

SURVEY ON PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS AND CONFIDENCE

IN ELECTION MANAGEMENT BODIES IN MONTENEGRO



Organization for Security and
Co-operation in Europe
Mission to Montenegro



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	03
THE SURVEY METHODOLOGY	03
KEY SURVEY FINDINGS	03
INTRODUCTION	04
GENERAL ASSESSMENTS OF ELECTION PROCESSES	05
CITIZENS' TRUST IN ELECTION BODIES WITH A FOCUS ON THE STATE ELECTION COMMISSION	12
CITIZENS' ATTITUDES TO ELECTORAL REFORM	18
ANEX	21

DISCLAIMER

The contents of this publication, views, opinions, research results, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this publication belong to the authors and contributors, and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the OSCE Mission to Montenegro.

■ EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Damar Agency is in the period from 08.10 to 17.10.2021. conducted a public opinion poll to examine citizens' attitudes on trust in the bodies of the election administration in Montenegro, with a focus on the State Election Commission (SEC). In addition, the survey covered topics related to the general assessments of citizens about the elections and the ongoing electoral reform process. The survey resulted in a comprehensive analysis in which the survey results were presented systematically, and an analytical review of them was given.

■■ THE SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The realization of this survey involved using a random multi-stage sample of 1200 adults. The stratification of the sample was done according to 6 strata concerning the region (North, Central, and South) and the type of settlement (urban and rural). The sample included 24 municipalities in the territory of Montenegro. The questionnaire consisted of 35 closed-ended and open-ended questions. The time required to complete the questionnaire was about 15 minutes.

■■■ KEY SURVEY FINDINGS

- Slightly more than half of the citizens (51.8%) generally think that the elections in Montenegro are fair and free, while somewhat less than a third of them (31.9%) believe that the elections are not honest and free. Interestingly, one-fifth of the respondents who think that the elections are not fair and free (23.1%) base their views on doubts about the accuracy of the ballot counting.
- As many as 89.9% of respondents believe that the functioning of the SEC affects the democracy of electoral processes and the trust that citizens have in the elections in Montenegro. On a scale of 1-5, the citizens rate the SEC and its work in 2014-2021. with 2.8 points. The results show that 55.3% of citizens are little or not familiar with the SEC, while 87.6% do not know how many permanent SEC members have. As many as 91.9% of citizens do not know the name or surname of any of the SEC members.
- 44.2% of citizens believe that opening the sessions to the public would contribute to greater public confidence in the work of the SEC and the election process as a whole.
- Almost half of the citizens (49.7%) believe that electoral reform is needed, and most of them (58%) believe that electoral reform is needed urgently. If electoral reform were to take place, 41.4% of citizens would change the structure of the SEC. More than half of the citizens (51.8%) support the model according to which SEC members would be professionals (electoral experts). In comparison, only 8.2% of them support the model according to which the SEC would be composed exclusively of representatives of political parties.
- The survey results indicate that as many as 45.1% of citizens are little or not familiar with the voting procedure, while more than half (54.9%) believe that they are familiar with the voting procedure.
- A very high percentage of citizens (80.2%) believe that election fraud (all irregularities that may negatively affect the election result) is a problem in implementing election processes in Montenegro. More than half of the citizens (54%) believe that electronic voter identification devices have contributed to greater public confidence in the election process.

■■■■ INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, Montenegro has faced a crisis of citizens' trust in the electoral process. The causes of the situation should be sought in the tensions and the atmosphere of mutual mistrust among the actors on the political scene and the insufficiently efficient action of the institutions on the prevention of electoral abuses. Also, the insufficient level of transparency and the challenge of the election results by some political subjects caused the citizens to express a certain degree of reserve towards the work of the bodies for conducting the elections. Citizens' attitudes about electoral processes, which are reviewed through public opinion polls of this type, aim to answer how citizens perceive the overall institutional and legal-political environment in which elections are held. The survey results for the general political public should be a signal in which direction electoral reforms should be implemented so that the citizens ultimately show a greater degree of trust in the electoral processes.


SECTION 01

GENERAL ASSESSMENTS OF ELECTION PROCESSES

The survey results show that more than half of Montenegrin citizens (51.8%) generally believe that the election process in Montenegro is fair and free, while slightly less than a third (31.9%) think that the election is not fair and free. Of the respondents who expressed a positive attitude about the democracy of electoral processes, 11.2% believe that the elections are entirely impartial and free. In comparison, 40.6% believe that the elections are partially fair and free.

16.3% of respondents did not express an opinion on this issue. Among those who say that the elections are not fair and free, the most numerous are men; respondents older than 65 years; respondents with secondary education; respondents from urban areas, and respondents living in the Central region of Montenegro.


■ Do you think that the elections in Montenegro are fair and free?



The results of this survey represent some progress compared to the previous survey results. We remind you that similar surveys conducted by relevant NGOs gave a result according to which 42.9 percent of respondents rated the 2016 parliamentary elections as fair and free. Interestingly, a fifth of respondents who believe that the elections are not fair and free (23.1%) base their views on doubts about the accuracy of the ballot counting. In comparison,

15.9% of citizens expressed the opinion that there is not enough information about the elections. It can be concluded that the peaceful transition of power after the last parliamentary elections in 2020 has contributed to an increase in the percentage of citizens who expressed a positive attitude about the democracy of electoral processes in the previous period.


■ How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the actual process of voting at elections in Montenegro?



Despite the crisis of electoral confidence, the citizens of Montenegro in the previous period continuously went to the polls in "large numbers". Thus, in the last parliamentary elections held in August 2020, a record voter turnout of **76.7%** was recorded in Montenegro. The survey results show that citizens have different impressions about the implementation of the voting procedure in the elections - **26.1%** of citizens are generally satisfied. In comparison, **24.2%** of citizens are generally dissatisfied with the experience of voting in the elections in Montenegro. Interestingly, a very small percentage of respondents (**4.6%**) point out that they are very dissatisfied with the experience of voting in elections, which points to the conclusion that most members of polling stations conduct polling stations professionally and responsibly. Almost half of the respondents (**49.7%**) have a neutral attitude on this issue.

Among those who are more or less dissatisfied with the voting procedure, the most numerous are: men; middle-aged respondents (aged 35-44); respondents with secondary education; respondents living in urban settlements, and respondents from the Central region. On the other hand, among the satisfied are the most numerous respondents of older age, followed by respondents with higher education as well as respondents from the Southern region.


■ Which one of the following would be the most likely to increase your satisfaction with the process of voting at elections in Montenegro?



The results of this survey indicate that citizens want more information about electoral processes. As many as 63.8% of respondents believe that the election process in Montenegro would be better if voters had more information on how the election process works (40.6%) and more information on political parties and their policies. Voters still do not have a clearly defined position on how the quality of electoral processes can be improved through the establishment of online voting. Only 12.9% of citizens believe that such an opportunity would increase the quality of the electoral experience in Montenegro. Interestingly, 9.5% of citizens believe that the possibility of voting for more than one day could improve the election experience. According to the current legal solution from Article 13 of the Law on Election of Councilors and Deputies, it is defined that elections are held during a non-working day (Sunday).

Among those respondents who believe that the electoral process in Montenegro would be better if voters had more information on how the electoral process works, the most represented from the following group of respondents: women; older than 65, respondents with primary and secondary education; respondents living in an urban environment, as well as respondents from the Central region.


■ How familiar are you with the voting procedure?



