

Usability of Electronic Voting Systems: Results from a Laboratory Study



Frederick Conrad
Brian Lewis
Emilia Peytcheva
Michael Traugott
University of Michigan

Michael Hanmer
Georgetown University

Paul Herrnson
University of Maryland

Richard Niemi
University of Rochester

Ben Bederson
University of Maryland

Acknowledgements

- Colleagues and Students
 - Alex Carrick, Wil Dijkstra, Ralph Franklin, Shweta Jayaprakash, Rachel Orlowski, Allison Negrinelli, Esther Park, Wan-Ho Park, Roma Sharma, Mike Toomey, Dale Vieriegge
- National Science Foundation:
 - Grant IIS-0306698
- Survey Research Center
Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan
- Partners:
 - Federal Election Commission (FEC), Maryland State Board of Elections, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)
- Vendors:
 - Hart InterCivic, ES&S, NEDAP, Avante

Take Home Points

- People have problems using these voting systems
 - Reduce Satisfaction
 - Increase Errors
- The particular interface (navigation and selection) matters
- Some tasks especially problematic
 - Irrespective of the system
 - E.g. changing votes, writing-in votes

Usability has real consequences

CLEVELAND --- A 61-year-old man was arrested after an alleged poll rage incident, NewsChannel5 reported.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Voter smashes touch-screen machine in Allentown

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Current Study: Participants

- 42 participants visited lab in Ann Arbor, MI in Summer, 2004
 - 31 with limited computer experience
 - “less than two times a week” or less
 - 29 older than 50 years of age
 - Each paid \$50 for up to 2 hours

Current Study: Procedure

1. Voters (users) indicate intentions by circling choices in booklet
 - a. In a few cases, voters instructed how to vote
2. Voters vote for their choices on each of 6 systems
 - a. Interactions video-recorded
 - b. After using each system complete satisfaction questionnaire
3. Voters complete questionnaire about overall experience, opinions, demographics

Coding the Video

Sequence Viewer File Edit Sequences Text Sequence variables Code variables Event variables Help Mon 2:43 PM

ALLOB_diebold.sv3

798 sequences 1 marked sequence mark set: set 1

- UM00 PROBATE JUDGE:
- UM10 Please cast your vote for Jeanette Anderson.
- UX00 Then, CHANGE your vote to Kenneth Hager.
- UM00

Layout NONE

Linked files Voter07_Diebold.mov

Sequence variables

SEQSIZE	4
STARTTIME	1629
Task	16
Choice	0
Accuracy	1
Votenum	7
Machine	4
segnum	17
Computer Exp	0
Ballot Desig	1
Order	4

Voter07_Diebold.mov

time: 1679

workshop invitation.doc

Voting Video Analysis

SV.dmg

SV 3.1 demo

SEA_DISK

Results: Satisfaction and Effort

- Satisfaction (“easy to use” and “comfort”) depends on the user interface
 - Diebold rated highest and Hart lowest
- Effort (number of actions and duration) depends on user interface
 - Diebold requires relatively few actions and the least time, Hart requires most actions and most time

Satisfaction and Effort


- The more effort required to vote, the less satisfied voters are with the experience
 - Effort: Number of Actions, Duration
 - Satisfaction: “easy to vote” and “comfortable voting” *

	<u>Satisfaction</u>	
<u>Effort</u>	Ease	Comfort
Duration	-0.40	-0.37
Number of Actions	-0.33	-0.33


$p < .001$ for all correlations

*Agreement scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree)

Errors (Inaccuracy)



What kind of errors did voters make?




Results: Errors and Satisfaction

- As voters make more errors they are less satisfied
 - Easy to use ($\rho = -0.23, p < .001$)
 - Comfortable using ($\rho = -0.18, p < .005$)

- Suggests that errors are associated with frustration, not simple inaccuracy

Critical Path and Accuracy



- Effect is stronger for voters with low computer experience

Video Examples:

- Some tasks lead to low levels of performance no matter how implemented in different interfaces
 - Changing a vote
 - Writing-in a vote

- What happens if voters do not take advantage of features that might help?
 - Reviewing ballot

- Verifying paper audit trail

Changing a Vote

- For Probate Judge, voters instructed to first choose Jeanette Anderson and then change to Kenneth Hager

<i>System</i>	Errors
Diebold	.04
ESS	.22
Avante	.18
Zoomable	.10
Liberty	.02
Hart	.07

Vote-change video examples: [Diebold](#), [Avante](#)

Writing-in a vote

- For write-in task, voters given name of candidate to enter

<i>System</i>	Errors
Diebold	.16
ESS	.12
Zoomable	.19
Liberty	.27
Avante	.17
Hart	.34

Write-in video examples: [Avante](#), [Hart](#), [Zoomable](#)

Reviewing Ballot

- Voters review ballot with different levels of care on different systems

<i>System</i>	Duration (min's)
Diebold	.59
ESS	.56
Zoomable	.67
Liberty	.75
Avante	1.66
Hart	1.16

- Ballot Review example ([Diebold, Hart](#))

Paper Trail

- “Voter verified paper audit trail” makes recounts possible despite vanishing character of e-voting
- But critical that voters verify
- Usability of Avante printed receipt interferes with voter verification
 - System times out, automatically depositing (unverified receipt) for 38% (16/42) voters
 - 24% (10/42) voters deposited (verified) receipt without looking at it
 - Only 26% (11/42) follow ideal sequence of looking at receipt then depositing
- [Video example of paper record verification](#)

Conclusions

- ❑ In a situation designed to maximize usability problems, the systems fared reasonably well
 - Error rates relatively low
- ❑ But did exhibit serious usability problems and, for some systems, errors were disturbingly frequent
 - Particularly for complex voting tasks
 - For different reasons for different interfaces
- ❑ When people have trouble they have serious trouble
 - Long inefficient sequences of actions
 - Lower levels of satisfaction
- ❑ An unsatisfying experience could well translate to lower turnout and lower confidence in process

Implications

- Many design problems can be identified with usability engineering techniques
 - But industry and election officials need to make a priority
- Unparalleled design challenge:
 - Systems should be usable by all citizens all the time, even if used once every few years



Thank you!


Lab Study Design

Ballot Design	Computer Experience	
	Low	High*
Office Block	21	9
Straight Party	10	2


n = number voters

* > twice a week


“The voting system was easy to use”




“I felt comfortable using the system”




Duration




Number of Actions




Errors for simple voting tasks: one candidate, no changes, no-write-in




Efficiency and accuracy



Errors (Inaccuracy)



Duration



Number of Actions

