A Very Brief Analysis of Cumulative Voting in the Amarillo ISD in 2004

This table indicates how many voters cast how many votes on each ballot. You will note that 97.5 percent of ballots had the maximum four votes. Only .1 percent failed to vote for any Board of Trustees candidate. At 1.3 percent, there were very few overvotes. The overvotes will not be considered for further analysis.

AISD Total Votes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2	.1	.1	.1
	1	12	.4	.4	.5
	2	6	.2	.2	.7
	3	12	.4	.4	1.2
	4	2610	97.5	97.5	98.7
	5	10	.4	.4	99.1
	6	3	.1	.1	99.2
	7	9	.3	.3	99.5
	8	6	.2	.2	99.7
	10	1	.0	.0	99.8
	12	2	.1	.1	99.9
	16	2	.1	.1	99.9
	28	2	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	2677	100.0	100.0	

The following tables present information about each candidate. For example, the "Smith Total Votes" table presents data on how each of the ballots was marked for Pete Smith. A little over 41.3 percent of the voters did not vote for Smith. About 38 percent gave him one vote. The remainder of the voters "plumped" their vote for Smith. He received two votes from 13.6 percent of the voters. He received 3 votes from 1.6 percent of the voters. A little over 5 percent of the voters awarded him all four of their votes.

Smith Total Votes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1091	41.3	41.3	41.3
	1	1009	38.2	38.2	79.5
	2	358	13.6	13.6	93.0
	3	42	1.6	1.6	94.6
	4	142	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	2642	100.0	100.0	

Cettie Total Vote

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2118	80.2	80.2	80.2
	1	332	12.6	12.6	92.7
	2	82	3.1	3.1	95.8
	3	16	.6	.6	96.4
	4	94	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	2642	100.0	100.0	

James Allen (data presented in table below) received the most four-vote ballots at 7.7 percent. He received 2,149 votes total. While additional research is necessary to determine if certain precincts supported Allen at different levels, I "felt" that there were differences while I was typing the data into my computer.

Allen Total Vote

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1326	50.2	50.2	50.2
	1	910	34.4	34.4	84.6
	2	182	6.9	6.9	91.5
	3	21	.8	.8	92.3
	4	203	7.7	7.7	100.0
	Total	2642	100.0	100.0	

Lawrence Total Vote

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2389	90.4	90.4	90.4
	1	194	7.3	7.3	97.8
	2	26	1.0	1.0	98.8
	3	2	.1	.1	98.8
	4	31	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	2642	100.0	100.0	

Carlisle Total Vote

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1284	48.6	48.6	48.6
	1	1056	40.0	40.0	88.6
	2	210	7.9	7.9	96.5
	3	22	.8	.8	97.4
	4	70	2.6	2.6	100.0
	Total	2642	100.0	100.0	

Amerson Total Vote

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2193	83.0	83.0	83.0
	1	324	12.3	12.3	95.3
	2	64	2.4	2.4	97.7
	3	2	.1	.1	97.8
	4	59	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	2642	100.0	100.0	

Pitner Total Vote

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1348	51.0	51.0	51.0
	1	835	31.6	31.6	82.6
	2	250	9.5	9.5	92.1
	3	51	1.9	1.9	94.0
	4	158	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	2642	100.0	100.0	

Smith, Allen, Carlisle, and Pitner were elected. Probably the best predictor is to look at the number of zero-vote ballots. Those who were not elected have higher percentages of zero-vote ballots.