As many as 45.1% of citizens are little or not at all familiar with the voting procedure, while 54.9% of citizens believe that they are mostly familiar with the voting procedure. This is one of the survey results, which is worrying and indicates the need for continuous implementation of campaigns to raise citizens' awareness of voting procedures at polling stations. Citizens' awareness-raising activities should be well-designed and should be carried out in the run-up to elections and outside election periods. In that sense, the intensification of cooperation between the State Election Commission and NGOs dealing with election issues should be considered so that these activities can be carried out jointly through various methods of communication with citizens and campaigns to raise their awareness of voting procedures at polling stations.

Among those citizens who are little or not at all familiar with the voting procedure, the most numerous are women, respondents aged 18-24, respondents without or with primary education, and respondents from rural areas and the Southern region.

■ I believe the votes are counted accurately at elections in Montenegro?




As mentioned earlier, a fifth of respondents who believe that the elections are not fair and free (23.1%) base their views on doubts about the accuracy of the ballot counting. When asked - to what extent do you agree with the following position: I am sure that the votes in the elections in Montenegro are counted accurately

and precisely, 60.3% of citizens expressed the opinion that they are mostly sure of this statement, while 26% of citizens did not agree with this view. This issue should also be addressed through citizen awareness campaigns on the procedural aspects of the electoral process in Montenegro. Electoral legislation contains control mechanisms that enable effective control of voting procedures and counting of votes, which should be directly presented and brought closer to the citizens.

That the votes are counted, accurately and precisely (to a greater or lesser extent), is the attitude of the most significant percentage: men, respondents aged 45-55, then respondents with higher education, and respondents from urban areas and the Northern region. The opposite position is represented in the largest percentage: by women, respondents older than 65, respondents with higher education, and respondents from urban areas and the Central region.

■ How much of a problem, if at all, do you think that each of the following is in Montenegro at the moment?




The survey tried to summarize citizens' attitudes about the categories that represent problems in the conduct of elections in Montenegro. A very high percentage of citizens (80.2%) believe that election fraud (all irregularities that may negatively affect the election result) is a problem in implementing election processes in Montenegro. This data indicates that citizens recognize the low proactivity of law enforcement agencies in detecting and preventing electoral abuses. The new approach of law enforcement agencies to monitor election campaigns and prosecuting election abuses may improve citizens' perceptions of the existence of election abuses in Montenegro.

Also, as many as 67.5% of citizens believe that media bias is a problem in implementing electoral processes in Montenegro. In the latest report from the 2020 parliamentary elections, the OSCE / ODIHR made as many as five recommendations for improving the media environment during the election process. Among other things, the OSCE / ODIHR concludes that provisions on defamation and false news that contradict international standards regarding freedom of expression should be removed from the legislation. It also recommends that additional efforts be made by broadcasters to improve the quality of campaign editorial reporting and to develop their content instead of using footage submitted by election participants. The OSCE / ODIHR recommends that the election law be amended to stipulate that complaints from all actors should be submitted and considered within a short time frame to ensure an effective remedy for media disputes during the election campaign.

International and domestic observation missions in the last few election processes point to the problem of the existence of barriers for persons with disabilities to exercise their right to vote. According to the survey results, 42.9% of citizens recognize this problem, while 20.8% of citizens believe that this problem does not exist. We recall that the OSCE / ODIHR EOM recommended that further efforts be made to ensure that the premises and layout are suitable for independent access by voters with disabilities. In addition, additional measures were suggested, including the availability of voter education materials in various formats and effective training on the inclusion of persons with disabilities at lower levels of election commissions. In this part, it seems that a more proactive approach of the State Election Commission is needed to implement the proposed activities in close cooperation with non-governmental organizations dealing with the protection of human rights of persons with disabilities.

For 47.5% of citizens, inadequate control of political activities on social networks is a problem. In the last few election processes, an increased dynamics of activities of political entities during election campaigns on social networks has been noticed. According to the conclusions of domestic NGOs that monitored the 2020 elections, an extremely aggressive campaign was conducted on social networks and it was emphasized that the materials placed by political entities on the Internet could contain content with elements of a negative campaign that are not allowed to be broadcast on traditional media. Also, examples of violating the rules on electoral silence through social networks were presented. It is essential to emphasize that the legal framework of the election legislation in Montenegro does not regulate the behavior of political actors on social networks. This area could be subject to detailed regulation in the next phase of the reform of the election legislation.

■ How confident are you that voter identification devices used at polling stations have increased public confidence in elections?



Citizens generally express a positive attitude regarding the electronic voter identification system's contribution to building citizens' trust in the electoral process. More than half of the citizens (54%) believe that electronic voter identification devices have contributed to greater public confidence in the election process. Following the 2016 parliamentary elections, when the electronic voter identification system was first implemented in Montenegro's elections, OSCE / ODIHR observation missions expressed support for a new voter identification system "that provides adequate protection against multiple voting". However, in the conclusions of the report, concerns were expressed regarding the operational challenges of electronic voter identification devices during election day. Still, it was assessed that these challenges did not significantly affect the voting process. As part of the preparatory activities for the elections, the State Election Commission conducts training programs for members of polling stations on voting procedures and the use of electronic voter identification devices on election day, which significantly improves the capacity of polling stations members to use these devices and conduct election actions at polling stations. The results of this survey confirm the

justification of the introduction of electronic voter identification in a set of control mechanisms for determining the identity of voters at polling stations. In the coming period, the focus should be on improving the system's performance and connecting devices for electronic voter identification in real-time with the central records of the voter list in the Ministry of Interior to remove theoretical doubts about the possibility of multiple voting polling stations in Montenegro.

Among the respondents who believe that electronic voter identification devices have not contributed to greater public confidence in the electoral process, the most numerous are: men, respondents aged 25-34, respondents with higher education, as well as respondents from urban areas and the Southern region.

SECTION 02


CITIZENS' TRUST IN ELECTION BODIES WITH A FOCUS ON THE STATE ELECTION COMMISSION

Electoral legislation was one of the seven key priorities for starting negotiations on Montenegro's membership with the EU. From the beginning of the negotiation process until today, the European Commission (EC), within the political criteria, has been closely monitoring the process of reforming the electoral legislation, which has been initiated on several occasions. In addition, the EC monitors and actively points out problems in the work of election administration bodies, primarily the State Election Commission (SEC), through regular annual reports. In its latest report on Montenegro, published in the second half of October 2021, the EC, citing the latest OSCE / ODIHR report, noted that the SEC had not adequately fulfilled its regulatory role. However, the overall assessment was that the 2020 parliamentary elections were conducted transparently and efficiently.

On a scale of 1-5, the citizens are the SEC and its work in the period 2014-2021, year with a grade of 2.8. This is especially important, bearing in mind that three electoral processes were conducted at the national level in this period (parliamentary elections in 2016 and 2020 and presidential elections in 2018). All three election processes were conducted by the SEC in an innovative composition, which was introduced into the election law by amendments to the election legislation in 2014, and which, in addition to representatives of political parties, includes the President of the Commission (professional function) and representatives of elected NGOs. by parliament, following a tender procedure.


The work of the SEC was rated lower than average by women, respondents aged 35-44, respondents with lower levels of education, and respondents from the Southern region.

■ To what extent do the affairs in the Commission affect the democracy and public confidence in elections in general?




The survey results indicate that as many as 89.9% of respondents believe that the functioning of the State Election Commission (SEC) affects the democratic electoral processes and the trust that citizens have in the elections in Montenegro. A significant number of respondents (62.1%) pointed out that if they were aware that the State Election Commission was unprofessionally and biasedly performing tasks within its competence, it would influence them to exercise their right to vote. These results confirm that citizens perceive the SEC as an institution that should have a strong foothold in the law to ensure the democracy of electoral processes in Montenegro.

