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Introduction
Survey design (I)

Goal and objectives

General objective
To track changes in the public perceptions regarding the work of the Central Electoral Commission and Center for Continuous Electoral Training.

Specific objectives
This presentation includes the comparative analysis of data collected for 3 post-electoral general population surveys (2019 Parliamentary, 2019 General Local and 2020 Presidential Elections).
**Survey design (II)**

**Methodology and sampling**

### Methodology

**Type of research:**
Quantitative nationally representative survey.

**Data collection method:**
CATI (computer assisted telephone interview).

**Target group and sample size:**
- *General population 18 years old and over* on a sample of 1,418 / 1,410 / 1,510 respondents. Sampling error +/- 2.6%.

**Questionnaire:**
Structured questionnaire.

**Language of interview:**
- Romanian (75% / 70% / 74%) and Russian (25% / 30% / 26%) depending on respondent’s preference.

**Average length of interview:**
24 / 26 / 24 minutes.

**Data collection period:**
- March 19 – May 14, 2019;
- November 9 – December 4, 2019;

**Net response rate:**
68% / 62% / 54%.

### Sample design

**Sampling framework:**
All households and individuals in the country. The reference data for the sampling scheme were taken from the 2014 population census / all telephone numbers assigned to mobile service providers (Orange, Mobitel and Unite).

**Sampling scheme:**
Probabilistic, stratified, with random selection principles.

**Geographical coverage:**
Urban and rural environment. The study included 108/106/480 localities.
02. Voting process and experience
02. Voting process and experience

To what extent are you interested in the socio-political life of the Republic of Moldova?

Voters' interest in socio-political events in the country has increased significantly compared to the previous poll, since 40% gave a score of 8 points and more (on a scale of 10 points), compared to 28% in the autumn 2019 study.

People who participated in the Presidential Elections (6.9 points) and those who heard / read information campaign materials (6.9 points) show a higher level of interest in socio-political life, compared to those who did not participate (5.8 points) and those who were not exposed to the information campaign (6.3 points).
Voting process and experience

Did you participate in the Parliamentary / General Local / Presidential Elections?

The self-declared turnout in the Presidential Elections in November 2020 is higher by 2% to 5% than that in the General Local Elections on 20 October 2019 and in the Parliamentary Elections in February 2019.

The turnout increases with the voters’ age.

The civic education campaign had a significant impact on the decision to vote, since the participation rate among those exposed to the campaign (89%) is significantly higher than the participation rate of those who were not exposed to the campaign (75%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Percentage Participating</th>
<th>Percentage Not Participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 Round 1</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 Round 2</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 Round 1</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 Round 2</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample for W2 (Round 2): 777 respondents who had second round of General Local Elections in their locality.

The percentage of those who voted in the Presidential Elections is higher among the respondents with a high level of education (92%), as opposed to those with a low level of education (82%). Another pattern is that the participation rate increases with age from 80% in case of young people to 91% in case of the elderly people.
Following your participation in the Parliamentary / Local / Presidential Elections, how satisfied were you with each item?

An absolute majority of those who casted their ballot during elections were satisfied with almost all aspects of how the voting process was organized at the polling station level. The level of satisfaction with most aspects increased by 4% on an average (the percentage of those satisfied is close to 100%). 39% were satisfied with all listed organizational aspects, especially women (42%) and rural voters (45%).

Distance to the polling station
Accessibility of the polling station (ramp/ stairs; 1st floor/ 2nd floor, etc.)
Polling station premises
Time you had to wait at the polling station
Preparedness of the polling station personnel
Friendly attitude of the polling station personnel
Compliance with anti-COVID-19 measures by members of polling station
 Provision of the members of the polling station with anti-COVID-19 protection equipment
Efficiency of the polling station personnel
Ease of navigation at the polling station
Webcam above the ballot box
Availability of the information about the election at the polling station

Sample: 1179 / 1172 / 1329 respondents who participated in the elections
Was there an access ramp for wheelchairs (for people with disabilities) and for baby prams/strollers at the polling station where you voted in the last election?

