

Short Communication

Three quantitative predictions based on past regularities about voter turnout at the French 2009 European election

Christian Borghesi*

*Service de Physique de l'État Condensé, Orme des Merisiers,
CEA Saclay, Gif sur Yvette Cedex, 91191, France.*

(May 27, 2009)

Abstract

The previous twelve turnout rates of French national elections by municipality show regularities. These regularities do not depend on the national turnout level, nor on the nature of the election. Based on past statistical regularities we make three predictions. The first one deals with the standard deviation of the turnout rate by municipality. The second one refers to the continuity in time of the heterogeneity of turnout rates in the vicinity of a municipality. The last one is about the correlation between the heterogeneity of turnout rates in the vicinity of a municipality and the population in its surroundings. Details, explanations and discussions will be given in forthcoming papers.

Most of the empirical electoral studies made by physicists deal with proportional voting from multiple choice lists, and investigate the distribution of votes ; as in Brazil [1, 2, 3, 4], in Brazil and India [5], in India and Canada [6], in Mexico [7, 8], in Indonesia [9]. A universal behavior is seen in [10]. Statistical results of elections for city mayor, focused on few candidates, are studied in [11], typology of Russian elections in [12], a correlation between electoral results and party members in Germany in [13], and statistics of votes per cabin for three Mexican elections in [14].

In this paper, we are interested in a probably simpler phenomenon: the participation in elections. Table A-1 shows the previous twelve French national elections for which we know the turnout rate for each of the approximately 36200 municipalities (called “communes” in French)¹. It is worth to stress that for each one of these elections (first or second presidential round, referendum, European Parliament), the choice list is the same for the whole country². This investigation is restricted to metropolitan France.

The three predictions are produced by statistical regularities observed over the previous twelve elections, while global turnout rates stretch from 31% up to 85%. Moreover, these elections are not of the same nature. A standard deviation (sigma) is measured, and a prediction is made with an arbitrary *two sigma* error bar. Note that for each one of the three regularities, data do not seem to show any global shift during the studied fifteen year period.

1 Standard deviation of τ^α

Let α be a municipality, with N^α registered voters, of whom N_+^α take part in the election, and the remaining N_-^α do not ($N^\alpha = N_+^\alpha + N_-^\alpha$). In order to compare in an easier way elections with different turnout levels, let us define the unbounded value for one municipality α :

$$\tau^\alpha = \ln\left(\frac{N_+^\alpha}{N_-^\alpha}\right). \quad (1)$$

$\tau^\alpha > 0$ means that the usual turnout rate $\frac{N_+^\alpha}{N^\alpha}$ is greater than 50%. To prevent τ^α from diverging, we modify real values by $\frac{1}{2}$ when necessary. (If $N_-^\alpha = 0$, then $N_-^\alpha \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$, $N_+^\alpha \rightarrow N^\alpha - \frac{1}{2}$; and if $N_+^\alpha = 0$, then $N_+^\alpha \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$, $N_-^\alpha \rightarrow N^\alpha - \frac{1}{2}$.)

*Electronic address: christian.borghesi@cea.fr

¹Data are from the *bureau des élections et des études politiques* of the French Home Office, kindly given by Brigitte Hazart, who I would like to especially thank for the great work she did.

²This is strictly true in all elections considered, excepted in the 2004 and the future 2009 European Parliament elections, in which there are seven different choice lists over metropolitan France. In the latter case, the main political parties propose candidates in each of the seven regions. Nevertheless, we assume that, regarding voter turnout, it is not a great mistake to assimilate these seven lists to a single one.




Figure 1: Histograms of $\tau^\alpha - \langle \tau \rangle$, for the twelve elections. $\langle \tau \rangle$ means the average value of τ^α over the approximately 36200 municipalities α of metropolitan France. The letter *b* (or *m*) added to the election year indicates that the choice list is binary (or multiple). For more information about elections, see Tab. A-1. The inset shows the histograms of the turnout rate $\frac{N_\pm^\alpha}{N^\alpha}$ per municipality.

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92-b | 94-m | 95-m | 95-b | 99-m | 00-b | 02-m | 02-b | 04-m | 05-b | 07-m | 07-b |
| 0.355 | 0.398 | 0.375 | 0.398 | 0.392 | 0.377 | 0.347 | 0.367 | 0.366 | 0.351 | 0.396 | 0.394 |

Table 1: Standard deviation of τ^α over all the municipalities. The mean value and the standard deviation over the twelve elections are respectively equal to 0.376 and 0.019.

