

### Other advertising and information

- 98% of voters with a disability and 67% of non-voters with a disability recall receiving the EasyVote pack in the mail.
- Voters who received and read the EasyVote pack were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with it. 85% of voters with a disability were satisfied with the EasyVote pack. This is lower than the general population of voters (92%).
- 52% of non-voters with a disability were satisfied with the EasyVote pack (which is not a significant difference from the proportion of non-voters in the general population that were satisfied). 24% were dissatisfied (which is higher than the proportion of non-voters in the general population that were dissatisfied - 9%).
- 63% of voters with a disability, and 57% of non-voters with a disability, had seen 'other' advertising about voting. That is advertising about how to vote, not including: the EasyVote

pack, disability specific information, or political advertising. This advertising was mostly seen on TV.

- 59% of voters with a disability and 29% of non-voters with a disability found this other advertising useful.
- 73% of voters with a disability, and 60% of non-voters with a disability, said they did not require further information about voting. Those that would like further information would like to receive it via TV.

## Polling place

- Just over half (52%) of voters with a disability who went to a polling place, did so with family members. 7% of voters with a disability said they were accompanied by non-family members. Differences between voters with a disability and the general population of voters are not statistically significant.
- 56% of voters with a disability voted in the morning (before noon), 34% voted in the afternoon (between noon and 5pm), and 6% voted in the evening (after 5pm). Compared with the general population of voters, voters with a disability were more likely to vote in the morning and less likely to vote in the afternoon.
- 87% of voters with a disability brought the EasyVote card with them to the polling place. 9% brought the letter from the Chief Electoral officer with them. These results are not significantly different from the general population of voters.
- 59% of voters with a disability said they only spent up to five minutes at the polling place. Compared with the general population of voters, voters with a disability were more likely to spend longer than 5 minutes (71% of voters in the general population spent up to five minutes, compared with 59% of voters with a disability). As with the main survey, almost all (96%) voters with a disability said the length of time spent was 'about right'.
- 67% of voters with a disability saw desk voting facilities at the polling place
- Over two-thirds (67%) of voters with a disability were either 'happy' or 'very happy' with the voting facilities.
- Most voters with a disability rated the voting process as either 4 or 5 out of 5, the proportions giving these scores are outlined below.
  - Clear instructions on how to cast vote (84%).
  - Ease of finding name of person or party (90%).
  - Electoral staffs' ability to answer questions (87%).
  - Pleasantness and politeness of Electoral staff (89%).
  - Efficiency of Electoral staff (87%).
  - How well Electoral staff provided for needs of disabled (66%).
- Voters with a disability were less likely than the general population of voters to give positive ratings for: ease of finding name of person or party, Electoral staffs' ability to answer questions, pleasantness and politeness of Electoral staff, and efficiency of Electoral staff.

## Election night results

- 86% of voters with a disability and 49% of non-voters with a disability said they followed the Election results. Most watched the results on TV (96% of voters and 85% of non-voters). These results are not significantly different from the main survey of voters and non-voters.
- Three quarters (75%) of voters with a disability were satisfied with the timeliness of results, this is lower than the equivalent proportion in the general population of voters (90%).
- 55% of non-voters with a disability were satisfied with the timeliness of results.

## Non-voters

(Please note that many of the differences between non-voters with a disability and non-voters in the general population are not statistically significant, mainly because of the small survey population of non-voters with a disability).

- 47% of non-voters with a disability said they 'considered voting at some stage' in the run up to the Election.
- Non-voters with a disability were asked when they decided not to vote. 48% of all non-voters decided not to vote on Election Day. The rest decided not to vote before then.
- Non-voters with a disability were asked how much thought they put into their decision not to vote. 33% put 'a lot of thought' into it, 26% put 'a little thought into it', and 41% did not put any thought into it.
- Most (76%) non-voters with a disability knew the location of a polling place that was convenient for them.
- The main overall reasons for not voting among non-voters with a disability were: having a disability (15%), health reasons (13%), not being able to work out who to vote for (13%), and the polling place being too far away or not having transport (10%).
- Compared with non-voters in the general population, non-voters with a disability were more likely to give the following reasons for not voting:
  - having a disability (15% vs. 1%),
  - health reasons (13% vs. 5%),
  - polling place too far away/no transport (10% vs. 1%), and
  - it is not important (8% vs. 2%).

## Background and objectives

The Chief Electoral Office is responsible for the administration of parliamentary Elections and referenda, advising Ministers and Select Committees of Parliament on electoral matters, and supporting the Representation Commission in its determination of electoral boundaries. The Chief Electoral Office is a division of the Ministry of Justice.

To ensure its service is appropriate to legal and political requirements, and to the electorate, the Chief Electoral Office (CEO) undertakes a Voter and Non-Voter Survey following each General Election. The primary objectives of the survey are to:

- ascertain voter satisfaction with the services the CEO provides, and to
- understand what the barriers to voting are, and how to address these for each identified population group.

The CEO commissioned Colmar Brunton to conduct a nation-wide survey with voters and non-voters in 2008. The results for the main survey are contained within a separate report. In addition, Colmar Brunton were commissioned to undertake a booster survey to obtain the views of those with a disability. This report is based on the data obtained from those who stated they had a long-term disability in the main nation-wide survey, combined with data obtained from a separate booster survey conducted among those with a disability.



# Methodology

## Data collection method

A mixed method approach was used to collect data from disabled respondents. A nation-wide telephone survey obtained responses from 122 disabled individuals, and a booster survey obtained a further 128 interviews.

For the booster survey Colmar Brunton worked alongside a number of disability organisations to survey those with a disability. Organisations included the Deaf Association, IHC, People First New Zealand, and the Disabled Persons Assembly. Most booster interviews were conducted face-to-face, with some questionnaires completed through a postal self-completion survey. Special provisions were used to assist with survey completion, such as interviews conducted using sign language, and a plain language version of the questionnaire being available for those with an intellectual disability.

## Questionnaire

In total six versions of the questionnaire were used to meet the research objectives and allow for the required flexibility for surveying those with disabilities. The different versions used are listed below:

- Nation-wide telephone survey – voter questionnaire - using data from disabled respondents
- Nation-wide telephone survey – non-voter questionnaire - using data from disabled respondents
- Main disability booster survey – voter questionnaire
- Main disability booster survey – non-voter questionnaire
- Plain language survey – voter questionnaire
- Plain language survey – non-voter questionnaire

The different versions contained questions that overlapped, however there were some questions that were not asked across all versions, for example, the plain language version contained fewer questions than the main booster survey, and the nation-wide telephone survey did not contain some of the specific questions about services for the disabled. Therefore the base sizes in some questions vary depending on how many respondents were asked a particular question. Base sizes also vary because some individual questions were not answered by respondents.

## Sample

This report is based upon data from two sample sources: all those stating they had a long-term disability within the main nation-wide telephone survey, combined with data obtained from a separate booster survey conducted among those with a disability.

### Sample for main nation-wide survey

The nation-wide telephone survey employed the electoral roll as a sample frame. It should be noted that the electoral roll contains people who have enrolled to vote. The following people are eligible to be on the electoral roll:

- those aged eighteen years or older, and
- are New Zealand citizens or permanent residents, and

- have lived in New Zealand for a year or more without leaving the country, and
- are not disqualified under the Electoral Act 1993 from enrolling.