■ If you knew the Commission was biased and worked unprofessionally, would that affect your decision to vote?



■ How do you see the current composition of Commissioners all of which are members of political parties?



Following the 2018 presidential election, the OSCE / ODIHR EOM has addressed the issue of politically biased decisions emerging in SEC practice. The report states that "SEC members made decisions following party interests both before and after election day." 39.5% of citizens believe that the current composition of the SEC (which is predominantly made up of representatives of political parties) reflects a bias in decision-making and the functioning of the SEC, while 21.4% of them have the opposite view. The report emphasizes that the election law does not contain any provision on the impartiality and professionalism of election administration bodies.


The purpose of professionalization of the election administration, which should be one of the priorities in the upcoming election reform, is to create a system that will entrust the organization of the election process to experts to whom it will be permanent - professional and not party engagement. The results of this survey show that citizens believe that the conduct of election activities should be the responsibility of a professional, independent, and politically neutral election administration, which will protect the legality of the election procedure and which will be expected not to be influenced by political parties and participants electoral processes.

TRANSPARENCY AND PUBLIC RECOGNITION OF THE SEC


The OSCE / ODIHR observation missions have already pointed to the problem of insufficient transparency in the work of the State Election Commission, which is reflected in the non-publication or untimely publication of decisions and the closedness of sessions for media representatives.

The recommendation to increase transparency and enhance public confidence in the work of the SEC has still not been implemented. Accordingly, the State Election Commission should enable the presence of the media at its sessions, while the election administration bodies (SEC and municipal election commissions) should publish all relevant documents and decisions on their websites in due course.

■ Before this survey, how much if anything had you heard about:




■ Do you know how many commissioners does the Commission have?




The survey results indicate that more than half of the citizens of Montenegro are little or not familiar with the work of election administration bodies. For example, 55.3% of citizens are little or unfamiliar with the SEC, while 87.6% do not know how many SEC members. Of the 12.4% of citizens who stated that they knew how many members the SEC had, 30.5% of respondents gave the correct answer to the question about the number of members counted by the SEC.

■ Are you familiar with the structure / composition of the State Election Commission?




As many as 80.8% of citizens stated that they were not familiar with the structure/composition of the SEC, while 19.2% of citizens said that they were familiar with the composition of the SEC. Only a fifth of the respondents pointed out that they had read something about the State Election Commission in the previous year. Among them are the most numerous men, the youngest group of respondents, then respondents with higher education, and respondents from urban areas and the Central region.

■ Have you heard or seen anything about the Electoral Commission in the news in the last 12 months?




Interestingly, as many as 91.9% of citizens do not know the name or surname of some of the SEC members.

■ Do you know any commissioners by their name, including President and Secretary?



These results indicate the problem of insufficient information of citizens, but also public recognition of the work of the State Election Commission, which in the coming period must improve communication with all interested publics and citizens, about all segments of work and the role of the SEC in election processes.

■ Would you say that granting access to the media could build greater trust in the Electoral Commission and elections?



One of the most effective methods of improving public visibility, transparency, and the overall image of the SEC, which can produce positive results in a short period, is the opening of sessions of the Commission for the public. According to the results of this survey, 44.2% of citizens believe that opening sessions to the public would contribute to greater public confidence in the work of the SEC and the election process as a whole.

We recall that after the last parliamentary elections in 2020, the OSCE / ODIHR recommended that further to increase transparency and public confidence in election administration bodies, additional measures should be considered, including live (online) broadcasting of State Election Commission sessions and media access to them as well as the timely publication of all relevant documents produced by all levels of the election administration.

As the Parliamentary channel on the public service RTCG came to life in the previous period, it seems that there are all technical preconditions for SEC sessions (especially those during election processes) to be broadcast live on this channel (such as sessions of Parliamentary working bodies) which will undoubtedly affect visibility, recognizability, and authority of both the State Election Commission and its members. Non-governmental organizations monitoring the work of the State Election Commission, such as the Center for Civic Education (CCE), have rightly suggested in the past that opening public sessions would lead to a greater degree of personal responsibility among SEC members, who are not yet bound by the Code, to ensure their impartiality, which was one of the recommendations of the OSCE / ODIHR mission.


SECTION 03

CITIZENS' ATTITUDES TO ELECTORAL REFORM

One of the OSCE / ODIHR's priority recommendations for Montenegro is to comprehensively reform the electoral legal framework and regulate key aspects of the elections. It was stressed that in line with international commitments, the reform process should be comprehensive to ensure public debate and be completed well before the next elections. This recommendation of the OSCE / ODIHR is also indicated by the recently published report of the European Commission. Montenegro has tried several times in recent years to implement a process of comprehensive electoral reform, but so far, this process has not resulted in the adoption of key changes that would lead to improved electoral

legislation. Electoral reforms were reduced to partial amendments to the law from the set of electoral legislation, while key aspects of electoral reform and amendments to the Law on the Election of Councilors and Deputies were omitted. The European Commission points out in the report that despite the previously reached inter-party agreement that all local elections be held on the same day, the legal framework still provides for their holding at different times, which, according to them, leads to a constant election campaign at both local and national level.


■ Do you believe that Montenegro needs electoral reform?



This survey indicates that almost half of the citizens (49.7%) believe that electoral reform is needed, and most of them (58%) believe that electoral reform is necessary urgently. These results are a clear signal to political decision-makers that comprehensive electoral reform is needed to meet the forthcoming elections. The work of the parliamentary committee

for comprehensive electoral reform, established in December 2020 and lasting until the end of this year, has been severely blocked. It is uncertain when it will continue its electoral reform and meet OSCE / ODIHR priority recommendations.

■ Should electoral reform include changes in the structure of the Electoral Commission?



If electoral reform were to take place, 41.4% of citizens would change the structure of the SEC. Among them, the most numerous are: men, respondents aged 45-54, then respondents with secondary education, as well as respondents from urban areas and the Southern region.

More than half of the citizens (51.8%) support the model according to which SEC members would be professionals (electoral experts), while only 8.2% of them support the model according to which the SEC would be composed exclusively of representatives of political parties.

In this context, the results of this survey should be the basis and message to political actors that the next phase of electoral reforms should include professionalization and stronger positioning of election administration bodies and the State Election Commission as the "supreme electoral authority". Electoral reform and possible changes in the model of electoral administration bodies in Montenegro should be based on the principles of professionalism and independence while eliminating direct or indirect political influences on the work of electoral administration at all three levels (State Election Commission, Municipal Election Commissions, and Polling Station Committees).

■ Opinion about structure of the Electoral Commission



The Parliament of Montenegro should ensure the continuation of the process of the comprehensive reform of electoral legislation through the establishment of a genuine and sustainable dialogue between political parties and with the active participation of representatives of academia and NGOs with expertise in this field. Reforms should cover almost all segments of the electoral system, from considering the introduction of an open list system through creating conditions for full professionalization of electoral administration bodies to creating an entirely new legal framework that will regulate the conduct of elections at the local level.

METHODOLOGY

■ SAMPLE DESIGN

Observing the estimated population from sample based survey requires that the sample be representative of the entire population. The best results are achieved by probabilistic sampling, with each selection unit have a known non-zero probability of selection. The sample selection method used was a stratified multi-stage sample, in which voting districts were selected as units of the first stage (Primary sampling units - PSU), households were selected as units of the second stage according to a predetermined step, and persons in the household were selected as units of the last stage (birthday).

