



Disability voter and non-voter survey report

Report prepared for: The Electoral Commission

Colmar Brunton contact Ian Binnie

Date: 1 March 2012

Level 9, Sybase House, Lambton Quay
PO Box 3622, Wellington
Ph: 04 913 3000

www.colmarbrunton.co.nz

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Background and method | 1 |
| Summary of findings | 2 |
| Background and Objectives | 6 |
| Methodology | 7 |
| Data collection method | 7 |
| Questionnaire | 7 |
| Sample | 7 |
| Cautions associated with the data collection method | 8 |
| Differences between 2008 and 2011 methodology | 9 |
| Notes on reading this report | 10 |
| 2011 and 2008 disability sample profile | 11 |
| Previous voting behaviour | 14 |
| Voting in 2008 election | 14 |
| Voting | 15 |
| Voting method | 15 |
| Help voting | 15 |
| Voting preference | 16 |
| Knowledge of advance voting and voting by mail | 18 |
| 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 | 20 |
| Would knowledge of voting by mail lead to voting by mail? | 21 |
| Information for people with disabilities | 22 |
| Disability information sources | 22 |
| Usefulness of poster about what to do in polling place | 23 |
| Usefulness of booklet on enrolling and voting | 25 |
| Usefulness of brochure on what to do if cannot get to polling place | 25 |
| Usefulness of brochure in large print | 26 |
| Usefulness of audio clips online | 26 |
| Usefulness of captions on advertisements | 27 |
| Usefulness of captions on animated clips | 27 |
| Usefulness of elections website | 28 |
| Usefulness of disability newsletters | 29 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Other information about voting (including EasyVote pack) | 30 |
| Receiving EasyVote pack..... | 30 |
| Satisfaction with EasyVote pack | 31 |
| Other advertising about voting process including information about the Referendum | 32 |
| Where other advertising was seen or heard | 33 |
| Overall usefulness of information about voting process | 35 |
| Other information required..... | 36 |
| Polling Place | 39 |
| Proportion of disabled voters that went to the polling place | 39 |
| Who accompanied voters to polling place? | 39 |
| Time of day voted | 39 |
| Use of EasyVote card or CEO letter when voting | 40 |
| Time taken at polling place..... | 40 |
| Feelings on time taken at polling place | 41 |
| Disability facilities at polling place..... | 41 |
| Happiness with voting facilities at the polling place..... | 42 |
| The voting process | 43 |
| Rating the clarity of instructions on how to cast the Parliamentary vote | 43 |
| Rating the ease of finding name of person and party | 43 |
| Rating the clarity of instructions on the Referendum voting paper | 44 |
| Rating the ease of finding the options on the Referendum voting paper | 44 |
| Rating ability to answer questions..... | 45 |
| Rating pleasantness and politeness..... | 46 |
| Rating staff efficiency | 47 |
| Providing for needs of those with disabilities..... | 47 |
| Polling place problems..... | 48 |
| Description of polling place issues..... | 48 |
| Election night results | 50 |
| Watching results as they came in | 50 |
| How were results followed? | 50 |
| Timeliness of results | 52 |
| Non-voters | 53 |
| Possibility of voting in Election | 53 |
| When decided not to vote..... | 53 |
| Decision making process..... | 53 |
| Non-voters' awareness of where, and when, to vote | 54 |
| Reasons for not voting..... | 55 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Knowledge of the Referendum | 58 |
| Awareness of the Referendum | 58 |
| Level of knowledge about the Referendum | 58 |
| Confidence in making a decision in the Referendum | 59 |
| Appendix A: Overview tables | 61 |

Executive Summary

Background and method

The Electoral Commission commissioned Colmar Brunton to conduct a survey with voters and non-voters in 2011. Similar surveys were conducted on behalf of the Chief Electoral Office in 2002, 2005, and 2008. The primary objectives of the survey are to:

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

The 2011 survey also included a further objective which was to ascertain levels of understanding about the Referendum on the voting system.

Colmar Brunton were commissioned to undertake the 2011 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.

The disability booster survey sample was gathered from two sources: a) 171 interviews obtained in the main voter and non-voter survey – which was mainly sourced by a national telephone survey (with face-to-face boosts of the Pacific and Asian population) and b) 402 interviews obtained from disabled respondents from Colmar Brunton's online research panel. The sample includes anyone from these two sources who identified themselves as 'having a disability that is long-term (lasting six months or more)'.

The reader should apply caution when interpreting the results because there are limitations to this survey methodology. One limitation is that the survey is not a random sample of all disabled people in New Zealand which means the sample may not be representative by type of disability. For example, someone with serious communication difficulties, or someone with intellectual disability, may be unable, or unwilling, to take part in research of this nature. Furthermore, many of those with hearing impairments would be unable to take part in a telephone survey (which formed part of the sample), and many of those with visual impairments would be unable to take part in the online survey (which formed the main part of the sample contained within this report).

It should also be noted that respondents identified themselves as disabled by answering 'yes' to the question 'do you have a disability that is long-term (lasting six months or more)?'. There were no other questions used to identify whether or not someone was disabled. Answers to this question reflect respondents' own perception of 'disability' and their answers to this question are subjective.

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.

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

- 97% of voters with a disability and 54% of non-voters with a disability (who were eligible to vote in 2008) voted in the 2008 General Election. These proportions are not significantly different from the general public (in other words all voters and non-voters surveyed in the main national survey – details are in the main voter and non-voter satisfaction report).

Voting

- Most voters with a disability (80%) went to a polling place on Election Day. 18% went to an advance voting place, 1% voted from a hospital or a care home, and 1% voted using papers delivered by mail.
- 65% of voters with a disability did not require help with voting.
- 45% of voters with a disability and 6% of non-voters with a disability would prefer to vote in person at a polling place or advance voting place.
- 39% of voters with a disability and 62% of non-voters with a disability would prefer to vote online.
- 12% of voters with a disability and 17% of non-voters with a disability would prefer postal voting.
- 53% 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). 61% of those who did not know said they would have voted in advance if they had known about this option.
- 23% of voters with a disability and 10% of non-voters with a disability said they knew you could vote by post.

Disability information

- 60% 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 (31% of all voters with a disability recall this source) and the poster about enrolling and voting (29%). 22% of voters with a disability also recall disability information on the Electoral Commission's website (www.elections.org.nz).
- 40% of non-voters with a disability recall seeing electoral information specifically produced for people with a disability. The most commonly recalled sources were the poster about enrolling and voting (23% of all non-voters with a disability recalled this source), disability information on the Electoral Commission's website (19%), and the booklet on enrolling and voting (15%).
- 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.
 - Brochure in large print – 80%.
 - www.elections.org.nz – 78%.
 - Animated clips – 64%.
 - Booklet on enrolling and voting – 63%.
 - Articles and information in disability newsletters – 59%.
 - Brochure on what to do if you can't get to a polling place – 54%.
 - Captions on advertisements – 51%.
 - Poster on enrolling and voting – 46%.
 - Audio clips online – 40%.
 - Other disability resources were not used by survey respondents.

Other advertising and information

- 94% of voters with a disability and 68% 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. 74% of voters with a disability were satisfied with the EasyVote pack. This is lower than the general population of voters (88%).
- 41% 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).
- 57% of voters with a disability, and 42% of non-voters with a disability, had seen 'other' advertising about voting (either for Parliament or in the Referendum). This did not include: the EasyVote pack, disability specific information, or political advertising. This advertising was mostly seen on TV.
- 56% of voters with a disability and 20% 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. Among those who requested further information, the most common request was for further information on the Referendum voting systems (12% of all voters with a disability wanted more information on the voting systems, and 6% of non-voters with a disability).

Polling place

- 60% of voters with a disability who went to a polling place, did so with family members. 9% 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.
- 48% of voters with a disability voted in the morning (before noon), 46% 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 evening.
- 87% of voters with a disability brought the EasyVote card with them to the polling place (similar to the general population of voters). 3% brought the letter from the Chief Electoral officer with them (this is lower than the general population of voters - 6% of *all* voters brought the letter with them).
- 39% of voters with a disability said they only spent up to five minutes at the polling place. 60% took longer than five minutes. This proportion is not significantly different from the general population of voters, but voters with a disability were more likely to spend longer than 11 minutes (6% of voters in the general population spent longer than 11 minutes, compared with 17% of voters with a disability). As with the main survey, almost all (97%) voters with a disability said the length of time spent was 'about right'.
- 53% of voters with a disability saw 'easy to access doorways and corridors at the polling place', 47% saw a wheelchair ramp, 47% saw a disabled parking space, 45% saw easy to access paths from the car park to the entrance, and 43% saw desk voting facilities at the polling place.
- Three-quarters (75%) 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 Parliamentary vote (84%).
 - Ease of finding name of person or party for Parliamentary vote (85%).
 - Clear instructions on the Referendum voting paper (69%).
 - Ease of finding the options on the Referendum voting paper (74%).
 - Electoral staffs' ability to answer questions (88%).
 - Pleasantness and politeness of Electoral staff (90%).
 - Efficiency of Electoral staff (87%).

- How well Electoral staff provided for needs of disabled (82%).
- Voters with a disability were less likely than the general population of voters to give positive ratings for all of the questions above (although there is no comparable data for the question on 'how well Electoral staff provided for the needs of disabled people' from the general population of voters because they were not asked this question).

Election night results

- 71% of voters with a disability and 40% of non-voters with a disability said they followed the Election results. Most watched the results on TV (95% of voters and 90% of non-voters who followed the results). These results are not significantly different from the main survey of voters and non-voters.
- Three quarters (83%) of voters with a disability were satisfied with the timeliness of results (this is not significantly different from the equivalent proportion in the general population of voters).
- 62% 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).

- 68% 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. 42% 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. 44% put 'a lot of thought' into it, 33% put 'a little thought into it', and 22% did not put any thought into it.
- Most (79%) non-voters with a disability knew when and where they could vote.
- The main overall reasons for not voting were: health reasons (25%), the polling place being too far away or not having transport (24%), cannot be bothered voting (8%), makes no difference who the government is (8%), and my vote doesn't make a difference (8%).
- Compared with non-voters in the general population, non-voters with a disability were more likely to give the following reasons for not voting:
 - health reasons (25% of non-voters with a disability vs. 6% of non-voters in the general population),
 - polling place too far away/no transport (24% vs. 3%), and
 - makes no difference who the government is (8% vs. 2%).

Knowledge of the Referendum

- 92% of disabled respondents were aware of the Referendum. 96% of voters with a disability were aware and 68% of non-voters with a disability were aware – these results are not significantly different from the general population of voters and non-voters.
- 65% of disabled respondents who were aware of the Referendum said they knew either 'a lot' or 'a moderate amount' about it. 68% of voters with a disability said they knew 'a lot' or 'a moderate amount' and 35% of non-voters with a disability said they knew 'a lot' or 'a moderate amount' – these results are not significantly different from the general population of voters and non-voters.

- 75% of disabled respondents who were aware of the Referendum said they felt either 'very confident' or 'fairly confident' about making a decision in the Referendum. 77% of voters with a disability said they felt 'very confident' or 'fairly confident' and 59% of non-voters with a disability said they felt 'very confident' or 'fairly confident' – these results are not significantly different from the general population of voters and non-voters.

Background and Objectives

The Electoral Commission 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.

To ensure its service is appropriate to legal and political requirements, and to the electorate, the Electoral Commission 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 Electoral Commission provides, and to
- understand what the barriers to voting are, and how to address these for each identified population group.
- The 2011 survey also included a further objective which was to ascertain levels of understanding about the Referendum on the voting system.

The Electoral Commission commissioned Colmar Brunton to conduct a nation-wide survey with voters and non-voters in 2011. 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 (with face-to-face boosts for the Asian and Pacific populations) obtained responses from 171 disabled individuals, and an online booster survey obtained a further 402 interviews with disabled individuals.

For the booster survey Colmar Brunton randomly sourced those identifying themselves as having a 'disability that is long-term (lasting six months or more)' from their online panel (which contains 180,000 New Zealanders).

It should be noted that this booster methodology is different from the data collection methodology used in the 2008 research. In 2008 the research project involved the Deaf Association, IHC, People First New Zealand, and the Disabled Persons Assembly who identified people with a disability to take part in the research. The differences in methodology mean that caution should be applied when comparing 2008 results with 2011 results.