The nation-wide survey interviewed a random selection of enrolled individuals. All those who said they had a long-term disability (lasting six months or more) in the nation-wide telephone survey are included in the data within this report. In total 122 interviews were obtained this way (including 104 voters and 18 non-voters).

### **Sample for booster survey conducted among those with a disability**

A random selection of enrolled individuals were also contacted via the Deaf Association, IHC, People First New Zealand, and the Disabled Persons Assembly for the booster survey. In total 128 interviews were obtained this way (including 103 voters and 25 non-voters). Within this total, 52 interviews were conducted among those with an intellectual disability using a version of the questionnaire translated into plain language.

### **Margins of error**

In total 207 voters and 43 non-voters were interviewed. The maximum margin of error for a sample size of 207 is +/- 6.8%, and the maximum margin of error for a sample size of 43 is +/- 14.9%. (These margins of error are at the 95% confidence level). Due to the large margins of error for non-voters, results for non-voters should be treated with caution.

### **Weighting**

Results for this report are un-weighted.

## **Differences between 2005 and 2008 methodology**

### **Differences in the data collection method**

It should be noted that the 2005 survey used a slightly different methodology and this should be kept in mind when comparing results between 2005 and 2008. In 2005, the survey largely used a postal self-completion method, alongside a small scale CATI survey of blind voters and non-voters. The 2005 disability survey achieved 115 completed surveys with voters and 5 with non-voters. The exact breakdown of respondents by type of disability is unknown.

As stated above, the 2008 survey largely used face-to-face data capture (supplemented by some self-completion surveys), and achieved 207 interviews with voters and 43 with non-voters. It is possible that differences in the mode of data collection may account for some differences between 2005 and 2008.

### **Differences by type of disability**

A number of disability organisations assisted with this research by providing a random sample of disabled people from their contact lists ('the booster survey'). This was also the case in the 2005 survey, although different disability organisations were involved three years ago. As such the sample gathered reflects the type of organisations involved, it is not intended to be a random sample of all disabled people in New Zealand. Because different disability organisations were involved in 2005 and 2008, caution should be exercised when comparing 2008 results with 2005 results.

In 2005 the following organisations were involved in the data collection: the Deaf Association, CCS Disability Action, Disabled Persons Association, IHC, People First New Zealand, and the Association of Blind Citizens (ABC).

Whereas in 2008 the following disability organisations were involved: the Deaf Association, IHC, People First New Zealand, and the Disabled Persons Assembly. Other organisations were invited to assist but were not able to help.

Differences in the types of disability organisation involved will probably account for some differences in the type of respondent interviewed between 2005 and 2008. This could, in turn, result in differences between the 2005 and 2008 results. However, there are no data on the type of disabilities surveyed in 2005 so we are unable to assess the likely impact of possible changes in the sample composition between the two years.

The type of disability included in the 2008 survey sample is outlined below.

## Notes on reading this report

Most of this report is divided into separate sections for voters and non-voters. Voters are survey respondents who say they voted in the 2008 General Election, and non-voters are respondents who were eligible to vote in the 2008 General Election, but told us they did not vote.

Base sizes in tables represent the number of respondents answering that question (and give an indication of robustness of analysis for that particular question).

Percentages do not always add up to 100% on single coded choice questions due to rounding.

In tables '-' equates to zero (or no respondents), and '\*\*' equates to less than 1% of respondents.

When a cell in a table states 'N/A' this means that the question was not asked in this way in 2005 and so a direct comparison with the 2008 response is not possible.

Where there are statistically significant differences between subgroups of voters this is highlighted underneath the relevant table. Due to small base sizes, subgroup comparisons were not always possible (and were impossible for non-voters with a disability).

Unless otherwise stated, all reported differences between proportions are statistically significant at the 95% confidence level or greater.

Base sizes vary because not all respondents were asked all questions (because there were different versions of the questionnaire available) and because some respondents chose not to answer particular questions.

Due to small sample sizes (and consequently large margins of error), results for non-voters should be treated with caution.

Whenever a base size dropped below n=10 results are not displayed as they could be potentially misleading.

The results are compared with the 2005 survey where possible. If a table does not have the 2005 results displayed, this is because this data was not available from 2005, or the question was not asked in 2005. Please note that where significant differences are reported between 2005 and 2008

this is based upon the formula used to calculate differences between waves where a simple random sampling methodology has been used. In this instance, an element of the survey involved a purposive sample (i.e. selecting respondents in contact with different disability organisations). The formula used to test for significant differences does not take account of any differences inherent in the change in survey method between 2005 and 2008, for example, differences related to the different organisations who assisted with the research, or the different data collection mode - see 'differences between the 2008 and 2005 methodology' above for details. (There was not sufficient data to make an estimate of the statistical effect of this change in survey methodology). Therefore comparisons between 2008 and 2005 are indicative only and should be treated with caution.

Where relevant, results are compared against the main voter/non-voter report, and statistically significant differences are noted within the text.

## 2008 disability sample profile

The following section outlines the unweighted sample size (i.e. the number of interviews conducted) for key subgroups. This gives an indication of the spread of subpopulations within the overall survey sample, as well as the robustness of analysis available for particular sub-samples.

Gender	Voters	Non-voters
N=	207	43
Male	98	18
Female	108	25
Missing data	1	-

Age Band	Voters	Non-voters
N=	207	43
18-24 years old	15	4
25-34 years old	16	2
35-44 years old	30	14
45-54 years old	48	7
55-64 years old	32	4
65+ years old	64	12
Missing data	2	-

Ethnicity	Voters	Non-voters
N=	207	43
New Zealand European	167	30
Maori	48	11
Samoan	1	1
Cook Island Maori	1	1
Tongan	-	-
Niuean	-	-
Other Pacific Island Group	1	-
Chinese	1	-
Indian	1	-
Other Asian	2	-
Other ethnic group	4	4
New Zealand/Kiwi	1	1
Non-New Zealand European	6	2
Refused	1	-

Qualification (for those without an intellectual disability)	Non voters	Non-voters
N=	169	29
No qualification	62	15
School certificate or NCEA level 1	26	3
Sixth Form Certificate, University Entrance or NCEA level 2	17	4
Bursary, Scholarship or NCEA level 3 or 4	4	2
A Trade Qualification	13	2
A certificate or diploma that does not require a degree	18	1
A polytech degree	5	-
A university degree	14	1
Postgraduate qualification	7	-
Other	1	1
Don't know	2	-

Qualification (for those with an intellectual disability – this question was asked in a different way for this group of respondents)	Non voters	Non-voters
N=	38	14
Finished high school	16	5
Got a qualification after high school	5	1
No qualification	15	7
Missing data	2	1

Type of disability (for separate disability booster survey only, an additional 104 voters and 18 non-voters from the main CATI survey who had a disability were not asked this question – see below)	Voters	Non-voters
N=	103	25
Hearing	55	11
Visual impairment	10	4
Speech	7	3
Physical	10	4
Intellectual	45	14
Other	15	3
Missing data	2	

Type of health problem (The main CATI survey did not ask type of disability, however 'type of health problem' was asked – as worded below. Please note it is very unlikely that the CATI survey included many people with hearing difficulties).	Voters	Non-voters
N=	104	18
Everyday activities that people your age can usually do	82	14
Communicating, mixing with others or socialising	22	7
Any other activity that people your age can usually do	52	11
No difficulty with any of these	-	-

# Previous voting behaviour

## Voting in 2005 election

### Voters

96% of voters with a disability (who were eligible to vote in 2005) voted in the 2005 General Election. This proportion is not significantly different from the general public.

