

The Impact of Voter Knowledge Initiatives in Sierra Leone



In brief

- There exists little evidence over how to best enhance accountability and transparency, particularly in places where democratic institutions are nascent, or information regarding candidates is limited.
- The 2008 Sierra Leone elections suggested that people were more likely to vote against traditional party affiliations when they had more information about candidates. The 2012 elections were an opportunity to test new electoral programs to increase transparency, voter knowledge of candidates and voter engagement.
- 40 polling centers were assigned to receive designed information, with 5 different interventions: individuals were shown the same debate as in other polling centers; individuals were shown a ‘getting to know you’ video of candidates; individuals listened to a radio recording of a journalist summarizing candidates policy positions; individuals participated in a ‘lab’ experiment where they were asked to rate candidates in other constituencies based on isolated media; and individuals were not shown any media.
- Preliminary results suggest strong positive impacts of debates on voter knowledge of politics in general, specific candidates and policy stances; a better match between voter preferences and selected candidates; greater voter openness to all parties; and increased vote shares for candidates who perform best in the debates.
- The combination of charisma, professional qualifications and policy stances appear more powerful than each in isolation.
- Together with implementing partner, *Search for Common Ground*, we are planning additional pilot activities to explore how best to build upon these results.

Policy Issue

Transparent and accountable government institutions are thought to be more effective at delivering important social services such as education and healthcare. However, there is little consensus over how best to enhance these aspects of governance, particularly in places where conflict has recently caused breakdown in democratic institutions. Evidence from Brazil and India suggests that increased information about politician performance can result in lower vote shares for low-performing or corrupt representatives. There is also evidence that town hall meetings, where representatives meet directly with constituents, can increase voter knowledge, turnout and support for participating candidates. While many interventions have tested the efficacy of these strategies at increasing basic voter knowledge and access to candidates, little work has been done where democratic institutions are nascent and where public information is limited. In such settings reliable information on candidates may be limited or non-existent, and thus requires significant effort to collect, Directed and Organised by compile and then convey such information to voters in a comprehensible manner. Debates may provide a feasible alternative which could work in many settings.

Context of the Evaluation

“In previous elections voting patterns in Sierra Leone have been overwhelmingly based on pre-existing party affiliations”

Sierra Leone’s 2012 elections were hailed by international observers as generally peaceful, free, and fair. In previous elections voting patterns in Sierra Leone have been overwhelmingly based on pre-existing party affiliations. However, during the 2008 elections, people in Sierra Leone were more likely to vote against traditional party and ethnic affiliations in places where they had more information about candidates (for example, in local elections). Many election-related social programs focus on logistics and informing people about the importance of voting, but as Sierra Leoneans become more familiar with the democratic process there is also room to help people learn more about the different candidates among whom they will be choosing. The 2012 election presented an opportunity to test new electoral programs that could increase transparency, voter knowledge of candidates, and voter engagement.

Details of the Intervention

In the run-up to the November 2012 elections in Sierra Leone, implementing partner Search for Common Ground (SFCG) filmed debates between rival candidates for membership in parliament (MP). From a total of 264 polling centers, 112 were randomly assigned to receive community screenings of these debates, 40 received interventions that provided information to individual voters, and another 112 served as a comparison group.

Firstly, debates were shown at almost 200 community screenings in polling centers across Sierra Leone, where they were seen by an estimated 19,000 people. Surveys of voters before and after they watched these debates measured how their perception of candidates, their knowledge of candidate positions, and their voting intentions

were altered.

In the 40 polling centers assigned to receive individually delivered information, individuals were allocated one of the following groups

“Evaluating and comparing these groups will allow researchers to disentangle the effects of different kinds of information, such as policy positions, personal characteristics, or persuasive speeches, on voter behavior”

1. Debate: Individuals were shown the exact same debate screened in polling centers on a personal handheld device.
2. Getting to Know You: Individuals were shown a “getting to know you” video of the same two candidates speaking informally about their hobbies and interests.
3. Radio Report: Individuals listened to a recording of an independent moderator or journalist summarizing the main policy positions articulated by the two candidates during the debates.
4. Thin Slice Evaluations: Individuals participated in a “lab” experiment where they were exposed to pairs of isolated images, voice recordings, and names of candidates from other constituencies across the country and asked to rate them along a variety of metrics, such as who they thought would be a better leader.
5. Comparison Group: Individuals were surveyed, but not shown any media.