Questionnaire

In total four 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 survey (telephone and face-to-face) – voter questionnaire - using data from disabled respondents
- Nation-wide survey (telephone and face-to-face) – non-voter questionnaire - using data from disabled respondents
- Disability booster survey – voter questionnaire
- Disability booster 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 nation-wide 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.

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 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 survey employed those who were eligible to vote. The following people are eligible to vote:

- 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.

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 171 interviews were obtained this way (including 147 voters and 24 non-voters).

Sample for booster survey conducted among those with a disability

A random selection of 402 individuals (including 354 voters and 48 non-voters – i.e. eligible to vote but did not) identified themselves as having a ‘disability that is long-term (lasting six months or more)’ from Colmar Brunton’s online panel (which contains 180,000 New Zealanders).

Margins of error

In total 501 voters and 72 non-voters were interviewed. The maximum margin of error for a sample size of 501 is +/- 4.4%, and the maximum margin of error for a sample size of 72 is +/- 11.5%. (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.

Cautions associated with the data collection method

The reader should apply caution when interpreting the results because there are limitations to the survey methodology. One limitation is that the survey is not a random sample of all disabled people in New Zealand which means the sample may not be representative by type of disability. For example, someone with serious communication difficulties, or someone with intellectual disability, may be unable, or unwilling, to take part in research of this nature. Furthermore, many of those with hearing impairments would be unable to take part in a telephone survey (which formed part of the sample), and many of those with visual impairments would be unable to take part in the online survey (which formed the main part of the sample contained within this report).

It should also be noted that respondents identified themselves as disabled by answering 'yes' to the question 'do you have a disability that is long-term (lasting six months or more)?'. There were no other questions used to identify whether or not someone was disabled. Answers to this question reflect respondents' own perception of 'disability' and their answers to this question are subjective.

Differences between 2008 and 2011 methodology

Differences in the data collection method

It should be noted that the 2008 survey used a different methodology and this should be kept in mind when comparing results between 2008 and 2011.

In both years part of the sample was drawn from the main nationwide survey (in 2008 this included 104 voters and 18 non-voters from the main nationwide survey, in 2011 this included 147 voters and 24 non-voters). The nationwide survey methodology was the same in 2008 and 2011. However, the methodology used to boost the sample with additional disabled people was different in 2011 compared with 2008.

In 2008, 128 disabled respondents were identified for the disability booster survey. Participating individuals were identified by the Deaf Association, IHC, People First New Zealand, and the Disabled Persons Assembly. Data was gathered largely through face-to-face interviews (supplemented by some self-completion surveys).

In 2011, 402 disabled respondents were identified for the disability booster survey. Participating individuals were identified at random from those who said they had a long-term disability (lasting six months or more) on Colmar Brunton's online research panel.

It is possible that differences in the mode of data collection may account for some differences between 2008 and 2011.

When reading questions which draw upon the full sample size (sourced from *both* the main nationwide survey and the disability booster survey), it should be noted that a larger proportion of the 2011 sample consists of respondents who were asked the specific disability booster questionnaire (69%), whereas in 2008 this proportion was 51%.

Differences by type of disability

In 2008 a number of disability organisations provided a sample of disabled people from their contact lists for the disability booster survey. As such the sample gathered reflected the type of organisations involved, it was not intended to be a random sample of all disabled people in New Zealand. The following disability organisations were involved: the Deaf Association, IHC, People First New Zealand, and the Disabled Persons Assembly. It should also be noted that the type of disability was unknown for the sample which was drawn from the main 2008 nationwide survey (this is not the case in 2011 because a follow-up question on 'type of disability' was asked in the nationwide survey).

In 2011 disabled respondents were selected at random from Colmar Brunton's online panel – but only those with a long-term disability were eligible to participate. Many of those with visual impairment would not be able to take part in an online survey. Furthermore, the online panel may not include people with other types of disability such as those with serious communication difficulties or some of those with intellectual disability.

The profile of respondents in 2008 and 2011 shows some differences (for example, the 2011 sample contains a higher proportion of people with physical, mental and emotional disabilities – see tables below for more details), and this may be due to the different approaches to identifying respondents between the 2008 and 2011 surveys.

It is possible that differences in the profile of disabled respondents between 2008 and 2011 account for some of the differences in survey answers between the two years. Therefore caution should be applied when comparing results between 2008 and 2011.

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 2011 General Election, and non-voters are respondents who were eligible to vote in the 2011 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 2008 and so a direct comparison with the 2011 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 (particularly among non-voters with a disability). Where there is no commentary on subgroup analysis underneath a table this is because there were no statistically significant differences between subgroups.

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 2008 survey where possible. Please note that where significant differences are reported between 2008 and 2011 this is based upon the formula used to calculate differences between waves where a simple random sampling methodology has been used. The formula used to test for significant differences does not take account of any differences inherent in the change in survey method between 2008 and 2011, for example, differences related to the different organisations who assisted with the research in 2008, or the different data collection mode - see ‘differences between the 2008 and 2011 methodology’ above for details. Therefore comparisons between 2008 and 2011 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. Where comparisons against the main voter and non-voter satisfaction survey are possible, data for the general public is appended to the right hand side of the relevant table.

2011 and 2008 disability sample profile

The following section outlines the unweighted sample size (i.e. the number of interviews conducted) and percentage of the voters and non-voters for key subgroups. The unweighted sample size 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. The percentages of each subgroup of voter within the total population of voters and each subgroup of non-voter within the total population of non-voters is useful for comparing the 2011 survey profile against the 2008 survey profiles of voters and non-voters.

| Gender | Voters (2011) | | Non-voters (2011) | | Voters (2008) | | Non-voters (2008) | |
|--------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| | N= | 501 | 72 | | 207 | 43 | | |
| Male | | 265 (53%) | 37 (51%) | | 98 (47%) | 18 (42%) | | |
| Female | | 234 (47%) | 35 (49%) | | 108 (52%) | 25 (58%) | | |
| Missing data | | 2 (*) | - | | 1 (-) | - | | |

Comment on changes since 2008: No significant change by gender between 2008 and 2011.

| Age Band | Voters (2011) | | Non-voters (2011) | | Age Band | Voters (2008) | | Non-voters (2008) | |
|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| | N= | 501 | 72 | | | N= | 207 | 43 | |
| 18-24 years old | | 44 (9%) | 18 (25%) | | 18-24 years old | 15 (7%) | 4 (9%) | | |
| 25-35 years old | | 63 (13%) | 13 (18%) | | 25-34 years old | 16 (8%) | 2 (5%) | | |
| 36-45 years old | | 50 (10%) | 9 (12%) | | 35-44 years old | 30 (14%) | 14 (33%) | | |
| 46-55 years old | | 72 (14%) | 12 (17%) | | 45-54 years old | 48 (23%) | 7 (16%) | | |
| 56-65 years old | | 109 (22%) | 8 (11%) | | 55-64 years old | 32 (15%) | 4 (9%) | | |
| 66+ years old | | 160 (32%) | 10 (14%) | | 65+ years old | 64 (31%) | 12 (28%) | | |
| Missing data | | 3 (1%) | 2 (3%) | | Missing data | 2 (1%) | - | | |

Comment on changes since 2008: Please note, the age-bands in 2011 were slightly different and started one year later, for example the age-band 35-44 used in 2008 has become 36-45 in 2011. This relates to changes in the Electoral Roll cohort age-bands between the two Elections. Generally the age-profiles are similar between 2008 and 2011. In 2011 there are more voters aged in their late 50s/early 60s and less aged in their late 40s/early 50s, furthermore there are more non-voters aged under 35. Other differences in the non-voter age bands are not statistically significant (mainly because of the small sample size of non-voters).

| Ethnicity | Voters (2011) | | Non-voters (2011) | | Voters (2008) | | Non-voters (2008) | |
|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------|--|
| | N= | 501 | 72 | 207 | 43 | | | |
| New Zealand European | | 406 (81%) | 60 (83%) | 167 (81%) | 30 (70%) | | | |
| Maori | | 69 (14%) | 9 (12%) | 48 (23%) | 11 (26%) | | | |
| Samoan | | 7 (1%) | - | 1 (*) | 1 (2%) | | | |
| Cook Island Maori | | - | 1 (1%) | 1 (*) | 1 (2%) | | | |
| Tongan | | 2 (*) | - | - | - | | | |
| Niuean | | - | - | - | - | | | |
| Other Pacific Island Group | | 1 (*) | - | 1 (*) | - | | | |
| Chinese | | 6 (1%) | - | 1 (*) | - | | | |
| Indian | | 6 (1%) | 1 (1%) | 1 (*) | - | | | |
| Other Asian | | 1 (*) | 1 (1%) | 2 (1%) | - | | | |
| Other ethnic group | | 2 (*) | 2 (3%) | 4 (2%) | 4 (9%) | | | |
| New Zealand/Kiwi | | 12 (2%) | - | 1 (*) | 1 (2%) | | | |
| Non-New Zealand European | | 27 (5%) | 3 (4%) | 6 (3%) | 2 (5%) | | | |
| Refused | | 9 (2%) | 2 (3%) | 1 (*) | - | | | |

Comment on changes since 2008: No significant changes by ethnicity between 2008 and 2011 – although there are now 2% voters identifying as ‘New Zealanders’ (vs. 0% in 2008), and a similar difference exists in the proportion that ‘refused’.

| Qualification | Voters (2011) | | Non-voters (2011) | | Voters (2008) | | Non-voters (2008) | |
|---|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|-------------------|--|
| | N= | 501 | 72 | 207 | 43 | | | |
| No qualification | | 70 (14%) | 20 (28%) | 62 (30%) | 15 (35%) | | | |
| School certificate or NCEA level 1 | | 65 (13%) | 7 (10%) | 26 (13%) | 3 (7%) | | | |
| Sixth Form Certificate, University Entrance or NCEA level 2 | | 51 (10%) | 11 (15%) | 17 (8%) | 4 (9%) | | | |
| Bursary, Scholarship or NCEA level 3 or 4 | | 32 (6%) | 4 (6%) | 4 (2%) | 2 (5%) | | | |
| A Trade Qualification | | 47 (9%) | 5 (7%) | 13 (6%) | 2 (5%) | | | |
| A certificate or diploma that does not require a degree | | 80 (16%) | 8 (11%) | 18 (9%) | 1 (2%) | | | |
| A polytech degree | | 16 (3%) | 2 (3%) | 5 (2%) | - | | | |
| A university degree | | 61 (12%) | 7 (10%) | 14 (7%) | 1 (2%) | | | |
| Postgraduate qualification | | 54 (11%) | 5 (7%) | 7 (3%) | - | | | |
| Other | | 2 (*) | - | 1 (*) | 1 (2%) | | | |
| Don't know | | 9 (2%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (1%) | - | | | |
| Refused | | 14 (3%) | 1 (1%) | - | - | | | |

Comment on changes since 2008: In 2011 there are more voters with a qualification, and the proportion of voters with a university degree or postgraduate qualification is higher than in 2008. There are no significant changes in the non-voter survey sample. Please note that those with an intellectual disability were not asked the qualifications question in 2008 and this may have an impact on comparisons.

| Type of disability | Voters (2011) | Non-voters (2011) | Voters (2008) | Non-voters (2008) |
|---|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| N= | 501 | 72 | 103 | 25 |
| Hearing | 108 (22%) | 8 (11%) | 55 (53%) | 11 (44%) |
| Visual | 89 (18%) | 7 (10%) | 10 (10%) | 4 (16%) |
| Speech | 14 (3%) | 1 (1%) | 7 (7%) | 3 (12%) |
| Physical (including mobility, coordination/dexterity, muscular, spinal) | 244 (49%) | 34 (47%) | 10 (10%) | 4 (16%) |
| Intellectual (including learning, concentration problems, brain injury, intellectual) | 55 (11%) | 8 (11%) | 33 (32%) | 10 (40%) |
| Mental / emotional | 57 (11%) | 11 (15%) | 4 (4%) | - |
| Other (including respiratory, asthma, epilepsy, arthritis, heart condition, diabetes) | 89 (18%) | 13 (18%) | 15 (15%) | 3 (12%) |
| Missing data (including refused) | 32 (6%) | 9 (12%) | 2 (2%) | - |

Comment on changes since 2008: Comparisons against the 2008 survey are limited because in 2008 only those answering the disability booster questionnaire were asked a question on 'type of disability' (whereas the 2011 survey sample includes 'type of disability' from the disability booster survey data and the main nationwide survey data). Compared with 2008, in 2011 there are significantly more voters and non-voters with physical disabilities and mental/emotional disabilities, and significantly less voters and non-voters with hearing, speech, and intellectual disabilities. In 2011 there are significantly more voters with a visual impairment (compared with voters in 2008).

| Type of health problem | Voters (2011) | Non-voters (2011) | Voters (2008) | Non-voters (2008) |
|---|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| N= | 501 | 72 | 207 | 43 |
| Everyday activities that people your age can usually do | 240 (48%) | 40 (56%) | 82 (40%) | 14 (33%) |
| Communicating, mixing with others or socialising | 126 (25%) | 19 (26%) | 22 (11%) | 7 (16%) |
| Any other activity that people your age can usually do | 185 (37%) | 28 (39%) | 52 (25%) | 11 (26%) |

Comment on changes since 2008: A larger proportion of voters in 2011 said that the disability caused communication and other activity problems (and a higher proportion of non-voters said that the disability caused problems with everyday activities).