Vote in 2005?	Total 2008
N=	154
Yes	<b>96%</b>
No	<b>3%</b>
Don't know / cannot remember	<b>1%</b>

### Non-voters

68% of non-voters with a disability (who were eligible to vote in 2005) voted in the 2005 General Election. This proportion is not significantly different from the general public. Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

Vote in 2005?	Total 2008
N=	25
Yes	<b>68%</b>
No	<b>24%</b>
Don't know / cannot remember	<b>8%</b>

# Voting<sup>1</sup>

## Voting method

Most voters with a disability (86%) went to a polling place on Election Day. The 2005 survey did not have an option for voting at a hospital, rest home or care facility, so results are not directly comparable. However, it appears that voting at a polling place has increased since 2005, from 70% to 86%, and voting at an advance voting place has decreased (from 28% to 7%).

It should be noted that the proportion of voters with a disability voting in advance is not significantly different from the proportion of voters in the general public saying they voted in advance. However, the proportion of voters with a disability who voted from hospital, or by using voting papers delivered by mail, is higher than the general public (3% vs. 1% in both cases).

Voting method	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	203	111
At a polling place on Election Day	86%	70%
At an advance voting place, before Election Day	7%	28%
In a hospital, rest home or other care facility	3%	N/A
Using voting papers delivered by mail	3%	2%

## Help voting

Fifty seven per cent of voters with a disability did not require help with voting.

Help voting	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	100	112
No help with voting	57%	45%
Family member	18%	17%
Staff at the voting place	17%	29%
Support person	8%	2%
Friend	3%	5%
Cannot remember	1%	-

- Older voters were less likely to have help from family members (30% of those aged under 45 had help from family, compared with 6% of those aged 45 and over).

## Voting preference

### Voters

Sixty three per cent of voters with a disability would prefer to vote in person at a polling place or advance voting place. The next most common preference was to vote online (19%).

<sup>1</sup> Please note that where significant differences are reported between 2005 and 2008 this is based upon the formula used to calculate differences between waves where a simple random sampling methodology has been used. In this instance, an element of the survey involved a purposive sample (i.e. selecting respondents in contact with different disability organisations). The formula used to test for significant differences does not take account of any differences inherent in the change in survey method between 2005 and 2008, for example, differences related to the different organisations who assisted with the research, or the different data collection mode - see 'differences between the 2008 and 2005 methodology' for details. (There was not sufficient data to make an estimate of the statistical effect of this change in survey methodology). Therefore comparisons between 2008 and 2005 are indicative only and should be treated with caution.



The following differences were observed between voters with a disability and voters in the general public.

- Preference for online voting was higher among voters in the general public (32% vs. 19% for voters with a disability).
- Preference for postal voting was higher among voters with a disability (11% vs. 4% among voters in the general public).

Voting preference	Total 2008
N=	206
Voting in person at a polling place or advance voting place	<b>63%</b>
Online using a computer or mobile internet device	<b>19%</b>
Using voting papers delivered by mail	<b>11%</b>
Using touch-tone phone	<b>4%</b>
Other	<b>2%</b>
Don't know	<b>1%</b>

### Non voters

Forty per cent of non-voters with a disability would prefer to vote in person at a polling place or advance voting place.

The following differences were observed between non-voters with a disability and non-voters in the general public.

- Preference for postal voting was higher among non-voters with a disability (19% vs. 5% among non-voters in the general public).
- Preference for voting in person was higher among non-voters with a disability (40% vs. 22% among non-voters in the general public).
- Preference for online voting was higher among non-voters in the general public (53% vs. 17% for non-voters with a disability).

Voting preference	Total 2008
N=	42
Voting in person at a polling place or advance voting place	<b>40%</b>
Using voting papers delivered by mail	<b>19%</b>
Online using a computer or mobile internet device	<b>17%</b>
Using touch-tone phone	<b>5%</b>
Don't know	<b>19%</b>

# Knowledge of advance voting, voting by mail, and MMP<sup>2</sup>

## Knowledge of advance voting

### Voters

71% of voters with a disability knew they could vote before Election Day, this is lower than in 2005 when 85% of voters with a disability said they knew they could vote in advance.

Knowledge of advance voting	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	98	98
Yes, knew you could vote before Election Day	<b>71%</b>	<b>85%</b>
No, did not know you could vote before Election Day	<b>29%</b>	<b>15%</b>

### Non-voters

62% of non-voters with a disability knew they could vote before Election Day (this is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters). Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base size. Results for this question for non-voters were not available from 2005.

Knowledge of advance voting	Total 2008
N=	42
Yes, knew you could vote before Election Day	<b>62%</b>
No, did not know you could vote before Election Day	<b>38%</b>

## Would knowledge of advance voting lead to voting in advance?

### Voters

Forty three per cent of voters with a disability, who did not know about advance voting, say they would have voted in advance if they had known about this option. The difference between 2008 and 2005 is not statistically significant. Results should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

Would knowledge of advance voting make a difference?	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	30	51
Yes, would use advance vote	<b>43%</b>	<b>31%</b>
No, would not use advance vote	<b>57%</b>	<b>69%</b>

<sup>2</sup> Please note that where significant differences are reported between 2005 and 2008 this is based upon the formula used to calculate differences between waves where a simple random sampling methodology has been used. In this instance, an element of the survey involved a purposive sample (i.e. selecting respondents in contact with different disability organisations). The formula used to test for significant differences does not take account of any differences inherent in the change in survey method between 2005 and 2008, for example, differences related to the different organisations who assisted with the research, or the different data collection mode - see 'differences between the 2008 and 2005 methodology' for details. (There was not sufficient data to make an estimate of the statistical effect of this change in survey methodology). Therefore comparisons between 2008 and 2005 are indicative only and should be treated with caution.

## Non-voters

Fifty three per cent of non-voters with a disability, who did not know about advance voting, say they would have voted in advance if they had known about this option. Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the very small base size.

Would knowledge of advance voting make a difference?	Total 2008
N=	17
Yes, would use advance vote	53%
No, would not use advance vote	41%

## Source of information about advance voting

Voters with a disability, who had heard of advance voting, were asked for their information source. The most common way to find out about advance voting was through the EasyVote pack (68%). A notable proportion of voters with a disability (44%) also found out by seeing, hearing or reading advertisements. This question was not asked the same way in 2005, so differences between 2008 and 2005 should be treated with caution, however it appears that finding out about advance voting through the EasyVote pack has increased (from 23% to 68%), and finding out about this from disability organisations has decreased (from 33% to 14%).

Source of knowledge about advance voting	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	50	80
EasyVote pack	68%	23%
Saw, heard or read about it in advertisements	44%	N/A
Word of mouth	20%	20%
Disability organisations	14%	33%
Other	2%	1%

Results for non-voters are not reported because of the very small base sizes (less than n=10).

## Knowledge of voting by mail

### Voters

Voters who did not vote by post were asked if they were aware of postal voting.

Knowledge of voting by mail	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	56	112
Yes, knew you could vote by mail	43%	42%
No, did not know you could vote by mail	57%	58%

## Non-voters

Non-voters who did not vote by post were asked if they were aware of postal voting. Results should be treated with caution due to the very small base sizes. Results were not available from 2005.

