

Sinaloa

2010

Gubernatorial Election Results

Pre-election Surveys

**Comparative:
Final Results – Exit Polls – Quick Counts**

State Congress: Election Results

Municipal Election Results

1. *The percentage of support for the PRI Governor has not changed much from 1998 to 2010: 1998, 47.5%; 2004, 46.9%; 2010, 46.36% (see charts on page 2). This level of support may be considered “static” and therefore vulnerable.*

2. *The sum of the main opposition to the PRI in 1998 and 2004 was larger than the number of votes to PRI, serving as a base to join forces in 2010 around a “citizen candidate.” In this instance, the total of the alliance is the nearly exact sum of the parts. The Alliance may have stimulated voter participation, an increase of 13% since 2004. (page 2)*

3. *The PRI held its majority in the State Congress, even with a slightly lower total of votes than the opposition. The PRI and the alliance split the municipalities. (pages 5, 6)*

4. *The candidate nominated by the opposition alliance is a life-long Priista who failed to secure the candidacy of PRI, but still maintains a network of support within the party.*

Gubernatorial Election Results

2010					
(Final Results)	PAN+ PRD+ CONV	PRI+ PVEM+ PANAL	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	51.94%	46.36%			60%
Votes	576,431	515,483	1,109,469	1,865,171	

2004										
	PAN	PRI	PRD	PT	PVEM	CONV	B	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	45.60%	46.90%	4.20%	0.70%	0.30%	0.30%	0.40%			44.70%
Votes	416,205	427,585	38,174	6,441	2,427	2,696	3,686	912,569	1,655,160	

1998								
	PAN	PRI	PRD	PT	PVEM	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	32.80%	47.50%	18.10%	1.10%	0.50%			46.30%
Votes	214,961	311,926	119,037	7,299	3,041	656,264	1416255	

Pre-election Surveys

Candidate/ Party/Ally	Reforma June	Noroeste Grupo Editorial June	CONSULTA MITOFSKY June	GCE June 24	GCE June 2	CONSULTA MITOFSKY May	GCE April	CONSULTA MITOFSKY March
PRD+PAN+CONV Mario López V	37.8%	36.5%	38%	36.9%	37.3%	42%	41.6%	36.2%
PRI+PANAL+PVEM Jesús Vizcarra Calderón	41.1%	41.8%	44%	44.8%	48.4%	46%	46.8%	38.7%
None	3.1%	5.15%				12%		10.7%
Ns/Nc	18%		18%	15.5%	10.2%		4%	14.4%

It is noteworthy that no survey projected the alliance as a winner. We do not know the results of those pre-election surveys that are the property of the alliance. They were not published (either before or after the elections) and we can not use them as reference points

It requires a self-critique of the polling agencies to identify their collective error. Either way, the starting point for reflection as well as post-electoral studies would be with regard to the sampling - were the likely voters identified? Who were not interviewed? Why? Were there “switches” at the last moment?

Even while projecting an unfavorable outcome for the Alliance, nearly all pollsters noted the attractive quality of the Alliance candidate.

Comparative: Final Results – Exit Polls – Quick Counts

Party	Final Results	Quick Count Mitofsky	Exit Poll Mitofsky
PAN+PRD+CONV	51.94%	52%	49%
PRI+PVEM+ PANAL	46.31%	48%	51%
NR			10.6%

Even the exit poll of Consulta Mitofsky had the PRI winning. However, the quick count by the same company was roughly correct. In general, polling groups should not make public their exit poll without corroborating quick count data. It is the famous “lesson” of the USA in 2000; and from other examples in electoral democracies.

Frankly, in terms of the political culture generally there is no haste to know the election results. Rapid election results are a project of dynamics of electronic media. However, given the history of electoral fraud and corruption in Mexico there is an argument of “rushing the results.” The “system crash” in 1998 is an example of where delay represented the possibility of fraud. On balance, nonetheless, it is better for the electoral culture to count well than to project immediately.