■ STRATIFICATION AND ALLOCATION

The framework for the selection of the sample is the Voters' List for 2020.

The target population is people aged 18 and over. As already described, stratified multi-stage sample design was applied. The units are grouped into 6 strata (groups) according to the territorial division (North, Center, South) and according to the type of settlements (urban and rural). Number of units of the first stage, were selected by the method of probability proportional to the number of persons aged 18 and over.

Second stage units, households, were selected by a simple random sample, with a predefined step to ensure randomness and selection of 10 households at the voting district level.

The units of the last stage, the persons in the household were selected by the method of the last birthday.

■ SAMPLE SIZE

1200 households and 1200 persons was distributed to cover all territory of Montenegro.

■ WEIGHTING

Weights are used to compensate for the unequal chances (probabilities) of different persons / households to be included in the sample. The weights was calculated in several consecutive steps. First, the so-called design weights. Since the selection of voting districts is done with probabilities proportional to the number of persons aged 18 and over, we obtain the probability in the first stage of the selection. In the second stage of the selection, we get the probability of choosing a household within the polling station.

The final weights of households and persons were calculated by normalizing the weights so that the weighted number of households / persons was equal to the unweighted number of households / persons.

DISAGGERGATED DATA

		DO YOU THINK THAT THE ELECTIONS IN MONTENEGRO ARE FAIR AND FREE?			
		Yes, completely	Yes, partially	No	I don't know
GENDER	Male	12.1	44.7	32.2	11.0
	Female	10.3	36.8	31.7	21.3
AGE	18-24	12.5	36.2	33.3	18.0
	25-34	9.0	39.8	32.0	19.2
	35-44	10.3	41.2	33.7	14.8
	45-54	12.2	52.0	27.5	8.4
	55-64	13.4	39.7	30.3	16.6
	65+	10.3	32.7	35.2	21.8
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	11.2	11.9	76.9
	Elementary	13.0	28.7	21.7	36.6
	Secondary	10.9	42.5	33.2	13.4
	Higher	9.9	40.7	32.7	16.7
	University	13.4	40.3	31.8	14.5
Settlement	Urban	12.6	37.7	34.9	14.7
	Rural	8.7	45.5	26.8	19.0
Region	North	12.7	46.0	23.8	17.5
	Center	11.4	37.1	37.0	14.6
	South	9.0	40.9	31.8	18.3

		HOW SATISFIED OR DISSATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE ACTUAL PROCESS OF VOTING AT ELECTIONS IN MONTENEGRO?				
		Very dissatisfied with voting procedure	Fairly dissatisfied with voting procedure	Neither satisfied not dissatisfied with voting procedure	Fairly satisfied with voting procedure	Very satisfied with voting procedure
GENDER	Male	9.9	16.2	47.0	22.2	4.8
	Female	8.6	13.8	52.2	20.9	4.5
AGE	18-24	10.7	10.6	54.2	22.6	1.8
	25-34	8.4	11.0	59.3	18.4	2.8
	35-44	9.7	20.4	46.8	20.0	3.1
	45-54	6.7	16.4	45.3	25.2	6.6
	55-64	8.6	17.5	45.0	22.7	6.3
	65+	11.8	13.3	47.3	20.8	6.8
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	5.4	17.5	66.9	10.2	0.0
	Elementary	5.4	14.6	49.0	21.8	9.2
	Secondary	9.2	17.1	49.4	20.4	3.9
	Higher	9.6	11.1	46.7	25.0	7.6
	University	10.8	8.9	52.2	24.5	3.6
Settlement	Urban	9.4	15.0	48.9	21.1	5.7
	Rural	8.8	15.0	51.0	22.3	2.8
Region	North	5.7	13.5	54.7	21.3	4.9
	Center	11.7	16.4	47.7	18.6	5.7
	South	8.7	14.1	47.5	27.3	2.4

		WHICH ONE OF THE FOLLOWING WOULD BE THE MOST LIKELY TO INCREASE YOUR SATISFACTION WITH THE PROCESS OF VOTING AT ELECTIONS IN MONTENEGRO?					
		More information on how the voting process works	More information on the parties standing and their policies	If it was possible to vote online	Being able to vote in locations other than a polling station	Voting across multiple days	Other
GENDER	Male	39.3	22.6	14.9	5.1	10.4	7.7
	Female	41.7	23.8	10.9	6.8	8.6	8.1
AGE	18-24	28.0	25.9	22.5	4.2	9.2	10.1
	25-34	38.6	18.4	20.4	6.6	9.6	6.5
	35-44	42.1	19.9	15.2	4.3	10.8	7.7
	45-54	37.9	30.1	10.7	4.4	6.9	10.0
	55-64	44.5	24.3	5.4	9.2	8.1	8.6
	65+	50.1	21.5	3.9	6.8	12.4	5.3
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	28.5	54.8	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
	Elementary	45.5	33.5	3.8	0.0	10.0	7.3
	Secondary	42.2	22.2	11.9	6.2	8.9	8.6
	Higher	30.2	25.5	20.2	6.9	11.2	6.0
	University	40.6	18.4	16.4	6.1	11.1	7.4
Settlement	Urban	41.6	23.6	12.9	5.5	9.8	6.5
	Rural	38.8	22.5	12.8	6.7	8.9	10.3
Region	North	42.3	17.3	12.4	7.1	8.3	12.6
	Center	42.5	26.1	13.1	3.7	8.2	6.4
	South	35.0	24.6	13.0	8.8	13.3	5.3

		HOW FAMILIAR ARE YOU WITH THE VOTING PROCEDURE?			
		Very familiar	Fairly familiar	A little familiar	Not familiar
GENDER	Male	15.3	45.7	31.3	7.6
	Female	10.6	38.5	37.5	13.4
AGE	18-24	8.3	36.5	39.0	16.1
	25-34	10.1	41.6	36.4	11.9
	35-44	16.3	44.9	29.1	9.8
	45-54	14.3	48.5	32.3	4.9
	55-64	18.0	41.8	31.3	8.9
	65+	9.6	36.7	40.1	13.5
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	0.0	11.9	88.1
	Elementary	13.4	12.1	43.2	31.4
	Secondary	11.2	43.1	37.0	8.6
	Higher	12.6	51.5	29.1	6.9
	University	21.0	46.7	25.9	6.4
Settlement	Urban	12.6	45.1	32.8	9.5
	Rural	13.5	36.7	37.4	12.4
Region	North	16.6	41.1	31.8	10.6
	Center	10.8	44.6	34.7	9.9
	South	12.5	38.3	37.4	11.8

		TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU AGREE/DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT? I BELIEVE THE VOTES ARE COUNTED ACCURATELY AT ELECTIONS IN MONTENEGRO?			
		Agree strongly	Tend to agree	Disagree	Don't know
GENDER	Male	20.2	45.7	25.3	8.7
	Female	16.1	38.8	26.7	18.4
AGE	18-24	15.6	41.5	28.9	14.0
	25-34	12.1	42.9	29.3	15.7
	35-44	18.6	43.7	22.4	15.2
	45-54	22.9	48.2	22.0	6.9
	55-64	22.1	41.6	23.2	13.1
	65+	17.2	34.3	30.8	17.8
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	6.5	5.4	88.1
	Elementary	26.9	30.7	17.8	24.7
	Secondary	17.3	43.6	26.8	12.3
	Higher	20.0	37.3	30.6	12.2
	University	17.2	48.3	24.2	10.4
Settlement	Urban	18.9	41.9	27.1	12.2
	Rural	16.8	42.6	24.2	16.4
Region	North	22.9	44.4	16.0	16.7
	Center	16.0	39.9	32.2	12.0
	South	16.4	43.9	26.2	13.5

HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM, IF AT ALL, DO YOU THINK THAT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING IS IN MONTENEGRO AT THE MOMENT?				
		ELECTORAL FRAUD		
		Not a problem	Problem	Don't know
GENDER	Male	6.7	82.3	11.0
	Female	3.1	78.3	18.6
AGE	18-24	5.8	74.4	19.9
	25-34	1.4	80.7	17.9
	35-44	8.5	78.3	13.1
	45-54	6.5	84.3	9.2
	55-64	3.8	81.7	14.5
	65+	3.3	80.3	16.3
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	6.5	39.3	54.2
	Elementary	5.6	69.4	25.0
	Secondary	4.0	82.3	13.7
	Higher	7.3	76.6	16.0
	University	5.8	82.5	11.7
Settlement	Urban	4.3	81.2	14.5
	Rural	5.7	78.6	15.7
Region	North	9.5	73.2	17.3
	Center	2.9	85.6	11.5
	South	3.1	78.4	18.5

		BIAS IN THE MEDIA		
		Not a problem	Problem	Don't know
GENDER	Male	17.1	69.4	13.5
	Female	13.0	65.6	21.4
AGE	18-24	19.8	62.2	18.0
	25-34	15.2	63.7	21.2
	35-44	14.8	69.3	15.9
	45-54	13.6	72.4	14.0
	55-64	15.9	66.0	18.0
	65+	11.8	70.0	18.2
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	6.5	28.0	65.5
	Elementary	11.3	54.1	34.5
	Secondary	15.2	68.2	16.5
	Higher	11.7	73.5	14.8
	University	18.7	68.7	12.6
Settlement	Urban	16.0	67.3	16.7
	Rural	13.2	67.8	19.0
Region	North	13.2	68.7	18.1
	Center	17.8	67.5	14.7
	South	11.7	66.0	22.3

		BARRIERS TO DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION FOR DISABLED PEOPLE		
		Not a problem	Problem	Don't know
GENDER	Male	22.0	43.7	34.2
	Female	19.5	42.1	38.4
AGE	18-24	20.1	44.0	35.8
	25-34	19.9	40.5	39.6
	35-44	24.6	40.3	35.1
	45-54	23.2	43.8	33.0
	55-64	25.8	35.7	38.5
	65+	10.7	53.4	35.9
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	16.8	28.1	55.2
	Elementary	16.9	38.9	44.2
	Secondary	20.7	44.4	34.9
	Higher	20.5	39.9	39.6
	University	23.3	41.8	34.9
Settlement	Urban	19.3	45.0	35.7
	Rural	23.2	39.4	37.4
Region	North	21.3	44.1	34.6
	Center	21.7	44.7	33.6
	South	18.5	38.1	43.5

		INADEQUATE CONTROL OF POLITICAL ACTIVITY ON SOCIAL MEDIA		
		Not a problem	Problem	Don't know
GENDER	Male	22.8	49.8	27.4
	Female	18.4	45.4	36.2
AGE	18-24	21.8	54.3	23.9
	25-34	21.0	47.6	31.4
	35-44	24.4	46.1	29.6
	45-54	19.0	53.3	27.7
	55-64	25.8	37.7	36.5
	65+	11.7	46.6	41.7
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	6.5	16.7	76.8
	Elementary	13.3	30.1	56.6
	Secondary	20.1	49.7	30.2
	Higher	21.0	47.1	31.9
	University	26.4	48.8	24.8
Settlement	Urban	22.4	46.7	30.9
	Rural	17.4	48.9	33.7
Region	North	13.7	57.3	29.0
	Center	26.1	43.9	30.0
	South	18.2	42.8	39.0

		HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU THAT VOTER IDENTIFICATION DEVICES USED AT POLLING STATIONS HAVE INCREASED PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN ELECTIONS?				
		Very confident	Fairly confident	Not confident	Don't know	I do not know what voter identification devices are
GENDER	Male	20.1	37.2	22.8	15.0	4.8
	Female	18.3	32.5	20.8	22.3	6.1
AGE	18-24	19.5	29.8	20.3	22.5	7.9
	25-34	19.8	30.3	25.7	16.8	7.4
	35-44	17.2	40.0	19.2	20.1	3.5
	45-54	19.8	42.7	18.9	15.2	3.4
	55-64	17.9	37.0	23.5	19.1	2.6
	65+	20.8	27.7	22.5	20.5	8.5
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	6.5	11.3	5.4	54.2	22.6
	Elementary	23.4	24.7	8.6	34.9	8.3
	Secondary	18.3	36.8	23.0	16.5	5.4
	Higher	17.5	37.6	25.9	14.9	4.0
	University	23.4	30.6	20.4	21.3	4.4
Settlement	Urban	19.2	32.2	23.5	19.6	5.5
	Rural	19.2	39.3	18.7	17.4	5.4
Region	North	21.9	38.0	15.5	19.8	4.7
	Center	19.4	32.8	24.0	17.4	6.4
	South	15.5	34.8	24.9	20.2	4.6

		IF YOU ARE CONFIDENT THAT VOTER IDENTIFICATION DEVICES AT POLLING STATIONS HAVE HELPED INCREASE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN ELECTIONS, TO WHICH EXTENT DO YOU THINK THEY HELPED?		
		Significantly	Moderately	Slightly
GENDER	Male	62.0	34.6	3.4
	Female	59.5	39.1	1.4
AGE	18-24	67.1	30.2	2.6
	25-34	65.5	33.4	1.1
	35-44	59.9	36.9	3.2
	45-54	53.6	44.9	1.5
	55-64	58.7	36.0	5.3
	65+	63.7	35.1	1.1
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Elementary	58.6	38.8	2.7
	Secondary	60.5	37.0	2.5
	Higher	64.2	33.4	2.4
	University	59.3	38.7	2.0
Settlement	Urban	58.6	39.2	2.2
	Rural	64.0	33.2	2.8
Region	North	67.0	32.1	0.9
	Center	58.3	39.9	1.8
	South	56.9	37.3	5.8

BEFORE THIS SURVEY, HOW MUCH IF ANYTHING HAD YOU HEARD ABOUT:					
		THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION			
		Heard a great deal	Heard a fair amount	Heard a little	Not heard of it at all
GENDER	Male	7.8	44.0	41.6	6.6
	Female	4.9	33.0	48.5	13.6
AGE	18-24	3.4	30.1	48.4	18.1
	25-34	3.6	38.5	45.8	12.0
	35-44	9.0	43.7	38.4	8.8
	45-54	8.0	47.3	40.8	4.0
	55-64	7.8	36.2	49.9	6.1
	65+	5.4	31.1	49.1	14.4
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	6.5	22.2	71.3
	Elementary	1.6	19.1	60.7	18.6
	Secondary	4.3	36.7	48.7	10.4
	Higher	11.8	50.8	31.3	6.1
	University	13.0	46.8	35.7	4.5
Settlement	Urban	7.2	42.5	42.1	8.2
	Rural	4.8	31.3	50.3	13.6
Region	North	5.5	34.8	49.4	10.4
	Center	7.2	39.9	43.3	9.6
	South	5.6	39.7	43.7	11.1