Knowledge of voting by mail	Total 2008
N=	11
Yes, knew you could vote by mail	<b>73%</b>
No, did not know you could vote by mail	<b>27%</b>

## Would knowledge of voting by mail lead to voting by mail?

### Voters

Voters who did not vote by mail, or did not know about voting by mail, were asked, 'would they have voted by mail if they knew about this option?'. The difference between 2008 and 2005 is not significant.

Would knowledge of voting by mail make a difference?	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	59	93
Yes, would use mail vote	<b>41%</b>	<b>35%</b>
No, would not use mail vote	<b>59%</b>	<b>65%</b>

### Non-voters

Non-voters who did not vote by mail, or did not know about voting by mail, were asked, 'would they have voted by mail if they knew about this option?'. Results should be treated with caution due to the very small base sizes. Results were not available from 2005.

Would knowledge of voting by mail make a difference?	Total 2008
N=	11
Yes, would use mail vote	<b>64%</b>
No, would not use mail vote	<b>36%</b>

## Ease of understanding MMP

### Voters

Thirty five per cent of voters with a disability said MMP was either 'easy' or 'very easy' to understand (see overleaf). Forty one per cent said it was either 'difficult' or 'very difficult' to understand. Compared with the general population of voters, voters with a disability are more likely to find MMP difficult, and less likely to find it easy (46% of voters in the general population found it either 'easy' or 'very easy', and 30% found it either 'difficult' or 'very difficult').

Ease of understanding MMP	Total 2008
N=	168
Very difficult	14%
Difficult	27%
Neither difficult nor easy	21%
Easy	20%
Very easy	15%
Don't know	3%

### Non-voters

No non-voters with a disability said MMP was 'very easy' to understand. In total, 52% said it was either 'difficult' or 'very difficult' to understand. Due to small base sizes, differences between non-voters with a disability and non-voters in the general public are not statistically significant.

Ease of understanding MMP	Total 2008
N=	27
Very difficult	22%
Difficult	30%
Neither difficult nor easy	22%
Easy	26%
Very easy	-
Don't know	-

# Information for people with disabilities<sup>3</sup>

## Disability information sources

### Voters

81% of voters with a disability recall seeing electoral information specifically produced for people with a disability. 19% do not recall seeing any information for those with disabilities.

The most commonly recalled sources were the booklet on enrolling and voting (45% of all voters with a disability recall this source) and the poster about what to do in a polling place (43%). Subgroup analysis can be found underneath the table.

The question was not asked in the same way in 2005 and so results cannot be directly compared, however it appears that the proportion who did not see any disability specific information has decreased from 31% to 19%. The proportion recalling captions on advertisements has increased (from 6% to 21%). The proportion recalling the brochure in large print has decreased from 11% to 2%.

Information sources recalled*	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	99	113
Didn't see any of the disability information	19%	31%
Booklet on enrolling and voting	45%	N/A
Poster about what to do in a polling place	43%	N/A
Captions on advertisements	21%	6%
Articles/information in disability newsletters and magazines	21%	19%
DVD in NZ sign language	20%	16%
DVD featuring people w/intellectual disabilities	16%	N/A
The website <a href="http://www.elections.org.nz">www.elections.org.nz</a>	14%	14%
Brochure on what to do if you if you can't get to a polling place	9%	N/A
Brochure in large print	2%	11%

\* Although the questionnaire asked about other disability resources not mentioned in this table, none of the survey respondents were aware of these other resources.

- Voters with an intellectual disability were more likely than average to recall the DVD featuring people with an intellectual disability (33% vs. 16% for all voters with disabilities). Those with an intellectual disability were less likely than average to recall captions on advertisements (5% vs. 21%).
- Those with a physical disability were more likely than average to recall the poster about what to do in a polling place (80% vs. 43% for all voters with disabilities).
- Although there were some other variations by type of disability, these were not statistically significant.

<sup>3</sup> Please note that where significant differences are reported between 2005 and 2008 this is based upon the formula used to calculate differences between waves where a simple random sampling methodology has been used. In this instance, an element of the survey involved a purposive sample (i.e. selecting respondents in contact with different disability organisations). The formula used to test for significant differences does not take account of any differences inherent in the change in survey method between 2005 and 2008, for example, differences related to the different organisations who assisted with the research, or the different data collection mode - see 'differences between the 2008 and 2005 methodology' for details. (There was not sufficient data to make an estimate of the statistical effect of this change in survey methodology). Therefore comparisons between 2008 and 2005 are indicative only and should be treated with caution.

## Non-voters

64% of non-voters with a disability recall seeing electoral information specifically produced for people with a disability. 36% do not recall seeing any information for those with disabilities.

The most commonly recalled sources were the DVD in NZ sign language (27% of all non-voters with a disability recall this source) and captions on advertisements (23%). Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small sample sizes. Results for non-voters are not available from 2005.

Information sources recalled	Total 2008
N=	22
Didn't see any of the disability information	36%
DVD in NZ sign language	27%
Captions on advertisements	23%
Booklet on enrolling and voting	23%
The website <a href="http://www.elections.org.nz">www.elections.org.nz</a>	14%
DVD featuring people w/intellectual disabilities	9%
Poster about what to do in a polling place	9%
Brochure on what to do if you if you can't get to a polling place	5%
Articles/information in disability newsletters and magazines	5%

## Usefulness of DVD in NZ Sign Language

For the following questions on 'usefulness', all those who said 'not applicable' have been removed from the analysis. This is because many people who were aware of a particular disability resource may not find it applied to them or may not have received or read it.

Voters who saw the sign language DVD were asked how useful it was. Sixty one per cent found it useful.

Usefulness of information source was asked in a different manner (i.e. only useful/not useful with no in-between category) in 2005 and so results are not comparable for the following questions.

Usefulness of DVD in sign language	Total 2008
N=	23
Not useful*	17%
Neither useful nor un-useful	13%
Useful*	61%
Don't know	9%

\* This question (and subsequent questions in this section) were asked using a five point scale in the main disability booster questionnaire, and using a three point scale in the questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore results presented in this table merge the top two and bottom two responses from the five point scale used in the main disability booster questionnaire.

The results for non-voters cannot be displayed due to very small base sizes.

## Usefulness of DVD featuring people with an intellectual disability

Voters who saw the DVD featuring people with intellectual disabilities talking about voting were asked how useful it was. Fifty six per cent found it useful.

Usefulness of DVD featuring people with an intellectual disability	Total 2008
N=	32
Not useful	25%
Neither useful nor un-useful	6%
Useful	56%
Don't know	12%

The results for non-voters cannot be displayed due to very small base sizes.

## Usefulness of poster about what to do in polling place

Voters who saw the poster about what to do in a polling place were asked how useful it was. Seventy per cent found it useful.

Usefulness of poster	Total 2008
N=	57
Not useful	14%
Neither useful nor un-useful	12%
Useful	70%
Don't know	4%

The results for non-voters cannot be displayed due to very small base sizes.

## Usefulness of booklet on enrolling and voting

Voters who saw the booklet on enrolling and voting were asked how useful it was. Seventy three per cent found it useful.