There were no ramps for wheelchair access in at least 4 out of each 10 polling stations (assuming that the respondents were distributed evenly across all polling stations). The lack of ramps was mentioned more often in the central (45%) and northern (40%) parts of Moldova as well as in rural areas (45% as opposed to 31% in urban areas).
Voting process and experience

Perceptions regarding the organization of the voting process during pandemic caused by COVID-19

97% of the respondents were satisfied how the voting process was managed on E-Day of the Presidential Elections in the pandemic environment. 92% of the respondents felt secure of not being infected with COVID-19 while casting their ballot. According to respondents, almost all pandemic-prevention rules at the polling station level were observed in almost all cases, except for the use of a personal pen (20% did not use their own pen).

Sample: 1329 respondents who participated in the Presidential Elections.
02. Voting process and experience

Did you personally noticed any irregularities during the E-Day?

4% of the respondents noted irregularities during E-Day (a decrease by 5% from the first survey).
Actions to report the observed irregularities were taken by 41% of the voters who noted irregularities (two-fold of the percentage found during the Parliamentary Elections in February 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Refuse to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019 (V1)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 (V2)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 (V3)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 1179 / 1172 / 1329 respondents who participated in the elections
What types of irregularities have you heard about/seen during the last elections?

1/3 of the voters have heard about or seen irregularities during the last elections (a decrease by half compared with the Parliamentary Elections in February 2019) – in particular, these irregularities concerned election gifts (money, food, etc.) and voting in place of persons who did not show up to cast their ballot. 4% mentioned illegal transportation of voters to polling stations.
# Voting process and experience

## Perceptions towards presentation of preliminary results (1/2)

### When did you gain information on preliminary outcome of elections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time After Elections</th>
<th>2019 (W1)</th>
<th>2019 (W2)</th>
<th>2020 (W3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late at night on day of the elections</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next day after the elections</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within one week of the elections</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later in time</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know about outcomes till present</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What is your opinion about the online presentation of the voter turnout and preliminary results by the CEC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>2019 (W1)</th>
<th>2019 (W2)</th>
<th>2020 (W3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear and efficient</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiently clear and efficient</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not quite clear and efficient at all</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear and efficient at all</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to tell</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions towards presentation of preliminary results (2/2)

Where or from whom did you gain information about the outcome of elections?

- Directly on the official website of the CEC: 2% (2019 (V1)), 3% (2019 (V2)), 10% (2020 (V3))
- Facebook account of CEC: 2%
- TV news release: 67%
- Internet: 16% (2019 (V1)), 17% (2019 (V2)), 17% (2020 (V3))
- Online Media: 9%
- Social networks: 17%
- Friends, neighbours/relatives/colleagues: 15% (2019 (V1)), 10% (2020 (V3))

This survey registered the highest level of interest in the elections’ preliminary results among the three surveys: 95% of voters (by 15% more than in the 2019 Parliamentary Elections) found out the results of the Presidential Elections not later than on the next day after the elections. The CEC website was visited for this purpose by 10% of the respondents (3-fold of the percentage registered in the previous survey).

80% of voters (an increase by 10% from the previous survey and by 17% from the first survey) appreciated the clarity, promptness and format of the CEC presentation of the online voter turnout and preliminary election results.
03. Attitudes and perceptions towards CEC
Attitudes and perceptions towards CEC

The notoriety of the CEC and Center for Continuous Electoral Training

The spontaneous awareness of the CEC has improved by 15% since the previous surveys and reached 69%. The spontaneous awareness is higher among respondents with a high level of education (88%), those with a medium level of income (68%), urban residents (74%), residents of Chisinau (79%), those who have been exposed to the civic education campaign (74% as opposed to 43% of the respondents not exposed to the campaign) and those who voted (71% as opposed to 53% of those who did not vote). The assisted awareness of the CEC has improved by 11% since the previous studies: 9 out of each 10 voters have heard about the CEC, but the level of knowledge about CCET decreased by 5% and fell to 20%. The CEC was not known mainly by persons with a low level of education (23%), rural residents (13%), those who do not vote in the elections (16%) and those who were not trying to find out information about the elections (21%).

What institution is responsible for organizing and holding elections in the Republic of Moldova? (Open question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2019 (W1)</th>
<th>2019 (W2)</th>
<th>2020 (W3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidency</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever heard of the following institutions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much confidence do you have in professionalism and transparency of the Central Electoral Commission?