Previous voting behaviour

Voting in 2008 election

Voters

Ninety seven per cent of voters with a disability (who were eligible to vote in 2008) voted in the 2008 General Election. This proportion is similar to the last post-election survey conducted in 2008 (when 96% of those eligible to vote in 2005 did so). And the proportion is also similar to the general public (96% of voters in the general public who were eligible to vote in 2008 said they voted in 2008).

| Vote in 2008? | Disabled survey 2011 | | Disabled survey 2008 | | General public 2011 | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|
| | N= | | | | | |
| Yes | | 97% | | 96% | | 96% |
| No | | 3% | | 3% | | 4% |
| Don't know / cannot remember | | * | | 1% | | * |

Non-voters

54% of non-voters with a disability (who were eligible to vote in 2008) voted in the 2008 General Election. This proportion is not significantly different from the general public (60%). It is also not significantly different from the 2008 disability survey. Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

| Vote in 2008? | Disabled survey 2011 | | Disabled survey 2008 | | General public 2011 | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|
| | N= | | | | | |
| Yes | | 54% | | 68% | | 60% |
| No | | 42% | | 24% | | 38% |
| Don't know / cannot remember | | 5% | | 8% | | 2% |

Voting

Voting method

Most voters with a disability (80%) went to a polling place on Election Day. It appears that voting at an advance voting place has increased since 2008 (from 7% to 18%). Other changes are not statistically significant.

| Voting method | Disabled survey | |
|---|-----------------|------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| | N= 354 | 203 |
| At a polling place on Election Day | 80% | 86% |
| At an advance voting place, before Election Day | 18% | 7% |
| In a hospital, rest home or other care facility | 1% | 3% |
| Using voting papers delivered by mail | 1% | 3% |

Help voting

Sixty five per cent of voters with a disability did not require help with voting. Since 2008 there appears to be a decline in use of support persons (from 8% in 2008 to 2% in 2011).

| Help voting | Disabled survey | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| | N= 354 | 100 |
| No help with voting | 65% | 57% |
| Family member | 19% | 18% |
| Staff at the voting place | 17% | 17% |
| Support person | 2% | 8% |
| Friend | 4% | 3% |
| Cannot remember | 1% | 1% |

- Those with speech difficulties were more likely to say they received help from family members (75% vs. 19% for all voters with a disability) and less likely to say they required no help (12% vs. 65%).
- Those with intellectual disability were less likely to say they required no help (40% vs. 65% for all voters with a disability).
- Older voters were less likely to have help from friends (7% of those aged up to 45 had help from friends, compared with only 2% of those aged 46 and over).
- Asian voters were more likely to say they had help from family members (60% vs. 19% of all voters with a disability).
- Those with no health problems were more likely to say they didn't require help (76% vs. 65% of all voters with a disability).

Voting preference

Voters

Forty five per cent of voters with a disability would prefer to vote in person at a polling place or advance voting place (this appears to have decreased since 2008 when 63% of voters with a disability preferred this voting method). The next most common preference was to vote online (39% - this appears to have increased from 19% in 2008).

Differences between the survey methodology in 2008 and 2011 may account for differences in voting preference. In 2011 most respondents were sourced from Colmar Brunton's online panel – and this population group may have a greater preference for conducting matters online generally).

| Voting preference | Disabled survey | |
|---|-----------------|------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| N= | 354 | 206 |
| Voting in person at a polling place or advance voting place | 45% | 63% |
| Online using a computer or mobile internet device | 39% | 19% |
| Using voting papers delivered by mail | 12% | 11% |
| Using touch-tone phone | 2% | 4% |
| Other | * | 2% |
| Don't know | 2% | 1% |

- Those with a visual impairment were less likely to say they preferred voting online (23% vs. 39% of all voters with a disability).
- Those with mental and emotional disability were less likely to say they preferred to vote in person (24% vs. 45% of all voters with a disability).
- Males were more likely to say they preferred to vote in person (54% vs. 37% of females) and less likely to say they preferred to vote online (7% vs. 16% of females).

Non voters

Only six per cent of non-voters with a disability said they would prefer to vote in person, 62% said they would prefer to vote online. Preference for voting online appears to have increased since 2008 (from 17% of non-voters with a disability in 2008 to 62% in 2011) and preference for voting in person appears to have decreased since 2008 (from 40% to 6%). Please see table overleaf for details.

Results should be treated with caution due to the small base size and the survey methodology (most of the 2011 survey sample was sourced from Colmar Brunton's online panel who may have a preference for conducting more matters online).

| Voting preference | Disabled survey | |
|---|-----------------|------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| N= | 48 | 42 |
| Voting in person at a polling place or advance voting place | 6% | 40% |
| Using voting papers delivered by mail | 17% | 19% |
| Online using a computer or mobile internet device | 62% | 17% |
| Using touch-tone phone | 6% | 5% |
| Don't know | 8% | 19% |

Knowledge of advance voting and voting by mail

Knowledge of advance voting

Voters

Eighty seven per cent of voters with a disability knew they could vote before Election Day, this is higher than in 2008 when 71% of voters with a disability said they knew they could vote in advance.

| Knowledge of advance voting | Disabled survey | Disabled survey |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| | N= 354 | 98 |
| Yes, knew you could vote before Election Day | 87% | 71% |
| No, did not know you could vote before Election Day | 13% | 29% |

Non-voters

Fifty three per cent of non-voters with a disability knew they could vote before Election Day. This proportion is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters, nor is it significantly different from the result in 2008. Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

| Knowledge of advance voting | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | N= 72 | 42 | 272 |
| Yes, knew you could vote before Election Day | 53% | 62% | 63% |
| No, did not know you could vote before Election Day | 47% | 38% | 37% |

Would knowledge of advance voting lead to voting in advance?

Voters

Forty seven 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 2011 and 2008 is not statistically significant. Results should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

| Would knowledge of advance voting make a difference? | Disabled survey | Disabled survey |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| | N= 45 | 30 |
| Yes, would use advance vote | 47% | 43% |
| No, would not use advance vote | 53% | 57% |

Non-voters

Sixty one 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. This is not significantly different from the previous survey in 2008 (nor is it significantly different from the main national survey result for non-voters).

Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the very small base size.

| Would knowledge of advance voting make a difference? | Disabled survey 2011 N= | Disabled survey 2008 | General public 2011 |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Yes, would use advance vote | 33 61% | 17 53% | 95 59% |
| No, would not use advance vote | 39% | 41% | 41%* |

* This cell combines 'no' and 'don't know' from non-voters in the general public.

Source of information about advance voting

Voters

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 (46%). (Although this proportion has declined from 68% in 2008).

A notable proportion of voters with a disability (43%) also found out by seeing, hearing or reading advertisements.

| Source of knowledge about advance voting | Disabled survey 2011 N= | Disabled survey 2008 |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| EasyVote pack | 309 46% | 50 68% |
| Saw, heard or read about it in advertisements | 43% | 44% |
| Word of mouth | 27% | 20% |
| Disability organisations* | 3% | 14% |
| Other | 9% | 2% |

* The proportion finding out about advance voting from disability organisations appears to have declined between 2008 and 2011, however this change is likely to be related to the data collection methodology (in 2008 disability organisations were involved in providing the sample of disabled respondents, whereas they were not in 2011).

Non-voters

Non-voters with a disability, who had heard of advance voting, were asked for their information source. Advertising was the most common source, although results should be treated with caution due to the small base size (23 respondents).

| Source of knowledge about advance voting | Disabled survey 2011* |
|---|--------------------------|
| | N= 23 |
| EasyVote pack | 22% |
| Saw, heard or read about it in advertisements | 70% |
| Word of mouth | 39% |
| Disability organisations* | - |
| Other | 9% |

* Results for non-voters in 2008 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 that they could have their voting papers delivered by mail. Just over a fifth knew about this option (23%). This appears to have declined since 2008 when 43% said they knew about the option of voting by mail.

| Knowledge of voting by mail | Disabled survey 2011 | Disabled survey 2008 |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | N= 354 | 56 |
| Yes, knew you could vote by mail | 23% | 43% |
| No, did not know you could vote by mail | 77% | 57% |

Non-voters

Non-voters were asked if they were aware of postal voting. Only one in ten had heard about this option. This appears to be lower than in 2008 when 73% of non-voters interviewed claimed to be aware of this option. Results should be treated with caution due to the very small base sizes.

| Knowledge of voting by mail | Disabled survey 2011 | Disabled survey 2008 |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | N= 48 | 11 |
| Yes, knew you could vote by mail | 10% | 73% |
| No, did not know you could vote by mail | 90% | 27% |

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?'. 43% said they would have voted by mail. The difference between 2008 and 2005 is not significant.

| Would knowledge of voting by mail make a difference? | Disabled survey 2011 | Disabled survey 2008 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| N= | 272 | 59 |
| Yes, would use mail vote | 43% | 41% |
| No, would not use mail vote | 57% | 59% |

Non-voters

Non-voters who did not know about voting by mail, were asked, 'would they have voted by mail if they knew about this option?'. 77% said they would have voted by mail. Results should be treated with caution due to the very small base sizes. Results were not significantly different from 2008.

| Would knowledge of voting by mail make a difference? | Disabled survey 2011 | Disabled survey 2008 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| N= | 43 | 11 |
| Yes, would use mail vote | 77% | 64% |
| No, would not use mail vote | 23% | 36% |

Information for people with disabilities

Disability information sources

Voters

60% of voters with a disability recall seeing electoral information specifically produced for people with a disability. 40% do not recall seeing any information for those with disabilities. The equivalent proportions in 2008 were 81% and 19% (respectively)¹, therefore it appears that less disabled voters were aware of disability information in 2011 compared with 2008. However, as stated in the methodology section, the 2008 and 2011 surveys used different methodologies, so the results are not directly comparable.

As in 2008, the most commonly recalled sources were the booklet on enrolling and voting (31% of all voters with a disability recall this source) and the poster (29%). (In 2011 the poster referred to in the questionnaire was about ‘enrolling and voting’ – whereas in 2008 the poster was about ‘what to do in a polling place’).

Subgroup analysis can be found underneath the table.

Later in this section the perceived usefulness of different disability resources are examined. Two of the most useful resources appear to be the Elections website and the booklet on enrolling and voting (see details below).

| Information sources recalled* | Disabled survey 2011 | Disabled survey 2008 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| N= | 354 | 99 |
| Didn't see any of the disability information | 40% | 19% |
| Booklet on enrolling and voting | 31% | 45% |
| Poster about enrolling and voting | 29% | n/a |
| Poster about what to do in a polling place | n/a | 43% |
| The website www.elections.org.nz | 22% | 14% |
| Brochure on what to do if you if you can't get to a polling place | 15% | 9% |
| Captions on advertisements | 13% | 21% |
| Articles/information in disability newsletters and magazines | 8% | 21% |
| Audio clips online | 3% | n/a |
| Captions on animated clips | 3% | n/a |
| Brochure in large print | 3% | 2% |
| DVD in NZ sign language | 1% | 20% |
| DVD featuring people w/intellectual disabilities | 1% | 16% |
| Brochure in Braille | 1% | - |
| Brochure on audio cassette or CD | 1% | - |

- Voters with a hearing disability were more likely to recall captions on animated clips (8% vs. 3% of all voters with a disability). (Please note that this difference is only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level).