**“Exit poll” is based on a sample of voters immediately after casting their vote in the box (that is why it is known as “encuesta a pie de urna” in some Latin-American countries, or “encuesta a boca de urna” in some others.

** “Quick Count” has its basis in a sample of posted results from a given number of election places.

State Congress: Election Results

2010 (Final Results)	PAN+ PRD+ PT+CONV	PRI+PVEM+PANAL	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	48.88%	48.67%			59.01%
Votes	537,935	535,644	1,100,564	1,865,171	
Deputies	17	23			

2007	PAN	PRD	PT	PVEM	CONV	ALTERNAT	PRD+PT	PRD+PT+CONV	PRI+PVEM	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	36.10%	5.00%	1.30%	1.30%	0.60%	0.40%	1.60%	1.50%	50.30%			49.10%
Votes	308,798	42,590	10,729	11,343	4,970	3,688	13,671	12,552	430,229	855,354	1,743,833	
Deputies	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	PRI 24			

2004	PAN	PRI	ALIANZA	PRD	PT	PVEM	CONV	B	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	26.90%	58.90%	4.20%	5.30%	1.60%	0.60%	0.60%	0.60%			77%
Votes	341,934	749,062	53,701	66,932	19,944	7,582	7,694	7,529	1,271,306	1,655,160	
Deputies	15	21	0	3	1	0	0	0			

2001	PAN	PRI	PRD	ALIANZ	PVEM	CONV	PSN	PAS	PT	B	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	30.00%	48.90%	11.30%	1.10%	0.80%	0.70%	0.50%	1.20%	0.10%	3.00%			97.21%
Votes	229,301	373,312	86,485	8,765	6,071	5,077	3,574	8,894	547	22,591	807,592	785,135	
Deputies	12	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	1			

Municipal Election Results

2010 (Final Results)	PAN+PRD+ PT+CONV	PRI+ PVEM+ PANAL	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	49.77%	48.07%			59.03%
Votes	547,945	529,176	1,100,927	1,865,171	
Municipalities	9	9			

2007	PAN	PRD	CC	PT	PVEM	PRD	PRI+PVEM+CONV	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	33.90%	3.20%	0.00%	0.50%	0.70%	3.50%	54.10%			48.90%
Votes	289,392	27,284	0	3,914	6,187	29,569	460,863	852,735	1,743,833	
Municipalities	2	0	0	0	0	0	16 (14 PRI+PVEM Y 2 PRI+CONV)			

2004	PAN	PRI	PRD	PT	PVEM	CONV	B	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	38.30%	43.90%	6.90%	1.20%	0.40%	0.50%	7.00%			54.88%
Votes	347,520	399,139	62,438	10,884	3,764	4,636	63,875	908,412	1,655,160	
Municipalities	5	13	0	0	0	0	0			

2001	PAN	PRI	PRD	PT	PVEM	CONV	PSN	PAS	B	Total Votes	Registered Voters	Participation
% Votes	28.90%	45.20%	10.30%	7.80%	0.40%	0.30%	0.30%	1.00%	2.90%			97.21%
Votes	233,350	365,000	82,957	63,322	3,559	2,448	2,367	8,180	23,149	807,592	785,135	
Municipalities	3	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	0			

REFERENCES:

The organization of these results is a work product of the MUND Group research team, based on the sources indicated below. In this series of reports/bulletins we have utilized only public and published material. Of course, there is information from non-public and non-published sources, but that is for use at another time. The observations we make are hypotheses developed to guide our initial follow up work.

Consejo Estatal Electoral de Sinaloa

PREP Sinaloa

IMOCORP

CIDAC

Consulta Mitofsky

El Universal

Milenio

Mund Group
Research in Global Demographics
Tehuantepec 55 Bis Col. Roma Sur
México 06760 D.F.
Tel. +52 (55) 5584 3020
e-mail: mund@mundgroup.com
Website: www.mundgroup.com