Turnout for the 11 October and 8 November 2005 Elections
Summary

- 74.9% turnout for 11 October 2005 election
- 61.0% turnout for 8 November 2005 election
- Nearly 80% of the registered voters participated in at least one of the 2005 elections
  - 52.1% voted in both
  - 20.2% voted only in the 11 October election
  - 7.1% voted only in the 8 November election
  - Only 20.6% did not participate in either election
- Similar turnout among females and males overall
  - Female turnout may have been slightly higher (0.9%) than male turnout in 11 October election
  - Male turnout slightly higher (2.0%) than female turnout in 8 November runoff
- Differences by age of voters
  - Highest turnout generally among 38-57 year olds
  - Lowest turnout experienced in youngest age groups (18-22) with nearly as low turnout in oldest age group (68+)
  - In 11 October election, slightly higher turnout among younger females than males but significantly higher turnout among males for registered voters 58+
  - In 8 November election, turnout similar among females and males age 37 and younger. For ages 38 and above, male turnout consistently higher than female turnout
  - Younger males (18-37) more frequently did not participate in either election than younger females; older females (58+) more frequently did not participate than older males
- Literacy
  - Turnout was higher among registered voters identified as likely literate with a more substantial difference (15.0% vs 5.5%) in the 8 November election
  - Literate females had the highest turnout in both elections
- Urban/Rural Categorization of Precinct
  - Turnout was significantly higher in urban precincts in both elections with a larger difference (18.6%) in the 8 November election than the 11 October election (7.5%)
  - Turnout decreased more substantially in the 311 “Difficult Access” precincts than the 273 “Inaccessible” precincts
- IDP
  - IDP turnout significantly lower than national average in 11 October election but higher than national average in 8 November runoff.
  - IDPs registered for county of origin voted approximately half of the time in county of origin and half in the special IDP polling places provided in the IDP Camps.
- Please see important notes regarding methodology and data in Appendix
Registered Voters and Turnout for 2005 Elections

Source:
Registered Voter Turnout Across Both 2005 Elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnout of Registered Voters</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted in Both Elections</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in 11 October Election Only</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in 8 November Election Only</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in Neither Election</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly 80% of the registered voters participated in at least one of the 2005 elections.

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
Slightly higher (0.9%) turnout among females in 11 October election but 2.0% higher turnout among males in 8 November runoff.
Turnout by Gender Across Both 2005 Elections

Suggests females participated slightly more than males in at least one of the elections (80.4% vs. 78.5%). Males voted in both elections more frequently than females. More females than males voted in only the runoff but a higher portion of females chose to vote in only the first election.

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
Turnout by Age

Turnout lowest among the youngest and oldest voters. Consistent 10-14% decrease in turnout across age groups from 11 October to 8 November election.

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
Turnout by Age Across Both Elections

Participation in only one election was relatively constant with age. Participation in both or neither election varies with age with youngest and oldest least likely to vote in either election.

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
Turnout by Age and Gender

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.

Turnout in 11 October election similar between males and females until age 58+ where female turnout dropped. In runoff, male and female turnout similar until 38+ where male turnout continued to rise slightly with age but female turnout remained flat or declining with age.
Turnout by Age and Gender Across Both Elections

Females

Female Turnout Across 2005 Elections by Age

Males

Male Turnout Across 2005 Elections by Age

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
Turnout by Age and Gender Across Both Elections

Percent of Registered Voters Voting in Both Elections by Gender and Age

Percent of Registered Voters Voting Only in the 11 October Election by Gender and Age

Percent of Registered Voters Voting Only in the 8 November Election by Gender and Age

Percent of Registered Voters Voting in Neither Election

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
### Turnout by County

#### Turnout as Percent of Registered of Voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>11-Oct</th>
<th>8-Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bomi</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbarpolu</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Bassa</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Cape Mount</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Gedeh</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Kru</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lofa</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margbi</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montserrado</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimba</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Cess</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Gee</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoe</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures do not include voters at "Special IDP Polling Places". Turnout at these polling places was 34.6% (11-Oct) and 34.1% (8-Nov). Note that this is not IDP turnout.

Turnout by County

11 October 2005 Turnout

8 November 2005 Turnout

Note: Figures do not include voters at "Special IDP Polling Places". Turnout at these polling places was 34.6% (11-Oct) and 34.1% (8-Nov). Note that this is not IDP turnout.

Source: 2005 election results.
8 November Turnout as Percent of 11 October Turnout by County

Turnout for 8 November runoff election was 81.4% of 11 October election.

Note: Figures do not include voters at "Special IDP Polling Places". 8-Nov turnout at these polling places was 98.6% of 11-Oct turnout.

Source: 2005 election results.
Turnout by County Across Both Elections

Turnout by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>56.4%</th>
<th>23.9%</th>
<th>17.6%</th>
<th>38.9%</th>
<th>29.7%</th>
<th>45.8%</th>
<th>49.3%</th>
<th>35.5%</th>
<th>39.7%</th>
<th>29.3%</th>
<th>59.6%</th>
<th>45.6%</th>
<th>47.3%</th>
<th>7.2%</th>
<th>6.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bomi</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbarpolu</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Bassa</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Cape</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Gedeh</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Kru</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lofa</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montserrado</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimba</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Cess</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Gee</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoe</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special IDP</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Places</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
Turnout by County and Gender – 11 October

11 October 2005 Turnout by County and Gender

In 4 counties (plus Special IDP Polling Places), female turnout for 11 October election significantly exceeded male turnout. In 2 counties male turnout significantly exceeded female turnout. In 9 counties the difference between male and female turnout was statistically insignificant.