¹ (The equivalent proportions in 2005 were 69% and 31% respectively).

- Asian voters with a disability were more likely to recall the elections website (50% compared with 22% of all voters with a disability). (Please note that this difference is only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level).

Non-voters

40% of non-voters with a disability recall seeing electoral information specifically produced for people with a disability. 60% do not recall seeing any information for those with disabilities. Awareness of disability resources appears to be lower than in 2008 (when 64% of disabled non-voters said they were aware of disability specific resources). However, as noted above, the 2008 and 2011 surveys used different sampling approaches, so the results are not directly comparable.

The most commonly recalled resource was the poster (23% of disabled non-voters). (In 2011 the poster referred to was about ‘enrolling and voting’ – whereas in 2008 the poster was about ‘what to do in a polling place’). 19% were aware of the website and 15% were aware of the booklet on enrolling and voting.

Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small sample sizes.

| Information sources recalled* | Disabled survey 2011 N= 48 | Disabled survey 2008 22 |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Didn't see any of the disability information | 60% | 36% |
| Poster about enrolling and voting | 23% | n/a |
| Poster about what to do in a polling place | n/a | 9% |
| The website www.elections.org.nz | 19% | 14% |
| Booklet on enrolling and voting | 15% | 23% |
| Captions on advertisements | 10% | 23% |
| Brochure on what to do if you if you can't get to a polling place | 10% | 5% |
| Brochure in large print | 4% | - |
| DVD in NZ sign language | 2% | 27% |
| Articles/information in disability newsletters and magazines | 2% | 5% |
| Captions on animated clips | 2% | n/a |
| DVD featuring people w/intellectual disabilities | - | 9% |

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

Usefulness of poster about enrolling and voting

Voters

Voters who saw the poster about enrolling and voting were asked how useful it was (on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 was not at all useful, and 5 was very useful). Forty six per cent found it useful (i.e. scored a 4 or 5 out of 5). (This is lower than the proportion of voters who found the 2008 poster on ‘what to do in a polling place’ useful – which was 70%).

| Usefulness of poster | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey |
|--|----|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008† |
| Very useful (5) | | 17% | n/a |
| 4 | | 29% | n/a |
| NETT Useful* | | 46% | 70% |
| 3 | | 33% | 12% |
| 2 | | 15% | n/a |
| Not at all useful (1) | | 4% | n/a |
| NETT Not useful (* see note under table) | | 19% | 14% |
| Don't know | | 3% | 4% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that found the information source useful overall, and the proportion that found it not useful are available and are presented in this table.

† Please note that the 2008 question was about a poster on 'what to do in a polling place' whereas the 2011 question was about a poster about 'enrolling and voting'.

- Voters who said their disability did not give them serious health problems were more likely to find the poster useful (67% vs. 46% for all voters with a disability). (This difference was only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level).

Non- Voters

Thirty six percent of non-voters found the poster useful. Results should be treated with caution due to the very small base size. Results to this question from 2008 were not available due to the small base size of non-voters in that year.

| Usefulness of poster | N= | Disabled survey |
|-----------------------|----|-----------------|
| | | 2011 |
| Very useful (5) | | 18% |
| 4 | | 18% |
| NETT Useful | | 36% |
| 3 | | - |
| 2 | | 36% |
| Not at all useful (1) | | 18% |
| NETT Not useful | | 55% |
| Don't know | | 9% |

Usefulness of booklet on enrolling and voting

Voters

Voters who saw the booklet on enrolling and voting were asked how useful it was. 63% found it useful, in other words they scored it as a 4 or 5 out of 5. (This result is not significantly different from the equivalent result in 2008 – when 73% found the brochure useful).

| Usefulness of booklet on enrolling and voting | Disabled survey 2011 | Disabled survey 2008 |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| N= | 110 | 62 |
| Very useful (5) | 30% | n/a |
| 4 | 33% | n/a |
| NETT Useful* | 63% | 73% |
| 3 | 25% | 16% |
| 2 | 11% | n/a |
| Not at all useful (1) | 1% | n/a |
| NETT Not useful (* see note under table) | 12% | 8% |
| Don't know | 1% | 3% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that found the information source useful overall, and the proportion that found it not useful are available and are presented in this table.

- Those with a hearing disability were more likely to find the booklet on enrolling and voting useful (81% rated the booklet a 4 or 5 out of 5, compared to 63% of all voters with a disability).
- Those aged 46 and over were more likely to find the booklet 'very useful' (i.e. 5 out of 5) (36% vs. 18% of those aged up to 46).

Results for non-voters are not available due to the small base size of non-voters answering this question.

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. 54% found it useful (i.e. 4 or 5 out of 5), this is not significantly different from the equivalent result in 2008 (60%).

| Usefulness of brochure on what to do if cannot get to polling place | Disabled survey 2011 | Disabled survey 2008 |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| N= | 54 | 30 |
| Very useful (5) | 24% | n/a |
| 4 | 30% | n/a |
| NETT Useful* | 54% | 60% |
| 3 | 31% | 20% |
| 2 | 6% | n/a |
| Not at all useful (1) | 6% | n/a |
| NETT Not useful (* see note below) | 11% | 13% |
| Don't know | 4% | 7% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that found the information source useful overall, and the proportion that found it not useful are available and are presented in this table.

- Those aged 46 and over were more likely to find the brochure useful (62% rated the booklet a 4 or 5 out of 5, compared to 35% of those aged up to 46). Please note that this difference was only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level.

Results for non-voters are not available due to the small base size of non-voters answering this question.

Usefulness of brochure in large print

Voters who saw brochures in large print were asked how useful they were. 80% found the brochure in large print useful - i.e. 4 or 5 out of 5 (this appears to be higher than the equivalent result in 2008 which was 47% - but due to small base sizes the difference between the two results is not statistically significant).

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

| Usefulness of brochure in large print | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey |
|--|----|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 |
| | | 10 | 15 |
| Very useful (5) | | 40% | n/a |
| 4 | | 40% | n/a |
| NETT Useful* | | 80% | 47% |
| 3 | | 10% | 13% |
| 2 | | 10% | n/a |
| Not at all useful (1) | | - | n/a |
| NETT Not useful (* see note under table) | | 10% | 33% |
| Don't know | | - | 7% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that found the information source useful overall, and the proportion that found it not useful are available and are presented in this table.

Results for non-voters are not available due to the small base size of non-voters answering this question.

Usefulness of audio clips online

Voters who heard audio clips online were asked how useful they were. 40% found the clips useful (i.e. 4 or 5 out of 5). Please see table overleaf for details. This question was not asked in 2008.

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

| Usefulness of audio clips online | Disabled survey | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|------|
| | N= | 2011 |
| Very useful (5) | | 10% |
| 4 | | 30% |
| NETT Useful | | 40% |
| 3 | | 40% |
| 2 | | 10% |
| Not at all useful (1) | | - |
| NETT Not useful | | 10% |
| Don't know | | 10% |

No non-voters were asked this question (because none were aware of the audio clips online).

Usefulness of captions on advertisements

Voters who saw captions on advertisements were asked how useful they were. 51% found the captions useful - i.e. 4 or 5 out of 5 (this is lower than the equivalent result in 2008 which was 70% - but due to small base sizes the difference between the two results is not statistically significant).

| Usefulness of captions on advertisements | Disabled survey | | Disabled survey |
|--|-----------------|------|-----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2008 |
| Very useful (5) | | 26% | n/a |
| 4 | | 26% | n/a |
| NETT Useful* | | 51% | 70% |
| 3 | | 34% | 11% |
| 2 | | 9% | n/a |
| Not at all useful (1) | | 4% | n/a |
| NETT Not useful (* see note under table) | | 13% | 11% |
| Don't know | | 2% | 8% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that found the information source useful overall, and the proportion that found it not useful are available and are presented in this table.

- Those aged 46 and over were more likely to find the captions useful (61% rated the booklet a 4 or 5 out of 5, compared to 31% of those aged up to 46). Please note that this difference was only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level.

The results for non-voters are not available due to very small base sizes.

Usefulness of captions on animated clips

Voters who saw captions on animated clips were asked how useful they were. 64% found the clips useful (i.e. 4 or 5 out of 5). This question was not asked in 2008.

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

| Usefulness of captions on animated clips | Disabled survey | |
|--|-----------------|------|
| | N= | 2011 |
| Very useful (5) | | 27% |
| 4 | | 36% |
| NETT Useful | | 64% |
| 3 | | 27% |
| 2 | | 9% |
| Not at all useful (1) | | - |
| NETT Not useful | | 9% |
| Don't know | | - |

The results for non-voters are not available due to very small base sizes.

Usefulness of elections website

Voters who were aware of the www.elections.org.nz website were asked how useful it was. 78% found it useful (i.e. 4 or 5 out of 5). This appears to be significantly higher than the equivalent finding in 2008 (48%).

| Usefulness of elections website | N= | Disabled survey | |
|--|----|-----------------|------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 |
| Very useful (5) | | 46% | n/a |
| 4 | | 33% | n/a |
| NETT Useful* | | 78% | 48% |
| 3 | | 18% | 17% |
| 2 | | 4% | n/a |
| Not at all useful (1) | | - | n/a |
| NETT Not useful (* see note under table) | | 4% | 24% |
| Don't know | | - | 10% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that found the information source useful overall, and the proportion that found it not useful are available and are presented in this table.

- Those with mental or emotional disabilities were more likely to find the website useful (100% of respondents with these disabilities found the website useful compared with 78% of all voters with disabilities).

The results for non-voters are not available 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. 59% found the articles useful (the equivalent result in 2008 was 61% - which is not significantly different).

| Usefulness of disability newsletter | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey |
|--|----|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 |
| | | 27 | 31 |
| Very useful (5) | | 26% | n/a |
| 4 | | 33% | n/a |
| NETT Useful* | | 59% | 61% |
| 3 | | 37% | 19% |
| 2 | | - | n/a |
| Not at all useful (1) | | 4% | n/a |
| NETT Not useful (* see note under table) | | 4% | 13% |
| Don't know | | - | 6% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that found the information source useful overall, and the proportion that found it not useful are available and are presented in this table.

The results for non-voters are not available due to very small base sizes.

Note on lack of 'usefulness' data for other disability information sources

Information on the usefulness of the four other disability information sources (listed below) was unavailable. This was because too few respondents recalled those particular sources. These other sources include:

- DVD in NZ sign language.
- DVD featuring people w/intellectual disabilities.
- Brochure in Braille.
- Brochure on audio cassette or CD.

Other information about voting (including EasyVote pack)

Receiving EasyVote pack

Voters

Over 9 in 10 (94%) of voters with a disability recall receiving the EasyVote pack in the mail. This is significantly lower than in 2008 when it was 98%. The proportion of disabled voters that recall receiving the EasyVote pack is not significantly different from the proportion of voters in the general public that recall receiving the EasyVote pack (94% vs. 96%).

| Receive EasyVote pack? | Disabled survey | | General public |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2008 2011 |
| Yes | 501 | 94% | 98% 96% |
| No | | 5% | 1% 3% |
| Don't know / cannot remember | | 1% | 1% * |

- Voters with mental or emotional disability are less likely to recall receiving the pack (88% compared to 94% of all voters with a disability). (This difference was only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level).

Non-voters

Over two-thirds (68%) of non-voters with a disability recall receiving the EasyVote pack in the mail (this is not significantly different from the result in 2008 – 67%). The difference between non-voters with a disability and non-voters in the general population is not statistically significant (67% vs. 77% for non-voters in the general public).

Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

| Receive EasyVote pack? | Disabled survey | | General public |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2008 2011 |
| Yes | 72 | 68% | 67% 77% |
| No | | 28% | 28% 21% |
| Don't know / cannot remember | | 4% | 5% 2% |

Satisfaction with EasyVote pack

Voters

Voters who received the EasyVote pack were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with it. 74% of voters who recall the pack were satisfied with it. This is lower than the general population of voters (88%). It also appears to be lower than the equivalent proportion from the 2008 survey (85%).

9% of voters who received the pack were dissatisfied with it, this is higher than the equivalent proportion among the general population of voters (3%). Also it appears that the proportion of voters with a disability that are dissatisfied with the EasyVote pack has increased since 2008 (when it was 4%).

| Satisfaction with the EasyVote pack | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|--|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | | 461 | 191 | 953 |
| Very satisfied (5) | | 48% | n/a* | 62% |
| 4 | | 27% | n/a* | 27% |
| NETT Satisfied* | | 74% | 85% | 88% |
| Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied (3) | | 15% | 9% | 8% |
| 2 | | 4% | n/a* | 2% |
| Very dissatisfied (1) | | 5% | n/a* | 1% |
| NETT Dissatisfied (* see note under table) | | 9% | 4% | 3% |
| Don't know | | 1% | 2% | 1% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that are satisfied overall, and the proportion that are dissatisfied overall are available and are presented in this table.

- Voters who said their disability did not give them serious health problems were more likely to be satisfied (82% gave a score of 4 or 5 out of 5 vs. 74% for all voters with a disability). (This difference was only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level).

Non-voters

Non-voters who received the EasyVote pack were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with it. 41% of non-voters with a disability were satisfied with the EasyVote pack (this compares with 58% of non-voters in the general population, but due to the small sample size the difference is not statistically significant). 7% were dissatisfied (compared with 8% of non-voters in the general population).

It appears that the proportion of non-voters with a disability who are dissatisfied with the EasyVote pack has decreased since 2008 (when it was 24%). However, results should be treated with caution due to the small base sizes involved.

| Satisfaction with the EasyVote pack | Disabled survey | | General public |
|--|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2011 |
| | | 44 | 158 |
| Very satisfied (5) | | 20% | n/a* |
| 4 | | 20% | 31% |
| NETT Satisfied* | | 41% | 52% |
| Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied (3) | | 41% | 16% |
| 2 | | 5% | n/a* |
| Very dissatisfied (1) | | 2% | n/a* |
| NETT Dissatisfied (* see note under table) | | 7% | 24% |
| Don't know | | 11% | 8% |
| | | | 2% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that are satisfied overall, and the proportion that are dissatisfied overall are available and are presented in this table.

Other advertising about voting process including information about the Referendum (not including the EasyVote pack or disability information)

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

Fifty seven 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. There is no directly comparable general public data for this question because it was asked a different way in the main voter and non-voter questionnaire.

Because there was no Referendum advertising in 2008, this question is not directly comparable with 2008 (however the proportion of voters that recalled general Electoral advertising in 2008 was not significantly different from the proportion of voters that recalled Electoral or Referendum advertising in 2011 – 63% compared with 57% respectively).

| Seen other advertising about the Election/Referendum? | Disabled survey |
|---|-----------------|
| N= | 2011 |
| Yes | 354 |
| | 57% |
| No | 27% |
| Don't know / cannot remember | 16% |

Non-voters

Forty two per cent 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. There is no directly comparable general public data for this question because it was asked a different way in the main voter and non-voter questionnaire.

Because there was no Referendum advertising in 2008, this question is not directly comparable with 2008 (however the proportion of non-voters that recalled general Electoral advertising in 2008 was not significantly different from the proportion of non-voters that recalled Electoral or Referendum advertising in 2011 – 57% compared with 42% respectively).

Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

| Seen other advertising? | Disabled survey | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|------|
| | N= | 2011 |
| | | 48 |
| | Yes | 42% |
| | No | 42% |
| | Don't know / cannot remember | 17% |

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 (75%). Other common sources recalled include newspapers (23%) and radio (17%).

Although the question about advertising sources was different in 2008 because it did not include advertising about the Referendum (only Electoral advertising) – the results from the 2008 question are shown in the table overleaf (there are no significant differences in recall by source between 2008 and 2011).

Although the question is not directly comparable with the main survey of voters and non-voters (because the general public survey asked about Electoral advertising – *not* including Referendum advertising), it appears that pamphlets and the Internet have lower recall among disabled voters (22% of voters in the general public recall pamphlets and 12% recall advertising on the Internet – the equivalent figures in the table overleaf are 2% and 4%).

| Where seen other advertising | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|---|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011* |
| | | 201 | 116 | 690 |
| Television | | 75% | 81% | 66% |
| Newspapers | | 23% | 26% | 35% |
| Radio | | 17% | 16% | 18% |
| Internet | | 4% | 1% | 12% |
| Billboards/Posters/Banners | | 3% | 5% | 1% |
| Letters Through the Mail | | 2% | 3% | 5% |
| Pamphlets or fliers | | 2% | 6% | 22% |
| University/Technical Institute | | 1% | 3% | 1% |
| Word of mouth | | - | 3% | 3% |
| Signs | | - | 3% | 3% |
| Bus shelters | | - | 2% | 1% |
| Shopping Malls/Supermarket | | - | 2% | 2% |
| Signs On Buses/Back Of Buses/Other vehicles | | - | 2% | * |
| Schools | | - | 1% | * |
| Magazines | | - | 1% | 1% |
| Party Political gathering | | - | 1% | - |
| Other | | 4% | 1% | 2% |
| Don't know / cant remember | | 6% | 3% | 1% |

* This question is not directly comparable between the survey of disabled voters and the general public survey of voters. This is because the former asked about all Electoral and Referendum advertising whereas the latter asked about Electoral advertising only (not including Referendum advertising).

- Younger voters and voters with a mental or emotional disability were less likely to recall advertising in newspapers. 8% of voters with a disability aged up to 46 recalled newspaper adverts compared to 31% of older voters with a disability. 10% of voters with a mental or emotional disability recalled newspaper adverts (compared to 23% for all voters with a disability).

Non-voters

Most non-voters with a disability who had seen the advertising said they saw this other advertising on television (80%). Other common sources recalled include newspapers (20%) and radio (20%).

Although the question about advertising sources was different in 2008 because it did not include advertising about the Referendum (only Electoral advertising) – the results from the 2008 question are shown in the table overleaf (there are no significant differences in recall by source between 2008 and 2011).

Although the question is not directly comparable with the main survey of voters and non-voters (because the general public survey asked about Electoral advertising – *not* including Referendum advertising), it appears that pamphlets have lower recall among disabled non-voters (18% of non-voters in the general public recall pamphlets compared to 5% of non-voters with a disability).

Caution should be applied to the results for non-voters due to the small base sizes involved.

| Where seen other advertising | Disabled survey | | General public |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2011* |
| | | 20 | 141 |
| Television | | 80% | 74% |
| Radio | | 20% | 26% |
| Newspapers | | 20% | 17% |
| Pamphlets or fliers | | 5% | 4% |
| Internet | | 5% | - |
| Word of mouth | | - | 9% |
| Shopping Malls/Supermarket | | - | 4% |
| Billboards/Posters/Banners/ | | - | 4% |
| Other | | - | 17% |
| Don't know | | 5% | - |
| | | | 1% |

* This question is not directly comparable between the survey of disabled non-voters and the general public survey of non-voters. This is because the former asked about all Electoral and Referendum advertising whereas the latter asked about Electoral advertising only (not including Referendum advertising).

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 (and the Referendum). The results are described below for voters and non-voters with a disability.

Voters

Fifty six per cent of voters with a disability rated all the information as useful (this is similar to the 2008 survey).

| Usefulness of all advertising | Disabled survey | | |
|---|-----------------|------|------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2008 |
| | | 354 | 95 |
| Very useful (5) | | 21% | n/a* |
| 4 | | 35% | n/a* |
| NETT Useful* | | 56% | 59% |
| Neither useful nor un-useful (3) | | 27% | 17% |
| 2 | | 9% | n/a* |
| Not at all useful (1) | | 4% | n/a* |
| NETT Un-useful (* see note under table) | | 13% | 15% |
| Don't know | | 4% | 9% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that found the information useful overall, and the proportion that found the information un-useful are available and are presented in this table.

- Those with a sensory disability (either visual or hearing disability) were more likely to find the information 'very useful' (28% vs. 21% of all voters with a disability – although this result is only significant at the 90% confidence level).

- Voters aged 46 or over were more likely to find the information ‘very useful’ (24% vs. 16% of voters with a disability aged up to 46 – although this result is only significant at the 90% confidence level).
- Voters who said their disability did not give them serious health problems were more likely to find the information useful (70% gave a score of 4 or 5 out of 5 vs. 56% for all voters with a disability).

Non-voters

Fifty six per cent of non-voters with a disability rated all the information as useful (this is similar to the 2008 survey). Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

| Usefulness of all advertising | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey |
|---|----|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 |
| | | 45 | 24 |
| Very useful (5) | | 11% | n/a* |
| 4 | | 9% | n/a* |
| NETT Useful* | | 20% | 29% |
| Neither useful nor un-useful (3) | | 29% | 42% |
| 2 | | 22% | n/a* |
| Not at all useful (1) | | 13% | n/a* |
| NETT Un-useful (* see note under table) | | 36% | 25% |
| Don't know | | 16% | 9% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that found the information useful overall, and the proportion that found the information un-useful are available and are presented in this table.

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 per cent of voters with a disability did not specify any further information requirements (this is equivalent to the survey in 2008 (73%). This population group consists of a combination of those who did not answer the question (39%), those who said ‘don’t know’ (29%), and those who specifically said ‘no further information required’ (3%). In 2011 the online data collection methodology may explain the lower proportion who typed in ‘no further information’ – instead these people could simply tick ‘don’t know’ (which was not available via the paper-based questionnaire in 2008).

Beyond this, the most common response for further information was ‘more information on the Referendum voting systems’ (12%) and information that was generally easier to understand (5%). No-one selected either of these answers in the previous survey (there was no Referendum in 2008). Since 2008 it appears that there has been a decrease in the proportion requesting more information via TV (from 16% to 1%). However, differences in the data collection methodology (see the methodology section) mean that answers are not directly comparable between 2008 and 2011.

(Wanting more information on the Referendum voting systems was also common among the general public, with 26% of all voters wanting more information on the voting systems. Please note that the general public tended to answer this question in a different way and so a different code-frame was used for the main survey meaning that data cannot be plotted alongside this table, please see the main voter and non-voter report for details).

The most common pieces of information requested by disabled voters are listed below.

| Other information required | Disabled survey | Disabled survey |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| N= | 354 | 103 |
| Don't know | 29% | n/a |
| Question not answered (i.e. left blank) | 39% | 55% |
| No further information required | 3% | 18% |
| More information on the Referendum voting systems | 12% | n/a |
| Information to be clearer and easier to understand | 5% | - |
| More information on special voting or advance voting | 2% | - |
| Provide information earlier | 2% | - |
| More information for people with disabilities (non-specific) | 2% | - |
| Prefer online / electronic communication | 1% | - |
| Would prefer someone to give a talk to a community group | 1% | - |
| More information via TV | 1% | 16% |
| More information on the EasyVote card | - | 6% |
| Explanation of voting system (MMP) | - | 5% |
| Information to be in large print | - | 3% |
| Information on how polling place will deal with my disability | 1% | 2% |
| Polling place locations | 1% | 1% |
| 0800 number for general information | - | 1% |

Non-voters

Similar to voters, 77% per cent of non-voters with a disability did not specify any further information requirements (in 2008 this was lower at 60%). This population group consists of a combination of those who did not answer the question (33%) and those who said 'don't know' (44%). In 2011 the online data collection methodology may explain why no non-voters typed in 'no further information' – instead these people could simply tick 'don't know' (which was not available via the paper-based questionnaire in 2008).

Beyond this, the most common response for further information was 'further information about the Referendum voting systems' (6%), further information about special/advance voting (4%) and for information to be provided earlier (4%).

Since 2008 there appears to have been a decrease in the proportion of disabled non-voters requesting more information via TV and more information about how the polling place will deal with disability.

The most common information requested is listed in the table overleaf.