Usefulness of booklet on enrolling and voting	Total 2008
N=	62
Not useful	8%
Neither useful nor un-useful	16%
Useful	73%
Don't know	3%

The results for non-voters cannot be displayed due to very small base sizes.



## Usefulness of brochure on what to do if cannot get to polling place

Voters who saw the brochure on what to do if you cannot get to a polling place were asked how useful it was. Sixty per cent found it useful.

Usefulness of brochure on what to do if cannot get to polling place	Total 2008
N=	30
Not useful	13%
Neither useful nor un-useful	20%
Useful	60%
Don't know	7%

The results for non-voters cannot be displayed due to very small base sizes.

## Usefulness of captions on advertisements

Voters who saw captions on advertisements were asked how useful they were. Seventy per cent found them useful.

Usefulness of captions on advertisements	Total 2008
N=	37
Not useful	11%
Neither useful nor un-useful	11%
Useful	70%
Don't know	8%

The results for non-voters cannot be displayed due to very small base sizes.

## Usefulness of brochure in large print

Voters who saw brochures in large print were asked how useful they were. Forty seven per cent found them useful. Results should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

Usefulness of brochure in large print	Total 2008
N=	15
Not useful	33%
Neither useful nor un-useful	13%
Useful	47%
Don't know	7%

The results for non-voters cannot be displayed due to very small base sizes.

## Usefulness of elections website

Voters who saw the [www.elections.org.nz](http://www.elections.org.nz) website were asked how useful it was. Forty eight per cent found it useful.

Usefulness of elections website	Total 2008
N=	29
Not useful	24%
Neither useful nor un-useful	17%
Useful	48%
Don't know	10%

The results for non-voters cannot be displayed due to very small base sizes.

## Usefulness of disability newsletters

Voters who saw articles or information in disability newsletters and magazines were asked how useful they were. Sixty one per cent found them useful.

Usefulness of disability newsletter	Total 2008
N=	31
Not useful	13%
Neither useful nor un-useful	19%
Useful	61%
Don't know	6%

- Disabled voters from ethnic groups other than New Zealand European were more likely to find newsletter articles useful (90% vs. 61% for all disabled voters surveyed).

The results for non-voters cannot be displayed due to very small base sizes.

## Other information about voting (including EasyVote pack)<sup>4</sup>

### Receiving EasyVote pack

#### Voters

Nearly all (98%) voters with a disability recall receiving the EasyVote pack in the mail. This is unchanged from 2005, the proportion is also no different from the general population of voters.

Receive EasyVote pack?	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	203	115
Yes	98%	98%
No	1%	2%
Don't know / cannot remember	1%	-

#### Non-voters

Over two-thirds (67%) of non-voters with a disability recall receiving the EasyVote pack in the mail. Results for non-voters were not available for 2005. The difference between non-voters with a disability and non-voters in the general population is not statistically significant.

Receive EasyVote pack?	Total 2008
N=	43
Yes	67%
No	28%
Don't know / cannot remember	5%

### Satisfaction with EasyVote pack

#### Voters

Voters who received and read the EasyVote pack were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with it. Eighty five per cent of voters with a disability were satisfied with the EasyVote pack. This is lower than the general population of voters (92%).

Satisfaction with the EasyVote pack	Total 2008
N=	191
Dissatisfied (* see overleaf)	4%
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	9%
Satisfied*	85%
Don't know	2%

<sup>4</sup> Please note that where significant differences are reported between 2005 and 2008 this is based upon the formula used to calculate differences between waves where a simple random sampling methodology has been used. In this instance, an element of the survey involved a purposive sample (i.e. selecting respondents in contact with different disability organisations). The formula used to test for significant differences does not take account of any differences inherent in the change in survey method between 2005 and 2008, for example, differences related to the different organisations who assisted with the research, or the different data collection mode - see 'differences between the 2008 and 2005 methodology' for details. (There was not sufficient data to make an estimate of the statistical effect of this change in survey methodology). Therefore comparisons between 2008 and 2005 are indicative only and should be treated with caution.

\* This question was asked using a five point scale in the main disability booster questionnaire, and using a three point scale in the questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore results presented in this table merge the top two and bottom two responses from the five point scale used in the main disability booster questionnaire. This is the same for the table of non-voters below.

## Non-voters

Non-voters who received and read the EasyVote pack were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with it. Fifty two per cent of non-voters with a disability were satisfied with the EasyVote pack (this compares with 66% of non-voters in the general population, but due to the small sample size the difference is not statistically significant). Twenty four per cent were dissatisfied, this is higher than the proportion of non-voters in the general population that were dissatisfied (9%).

Satisfaction with the EasyVote pack	Total 2008
N=	25
Dissatisfied	<b>24%</b>
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	<b>16%</b>
Satisfied	<b>52%</b>
Don't know	<b>8%</b>

## Other advertising about voting process

Respondents were asked whether they had seen any other advertising about the voting process. It was emphasised that this related to advertising about how to vote, not about advertising by political parties, candidates or lobby groups. It also excluded any disability specific information which had already been covered in the questionnaire.

### Voters

Sixty three per cent of voters with a disability had seen 'other' advertising about voting. That is advertising about how to vote, not including: the EasyVote pack, disability specific information, or political advertising. This is lower than the equivalent proportion (81%) of the general population of voters who had seen advertising (beyond the information received in the EasyVote pack).

Seen other advertising?	Total 2008
N=	206
Yes	<b>63%</b>
No	<b>29%</b>
Don't know / cannot remember	<b>8%</b>

- Voters with hearing difficulties were less likely than average to recall advertising (39%), voters with an intellectual disability were more likely than average to recall advertising (81%).

### Non-voters

Fifty seven per cent of non-voters with a disability had seen 'other' advertising about voting (see overleaf). That is advertising about how to vote, not including: the EasyVote pack, disability specific information, or political advertising. This is lower than the equivalent proportion (74%) of the general population of non-voters who had seen advertising (beyond the information received in the EasyVote pack).

Seen other advertising?	Total 2008
N=	44
Yes	<b>57%</b>
No	<b>36%</b>
Don't know / cannot remember	<b>2%</b>

## Where other advertising was seen or heard

Respondents were asked where the 'other' advertising was seen or heard. Results are described below.

### Voters

Most voters with a disability who had seen the advertising said they saw this other advertising on television (81%).

Compared with the general population of voters, voters with a disability were less likely to recall radio advertising (16% vs. 25%), and more likely to recall billboards/posters/banners (5% vs. 1%).

Where seen other advertising	Total 2008
N=	116
Television	<b>81%</b>
Newspapers	<b>26%</b>
Radio	<b>16%</b>
Pamphlets or fliers	<b>6%</b>
Billboards/Posters/Banners	<b>5%</b>
Word of mouth	<b>3%</b>
Letters Through the Mail	<b>3%</b>
Signs	<b>3%</b>
University/Technical Institute	<b>3%</b>
Bus shelters	<b>2%</b>
Shopping Malls/Supermarket	<b>2%</b>
Signs On Buses/Back Of Buses/Other vehicles	<b>2%</b>
Internet	<b>1%</b>
Schools	<b>1%</b>
Magazines	<b>1%</b>
Party Political gathering	<b>1%</b>
Other	<b>1%</b>
Don't know / cant remember	<b>3%</b>

### Non-voters

Most non-voters with a disability who had seen the advertising said they saw this other advertising on television (74%) – see overleaf. Compared with the general population of non-voters, non-voters with a disability were more likely to recall word of mouth (9% vs. 2%).