		MUNICIPAL ELECTORAL COMMISSIONS			
		Heard a great deal	Heard a fair amount	Heard a little	Not heard of it at all
GENDER	Male	9.4	42.0	40.6	8.1
	Female	5.5	35.6	45.5	13.4
AGE	18-24	5.4	29.3	46.0	19.4
	25-34	4.7	38.0	45.9	11.4
	35-44	8.2	44.9	35.1	11.9
	45-54	9.4	47.5	37.9	5.2
	55-64	11.6	37.2	44.3	6.9
	65+	4.9	32.0	50.7	12.4
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	6.5	32.2	61.3
	Elementary	4.0	24.8	54.5	16.8
	Secondary	5.5	38.2	45.1	11.2
	Higher	14.1	46.8	31.4	7.8
	University	12.1	43.3	39.6	5.0
Settlement	Urban	8.5	40.7	41.2	9.6
	Rural	5.4	35.3	46.3	12.9
Region	North	6.8	42.7	41.0	9.5
	Center	7.7	37.1	43.4	11.8
	South	7.4	37.1	45.1	10.5

		POLLING STATION STAFF			
		Heard a great deal	Heard a fair amount	Heard a little	Not heard of it at all
GENDER	Male	11.0	44.8	35.9	8.3
	Female	7.7	31.9	47.0	13.4
AGE	18-24	8.1	29.1	47.5	15.3
	25-34	6.7	37.3	45.5	10.4
	35-44	13.0	40.0	34.2	12.8
	45-54	10.7	47.3	36.4	5.7
	55-64	11.3	42.3	38.7	7.6
	65+	5.8	30.3	48.9	15.0
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	6.5	32.2	61.3
	Elementary	7.0	16.7	55.2	21.1
	Secondary	7.2	39.1	42.7	11.0
	Higher	15.2	42.0	37.2	5.6
	University	15.4	43.4	34.9	6.3
Settlement	Urban	10.8	39.2	39.8	10.3
	Rural	6.8	36.5	44.7	12.0
Region	North	8.4	42.9	39.4	9.3
	Center	9.7	37.1	41.9	11.4
	South	9.6	34.7	43.7	12.0

		HAVE YOU HEARD OR SEEN ANYTHING ABOUT THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION IN THE NEWS IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?		
		Yes	No	Can't remember
GENDER	Male	27.9	55.5	16.6
	Female	19.0	59.1	21.9
AGE	18-24	26.4	56.4	17.3
	25-34	21.6	59.1	19.3
	35-44	20.8	57.0	22.2
	45-54	25.1	56.3	18.6
	55-64	24.3	55.3	20.4
	65+	22.8	59.6	17.6
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	5.4	94.6	0.0
	Elementary	19.5	59.7	20.8
	Secondary	19.6	61.7	18.7
	Higher	32.9	45.4	21.7
	University	34.8	44.5	20.7
Settlement	Urban	26.5	52.3	21.2
	Rural	18.0	65.9	16.1
Region	North	18.8	66.7	14.5
	Center	27.9	48.3	23.8
	South	20.1	63.3	16.6

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WORDS WOULD YOU SAY BEST DESCRIBES THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION?					
		Transparent	Important	Unbiased	Professional
GENDER	Male	20.0	34.2	11.4	21.5
	Female	13.8	29.8	12.0	16.4
AGE	18-24	10.2	26.8	9.2	16.4
	25-34	16.0	29.3	10.5	16.7
	35-44	21.1	34.3	13.0	20.5
	45-54	19.2	37.3	15.7	21.8
	55-64	20.4	32.0	13.7	18.8
	65+	12.4	30.6	7.4	18.4
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	39.5	5.4	0.0
	Elementary	17.0	32.8	8.9	23.9
	Secondary	16.7	32.5	12.4	18.4
	Higher	15.7	30.1	10.9	18.2
	University	19.4	30.1	11.3	20.3
Settlement	Urban	17.3	31.1	12.6	19.0
	Rural	16.0	33.5	10.3	18.7
Region	North	9.1	37.5	11.0	16.6
	Center	19.8	32.5	12.0	18.0
	South	20.2	24.4	12.2	23.1

		Uninfluential	Biased	None of these	Other
GENDER	Male	13.8	21.4	19.0	4.5
	Female	10.7	20.1	23.8	9.7
AGE	18-24	10.6	14.4	29.8	8.7
	25-34	9.5	17.1	28.5	9.9
	35-44	13.9	19.9	19.0	3.5
	45-54	12.2	25.4	12.9	3.1
	55-64	14.5	23.6	17.7	9.1
	65+	12.5	22.9	22.8	9.5
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	10.2	22.2	22.7	0.0
	Elementary	10.8	20.2	16.3	9.8
	Secondary	12.6	20.2	22.0	7.7
	Higher	13.1	24.6	23.2	5.2
	University	10.4	20.2	20.3	5.9
Settlement	Urban	12.4	22.1	20.2	6.6
	Rural	11.9	18.4	23.6	8.2
Region	North	15.1	16.1	21.8	9.9
	Center	10.4	22.6	19.5	5.9
	South	12.1	22.6	24.9	6.5

		HOW MANY COMMISSIONERS DOES THE COMMISSION HAVE?	
		Yes	No
GENDER	Male	15.4	84.6
	Female	9.6	90.4
AGE	18-24	6.3	93.7
	25-34	10.3	89.7
	35-44	15.9	84.1
	45-54	17.4	82.6
	55-64	11.0	89.0
	65+	11.7	88.3
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	5.4	94.6
	Elementary	10.1	89.9
	Secondary	10.8	89.2
	Higher	15.8	84.2
	University	18.0	82.0
Settlement	Urban	12.2	87.8
	Rural	12.6	87.4
Region	North	12.4	87.6
	Center	13.5	86.5
	South	10.3	89.7

		NUMBER OF COMMISSIONERS								
		1	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GENDER	Male	0.0	5.4	7.1	10.8	5.6	3.3	5.4	2.1	17.1
	Female	3.4	9.6	8.5	13.8	4.9	3.3	0.0	3.0	12.6
AGE	18-24	7.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	10.1	0.0	0.0	18.0
	25-34	0.0	9.6	13.9	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.8
	35-44	0.0	8.4	8.2	16.1	5.1	2.8	2.7	2.8	5.7
	45-54	0.0	5.0	7.9	12.9	2.6	2.6	7.6	4.6	7.9
	55-64	6.1	4.8	11.5	7.3	4.8	9.6	4.8	4.8	18.6
	65+	0.0	11.0	0.0	15.6	14.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.2
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Elementary	0.0	12.4	0.0	12.4	28.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Secondary	1.5	7.3	7.4	15.6	3.3	1.2	1.2	3.4	14.2
	Higher	0.0	7.5	3.3	12.5	4.4	8.3	8.7	3.6	13.2
	University	0.0	5.1	13.5	2.3	5.2	6.1	5.5	0.0	23.9
Settlement	Urban	1.4	7.4	6.8	12.2	4.6	2.2	4.2	2.0	14.3
	Rural	1.3	6.6	9.1	11.6	6.5	5.1	1.6	3.3	16.9
Region	North	2.9	6.2	5.3	13.0	13.5	4.5	4.1	4.1	2.4
	Center	1.0	9.2	9.4	12.1	2.8	1.3	4.0	2.6	19.3
	South	0.0	3.2	6.8	10.2	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	23.7