The results for non-voters with a disability should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

| Other information required | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey |
|---|----|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 |
| | | 48 | 25 |
| Don't know | | 44% | n/a |
| Question not answered (i.e. left blank) | | 33% | 24% |
| No further information required | | - | 36% |
| More information on the Referendum voting systems | | 6% | n/a |
| More information on special voting or advance voting | | 4% | - |
| Provide information earlier | | 4% | - |
| Information to be clearer and easier to understand | | 2% | - |
| More information on the importance of voting | | 2% | - |
| More information for people with disabilities (non-specific) | | 2% | - |
| More information on party policies | | 2% | - |
| 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

Proportion of disabled voters that went to the polling place

Two 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 98% 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?

Sixty per cent of voters with a disability who went to a polling place did so with family members (this is not significantly different from 2008). 31% went by themselves (this appears to have decreased since 2008 when it was 42%). 9% went with other people (for example, friends or caregivers - this is not significantly different from 2008).

Differences in answers between voters with a disability and the general population of voters for this question are not statistically significant.

| Who accompanied voters? | Disabled survey | | General public 2011 |
|---|-----------------|------|------------------------|
| | 2011 | 2008 | |
| | N= 490 | 143 | 1085 |
| Went by myself | 31% | 42% | 32% |
| Family members | 60% | 52% | 63% |
| Other people (e.g. friends or care-giver) | 9% | 7% | 6% |

- Younger voters with a disability were more likely to be accompanied by 'other people' (13% of those aged up to 46 vs. 6% of older voters).
- Those with a University degree or postgraduate qualification were more likely to attend by themselves (40% vs. 31% of all voters with a disability). (This difference is only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level).
- Maori and Asian voters with disabilities were more likely to attend the polling place with family (71% and 85% compared to 60% of all voters with a disability). (This difference is only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level).

Time of day voted

Forty eight per cent of voters with a disability voted in the morning (before noon) (this is not significantly different from the equivalent figure in 2008 which was 56%), 46% voted in the afternoon (between noon and 5pm) (this is higher than the 2008 figure which was 34%), and 6% voted in the evening (after 5pm) (this is the same figure as the 2008 survey) – see table overleaf for details.

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 evening (40% of voters in the general population voted in the morning,

and 9% voted in the evening – as stated above the equivalent proportions for disabled voters were 48% and 6%).

| Time of day voted | Disabled survey | | General public |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2011 |
| | | 490 | 1094 |
| 9.00am - 10.00am | | 12% | 10% |
| 10.00am - 11.00am | | 15% | 15% |
| 11.00am - 12.00am | | 20% | 15% |
| 12.00am - 1.00pm | | 8% | 12% |
| 1.00pm - 2.00pm | | 14% | 11% |
| 2.00pm - 3.00pm | | 11% | 12% |
| 3.00pm - 4.00pm | | 7% | 7% |
| 4.00pm - 5.00pm | | 5% | 8% |
| 5.00pm - 6.00pm | | 5% | 5% |
| 6.00pm+ | | 1% | 4% |
| Don't know / can't remember | | * | * |

- Voters with a speech disability were more likely to vote in the afternoon (75% vs. 46% of all voters with a disability).
- Voters aged up to 46 were more likely to vote in the afternoon and less likely to vote in the morning (54% voted in the afternoon vs. 41% of older voters, and 36% voted in the morning vs. 53% of older voters).

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 (this is the same as 2008). Only 3% brought the letter from the Chief Electoral officer with them (this is lower than in 2008 when it was 9% - it is also lower than the general population of voters - 6% of all voters in 2011 brought the letter with them).

| Did you take the following when you voted? | Disabled survey | | General public |
|--|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2011 |
| | | 490 | 1094 |
| EasyVote card | | 87% | 86% |
| Letter from the Chief Electoral officer | | 3% | 6% |
| Neither | | 13% | 14% |

- Voters aged up to 46 were less likely to bring their EasyVote card (81% vs. 90% of older voters). And they were more likely to bring 'neither' (19% vs. 10% of older voters).

Time taken at polling place

Thirty nine per cent of voters with a disability said they only spent up to five minutes at the polling place (this is lower than the equivalent figure in 2008 – when it was 59%). Consequently the proportion of voters that took longer than 5 minutes has increase (from 40% in 2008 to 60% in 2011).

Compared with the general population of voters, voters with a disability were more likely to spend longer than 11 minutes at the polling place (17% of voters with a disability vs. 6% of voters in the general population).

| Total time at polling place | Disabled survey 2011 N= | Disabled survey 2008 | General public 2011 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | 490 | 165 | 1094 |
| Up to 5 minutes | 39% | 59% | 63% |
| 5-10 minutes | 44% | 29% | 31% |
| 11-15 minutes | 12% | 5% | 4% |
| 16-20 minutes | 4% | 3% | 1% |
| 21-25 minutes | * | 1% | * |
| 26-30 minutes | * | 2% | - |
| More than 30 minutes | - | 1% | * |
| Can't remember | 1% | 1% | * |

- Voters with no serious health difficulties were less likely to take 11 minutes or longer (9% vs. 17% of all voters with a disability).



Feelings on time taken at polling place

Almost all (97%) voters with a disability said the length of time spent was 'about right', this was not significantly different from the general population of voters, nor was it different to the 2008 result.

| Feelings on time taken at polling place | Disabled survey 2011 N= | Disabled survey 2008 | General public 2011 |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | 490 | 165 | 1092 |
| About right | 97% | 96% | 98% |
| Too long | 3% | 4% | 1% |
| 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 2008 the proportion of voters with a disability that saw easy to access paths from the car park appears to have declined (from 58% to 45%), and the proportion that saw desk voting facilities appears to have declined (from 67% to 43%). Other results are not significantly different from 2008.

| Disability facilities at polling place | Disabled survey | |
|--|-----------------|------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| N= | 346 | 165 |
| Easy to access doorways and corridors | 53% | 62% |
| Ramp for wheelchair access | 47% | 47% |
| Disabled car parking space | 47% | 43% |
| Easy to access path from the car park to entrance | 45% | 58% |
| Desk voting facilities | 43% | 67% |
| International symbol of access -  | 38% | 33% |
| Access with assistance symbol -  | 10% | 10% |

- Voters aged 46 and over were more likely to have seen easy-to-access paths (50% vs. 35% those aged up to 46).

Happiness with voting facilities at the polling place

Three-quarters (75%) of voters with a disability were either 'happy' or 'very happy' with the voting facilities (this is not significantly different from the result in 2008 when it was 67%).

| Feelings on voting facilities | Disabled survey | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| N= | 346 | 100 |
| Very unhappy | 5% | 11% |
| Unhappy | 3% | 2% |
| Neither unhappy nor happy | 16% | 15% |
| Happy | 40% | 33% |
| Very happy | 35% | 34% |
| Don't know | 1% | 5% |

- Voters aged 46 and over were more likely to be 'very happy' (40% vs. 26% those aged up to 46).

The voting process

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

Eighty four per cent of voters with a disability rated the instructions on how to cast a Parliamentary vote positively, this is the same as the 2008 result (also 84%) but is lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (94%).

| Clear instructions on how to cast vote | Disabled survey | | General public |
|--|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2008 |
| | | 498 | 201 |
| | | | 1094 |
| Excellent (5) | | 51% | n/a* |
| 4 | | 33% | n/a* |
| NETT Positive * | | 84% | 84% |
| Neutral (3) | | 11% | 8% |
| 2 | | 2% | n/a* |
| Poor (1) | | 1% | n/a* |
| NETT Negative (* see note under table) | | 3% | 5% |
| Don't know | | 1% | 3% |
| | | | 2% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that gave a positive rating, and the proportion that gave a negative rating are available and are presented in this table.

- Voters who said their disability did not give them serious health problems were more likely to be positive (94% vs. 84% for all voters with a disability).

Rating the ease of finding name of person and party

Eighty five per cent of voters with a disability rated the ease of finding the name of person and party on the Parliamentary ballot paper positively, this is significantly lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (95%). It is also significantly lower than the equivalent finding among disabled voters in 2008 (90%), although this change is only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level.

| Ease of finding name of person and party | Disabled survey | | General public |
|--|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2008 |
| | | 498 | 200 |
| | | | 1094 |
| Excellent (5) | | 54% | n/a* |
| 4 | | 31% | n/a* |
| NETT Positive * | | 85% | 90% |
| Neutral (3) | | 11% | 8% |
| 2 | | 1% | n/a* |
| Poor (1) | | 2% | n/a* |
| NETT Negative (* see note under table) | | 4% | 2% |
| Don't know | | * | 1% |
| | | | - |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that gave a positive rating, and the proportion that gave a negative rating are available and are presented in this table.

- Voters who said their disability did not give them serious health problems were more likely to be positive (95% vs. 85% for all voters with a disability).
- Maori voters were more likely to rate the ease of finding the name of the person and party as 'excellent' (71% vs. 54% of all voters with a disability).

Rating the clarity of instructions on the Referendum voting paper

Sixty nine per cent of voters with a disability rated the instructions on the Referendum voting paper positively, this is lower than the equivalent rating for the Parliamentary voting paper (84% - see above), and is lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (83%).

There was no Referendum in 2008 and so this question was not asked in the 2008 survey.

| Clear instructions on Referendum voting paper | Disabled survey | General public |
|---|-----------------|----------------|
| | 2011 | 2011 |
| N= | 498 | 1094 |
| Excellent (5) | 40% | 63% |
| 4 | 29% | 20% |
| NETT Positive | 69% | 83% |
| Neutral (3) | 20% | 11% |
| 2 | 5% | 2% |
| Poor (1) | 5% | 2% |
| NETT Negative | 10% | 4% |
| Don't know | 1% | 1% |

- Voters who said their disability did not give them serious health problems were more likely to be positive (79% vs. 69% for all voters with a disability).
- Maori voters with a disability were more likely to be positive (81% vs. 69% for all voters with a disability).
- Asian voters with a disability were less likely to be positive (38% vs. 69% for all voters with a disability).
- Voters aged 46 and over were more likely to be positive (72% vs. 63% those aged up to 46).

Rating the ease of finding the options on the Referendum voting paper

Seventy four per cent of voters with a disability rated the ease of finding the Referendum voting options positively, this is lower than the equivalent rating for the Parliamentary voting paper (85% - see above), and is lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (90%).

There was no Referendum in 2008 and so this question was not asked in the 2008 survey.

| Easy to find options | Disabled survey | | General public |
|----------------------|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2011 |
| | | 498 | 1094 |
| Excellent (5) | | 45% | 73% |
| 4 | | 30% | 18% |
| NETT Positive | | 74% | 90% |
| Neutral (3) | | 16% | 5% |
| 2 | | 5% | 1% |
| Poor (1) | | 3% | 2% |
| NETT Negative | | 8% | 3% |
| Don't know | | 1% | 1% |

- Maori voters with a disability were more likely to be positive (84% vs. 74% for all voters with a disability).
- Voters who said their disability did not give them serious health problems were more likely to be positive (85% vs. 74% for all voters with a disability).
- Voters with an intellectual disability were more likely to rate the ease of finding the Referendum voting options negatively. (19% of voters with an intellectual disability gave a score of 1 or 2 out of 5 vs. 8% of all voters with a disability).

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'. 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 below.

Eighty eight per cent of voters with a disability rated the ability of staff to answer questions positively, this is similar to the equivalent result in 2008 (87%), but is lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (96%).

| Ability to answer questions excluding Don't knows' and 'Did not meet staff' | Disabled survey | | General public |
|---|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | N= | 2011 | 2011 |
| | | 420 | 907 |
| Excellent (5) | | 62% | 84% |
| 4 | | 25% | 12% |
| NETT Positive * | | 88% | 96% |
| Neutral (3) | | 9% | 3% |
| 2 | | 3% | 1% |
| Poor (1) | | * | 1% |
| NETT Negative (* see note under table) | | 3% | 1% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that gave a positive rating, and the proportion that gave a negative rating are available and are presented in this table.

- Voters with an emotional or mental disability were less likely to be positive (77% vs. 88% for all voters with a disability).
- Voters with a University degree or postgraduate qualification were less likely to be positive (80% vs. 88% for all voters with a disability).
- Voters aged 46 and over were *more* likely to be positive (91% vs. 81% those aged up to 46).