Where seen other advertising	Total 2008
N=	23
Television	74%
Radio	26%
Newspapers	17%
Word of mouth	9%
Pamphlets or fliers	4%
Shopping Malls/Supermarket	4%
Billboards/Posters/Banners/	4%
Other	17%

## Overall usefulness of information about voting process

Respondents to the disability booster survey were asked to rate the usefulness of all the information they received about voting. The results are described below for voters and non-voters with a disability.

### Voters

Fifty nine per cent of voters with a disability rated all the information as useful.

Usefulness of all advertising	Total 2008
N=	95
Not useful	15%
Neither useful nor un-useful	17%
Useful	59%
Don't know	9%

\* This question was asked using a five point scale in the main disability booster questionnaire, and using a three point scale in the questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore results presented in this table merge the top two and bottom two responses from the five point scale used in the main disability booster questionnaire. This is the same for the table of non-voters below.

- Voters with an intellectual disability were more likely than average to find all of the information about the voting process useful (81%).

### Non-voters

Twenty nine per cent of non-voters with a disability rated all the information as useful. Forty two per cent gave a 'middling' response. Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base sizes.

Usefulness of all advertising	Total 2008
N=	24
Not useful	25%
Neither useful nor un-useful	42%
Useful	29%
Don't know	4%

## Other information required

Respondents to the disability booster survey were asked (in an open ended question) whether they would like any additional information about voting.

### Voters

Seventy three per cent of voters did not specify any further information requirements (this is equivalent to the general population of voters – 79%). This group consists of a combination of those who did not answer the question (55%) and those who specifically said 'no further information required' (18%). Beyond this, the most common response for further information was 'further information via TV' (16%) - which was not mentioned by many in 2005.

The most common pieces of information requested are listed below.

Other information required	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	103	51
Question not answered (i.e. left blank)	55%	N/A
No further information required	18%	63%
More information via TV	16%	2%
More information on the EasyVote card	6%	10%
Explanation of voting system (MMP)	5%	4%
Information to be in large print	3%	2%
Information on how polling place will deal with my disability	2%	4%
Polling place locations	1%	6%
0800 number for general information	1%	2%

### Non-voters

Sixty per cent of non-voters did not specify any further information requirements (this is equivalent to the general population of non-voters – 65%). This group consists of a combination of those who did not answer the question (24%) and those who specifically said 'no further information required' (36%). Beyond this, the most common response for further information was 'further information via TV' (16%).

The most common pieces of information requested are listed below.

The results for non-voters with a disability should be treated with caution due to the small base size. Results for non-voters are not available from 2005.

Other information required	Total 2008
N=	25
Question not answered (i.e. left blank)	24%
No further information required	36%
More information via TV	16%
Information on how polling place will deal with my disability	12%
More information on the EasyVote card	4%
Explanation of voting system (MMP)	4%
Prefer electronic advice	4%

## Polling Place<sup>5</sup>

### Proportion of disabled voters that went to the polling place

Six per cent of voters with a disability did not vote at a polling place (this compares with 1% within the general population of voters). This means that 94% of voters with a disability either voted at a polling place or advance voting place. These respondents were asked the questions in this section.

### Who accompanied voters to polling place?

Just over half (52%) of voters with a disability who went to a polling place did so with family members. This is higher than the proportion in 2005 (35%). In 2008 only 7% of voters with a disability said they were accompanied by non-family members, this is lower than in 2005 when the equivalent proportion was 23%. Differences between voters with a disability and the general population of voters are not statistically significant.

Who accompanied voters?	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	143	110
Went by myself	42%	43%
Family members	52%	35%
Other people (e.g. friends or care-giver)	7%	23%

- Older voters with a disability were less likely to be accompanied by family members (32% of those aged over 45 had help from family, compared with 52% of all voters with a disability).

### Time of day voted

Fifty six per cent of voters with a disability voted in the morning (before noon), 34% voted in the afternoon (between noon and 5pm), and 6% voted in the evening (after 5pm) – see table overleaf for details. Compared with 2005, fewer voters with a disability voted in the afternoon, and more voted in the morning.

Compared with the general population of voters, voters with a disability were more likely to vote in the morning and less likely to vote in the afternoon (46% of voters in the general population voted in the morning, and 45% voted in the afternoon).

<sup>5</sup> Please note that where significant differences are reported between 2005 and 2008 this is based upon the formula used to calculate differences between waves where a simple random sampling methodology has been used. In this instance, an element of the survey involved a purposive sample (i.e. selecting respondents in contact with different disability organisations). The formula used to test for significant differences does not take account of any differences inherent in the change in survey method between 2005 and 2008, for example, differences related to the different organisations who assisted with the research, or the different data collection mode - see 'differences between the 2008 and 2005 methodology' for details. (There was not sufficient data to make an estimate of the statistical effect of this change in survey methodology). Therefore comparisons between 2008 and 2005 are indicative only and should be treated with caution.



Time of day voted	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	202	110
9.00am - 10.00am	21%	14%
10.00am - 11.00am	25%	20%
11.00am - 12.00am	10%	15%
12.00am - 1.00pm	7%	15%
1.00pm - 2.00pm	9%	9%
2.00pm - 3.00pm	6%	10%
3.00pm - 4.00pm	4%	6%
4.00pm - 5.00pm	8%	7%
5.00pm - 6.00pm	3%	4%
6.00pm+	2%	1%
Don't know / can't remember	4%	-

## Use of EasyVote card or CEO letter when voting

Eighty seven per cent of voters with a disability brought the EasyVote card with them to the polling place. Nine per cent brought the letter from the Chief Electoral officer with them. These results are not significantly different from the general population of voters.

Did you take the following when you voted?	Total 2008
N=	200
EasyVote card	87%
Letter from the Chief Electoral officer	9%
Neither	10%

## Time taken at polling place

Over half (59%) of voters with a disability said they only spent up to five minutes at the polling place. This is higher than in 2005, when a larger proportion said they waited between 5 and 10 minutes (53% compared with 29% in 2008).

Compared with the general population of voters, voters with a disability were more likely to spend longer than 5 minutes (71% of voters in the general population spent up to five minutes, compared with 59% of voters with a disability).

Total time at polling place	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	165	108
Up to 5 minutes	59%	29%
5-10 minutes	29%	53%
11-15 minutes	5%	8%
16-20 minutes	3%	4%
21-25 minutes	1%	1%
26-30 minutes	2%	4%
More than 30 minutes	1%	2%
Cant remember	1%	-



## Feelings on time taken at polling place

Almost all (96%) voters with a disability said the length of time spent was 'about right', this was not significantly different from the general population of voters.

Feelings on time taken at polling place	Total 2008
N=	165
About right	96%
Too long	4%
Don't know	1%

## Disability facilities at polling place

Voters with a disability were asked if they saw the following facilities at the polling place. Compared with 2005, more voters with a disability saw desk voting facilities at the polling place (67% vs. 38% in 2005). Other results are not significantly different from 2005.

Disability facilities at polling place	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	165	101
Desk voting facilities	67%	38%
Easy to access doorways and corridors	62%	68%
Easy to access path from the car park to entrance	58%	57%
Ramp for wheelchair access	47%	59%
Disabled car parking space	43%	37%
International symbol of access - 	33%	24%
Access with assistance symbol - 	10%	15%

## Happiness with voting facilities at the polling place

Over two-thirds (67%) of voters with a disability were either 'happy' or 'very happy' with the voting facilities.