As compared with the 2019 Parliamentary Elections and 2019 General Local Elections, the latest survey registered a significant and stable improvement in the level of confidence in both the professionalism of the CEC staff (from 36% to 55%) and the transparency of the CEC activities (from 28% to 53%).

The level of confidence in the professionalism of the CEC staff was higher among women (58%), representatives of the ethnic majority (56%), residents of all regions (58% – excepting Chisinau with 48%), and those who voted in the elections (56% as opposed to 45% who did not vote).

The exposure to the civic education campaign has influenced positively the level of confidence in the professionalism (58% vs. 41%) and transparency of the CEC activities (55% vs. 37%).

Sample: 1132 / 1120 / 1370 respondents who heard about the Central Electoral Commission
Attitudes and perceptions towards CEC

Perceptions about the activity and independence of the Central Electoral Commission

75% of voters (an increase by 13% from the previous survey) believe the institution is performing its functions very well or rather well. Voters who have been exposed to the information campaign (77%) and those who have participated in elections (76%) consider in a higher proportion that the CEC is fulfilling its duties well.

57% respondents, compared to 47% in the previous study, consider that the CEC is a neutral and independent institution.

The percentage of the respondents who did not agree at all that the CEC is independent and neutral was 2.5 times less than in the first survey.

How well do you think the Central Electoral Commission is fulfilling its functions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019 (W1)</th>
<th>2019 (W2)</th>
<th>2020 (W3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly well</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly poorly</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poorly</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to say</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you believe the Central Electoral Commission is an independent and neutral institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019 (W1)</th>
<th>2019 (W2)</th>
<th>2020 (W3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully agree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly agree</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly disagree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully disagree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How confident are you in the results of the Parliamentary, General Local and Presidential Elections?

78% of voters trust the results of the Presidential Elections (compared to only 47% in the 2019 Parliamentary Elections), of which 17% have a lot of confidence.

The highest level of confidence in the results of the Presidential Elections was noted among representatives of the ethnic majority (82% vs. 60% for ethnic minorities), young people (83%), those who voted in the elections (79%), and those who have been exposed to the civic education campaign (81%).

42% of the voters consider that the 2020 Presidential Elections were better organized and conducted than the 2019 General Local Elections.
### Trust in the results of the 2020 Presidential Elections

The level of trust in the results of the Presidential Elections directly correlates with the level of trust in the professionalism of the CEC and transparency of its activities: the higher the level of confidence in the professionalism of the CEC and transparency of its activities, the higher is the level of confidence in the election results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust in CEC</th>
<th>CEC Professionalism</th>
<th>Transparency of CEC Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not trust</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Attitudes and perceptions towards CEC**

**How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about CEC’s activity?**

As compared to the previous survey, the percentage of voters with a critical attitude towards the CEC is on a significant steady declining pattern: only 9% of voters are not satisfied with one or other CEC’s activity (compared to 18% in the previous survey) and 44% are satisfied in all respects (an increase by 11% from the previous survey).

![Bar chart showing attitudes and perceptions towards CEC's activity over time](chart.png)
How do you assess the transparency level of financing of ...?

Only 15% of voters consider that the financing is sufficiently transparent in the both cases (and only 1% believe it is fully transparent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political parties in the Republic of Moldova/Electoral candidates</th>
<th>Not at all transparent</th>
<th>Quite non-transparent</th>
<th>Quite transparent</th>
<th>Very transparent</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political parties in the Republic of Moldova/Electoral candidates</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election stations</th>
<th>Not at all transparent</th>
<th>Quite non-transparent</th>
<th>Quite transparent</th>
<th>Very transparent</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election stations</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civic education campaign
04. Civic education campaign

What sources of information about elections did you use?

97% had heard about/saw some general information about the 2020 Presidential Elections.

The top two sources of information about elections used by respondents are still TV shows and reportages (83%) and TV promotion spots (81%).

They are closely followed by social media (72%) and online media (71%).
Have you ever visited the following websites?

The survey demonstrated a slight increase (by 6% on an average, as compared to the previous survey) in the popularity of specialized institution websites. The website www.cec.md is still the most popular one – it has been visited by every fourth voter (two-fold of the level registered in the first survey). Specialized online resources are visited mainly by young voters (20% on an average for all 6 sources), persons with a high level of education (22%), representatives of the ethnic majority (14%), and respondents who have been exposed to the civic education campaign (14%).
Have you heard about awareness raising campaigns?