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’ | Disabled survey 2011 | Disabled survey 2008 | General public 2011 |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| N= | 498 | 199 | 1094 |
| Excellent (5) | 53% | n/a* | 67% |
| 4 | 22% | n/a* | 9% |
| NETT Positive * | 74% | 55% | 76% |
| Neutral (3) | 8% | 6% | 2% |
| 2 | 2% | n/a* | 1% |
| Poor (1) | * | n/a* | * |
| NETT Negative (* see note under table) | 3% | 3% | 1% |
| Don’t know | 7% | 14% | 17% |
| Did not meet staff | 9% | 23% | 4% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that gave a positive rating, and the proportion that gave a negative rating are available and are presented in this table.

Rating pleasantness and politeness

In 2011 90% of voters with a disability gave positive ratings for Electoral staffs’ pleasantness and politeness, this is similar to the 2008 result (89%). But it is lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (98%).

| Pleasantness and politeness excluding ‘Did not meet staff’ | Disabled survey 2011 | Disabled survey 2008 | General public 2011 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| N= | 454 | 189 | 1081 |
| Excellent (5) | 71% | n/a* | 89% |
| 4 | 20% | n/a* | 9% |
| NETT Positive * | 90% | 89% | 98% |
| Neutral (3) | 7% | 4% | 1% |
| 2 | 2% | n/a* | 1% |
| Poor (1) | * | n/a* | * |
| NETT Negative (* see note under table) | 2% | 5% | 1% |
| Don’t know | 1% | 3% | * |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that gave a positive rating, and the proportion that gave a negative rating are available and are presented in this table.

- Voters with an emotional or mental disability were less likely to be positive (82% vs. 89% for all voters with a disability).
- Voters aged 46 and over were more likely to be positive (95% vs. 82% those aged up to 46).

Rating staff efficiency

Eighty seven per cent of voters with a disability gave positive ratings for staff efficiency, this is the same as the 2008 survey result but is lower than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (97%).

| Efficiency of staff excluding 'Did not meet staff' | Disabled survey | | General public |
|--|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| N= | 454 | 151 | 1073 |
| Excellent (5) | 64% | n/a* | 85% |
| 4 | 23% | n/a* | 11% |
| NETT Positive * | 87% | 87% | 97% |
| Neutral (3) | 8% | 7% | 2% |
| 2 | 3% | n/a* | 1% |
| Poor (1) | * | n/a* | 1% |
| NETT Negative (* see note under table) | 4% | 3% | 1% |
| Don't know | 1% | 3% | 1% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that gave a positive rating, and the proportion that gave a negative rating are available and are presented in this table.

- Voters with a University degree or postgraduate qualification were less likely to be positive (73% vs. 87% of all voters with a disability).
- Voters aged 46 and over were more likely to be positive (91% vs. 78% those aged up to 46).

Providing for needs of those with disabilities

Eighty two per cent of voters with a disability gave positive ratings for staff providing for the needs of those with disabilities. This appears to be higher than the equivalent proportion in 2008 (66%).

| Efficiency of staff excluding 'Did not meet staff' | Disabled survey | |
|--|-----------------|------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| N= | 316 | 71 |
| Excellent (5) | 52% | n/a* |
| 4 | 30% | n/a* |
| NETT Positive * | 82% | 66% |
| Neutral (3) | 12% | 17% |
| 2 | 3% | n/a* |
| Poor (1) | 2% | n/a* |
| NETT Negative (* see note overleaf) | 4% | 11% |
| Don't know | 1% | 6% |

* This question was asked using a three point scale in the 2008 questionnaire for those with intellectual disabilities. Therefore individual results for scores of 1, 2, 4 and 5 out of 5 from 2008 are not available. However, the proportion that gave a positive rating, and the proportion that gave a negative rating are available and are presented in this table.

- Voters aged 46 and over were more likely to be positive (86% vs. 76% those aged up to 46).

Polling place problems

Those who voted at a polling place were asked if they had any problems or difficulties, 11% of voters with a disability said they had problems or difficulties. This is similar to the result in 2008 (13%). But the proportion is higher than the equivalent proportion of voters in the general population (6% of voters in the general population said they had problems or difficulties – however a further 5% of the public had to ask for ‘information or help’ – this category was not asked in the disability survey so the results are not directly comparable).

| Issues at polling place | Disabled survey | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------|
| | 2011 | 2008 |
| | N= 493 | 164 |
| Had problems or difficulties | 11% | 13% |
| No problems or difficulties | 89% | 87% |

- Voters with a visual disability or intellectual disability were more likely to have problems or difficulties (25% and 24% compared with 11% of all voters with a disability).
- Voters with a health problem relating to difficulties communicating and mixing with others were more likely to have problems or difficulties (21% compared with 11% of all voters with a disability).

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 presented in the table overleaf.

Please note that the 2011 survey results were so different from the 2008 survey results that a different code-frame was created for 2011 which means results are not comparable with the 2008 survey. Similarly the answer codes are not comparable with the general public survey of voters.

The most common problem was that there needed to be more seating or that the text on the voting papers was too small to see properly (16% and 13% respectively).

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

| Specific issues at polling place | N= | Disabled survey 2011 |
|---|----|----------------------|
| | | 38 |
| Provide more seating (cannot stand for long periods) | | 16% |
| Text on voting papers too small to see properly | | 13% |
| Needed more information on how to vote | | 8% |
| Improved wheel-chair access needed | | 5% |
| General help (pens not working etc.) | | 5% |
| Needed more information on the Referendum voting systems | | 5% |
| Poor signage | | 3% |
| Needed more information on parties/candidates | | 3% |
| Not on the Electoral Roll | | 3% |
| Needed more help on how the second Referendum question worked | | 3% |
| Other | | 23% |

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

Seventy one per cent of voters with a disability said they followed the Election results, this is not significantly different from the result in 2008, nor is it significantly different from the general population of voters.

| Followed Election results? | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|----------------------------|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | | 501 | 204 | 1097 |
| Yes | | 71% | 68% | 70% |
| No | | 29% | 31% | 30% |
| Don't know | | - | 1% | - |

- Voters with a hearing disability were more likely to follow the results (81% compared with 71% of all voters with a disability). (This difference is only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level).

Non voters

Forty per cent of non-voters with a disability said they followed the Election results, this is not significantly different from the result in 2008, nor is it significantly different from the general population of non-voters.

Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base size.

| Followed Election results? | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|----------------------------|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | | 72 | 43 | 272 |
| Yes | | 40% | 49% | 33% |
| No | | 60% | 47% | 67% |
| 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 (95%) voters who followed the results said they watched the results come in on television, this is not significantly different from 2008 nor the general population of voters.

| How respondents followed Election results | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|---|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | | 357 | 119 | 746 |
| Television | | 95% | 96% | 93% |
| Radio | | 9% | 5% | 4% |
| Elections website | | 4% | 5% | 2% |
| Other website – other sites, e.g. news | | 7% | 3% | 4% |
| Word of mouth | | 1% | - | 1% |
| Iphone / smartphone | | * | - | 1% |
| Newspapers | | - | 3% | - |
| Telephone | | - | 1% | * |

- Voters aged 46 and over were more likely to follow results on television (97% vs. 89% those aged up to 46).
- Voters aged up to 46 were more likely to use ‘other websites’ (12% vs. 5% of those aged 46 and over).
- Voters with an intellectual disability were more likely to use ‘other websites’ (20% vs. 7% of all voters with a disability).

Non-voters

Nearly all non-voters who followed the results said they watched the results come in on television (90%), this is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters (nor is it different from the 2008 results). Results for non-voters should be treated with caution due to the small base sizes.

| How respondents followed Election results | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|---|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | | 29 | 13 | 99 |
| Television | | 90% | 85% | 83% |
| Elections website | | - | - | 3% |
| Other website (not the Elections website) | | 7% | - | 9% |
| Radio | | 3% | - | 4% |
| Iphone / smartphone | | 3% | - | 3% |
| 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

Eighty three per cent of voters with a disability were either very satisfied (45%) or satisfied (38%) with the timeliness of the results. The overall proportion that were satisfied is not significantly different from the equivalent proportion in 2008. And it is not significantly different from the equivalent proportion for voters in the general population (87% of whom were satisfied).

| Satisfaction with timeliness of results | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|---|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | | 357 | 122 | 746 |
| Very satisfied (5) | | 45% | 49% | 53% |
| 4 | | 38% | 25% | 35% |
| NETT Satisfied | | 83% | 75% | 87% |
| 3 | | 12% | 15% | 9% |
| 2 | | 4% | 2% | 1% |
| Very dissatisfied (1) | | 1% | 6% | 1% |
| NETT Dissatisfied | | 5% | 8% | 2% |
| Don't know | | * | 2% | 2% |

Non-voters

Sixty two per cent of non-voters with a disability were either very satisfied (52%) or satisfied (10%) with the timeliness of the results. The overall proportion that were satisfied is not significantly different from the equivalent proportion in 2008. And it is not significantly different from the equivalent proportion for voters in the general population (77% of whom were satisfied).

Results for non-voters with a disability should be treated with caution due to the small base sizes.

| Satisfaction with timeliness of results | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|---|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | | 29 | 11 | 99 |
| Very satisfied (5) | | 52% | 36% | 51% |
| 4 | | 10% | 18% | 25% |
| NETT Satisfied | | 62% | 55% | 77% |
| 3 | | 34% | 9% | 21% |
| 2 | | 3% | 18% | 2% |
| Very dissatisfied (1) | | - | 18% | - |
| NETT Dissatisfied | | 3% | 36% | 2% |
| Don't know | | - | - | - |

Non-voters

Please note that results in this section should be treated with caution due to the relatively small number of non-voters in the survey sample (n=72).

Possibility of voting in Election

Over two-thirds (68%) of non-voters with a disability considered voting in the Election. This is not significantly different from the general population of non-voters, although it does appear to be higher than the equivalent proportion of non-voters with a disability in 2008 (47%).

| Possibility of voting? | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|------------------------------|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| Yes | 72 | 68% | 47% | 64% |
| No | | 32% | 49% | 35% |
| 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 two per cent decided not to vote on Election Day. This is not significantly different from the 2008 result, nor is it significantly different from general population of non-voters.

| When decided not to vote | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|------------------------------|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| On Election Day | 72 | 42% | 48% | 43% |
| One week before Election Day | | 18% | 11% | 18% |
| Two weeks before | | 6% | 11% | 5% |
| About a month before | | 3% | 11% | 4% |
| More than a month ago | | 22% | 15% | 23% |
| Don't know/can't remember | | 10% | 4% | 6% |

Decision making process

Non-voters with a disability were asked how much thought they put into their decision not to vote. Forty four per cent put a lot of thought into it. This is not significantly different from the 2008 result, nor is it significantly different from general population of non-voters.

| Decision making process for non-voters | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| N= | 72 | 27 | 272 |
| Put a lot of thought into deciding whether or not to vote | 44% | 33% | 30% |
| Put just a little thought into it | 33% | 26% | 41% |
| Didn't think about it at all | 22% | 41% | 29% |

Non-voters' awareness of where, and when, to vote

Most (79%) non-voters with a disability knew when and where they could have voted. This is not significantly different from the 2008 result (although it should be noted the wording in 2008 was slightly different because it referred to 'knowledge of a convenient polling place'), nor is this result significantly different from general population of non-voters.

| Aware of when and where you could vote | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public* |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| N= | 72 | 29 | 272 |
| Yes | 79% | 76% | 85% |
| No | 21% | 24% | 15% |

* This question was asked slightly differently in the general public survey instead of 'where and when to vote' it was 'awareness of a convenient polling place'.