		NUMBER OF COMMISSIONERS					
		11	12	15	20	25	28
GENDER	Male	31.0	6.9	2.3	2.0	0.0	1.1
	Female	29.9	4.5	3.6	1.5	1.5	0.0
AGE	18-24	46.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.3
	25-34	23.1	8.8	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
	35-44	34.6	5.5	0.0	5.4	2.7	0.0
	45-54	36.2	7.8	2.6	2.3	0.0	0.0
	55-64	16.4	4.3	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
	65+	29.1	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Elementary	36.4	10.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Secondary	29.5	6.1	5.0	3.2	1.1	0.0
	Higher	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	University	26.9	8.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Settlement	Urban	33.6	7.5	1.9	1.0	0.0	1.1
	Rural	25.6	3.4	4.3	3.2	1.6	0.0
Region	North	29.8	2.1	3.8	6.2	2.1	0.0
	Center	27.5	8.1	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.3
	South	39.1	6.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

		DO YOU KNOW ANY COMMISSIONERS BY THEIR NAME?	
		Yes	No
GENDER	Male	11.4	88.6
	Female	4.9	95.1
AGE	18-24	5.3	94.7
	25-34	8.2	91.8
	35-44	10.1	89.9
	45-54	9.6	90.4
	55-64	10.4	89.6
	65+	4.0	96.0
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	100.0
	Elementary	2.5	97.5
	Secondary	6.8	93.2
	Higher	12.0	88.0
	University	13.4	86.6
Settlement	Urban	7.0	93.0
	Rural	9.9	90.1
Region	North	13.2	86.8
	Center	7.2	92.8
	South	3.6	96.4

		HOW DO YOU ASSESS THE WORK OF THE STATE ELECTION COMMISSION IN THE PERIOD FROM 2014 UNTIL TODAY? MEAN MARK FROM 1-5
GENDER	Male	2.9
	Female	2.7
AGE	18-24	2.9
	25-34	2.8
	35-44	2.7
	45-54	2.8
	55-64	2.8
	65+	2.9
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	2.5
	Elementary	2.7
	Secondary	2.8
	Higher	2.8
	University	2.9
Settlement	Urban	2.8
	Rural	2.8
Region	North	2.9
	Center	2.9
	South	2.5

		DOES THE QUALITY OF COMMISSION'S WORK GUIDE YOUR DECISION ON WHETHER YOU WILL VOTE IN ELECTIONS OR NOT?		
		Yes	Slightly	No
GENDER	Male	11.7	31.1	57.2
	Female	12.2	28.9	58.9
AGE	18-24	11.0	30.8	58.2
	25-34	11.5	29.9	58.6
	35-44	10.4	30.7	58.9
	45-54	13.1	34.5	52.5
	55-64	14.1	27.1	58.8
	65+	11.4	26.5	62.1
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	11.0	11.9	77.1
	Elementary	12.5	24.7	62.8
	Secondary	11.8	30.5	57.7
	Higher	11.9	30.3	57.8
	University	12.4	31.2	56.4
Settlement	Urban	11.8	29.6	58.6
	Rural	12.2	30.6	57.2
Region	North	11.4	26.8	61.8
	Center	11.5	33.5	55.0
	South	13.4	27.1	59.5

		IF YOU KNEW THE COMMISSION WAS BIASED AND WORKED UNPROFESSIONALLY, WOULD THAT AFFECT YOUR DECISION TO VOTE?		
		Significantly, I would not vote	Fairly, but I would still vote	It would not affect my decision to vote
GENDER	Male	23.2	42.4	34.4
	Female	23.6	35.2	41.2
AGE	18-24	32.5	30.9	36.6
	25-34	20.3	40.7	39.1
	35-44	23.2	40.7	36.1
	45-54	21.0	47.2	31.8
	55-64	24.1	36.8	39.1
	65+	22.1	33.0	44.9
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	6.5	93.5
	Elementary	18.3	32.6	49.1
	Secondary	23.9	38.7	37.4
	Higher	22.4	42.3	35.3
	University	26.4	41.0	32.6
Settlement	Urban	26.8	39.3	33.9
	Rural	17.7	37.7	44.6
Region	North	15.4	37.0	47.6
	Center	27.6	42.6	29.9
	South	25.0	33.5	41.5

		DO YOU BELIEVE THAT MONTENEGRO NEEDS ELECTORAL REFORM?		
		Yes	No	Don't know
GENDER	Male	54.6	19.8	25.6
	Female	45.0	15.6	39.4
AGE	18-24	46.4	16.7	36.9
	25-34	50.3	14.5	35.2
	35-44	54.1	15.6	30.3
	45-54	53.2	20.7	26.1
	55-64	54.1	17.8	28.1
	65+	38.8	20.6	40.7
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	11.9	0.0	88.1
	Elementary	28.2	15.9	55.9
	Secondary	51.3	17.7	31.0
	Higher	51.9	18.5	29.6
	University	54.0	18.7	27.3
Settlement	Urban	50.1	18.0	31.8
	Rural	49.0	17.0	34.1
Region	North	43.8	15.3	40.8
	Center	51.1	20.0	28.8
	South	53.8	15.9	30.3

		HOW URGENT DO YOU THINK IS THE MATTER OF REFORMING ELECTORAL LAWS?		
		Very urgent	It needs to be done soon	Should be done some time in the future
GENDER	Male	61.6	33.9	4.5
	Female	54.0	39.1	6.9
AGE	18-24	49.2	43.1	7.7
	25-34	62.9	32.2	4.9
	35-44	59.1	35.2	5.7
	45-54	63.8	34.5	1.6
	55-64	54.2	37.7	8.1
	65+	53.9	38.7	7.4
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	100.0	0.0
	Elementary	49.4	42.1	8.5
	Secondary	63.2	30.8	6.0
	Higher	46.4	46.1	7.5
	University	49.3	48.6	2.1
Settlement	Urban	56.4	37.5	6.1
	Rural	60.8	34.4	4.8
Region	North	55.6	38.9	5.5
	Center	55.9	38.1	6.0
	South	64.2	30.8	5.1

		ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE STRUCTURE / COMPOSITION OF THE STATE ELECTION COMMISSION?	
		Yes	No
GENDER	Male	23.1	76.9
	Female	15.5	84.5
AGE	18-24	12.6	87.4
	25-34	21.3	78.7
	35-44	23.1	76.9
	45-54	22.7	77.3
	55-64	16.8	83.2
	65+	16.1	83.9
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	100.0
	Elementary	6.4	93.6
	Secondary	17.4	82.6
	Higher	25.6	74.4
	University	29.0	71.0
Settlement	Urban	20.7	79.3
	Rural	16.6	83.4
Region	North	19.2	80.8
	Center	22.1	77.9
	South	13.7	86.3

IF YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH THE STRUCTURE / COMPOSITION OF THE STATE ELECTION COMMISSION, PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OF THE OFFERED ANSWERS - THE SEC CONSISTS OF:

		Party representatives, one member from each party	Representatives of the parties, two members from the government/ authority and one from the opposition	Representatives of parties and NGO sector	Party representatives and election professionals
GENDER	Male	44.2	32.5	7.1	12.1
	Female	33.2	31.6	10.8	20.0
AGE	18-24	23.8	39.1	10.2	23.1
	25-34	32.0	39.7	11.6	13.5
	35-44	44.7	30.7	1.9	11.4
	45-54	35.6	37.0	13.6	11.8
	55-64	35.9	12.8	14.4	33.8
	65+	62.8	30.2	0.0	6.9
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Elementary	25.3	37.2	17.4	20.1
	Secondary	43.1	32.9	8.6	12.8
	Higher	41.2	22.9	6.6	15.0
	University	30.9	36.2	9.3	21.8
Settlement	Urban	42.6	29.3	8.8	15.3
	Rural	33.3	38.1	8.3	15.7
Region	North	32.4	55.0	4.4	4.2
	Center	39.6	28.1	8.4	20.2
	South	51.5	6.7	16.2	19.4