Fig. 1 shows centered histograms of τ^α for the twelve elections studied. The centered distribution ($\tau^\alpha - \langle \tau \rangle$) seems to be similar for the twelve different elections. It is worth to stress that the similarity of the τ^α distribution cannot be explained by a simple binomial distribution, where N_\pm^α is obtained by the successes of N^α independent events with probability p . (According to the binomial distribution hypothesis, the probability p is the same for all the municipalities, and its value, which depends on the considered election, is equal to the global turnout rate given in Tab. A-1.) Note that other unbounded values, e.g. $-\text{erfc}^{-1}(\frac{2N_\pm^\alpha}{N^\alpha})$, can also lead to similar centered distributions for the twelve different elections. We choose the definition given in Eq. (1) because of its simplicity.

Here, we are just interested in the standard deviation of the τ^α distribution, which can easily be measured, and thus predicted. Tab. 1 gives the standard deviation of τ^α over all the municipalities α , for each election.

Thus, the predicted standard deviation of τ^α over all the municipalities becomes:

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Previous measures | Expected measure |
| Standard deviation of τ^α | 0.376 ± 0.019 | [0.338; 0.414] |

(In the above table, *Previous measures* is written as (*mean* \pm *standard deviation*), like in the next two similar ones.)

It can be interesting to compare the turnout rate of a central municipality α to its environment, defined as the n_v municipalities β in the vicinity of α [15, 16]. This environment, i.e. the set of the n_v different τ^β , can be characterized by its mean value, and also by its standard deviation. In order to take into account more properly the standard deviation of the environment, we define it as a constant number n_v (the same for each central municipality) of the nearest neighbor municipalities of a central municipality. It appears that generally, this standard deviation, called here σ_0^α , i.e. the heterogeneity of the environment of a central municipality α , remains relatively stable for each election. More precisely, the correlation over all the central municipalities α between σ_0^α at two different elections, is relatively high (around 0.6), and does not fluctuate a lot for different couples of elections.

2 Correlation of σ_0^α at different elections

Consider the $n_v = 16$ nearest neighbor municipalities of a central municipality α . Note that the location of a municipality is reduced to the location of its town hall³. These n_v municipalities have an estimated standard deviation of their turnout rates, written as:

$$\sigma_0^\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_v - 1} \sum_{\beta} (\tau^\beta - \tau_0^\alpha)^2}, \quad (2)$$

where β is one of the $n_v = 16$ municipalities, and $\tau_0^\alpha = \frac{1}{n_v} \sum_{\beta} \tau^\beta$.

The correlation of σ_0^α for all the α municipalities at two different elections, at time t_i and t_j , is written as $C_{t_i, t_j}(\sigma_0)$. $(C_{t_i, t_j}(\sigma_0) = \frac{\langle \sigma_0^\alpha(t_i) \sigma_0^\alpha(t_j) \rangle - \langle \sigma_0^\alpha(t_i) \rangle \langle \sigma_0^\alpha(t_j) \rangle}{\sqrt{[\langle \sigma_0^\alpha(t_i) \rangle - \langle \sigma_0^\alpha(t_i) \rangle]^2} \sqrt{[\langle \sigma_0^\alpha(t_j) \rangle - \langle \sigma_0^\alpha(t_j) \rangle]^2}}$, where $\sigma_0^\alpha(t_i)$ and $\sigma_0^\alpha(t_j)$ respectively mean σ_0^α

³Le *Repertoire Géographique des Communes* by l'Institut Géographique National provides latitude and longitude coordinates of the town hall of each municipality for 1999.

<http://professionnels.ign.fr/ficheProduitCMS.do?idDoc=5323862>

at times t_i and t_j , and $\langle \dots \rangle$ means the average value over the α municipalities.) Table 2 gives $C_{t_i, t_j}(\sigma_0)$ for every couple of different elections $t_i \neq t_j$.