In 2008 voters were asked how happy or unhappy they were with the voting facilities at the polling place. In 2005 voters with a disability were asked to rate their 'satisfaction' with voting facilities. Although not directly comparable because of the difference in question wording, analysis against 2005 suggests that the proportion that are 'very unhappy' may have increased in 2008.

Feelings on voting facilities (2008)	Total 2008	Satisfaction with voting facilities (2005)	Total 2005
N=	100	N=	100
Very unhappy	11%	Very dissatisfied	2%
Unhappy	2%	Dissatisfied	2%
Neither unhappy nor happy	15%	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	15%
Happy	33%	Satisfied	39%
Very happy	34%	Very satisfied	42%
Don't know	5%	Don't know	-

## The voting process<sup>6</sup>

### Rating the clarity of instructions on how to cast vote

Eighty four per cent of voters with a disability rated the instructions on how to cast a vote positively, this is lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (92%).

Clear instructions on how to cast vote	Total 2008
N=	201
Very Poor / poor*	5%
Neither	8%
Good / Excellent*	84%
Don't know	3%

\* This question (and subsequent questions in this section) were asked using a five point scale in the main disability booster questionnaire, and using a three point scale in the questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore results presented in this table merge the top two and bottom two responses from the five point scale used in the main disability booster questionnaire.

### Rating the ease of finding name of person and party

Ninety per cent of voters with a disability rated the ease of finding the name of person and party on the ballot paper positively, this is lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (95%).

Ease of finding name of person and party	Total 2008
N=	200
Very Poor / poor	2%
Neither	8%
Good / Excellent	90%
Don't know	1%

### Rating ability to answer questions

Respondents were asked to rate staff's ability to answer questions. A high proportion said 'Don't know or cannot remember' and 'did not meet staff' (the latter was a new option for the 2008 survey). As in the main report, those who said 'don't know or cannot remember' or 'did not meet staff' have been excluded from the analysis of the first table overleaf.

Eight seven per cent of voters with a disability rated the ability of staff to answer questions positively, this is lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (95%).

<sup>6</sup> Please note that where significant differences are reported between 2005 and 2008 this is based upon the formula used to calculate differences between waves where a simple random sampling methodology has been used. In this instance, an element of the survey involved a purposive sample (i.e. selecting respondents in contact with different disability organisations). The formula used to test for significant differences does not take account of any differences inherent in the change in survey method between 2005 and 2008, for example, differences related to the different organisations who assisted with the research, or the different data collection mode - see 'differences between the 2008 and 2005 methodology' for details. (There was not sufficient data to make an estimate of the statistical effect of this change in survey methodology). Therefore comparisons between 2008 and 2005 are indicative only and should be treated with caution.

Ability to answer questions excluding Don't knows' and 'Did not meet staff'	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	126	80
Very Poor / poor	4%	4%
Neither	9%	8%
Good / Excellent	87%	89%

The second table below shows the proportions *including* those who said 'don't know/cannot remember' or 'did not meet staff'.

Ability to answer questions including Don't knows' and 'Did not meet staff'	Total 2008
N=	199
Very Poor / poor	3%
Neither	6%
Good / Excellent	55%
Don't know	14%
Did not meet staff	23%

## Rating pleasantness and politeness

In 2008 89% of voters with a disability gave positive ratings for Electoral staffs' pleasantness and politeness, this is lower than in 2005 when the equivalent proportion was 96%. This is also lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (97%).

Pleasantness and politeness excluding 'Did not meet staff'	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	189	109
Very Poor / poor	5%	2%
Neither	4%	3%
Good / Excellent	89%	96%
Don't know	3%	-

## Rating staff efficiency

Eighty seven per cent of voters with a disability gave positive ratings for staff efficiency, this is lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (96%).

Efficiency of staff excluding 'Did not meet staff'	Total 2008	Total 2005
N=	151	103
Very Poor / poor	3%	4%
Neither	7%	12%
Good / Excellent	87%	84%
Don't know	3%	-

## Providing for needs of those with disabilities

Overall two thirds of voters with a disability rated staff's ability to provide for their needs positively.

Staff providing for needs of disabled excluding 'Did not meet staff'	Total 2008
N=	71
Very Poor / poor	11%
Neither	17%
Good / Excellent	66%
Don't know	6%

## Polling place problems

Those who voted at a polling place were asked if they had any problems or difficulties, 13% of voters with a disability said they had problems or difficulties. This is higher than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (2% of voters in the general population said they had problems or difficulties, and 6% said they had to ask for information or help).

Issues at polling place	Total 2008
N=	164
Had problems or difficulties	13%
No problems or difficulties	87%

## Description of polling place issues

Voters who did experience problems or difficulties were asked what happened. Answers were given unprompted (i.e. a set list of responses was not presented to respondents). Results are tabulated below. The most common problem was that voters with a disability felt that staff were not helpful or were unable to answer questions (30%).

Compared with voters in the general population who experienced problems, voters with a disability who experienced problems were more likely to say the issue related to staff not being helpful (30% vs. 4%), and more likely to say there was a lack of privacy (9% vs. 2%). However, voters with a disability were less likely to say there was poor signage (9% vs. 27%).

Results should be treated with caution due to the small base sizes.

Specific issues at polling place	Total 2008
N=	23
Staff were not helpful or were unable to answer questions	30%
Poor signage/direction once inside polling place	9%
General help – pens not working, couldn't read paper etc.	9%
Lack of privacy for voting/screens needed moving	9%
Needed information on how to vote	4%
Other	17%

# Election night results

## Watching results as they came in

Voters and non-voters were asked if they followed the Election results as they came in on Election night.

### Voters

Sixty eight per cent of voters with a disability said they followed the Election results, this is not significantly different from the general population of voters.

Followed Election results?	Total 2008
N=	204
Yes	68%
No	31%
Don't know	1%

### Non voters

Forty nine per cent of non-voters with a disability said they followed the Election results, this is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters.

Followed Election results?	Total 2008
N=	43
Yes	49%
No	47%
Don't know	5%

## How were results followed?

Voters and non-voters who followed the Election results on Election night were asked how they followed the results.

### Voters

Nearly all (96%) voters who followed the results said they watched the results come in on television, this is not significantly different from the general population of voters.

How respondents followed Election results	Total 2008
N=	119
Television	96%
Radio	5%
Elections website	5%
Other website – other sites, e.g. news	3%
Newspapers	3%
Telephone	1%

## Non-voters

Nearly all non-voters who followed the results said they watched the results come in on television (85%), this is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters. Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base sizes.

How respondents followed Election results	Total 2008
N=	13
Television	85%
Other	8%
Don't know / cannot remember	8%

## Timeliness of results

All respondents who followed the results were asked how satisfied they were with the timeliness of the results. A scale of 1 to 5 was used, where 1 was very dissatisfied and 5 was very satisfied.

### Voters

Three quarters (75%) of voters with a disability were either very satisfied (49%) or satisfied (25%) with the timeliness of the results. This is lower than the equivalent proportion for voters in the general population (90% of whom were satisfied).