Evaluating and comparing these groups will allow researchers to disentangle the effects of different kinds of information, such as policy positions, personal characteristics, or persuasive speeches, on voter behavior. On election day and the days following researchers administered a short exit survey to both comparison and treatment voters, assessing their knowledge about candidates, previous voting behavior, choices in the local and national election, and how they made their electoral choices.

Preliminary Results and Policy Lessons

Preliminary results suggest that voters acquired significant political knowledge from watching the debates, knowledge that persisted over a number of weeks, and importantly, influenced their voting choices on Election Day. Analysis is ongoing but to date we find strong positive impacts of debates on voter knowledge – of politics in general, and of specific candidate characteristics and policy stances; a better match between voter policy preferences and those of their selected candidate; greater voter openness to candidates from all parties; and increased vote shares for the candidates who performed the best in the debates. We further find that candidates responded to the road show by increasing their campaign effort, e.g. by giving more gifts and making more visits, in villages where screenings were held. By equipping voters with knowledge and influencing their voting choices, the debates thus further attracted greater campaign investment by candidates.

“These preliminary results indicate that debates convey comprehensive information”

Results from the series of individual treatment arms which isolated the role of charisma from that of policy stance and professional qualifications suggest that voters respond to both personality and hard facts, but only the combination of the two delivered by the debates moved them into better policy alignment and triggered changes in actual voting choices. These preliminary results indicate that debates convey comprehensive information – including charisma, professional qualifications and policy stances – and the combination of factors appears more powerful than

each in isolation.

“Together, we are planning additional pilot activities to explore how best to build upon these results and extend the impact of debates to mobilizing the public around the accountability of elected officials”

In addition to the impacts on knowledge, this initiative demonstrates that debates are logistically feasible to host and disseminate, which opens up wide scope for similar interventions in future. Commissioners of the National Electoral Commission of Sierra Leone, who have been close consults on this project from its inception, responded positively to our early dissemination events. In a joint presentation during IGC Growth Week 2013, SFCG Country Director Ambrose James explained that SFCG had been using radio as a tool to promote governance and conflict resolution in Sierra Leone for quite some time, however their use of video had been limited. While the individual treatment arms suggest that video is more effective than audio alone, the radio report we tested was rather dry, and one could imagine a livelier radio program that captures a real time debate between candidates in the recording studio that might come closer to the impacts of the film screening. This kind of radio counterpart could reach much larger audiences at minimal cost. Together, we are planning additional pilot activities to explore how best to build upon these results and extend the impact of debates to mobilizing the public around the accountability of elected officials.

About the authors

Kelly Bidwell joined IPA as Country Director for Ghana in 2008 and is now directing the Post-Conflict Recovery and Fragile States Initiative from headquarters. While Country Director in Ghana Kelly managed more than 14 evaluations related to education, agriculture, health, water and sanitation, and microfinance, and a large country program. Prior to joining IPA, Kelly was involved in research and evaluation related to post-conflict conflict rehabilitation and education in Sierra Leone, Senegal and Uganda. Kelly holds a MA in International Affairs from Columbia University.

Rachel Glennerster is Lead Academic for the IGC's Sierra Leone programme. She is also Executive Director of the Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL), and sits on the UK government's Department for International Development's Independent Advisory Committee on Development Impact. Rachel Glennerster worked on debt relief and the reform of the international monetary system at the IMF, and financial regulation at the Harvard Institute for International Development and the UK Treasury.

Katherine Casey is an Assistant Professor of Political Economy at the Stanford Graduate School of Business. Her current research examines how asymmetric information in electoral contests affects voting choice and public sector performance, and the impact of foreign aid on collective action and economic development. Katherine holds a PhD in Economics from Brown University and a Masters in Public Policy from Harvard University. She has worked as a consultant for the World Bank in Madagascar, the Comoros and Indonesia, and has spent several years working with the Government of Sierra Leone.

The International Growth Centre
(IGC) aims to promote sustainable
growth in developing countries
by providing demand-led policy
advice based on frontier research.

Find out more about
our work on our website
www.theigc.org

For media or communications
enquiries, please contact
mail@theigc.org

Follow us on Twitter
[@the_igc](https://twitter.com/the_igc)

International Growth Centre,
London School of Economic
and Political Science,
Houghton Street,
London WC2A 2AE



International
Growth Centre

Designed by soapbox.co.uk