| $t_i \backslash t_j$ | 94-m | 95-m | 95-b | 99-m | 00-b | 02-m | 02-b | 04-m | 05-b | 07-m | 07-b |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1992-b | 0.636 | 0.602 | 0.600 | 0.597 | 0.559 | 0.501 | 0.521 | 0.543 | 0.515 | 0.484 | 0.520 |
| 1994-m | | 0.609 | 0.595 | 0.686 | 0.607 | 0.524 | 0.509 | 0.603 | 0.535 | 0.463 | 0.505 |
| 1995-m | | | 0.732 | 0.607 | 0.555 | 0.551 | 0.549 | 0.554 | 0.531 | 0.507 | 0.535 |
| 1995-b | | | | 0.605 | 0.547 | 0.537 | 0.554 | 0.556 | 0.524 | 0.500 | 0.536 |
| 1999-m | | | | | 0.697 | 0.589 | 0.570 | 0.700 | 0.592 | 0.510 | 0.551 |
| 2000-b | | | | | | 0.552 | 0.546 | 0.662 | 0.542 | 0.485 | 0.532 |
| 2002-m | | | | | | | 0.694 | 0.581 | 0.557 | 0.499 | 0.535 |
| 2002-b | | | | | | | | 0.566 | 0.572 | 0.530 | 0.574 |
| 2004-m | | | | | | | | | 0.642 | 0.535 | 0.575 |
| 2005-b | | | | | | | | | | 0.567 | 0.600 |
| 2007-m | | | | | | | | | | | 0.704 |

Table 2: $C_{t_i, t_j}(\sigma_0)$ for all the couples of different elections. The mean value and the standard deviation are respectively equal to 0.567 and 0.058.

Thus, the predicted $\frac{1}{12} \sum_{i=1}^{12} C_{t_i, t_j}(\sigma_0)$, where i is one of the previous twelve elections and j the next European Parliament election, becomes:

| | Previous measures | Expected measure |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| $C_{t_i, t_j}(\sigma_0)$ | 0.567 ± 0.058 | [0.451; 0.683] |

The dispersion of turnout rates in the surroundings of a municipality shows a constant behavior in time. We will now see its connection with the population in the vicinity of the municipality.

3 Correlation between σ_0^α and π_0^α

Finite size effects are partially included in σ_0^α , and are due to the finite size of the population of the n_v municipalities that define σ_0^α . These finite size effects can be taken into account by the value π_0^α , written as:

$$\pi_0^\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_v} \sum_{\beta} \frac{1}{N^\beta}}, \quad (3)$$

where β means one of the $n_v = 16$ nearest neighbor municipalities of a central municipality α . According to Eq. (2), N_\pm^α obtained by the successes of N^α independent events with probability p (i.e. a binomial distribution), provides σ_0^α proportional to π_0^α (see Fig. 2).

Fig. 2 shows σ_0^α as a function of π_0^α for each election. There is a clear connection between σ_0^α and π_0^α , that can be evidenced by their correlation. Table 3 gives for each election the correlation between σ_0^α and π_0^α over all the central municipalities α .

| 92-b | 94-m | 95-m | 95-b | 99-m | 00-b | 02-m | 02-b | 04-m | 05-b | 07-m | 07-b |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0.636 | 0.633 | 0.665 | 0.662 | 0.661 | 0.677 | 0.615 | 0.635 | 0.679 | 0.609 | 0.610 | 0.663 |

Table 3: Correlation between σ_0^α and π_0^α over all the central municipalities α , and for the twelve elections. The mean value and the standard deviation are respectively equal to 0.645 and 0.026.

Thus, the predicted correlation between σ_0^α and π_0^α becomes:

| | Previous measures | Expected measure |
|--|-------------------|------------------|
| Correlation between σ_0^α and π_0^α | 0.645 ± 0.026 | [0.593; 0.697] |

To conclude, we have been interested in a relatively simple phenomenon: the participation in elections, in France. We have observed three regularities of turnout rate per municipality (or ‘‘commune’’ of France). (For each of the twelve elections studied, there is the same choice list for metropolitan France.) The first one is the standard deviation over the approximately 36200 municipalities of τ^α (an other way to write the turnout rate).




Figure 2: Mean value of σ_0^α inside π_0^α intervals, for the twelve elections. There are 36 intervals, and each one contains roughly 1000 σ_0^α . Legends are the same as in Fig. 1. In magenta, data derive from a binomial simulation, where N_+^α is obtained by the successes of N^α independent events with the same probability p for each municipality α . In this simulation, N^α and p are real values of the 2007-b election.

The second one involves the constant behavior in time of σ_0^α (the standard deviation of turnout rates in the vicinity of a municipality). The third one is about the connection of σ_0^α with π_0^α (the population distribution in the surroundings of a municipality). These three regularities do not depend on the turnout level, nor on the nature of the election. These facts incite us to make three predictions for the next 2009 European Parliament election, within an arbitrary *two sigma* error bar.