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 health reasons (17%), the next most commonly mentioned reason was that the polling place was too far away or they could not get to the polling place because there was no transport (11%), the third most commonly mentioned reason was that it makes no difference who the government is (8%). These reasons are used by a higher proportion of non-voters with disabilities compared with non-voters in the general public (see main voter and non-voter report for details). Since 2008 it appears that there has been a decrease in the proportion of non-voters saying they cannot be bothered with politics or politicians (from 8% in 2008 to 0% in 2011).

| Main reason for not voting | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|--|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | | 72 | 39 | 272 |
| Health reasons | | 17% | 5% | 5% |
| Polling place too far away/no transport | | 11% | 8% | 2% |
| Makes no difference who the government is | | 8% | - | 1% |
| Can't be bothered voting | | 8% | 5% | 8% |
| My vote doesn't make any difference | | 7% | 5% | 6% |
| Had other commitments | | 7% | 5% | 11% |
| Away from home and overseas | | 6% | - | 6% |
| Disagreed with the parties' policies | | 6% | - | 3% |
| Religious reasons - other | | 6% | 5% | 6% |
| Disability | | 4% | 10% | 1% |
| Couldn't work out who to vote for | | 3% | 5% | 8% |
| Had work commitments | | 3% | - | 8% |
| Forgone conclusion | | 1% | - | 1% |
| Didn't get to the polling place on time | | 1% | 3% | 2% |
| I forgot | | 1% | 3% | 4% |
| Can't be bothered with politics or politicians | | - | 8% | 5% |
| Religious day (ie, Sabbath, Holy Day) | | - | 3% | - |
| Not important | | - | 5% | - |
| No particular reason / don't know | | 9% | 10% | 1% |
| Other | | 13% | 23% | 7% |
| Refused | | - | 5% | 2% |

Other reasons for not voting

Non-voters with a disability were also asked if there were any *additional reasons* for not voting. Forty six per cent did not have any other particular reasons. Beyond this the three most commonly mentioned reasons were related to the polling place being too far away / no transport (14%), health reasons (8%), and knowing when to vote (4%).

| Other reason for not voting | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|--|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | | 72 | 29 | 264 |
| Polling place too far away/no transport | | 14% | 7% | 1% |
| Health reasons | | 8% | 10% | 1% |
| Knowing when to vote | | 4% | - | 1% |
| My vote does not make a difference | | 1% | - | 2% |
| Can't be bothered with politics or politicians | | 1% | - | 2% |
| Did not know the candidates | | 1% | - | 2% |
| No particular reason | | - | 7% | - |
| Couldn't work out who to vote for | | - | 10% | 3% |
| Disability | | - | 7% | - |
| Had other commitments | | - | 3% | 3% |
| Not important | | - | 3% | * |
| Other | | 22% | 14% | 4% |
| No other reason / don't know | | 46% | 45% | 68% |
| Don't know | | 11% | - | - |

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 overleaf.

The main overall reasons for not voting were: health reasons (25%), the polling place being too far away or not having transport (24%), cannot be bothered voting (8%), makes no difference who the government is (8%), and my vote doesn't make a difference (8%).

Since 2008 it appears that there has been a decline in the proportion of non-voters with a disability saying they did not vote because they 'couldn't work out who to vote for' (from 13% in 2008 to 3% in 2011), and 'that they had a disability' (from 15% to 4%).

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

- health reasons (25% vs. 6%),
- polling place too far away/no transport (24% vs. 3%), and
- makes no difference who the government is (8% vs. 2%).

| Overall reasons for not voting | N= | Disabled survey | Disabled survey | General public |
|--|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2008 | 2011 |
| | | 72 | 39 | 272 |
| Health reasons | | 25% | 13% | 6% |
| Polling place too far away/no transport | | 24% | 10% | 3% |
| Can't be bothered voting | | 8% | 5% | 14% |
| Makes no difference who the government is | | 8% | - | 2% |
| My vote doesn't make any difference | | 8% | 5% | 8% |
| Had other commitments | | 7% | 5% | 14% |
| Away from home and overseas | | 6% | - | 6% |
| Disagreed with the parties' policies | | 6% | - | 3% |
| Religious reasons (other) | | 6% | - | 6% |
| Disability | | 4% | 15% | 1% |
| Knowing when to vote | | 4% | - | 1% |
| Had work commitments | | 3% | - | 9% |
| Couldn't work out who to vote for | | 3% | 13% | 11% |
| Can't be bothered with politics or politicians | | 1% | 8% | 7% |
| Did not know the candidates | | 1% | - | 4% |
| Forgone conclusion | | 1% | - | 2% |
| I forgot | | 1% | 3% | 5% |
| Didn't get to the polling place on time | | 1% | 3% | 4% |
| Not important | | - | 8% | * |
| Religious day (ie, Sabbath, Holy Day) | | - | 3% | - |
| Other | | 24% | 25% | 11% |
| No particular reason / don't know | | 9% | 15% | 1% |
| Refused | | - | 5% | 2% |

Knowledge of the Referendum

This section contains findings about knowledge of the Referendum. Respondents were asked to think back to immediately prior to Election day and tell us about their level of knowledge at that point.

At the beginning of each set of findings we examine the results for all disabled respondents (including voters and non-voters) before then describing the answers given by voters and non-voters separately.

This is so the results for all disabled respondents can be compared with the results for all of the general public included in the main national survey (as well as comparing voters and non-voters separately).

Awareness of the Referendum

In total 92% of disabled respondents said they were aware that there was a Referendum. Although this is higher than the general public (87% awareness), this largely relates to the balance of voters and non-voters in the two different samples. Only 13% of disabled survey respondents were non-voters (the survey is likely to under-report the proportion of non-voters), whereas 22% of the main survey were non-voters (the main survey also under-reports the correct proportion of non-voters in 2011, but to a lesser extent).

The proportion of voters with a disability who were aware of the Referendum was 96%, this is not significantly different from the proportion of voters in the general public (93%). And the proportion of non-voters with a disability who were aware of the Referendum was 68%, this is not significantly different from the proportion of non-voters in the general public (66%). It should be noted that non-voters with a disability were significantly less likely to be aware of the Referendum compared with voters with a disability.

Other subgroups that were *less* likely to be aware include:

- Those with an intellectual disability (83% compared to 92% of all respondents with a disability).
- Those without an education qualification (83% compared to 94% of disabled respondents with an education qualification).
- Pacific respondents (68% compared to 93% of New Zealand European respondents with a disability, 87% of Maori respondents with a disability, and 82% of Asian respondents with a disability).
- Those aged up to 46 (86% compared to 96% of older respondents with a disability).

Level of knowledge about the Referendum

Respondents with a disability who were aware of the Referendum were asked how much they knew about the Referendum. In total 65% of those aware of the Referendum said they knew 'a lot' or 'a moderate amount' (this is the same percentage as the general public).

| Level of knowledge | Disabled survey | General public |
|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | 2011 N= 537 | 2011 1166 |
| A lot | 21% | 24% |
| A moderate amount | 44% | 42% |
| A little | 29% | 27% |
| Nothing at all | 6% | 5% |
| Don't know | 1% | 2% |

The proportion of voters with a disability (who were also aware of the Referendum) that knew 'a lot' or 'a moderate amount' was 68%, this is not significantly different from the proportion of voters in the general public (72%). And the proportion of non-voters with a disability (who were also aware of the Referendum) that knew 'a lot' or 'a moderate amount' was 35%, this is not significantly different from the proportion of non-voters in the general public (32%). It should be noted that non-voters with a disability were significantly less likely to know a lot, or a moderate amount, about the Referendum compared with voters with a disability.

Among those who were aware of the Referendum, the following groups were *less* likely to know 'a lot' or 'a moderate amount':

- Those with an emotional or mental disability (49% compared to 65% of all respondents with a disability).
- Females (60% compared to 70% of males).
- Asian respondents (43% compared to 66% of New Zealand European respondents with a disability, 61% of Maori respondents with a disability, and 67% of Pacific respondents with a disability). (The difference by Asian ethnicity is only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level).
- Those aged up to 46 (47% compared to 74% of older respondents with a disability).

Confidence in making a decision in the Referendum

Respondents with a disability who were aware of the Referendum were asked how confident they felt about making a decision in the Referendum. In total 75% of those aware of the Referendum felt either 'very confident' or 'fairly confident' (this is similar to the equivalent finding among the general public – 77%).

| Confidence in making a decision | Disabled survey | General public |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | 2011 N= 537 | 2011 1166 |
| Very confident | 39% | 42% |
| Fairly confident | 36% | 35% |
| Not very confident | 17% | 17% |
| Not at all confident | 7% | 6% |
| Don't know | 1% | 1% |

The proportion of voters with a disability (who were also aware of the Referendum) that felt 'very confident' or 'fairly confident' was 77%, this is not significantly different from the proportion of voters in the general

public (81%). And the proportion of non-voters with a disability (who were also aware of the Referendum) that felt 'very confident' or 'fairly confident' was 59%, this is not significantly different from the proportion of non-voters in the general public (57%). It should be noted that non-voters with a disability were significantly less likely to feel 'very confident' or 'fairly confident' compared with voters with a disability.

Among those who were aware of the Referendum, the following groups were *less* likely to feel 'very confident' or 'fairly confident':

- Those with an intellectual disability (62% compared to 75% of all respondents with a disability).
- Females (70% compared to 81% of males).
- Those aged up to 46 (60% compared to 83% of older respondents with a disability).

Appendix A: Overview tables

| | Voters with a disability | Non-voters with a disability |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Voting | | |
| <i>Base: All voters and non-voters with a disability</i> | 354 | 72 |
| At a polling place on Election Day | 80% | - |
| At an advance voting place, before Election Day | 18% | |
| In a hospital, rest home or other care facility | 1% | |
| Using voting papers delivered by mail | 1% | - |
| Knew about advance voting | 87% | 53% |
| Voting time | | |
| <i>Base: Those who voted in person at a polling place</i> | 490 | - |
| Before 11am | 27% | - |
| 11am – 1pm | 29% | - |
| 1pm – 3pm | 25% | - |
| 3pm – 5pm | 12% | - |
| 5pm – 7pm | 6% | - |
| Took EasyVote Card | 87% | - |
| Time in polling place | | |
| <i>Base: Those who voted in person at a polling place</i> | 490 | - |
| Up to 5 minutes | 39% | - |
| More than 5 minutes | 60% | - |
| Reasonable time | 100% | - |
| Rating of voting experience (% 4 or 5 out of 5) | | |
| <i>Base: Those who voted in person at a polling place</i> | 346 | - |
| Overall happiness with polling place | 75% | - |
| <i>Base: All voters with a disability</i> | 498 | |
| Clarity of instructions on Parliamentary ballot paper | 84% | - |
| Ease of finding the name and party to vote for (Parliamentary ballot paper) | 85% | - |
| Clarity of instructions on Referendum voting paper | 69% | - |

| Rating of Electoral Commission staff (% 4 or 5 out of 5) | | |
|--|---------------------------|------------|
| <i>Base: All voters with a disability who met Electoral Commission staff</i> | <i>(base size varies)</i> | - |
| Ability to answer questions (n=420) | 88% | - |
| Pleasantness and politeness (n=454) | 90% | |
| Efficiency (n=453) | 87% | - |
| Providing for the needs of those with a disability (n=316) | 82% | - |
| Satisfaction with EasyVote pack (% 4 or 5 out of 5) | | |
| <i>Base: All who received their EasyVote pack</i> | 461 | 44 |
| Satisfied with EasyVote pack | 74% | 41% |
| When decided not to vote | | |
| <i>Base: All non-voters</i> | - | 72 |
| Election Day | - | 42% |
| 1 week before | - | 18% |
| More than one week before | - | 31% |
| Knowledge of where to vote | - | 79% |
| Seen advertising | | |
| <i>Base: All voters and non-voters</i> | 354 | 48 |
| Seen Electoral or Referendum advertising (but not including EasyVote pack) | 57% | 42% |
| Referendum | | |
| <i>Base: All voters and non-voters</i> | 501 | 72 |
| Aware | 96% | 68% |
| <i>Base: All voters and non-voters aware of the Referendum</i> | 481 | 49 |
| Knew a 'moderate amount' or a 'a lot' about Referendum | 68% | 35% |
| Felt 'fairly confident' or 'very confident' about making a decision | 77% | 59% |
| Follow Election night results | | |
| <i>Base: All voters and non-voters with a disability</i> | 501 | 72 |
| Follow results on Election Night | 96% | 68% |
| <i>Base: Those who followed the results</i> | 357 | 29 |
| Followed results on television | 95% | 90% |
| Satisfied with timeliness of results | 83% | 62% |

