

Study from Utah Valley University refutes No on 3 campaign's claims of ballot errors caused by voter confusion

"One cannot point to the findings of the UPenn study to claim that Question 3 will lead to a spike in voter confusion and error rates."



NV, UNITED STATES, October 23, 2024

/EINPresswire.com/ -- Professors Alan Parry, PhD and

John Kidd, PhD from Utah Valley University have released a study showing serious errors with a University of Pennsylvania (UPenn) study, which is heavily sourced by the No on 3 campaign in support of claims of increased ballot error rates under Question 3. [The full study can be found HERE.](#)

The UPenn study broadly asserts that ranking candidates by order of preference increases ballot error rates, claiming that ballot marking errors increased ten times. Opponents of the initiative has used this study to justify claims in Nevada of ballots being thrown out in large quantities and overall voter confusion if Question 3 is adopted. Dr. Parry and Dr. Kidd found these claims to be baseless and largely out of context.

"The UPenn study claimed that 1 in 20 ballots considered were 'improperly marked'. But this is not the same as being an error and certainly does not mean that they were rejected. 90% of those ballots were counted. Claiming that 1 in 20 ballots were problematic exaggerates that the issue is over 10 times larger than it actually is, and as such, is remarkably misleading."

In ads and various interviews, opponents have further claimed that the UPenn study states that 1 in 20 ballots will be thrown out under Question 3. "Nowhere in the UPenn study do the authors claim that 1 out of 20 ballots will be thrown out due to marking errors," said Dr. Kidd.

While the UPenn study did state that rejected ballots could increase under a system where voters can rank candidates according to their preference, the difference was only 99.96% being accepted compared to 99.53%.

"Ten times a tiny number is still a tiny number," said Dr. Kidd.

"When you factor in the massive spike in meaningful votes under Question 3 compared to the

tiny amount of increased errors, there is no doubt Nevada voters will have much more voice in their democracy if Question 3 passes,” added Dr. Parry.

The UPenn study arrives at this estimate for rejected ballots by taking an average of recent elections in New York City, San Francisco, Maine and Alaska. Of those four, only Alaska has a system similar to Question 3. In the most recent election in Alaska, 99.9% of all ballots were counted and in recent exit polling, 85% of Alaskan voters said they found the system “simple”.

“One cannot point to the findings of the UPenn study to claim that Question 3 will lead to a spike in voter confusion and error rates,” said Dr. Parry.

Messaging and advertisements from No on 3 have focused heavily on voter confusion, increases in error rates and more ballots thrown out if Question 3 were implemented.

“It is incredibly disappointing that the opposition to Question 3 is trying to confuse Nevada voters by using a study that frames its findings in an incredibly hyperbolic way, and then blatantly lying about what the study actually says,” said Molly Ellery, spokesperson with Vote Yes on 3. “Nevadans deserve an honest debate about the merits of Question 3, not tactics designed to confuse Nevadans into voting for a system that allows elites to keep their power instead of taking it back for the people.”

Under Nevada’s current system, one million independent voters are denied the right to vote in its closed primary elections. Those voters, who are neither Republican or Democrat, many of whom are military veterans and first responders, are denied an equal voice in elections their tax dollars pay for.

If passed in the November election, Question 3 will provide more and better choices to Nevada voters while ensuring their voice counts in the election process.

For more information on [Ballot Question 3](#), visit yeson3nv.org.

###

Molly Ellery

Vote Yes on 3

info@yeson3nv.org

Visit us on social media:

[Facebook](#)

[X](#)

[Instagram](#)

[YouTube](#)

[TikTok](#)

This press release can be viewed online at: <https://www.einpresswire.com/article/753618614>

EIN Presswire's priority is source transparency. We do not allow opaque clients, and our editors try to be careful about weeding out false and misleading content. As a user, if you see something we have missed, please do bring it to our attention. Your help is welcome. EIN Presswire, Everyone's Internet News Presswire™, tries to define some of the boundaries that are reasonable in today's world. Please see our Editorial Guidelines for more information.

© 1995-2024 Newsmatics Inc. All Right Reserved.