We are convinced that science, fortunately, is not limited to observe empirical regularities. Nevertheless, knowing regularities allows to make irregularities significant, when they occur (as it is shown in [15]). But, what matters most is what we try to explain and to use (as we try to do in [15, 16]) some of the encountered regularities, in order to pursue theoretical investigation.

Acknowledgments

The brilliant idea to study electoral data in connection with their location is entirely due to Jean-Philippe Bouchaud, and I would like to thank him for this. A great thank to Ivan Dornic and Lionel Tabourier for their help and for their passionate discussions ; to Diana García López and Marie-Alice Gouin for their help with the translation.

Appendix A : Elections studied for the voter turnout

| Year | List | Election | Registered voters | Turnout rate |
|------|----------|--|-------------------|--------------|
| 1992 | binary | referendum, Maastricht Treaty | $36.6 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.713 |
| 1994 | multiple | European Parliament election | $37.6 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.539 |
| 1995 | multiple | presidential election, first round | $38.4 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.795 |
| 1995 | binary | presidential election, second round | $38.4 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.805 |
| 1999 | multiple | European Parliament election | $38.4 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.478 |
| 2000 | binary | referendum, five year presidential period | $38.2 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.308 |
| 2002 | multiple | presidential election, first round | $39.2 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.729 |
| 2002 | binary | presidential election, second round | $39.2 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.810 |
| 2004 | multiple | European Parliament election | $39.9 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.434 |
| 2005 | binary | referendum, European constitutional Treaty | $39.7 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.711 |
| 2007 | multiple | presidential election, first round | $41.9 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.854 |
| 2007 | binary | presidential election, second round | $41.9 \cdot 10^6$ | 0.853 |

Table A-1: Elections studied for their voter turnout. The choice list can be binary or multiple, and is uniform over the country. The data are limited to metropolitan France.

References

- [1] R. N. Costa Filho, M. P. Almeida, J. S. Andrade Jr., and J. E. Moreira, *Scaling behavior in a proportional voting process*, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 1067-1068 (1999).
- [2] R. N. Costa Filho, M. P. Almeida, J. E. Moreira and J. S. Andrade Jr., *Brazilian elections: voting for a scaling democracy*, Phys. A **322**, 698-700 (2003).
- [3] M. L. Lyra, U. M. S. Costa, R. N. Costa Filho and J. S. Andrade, *Generalized Zipf's law in proportional voting processes*, Europhys. Lett. **62**, 131-137 (2003).
- [4] A.T. Bernardes, D. Stauffer and J. Kertész, *Election results and the Sznajd model on Barabasi network*, Eur. Phys. J. B **25**, 123-127 (2002).
- [5] M.C. Gonzalez, A.O. Sousa and H.J. Herrmann, *Opinion Formation on a Deterministic Pseudo-fractal Network*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **15**(1), 45-47 (2004).

- [6] S. Sinha and R. K. Pan, *How a “Hit” is born: The Emergence of Popularity from the Dynamics of Collective Choice*, in *Econophysics and Sociophysics: Trends and Perspectives* Ed. Wiley, 2006 ; arXiv:physics/0704.2955.
- [7] G. Báez, H. Hernández-Saldaña and R.A. Méndez-Sánchez, *Statistical properties of electoral systems: the Mexican case*, arXiv:physics/0609114.
- [8] O. Morales-Matamoros, M. A. Martínez-Cruz and R. Tejeida-Padilla, *Mexican Voter Network as a Dynamic Complex System*, in 50th Annual Meeting of the ISSS (2006).
- [9] H. Situngkir, *Power-Law Signature in Indonesian Legislative Election 1999 and 2004*, arXiv:nlin/0405002.
- [10] S. Fortunato and C. Castellano, *Scaling and universality in proportional elections*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 138701 (2007).
- [11] L. E. Araripe, R. N. Costa Filho, H. J. Herrmann, and J. S. Andrade Jr., *Plurality Voting: the statistical laws of democracy in Brazil*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. C* **17**, 1809 (2006).
- [12] M. G. Sadosky, A. A. Gliskov, *Towards the Typology of Elections at Russia*, arXiv:physics/0706.3521.
- [13] J. J. Schneider and Ch. Hirtreiter, *The Impact of Election Results on the Member Numbers of the Large Parties in Bavaria and Germany*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. C* **16**, 1165-1215 (2005).
- [14] H. Hernández-Saldaña, *On the Corporate Votes and their relation with Daisy Models*, arXiv:physics/0810.0554
- [15] Ch. Borghesi, PhD Thesis, in preparation.
- [16] Ch. Borghesi, J.-Ph. Bouchaud, in preparation.