		Representatives of NGO sector	Representatives of Government	Other
GENDER	Male	0.7	2.0	1.4
	Female	0.8	2.6	0.9
AGE	18-24	0.0	3.8	0.0
	25-34	1.6	1.7	0.0
	35-44	1.9	5.6	3.8
	45-54	0.0	0.0	2.0
	55-64	0.0	3.1	0.0
	65+	0.0	0.0	0.0
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Elementary	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Secondary	0.0	1.8	0.7
	Higher	4.5	7.4	2.4
	University	0.0	0.0	1.7
Settlement	Urban	0.6	1.7	1.8
	Rural	1.0	3.5	0.0
Region	North	0.0	4.0	0.0
	Center	0.7	0.6	2.3
	South	1.9	4.4	0.0

		SHOULD ELECTORAL REFORM INCLUDE CHANGES IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION?		
		Yes	No	Don't know
GENDER	Male	46.3	17.8	35.9
	Female	36.7	17.0	46.3
AGE	18-24	34.0	15.1	50.9
	25-34	37.0	15.9	47.0
	35-44	45.2	16.0	38.8
	45-54	48.2	18.9	32.8
	55-64	44.7	20.7	34.7
	65+	37.3	17.3	45.4
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	5.4	6.5	88.1
	Elementary	26.1	13.9	60.1
	Secondary	43.4	16.7	39.9
	Higher	42.5	19.2	38.2
	University	41.5	21.0	37.5
Settlement	Urban	41.5	17.9	40.6
	Rural	41.2	16.5	42.4
Region	North	39.9	13.7	46.4
	Center	40.8	20.6	38.6
	South	44.2	15.6	40.2

		TO WHAT EXTENT DO THE AFFAIRS IN THE COMMISSION AFFECT THE DEMOCRACY AND PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN ELECTIONS IN GENERAL?			
		Significantly	Fairly	Slightly	They have no effect
GENDER	Male	31.0	41.7	18.3	9.0
	Female	25.8	46.0	17.2	11.1
AGE	18-24	22.4	40.8	26.9	9.9
	25-34	28.2	41.9	20.9	9.0
	35-44	30.2	45.5	16.1	8.3
	45-54	29.7	46.8	15.1	8.4
	55-64	28.5	44.4	13.2	13.9
	65+	29.3	43.3	15.9	11.5
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	44.5	0.0	55.5
	Elementary	15.0	46.2	17.9	20.9
	Secondary	31.0	42.9	16.8	9.3
	Higher	25.8	42.1	26.8	5.2
	University	27.1	48.4	15.6	8.9
Settlement	Urban	26.2	45.3	19.8	8.6
	Rural	31.8	41.5	14.1	12.6
Region	North	40.9	34.8	12.1	12.3
	Center	21.7	49.7	20.1	8.5
	South	26.0	43.7	19.7	10.5

		WHICH STATEMENT DO YOU AGREE MORE WITH:		
		Commissioners should be members of political parties	Commissioners should be independent professionals with expertise in elections	Commissioners should include both political party members and independent professionals with expertise in elections
GENDER	Male	8.6	52.6	38.8
	Female	7.8	51.0	41.3
AGE	18-24	7.7	54.7	37.6
	25-34	6.5	53.8	39.7
	35-44	7.1	61.8	31.1
	45-54	6.2	52.3	41.5
	55-64	9.4	44.1	46.5
	65+	12.3	43.6	44.1
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	28.5	16.4	55.2
	Elementary	23.5	41.2	35.3
	Secondary	7.1	52.2	40.7
	Higher	6.7	58.5	34.8
	University	5.3	52.2	42.5
Settlement	Urban	7.7	53.4	38.9
	Rural	9.0	48.9	42.0
Region	North	13.3	47.2	39.5
	Center	5.2	58.8	36.0
	South	7.7	44.0	48.3

		HOW DO YOU SEE THE CURRENT COMPOSITION OF COMMISSIONERS ALL OF WHICH ARE MEMBERS OF POLITICAL PARTIES?		
		The composition affects the impartiality of Commissioners' decisions	The composition does not affect the impartiality of Commissioners' decisions	Don't know
GENDER	Male	43.5	22.4	34.1
	Female	35.6	20.5	43.8
AGE	18-24	31.6	18.1	50.3
	25-34	34.5	17.8	47.8
	35-44	35.4	24.2	40.4
	45-54	48.5	20.7	30.8
	55-64	46.4	26.7	26.9
	65+	39.0	21.1	39.9
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Elementary	26.6	19.5	53.9
	Secondary	41.2	22.3	36.4
	Higher	37.8	20.6	41.6
	University	42.2	20.8	37.0
Settlement	Urban	41.3	20.2	38.5
	Rural	36.4	23.5	40.1
Region	North	29.3	20.0	50.7
	Center	44.1	20.2	35.7
	South	42.7	25.5	31.8

		IF YOU THINK THAT COMMISSIONERS' DECISIONS AFFECT THE IMPARTIALITY OF THEIR DECISIONS, TO WHICH EXTENT WOULD YOU SAY THIS HAPPENS?			
		Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Have no affect at all
GENDER	Male	36.1	46.5	13.9	3.5
	Female	39.3	47.1	8.9	4.6
AGE	18-24	28.9	52.1	15.8	3.2
	25-34	37.4	50.8	6.0	5.8
	35-44	37.0	48.4	9.7	4.9
	45-54	31.1	44.8	16.6	7.5
	55-64	39.0	47.8	11.7	1.6
	65+	51.1	39.5	9.4	0.0
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Elementary	23.5	59.0	12.7	4.8
	Secondary	38.8	45.3	12.1	3.8
	Higher	29.0	54.4	12.5	4.1
	University	42.8	43.9	8.6	4.8
Settlement	Urban	38.1	47.9	10.7	3.3
	Rural	36.7	44.5	13.4	5.4
Region	North	34.9	49.1	12.1	3.9
	Center	40.2	45.2	11.7	2.9
	South	34.7	48.0	10.9	6.4

		WOULD YOU SAY THAT GRANTING ACCESS TO THE MEDIA COULD BUILD GREATER TRUST IN THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION AND ELECTIONS?		
		Significantly	Moderately	It would not contribute to building trust in the Electoral Commission and elections
GENDER	Male	46.0	42.5	11.5
	Female	42.6	43.6	13.8
AGE	18-24	43.5	46.6	9.9
	25-34	42.5	45.1	12.4
	35-44	39.6	48.4	12.0
	45-54	42.7	44.4	12.8
	55-64	52.0	34.2	13.8
	65+	45.8	39.5	14.7
EDUCATION	Less than elementary	22.7	50.4	26.9
	Elementary	31.9	49.4	18.7
	Secondary	45.6	41.7	12.7
	Higher	44.2	46.3	9.5
	University	45.8	42.9	11.3
Settlement	Urban	46.5	42.6	10.9
	Rural	40.4	43.9	15.8
Region	North	27.3	52.8	19.9
	Center	48.7	43.0	8.3
	South	55.6	31.9	12.5