Satisfaction with timeliness of results	Total 2008
N=	122
Very dissatisfied (1)	6%
2	2%
3	15%
4	25%
Very satisfied (5)	49%
Don't know	2%

### Non-voters

Just over half (55%) of non-voters were either very satisfied (36%) or satisfied (18%) with the timeliness of the results. Results for non-voters with a disability should be treated with caution due to the small base sizes.

Satisfaction with timeliness of results	Total 2008
N=	11
Very dissatisfied (1)	18%
2	18%
3	9%
4	18%
Very satisfied (5)	36%

## Non-voters

(Please note that many of the differences between non-voters with a disability and non-voters in the general population are not statistically significant, mainly because of the small survey population of non-voters with a disability).

### Possibility of voting in Election

Around half (47%) of non-voters with a disability considered voting in the Election. This is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters.

Possibility of voting?	Total 2008
N=	43
Yes	47%
No	49%
Don't know / cannot remember	5%

### When decided not to vote

Non-voters with a disability were asked at what time before Election Day they decided not to vote. Forty eight per cent decided not to vote on Election Day. This is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters.

When decided not to vote	Total 2008
N=	27
On Election Day	48%
One week before Election Day	11%
Two weeks before	11%
About a month before	11%
More than a month ago	15%
Don't know/can't remember	4%

### Decision making process

Non-voters with a disability were asked how much thought they put into their decision not to vote. Thirty three percent put a lot of thought into it. This is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters.

Decision making process for non-voters	Total 2008
N=	27
Put a lot of thought into deciding whether or not to vote	33%
Put just a little thought into it	26%
Didn't think about it at all	41%

### Non-voters' awareness of a convenient polling place

Most (76%) non-voters with a disability knew the location of a polling place that was convenient for them. This is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters.



Aware of polling place?	Total 2008
N=	29
Yes	76%
No	24%

## Reasons for not voting

### Main reason for not voting

Non-voters with a disability were asked what their main reason was for not voting. The question was asked un-prompted (i.e. a response list was not read out). The biggest single response related to disability (10%).

Main reason for not voting	Total 2008
N=	39
Disability	10%
Can't be bothered with politics or politicians	8%
Polling place too far away/no transport	8%
Religious reasons - other	5%
Not important	5%
Health reasons	5%
Can't be bothered voting	5%
Had other commitments	5%
Couldn't work out who to vote for	5%
My vote doesn't make any difference	5%
Religious day (ie, Sabbath, Holy Day)	3%
I forgot	3%
Didn't get to the polling place on time	3%
Other	23%
No particular reason	10%
Refused	5%

### Other reasons for not voting

Non-voters with a disability were also asked if there were any *additional reasons* for not voting. Forty five per cent did not have any additional reason.

Other reason for not voting	Total 2008
N=	29
Health reasons	10%
Couldn't work out who to vote for	10%
Disability	7%
Polling place too far away/no transport	7%
Had other commitments	3%
Not important	3%
Other	14%
No particular reason	7%
No other reason	45%

## Overall reasons for not voting

The main reasons for not voting were combined with the secondary reasons for not voting to provide results for *all reasons* given by non-voters with a disability (regardless of whether that option was chosen as the main or additional reason). Results are outlined in the table below. The main overall reasons for not voting were: having a disability (15%), health reasons (13%), not being able to work out who to vote for (13%), and the polling place being too far away or not having transport (10%).

Compared with non-voters in the general population, non-voters with a disability were more likely to give the following reasons for not voting:

- having a disability (15% vs. 1%),
- health reasons (13% vs. 5%),
- polling place too far away/no transport (10% vs. 1%), and
- it is not important (8% vs. 2%).

Overall reasons for not voting	Total 2008
N=	39
Disability	15%
Can't be bothered with politics or politicians	8%
Polling place too far away/no transport	10%
Religious reasons - other	5%
Not important	8%
Health reasons	13%
Can't be bothered voting	5%
Had other commitments	5%
Couldn't work out who to vote for	13%
My vote doesn't make any difference	5%
Religious day (ie, Sabbath, Holy Day)	3%
I forgot	3%
Didn't get to the polling place on time	3%
Other	25%
No particular reason	15%
Refused	5%

## Appendix A: Overview tables

	Voters with a disability	Non-voters with a disability
<b>Voting</b>		
<i>Base: All voters and non-voters with a disability</i>	203	-
At a polling place on Election Day	<b>86%</b>	-
At an advance voting place, before Election Day	<b>7%</b>	-
In a hospital, rest home or other care facility	<b>3%</b>	-
Using voting papers delivered by mail	<b>3%</b>	-
<i>Base: All voters and non-voters with a disability</i>	98	42
Knew about advance voting	<b>71%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>Voting time</b>		
<i>Base: Those who voted in person at a polling place</i>	202	-
Before 11am	<b>46%</b>	-
11am – 1pm	<b>17%</b>	-
1pm – 3pm	<b>15%</b>	-
3pm – 5pm	<b>12%</b>	-
5pm – 7pm	<b>5%</b>	-
Took EasyVote Card	<b>87%</b>	-
<b>Time in polling place</b>		
<i>Base: Those who voted in person at a polling place</i>		-
Up to 5 minutes	<b>59%</b>	-
More than 5 minutes	<b>41%</b>	-
Reasonable time	<b>96%</b>	-
<b>Rating of polling place, ballot paper, and staff (% good or excellent)</b>		
<i>Base: Those who voted in person at a polling place</i>	200	-
Clear instructions about how to vote	<b>84%</b>	-
Easy to find name of candidate and party	<b>90%</b>	-
Pleasantness and politeness	<b>89%</b>	-
Ability to answer questions	<b>87%</b>	-
Efficiency	<b>87%</b>	-
Staff providing for needs of those with disabilities	<b>66%</b>	-
Tables continue overleaf /		

<b>EasyVote pack</b>		
<i>Base: All voters and non-voters with a disability</i>	203	43
Received EasyVote pack	<b>98%</b>	<b>67%</b>
Did not receive EasyVote pack	<b>1%</b>	<b>28%</b>
Don't know / cannot remember	<b>1%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Satisfaction with EasyVote pack (% satisfied or very satisfied)</b>		
<i>Base: All who read or glanced at their EasyVote pack</i>	191	25
Satisfied with EasyVote pack	<b>85%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>When decided not to vote</b>		
<i>Base: All non-voters</i>	-	43
Election Day	-	<b>48%</b>
1 week before	-	<b>11%</b>
More than one week before	-	<b>37%</b>
Knowledge of where to vote	-	<b>76%</b>
<b>Seen advertising</b>		
<i>Base: All voters and non-voters</i>	99	22
Seen electoral advertising specifically for those with disabilities	<b>81%</b>	<b>64%</b>
Seen other electoral advertising	<b>63%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>Follow Election night results</b>		
<i>Base: All voters and non-voters</i>	204	43
Follow results on Election Night	<b>68%</b>	<b>49%</b>
<i>Base: Those who followed the results</i>	119	13
Followed results on television	<b>96%</b>	<b>85%</b>
Satisfied with timeliness of results	<b>75%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>E-voting: Prefer to vote</b>		
<i>Base: All voters and non-voters</i>	206	42
Computer or mobile Internet device	<b>19%</b>	<b>17%</b>
Touch tone phone	<b>4%</b>	<b>5%</b>
In person	<b>63%</b>	<b>40%</b>
Postal	<b>11%</b>	<b>19%</b>