* Difference statistically significant at 98% confidence level.

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
Turnout by County and Gender – 8 November

Female turnout for 8 November election significantly exceeded male turnout only in the Special IDP Polling Places. In 7 counties male turnout significantly exceeded female turnout. In 8 counties the difference between male and female turnout was statistically insignificant.

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.

* Difference statistically significant at 98% confidence level.
Turnout by County and Gender for Both Elections

**Turnout by County and Gender**

With exception of Grand Gedeh, Lofa, Montserrado, and Special IDP Polling Places, turnout fell statistically significant amount among both females and males between 11 October and 8 November election.

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
Turnout and urban/rural precincts

Turnout by Urban/Rural Categorization* of Precinct

Urban turnout significantly higher in both elections. Decrease in turnout from 11 October to 8 November election significantly greater in rural precincts (-17.5%) vs. urban precincts (-6.7%)

Source: 2005 election results.

* Categorization of precincts as in Urban or Rural location approximated by NEC staff. 277 of precincts categorized as Urban and 1144 categorized as Rural.
Turnout by gender and urban/rural location of precinct

**Female Turnout and Location of Precinct**

- **Females - Urban**: 76.1%
- **Females - Rural**: 68.4%

**Male Turnout and Location of Precinct**

- **Males - Urban**: 73.2%
- **Males - Rural**: 67.8%

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.

*Categorization of precincts as in Urban or Rural location approximated by NEC staff. 277 of precincts categorized as Urban and 1144 categorized as Rural.*
Turnout by accessibility

Turnout in 11 October election was similar for both “Easily Accessible” and “Difficult Access” precincts but turnout dropped the most significantly (-22.0%) for the “Difficult Access” precincts between elections.

Source: 2005 election results.
## Turnout and Literacy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy</th>
<th>11 October Election</th>
<th>8 November Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details. Sample size for literacy statistics is approximately 7,000 resulting in confidence interval of +/- 1.5-2.2%

* Literacy of voter from previous sampling where registered voters were classified as likely literate if the registration form was signed and classified as illiterate if marked by finger print. Study found 45% literacy rate among registered voters.

Literate registered voters participated significantly more than illiterate voters. Decrease in turnout for 8 November election substantially greater among illiterate registered voters (17.6% decrease vs. 8.1% decrease).
Literate females had highest turnout in both elections while turnout among illiterate females had largest decline (18.5%) between elections.

* Literacy of voter from previous sampling where registered voters were classified as literate if the registration form was signed and classified as illiterate if marked by fingerprint. Study found 45% literacy rate among registered voters.
Turnout by Literacy* and Gender

Turnout by Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both Elections</th>
<th>11-Oct Only</th>
<th>8-Nov Only</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details. Sample size for literacy statistics is approximately 7,000 resulting in confidence interval of +/- 1.5-2.2%

Turnout by Gender and Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both Elections</th>
<th>11-Oct Only</th>
<th>8-Nov Only</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Literate</th>
<th>Illiterate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Literacy of voter from previous sampling where registered voters were classified as literate if the registration form was signed and classified as illiterate if marked by finger print. Study found 45% literacy rate among registered voters.
IDP turnout significantly lower than national average in 11 October election but higher than national average in 8 November runoff. IDPs registered for county of origin voted approximately half of the time in county of origin and half in the special IDP polling places setup in the IDP camps.

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
The location of voting of IDPs registered for county of origin varies significantly depending on the county which the IDP registered for. In 4 out of the 7 counties with significant number of registered IDPs, IDPs were more likely to vote in county of origin than in the special polling places provided in the IDP camps.

Includes only those counties with at least 1,000 IDP registered for as county of origin.

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.
Appendix
Methodology

- Turnout statistics from election results and voting history contained in randomly sampled voter rolls used during 2005 elections

- The Data Center randomly selected voter rolls from 342 polling places and recorded the voting history of approximately 150,000 registered voters
  - Distribution of sampling across counties was constructed to approximate distribution of registered voters
  - Voter rolls were eliminated from sample (and replaced) if polling staff did not follow procedures correctly

- Overall turnout for sample was lower than election reported turnout
  - 11-October turnout was 74.9% and 72.4% in sample (2.5% difference)
  - 8-November turnout was 61.0% but 59.2% in sample (1.9% difference)
  - Difference in turnout is within error margin expected in repetitive recording and data processing tasks
  - Sample suggests that additions to the voters roll (allowed for polling staff, police, etc.) accounted for approximately 1.9% of 11 October and 1.1% of 8 November turnout
    - Though efforts were made to include the additions to the voters roll in the data entry, not all additions were entered due to poorly handwritten numbers and time constraints
    - It is possible that these voter roll additions may account for a large portion of the observed difference in turnout
    - Note that it is also possible that the additions to FRR may partially explain a lower turnout among younger ages as it is assumed that a large portion of the additions were the (generally younger) polling staff. However, cursory review of the additions did not suggest significant difference in age or gender characteristics with other voters

- Confidence Interval
  - 98% confidence interval approximately +/- 0.4% at national level
  - 98% confidence interval varies from +/- 1.0% to +/- 3.0% at county level
  - Warnings on small sample sizes have been included where appropriate
First people to register were more likely to vote than those that registered later in process. However, this may be more correlated with more urban registrations in beginning and rural registration more predominant in end of registration.

Source: Random sample of voter rolls accounting for approximately 11% of registered voters. See Appendix for details.