The civic education campaign “Vote responsibly! Vote safely!” was recalled by a significantly higher percentage of respondents (every second voter) than the electoral education campaign “Democracy Matters” (each fourth respondent).

80% of the respondents remembered the promotion spots urging voters to go to the polling stations (as compared to 65% in case of the General Local Elections).

The civic education campaign played a more significant role in driving them to vote in the Presidential Elections (29% mentioned being influenced to a major or very great extent) than in the previous elections (14% on an average): the spots strongly influenced the voter’s decision to go to the polling station in case of almost every third respondent.
How important is in your opinion continuous civic education about elections and the electoral processes?

88% of the respondents (an increase by 8% from the first survey) believed that continuous civic education in the electoral field is important: especially women, young people, highly educated voters and those who have been exposed to the information campaign.
Do you believe that continuous electoral civic education contributes to more active involvement of citizens in electoral processes?

84% of respondents (increased by 13 per cent compared to the first survey) are confident that continuous electoral civic education can contribute to a more active involvement of citizens in electoral processes.

The degree of conviction is significantly higher among respondents with high level of education (88%) and those who were exposed to the information campaign (85%).
Civic education campaign

Level of interest in being involved in the electoral process

4% of voters personally participated in training or voter information events organized by the CEC or CCET during 2018-2020.

One of each three respondents would be interested to participate in electoral information events.

33% of the respondents would like to be actively involved in the electoral process in various roles, but mainly as observers, volunteers or electoral officials.

Would you personally be interested in becoming more involved in the electoral process as a ...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2019 (W1)</th>
<th>2019 (W2)</th>
<th>2020 (W3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral official</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate's representative</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer in the delivering of electoral information</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge about the voting procedure
How well did you understand the voting procedure before the E-day?

90% of voters (compared to 63% in the first survey) confirmed that until the day of Presidential Elections they were well informed about voting procedure.

The level of knowledge is lower among people with low level of education (17%), rural residents (13%), those living in remote regions (11%), those who did not vote in the elections (32% vs. 7% of those who voted) and those who were not exposed to the civic education campaign (20% vs. 7% among those who were exposed).

However, only 12% of the respondents could list correctly all identity documents required to cast their ballot.
Knowledge about the voting procedure

Do you know that you had the right to ...?

10% of voters did not know they had the right to vote at home in case of illness, and 22% did not know they had the right to file to the Precinct Electoral Bureau of the polling station a request to vote in the Presidential Elections in a locality other than the one where they have their residence or domicile.

Those who do not know their voting rights are mostly persons with a low level of education (33%), rural residents (25%), whose who did not vote in the elections (41%), and those who have not been exposed to the civic education campaign (45%).

To vote at home, requesting a mobile ballot box, if you could not go to the polling station on the day of the Presidential Elections

To ask at the polling station to vote in the Presidential Elections in a locality other than the one where you have your residence/domicile
Do you know that you can verify your personal data in the voters’ lists?

50% of the respondents (a drop by 8%) knew about the possibility to verify their personal data in the electoral lists at the polling stations, and 32% (an increase by 5%) knew they could also do this on the CEC website.

The level of knowledge becomes higher in line with the level of education (from 19% for verification online and 37% for verification at the polling station in case of respondents with a low level of education to 52% for verification online and 64% for verification at the polling station in case of voters with a high level of education), but decreases with age (from 38% for verification online and 53% for verification at the polling station in case of young people down to 22% for verification online and 44% for verification at the polling station in case of the elderly). Respondents from urban areas are informed better than rural residents about all possibilities of verifying own personal data.
Conclusions and recommendations
Conclusions and recommendations

**Conclusion 1:**
The level of interest in becoming involved in the electoral process as volunteers, observers or electoral officials continues to be high (it has been expressed by almost every third respondent).

**Recommendation 1:**
To inform those who are willing to be actively involved in organizing the electoral process about the registration procedure, the tasks associated with these roles and the possible benefits.

**Conclusion 2:**
TV shows and TV promotion spots as well as social media and online media are the most popular sources of information about the elections.

**Recommendation 2:**
To continue promoting information events and their content through the most popular information channels considering the specifics of different socio-demographic groups.
Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusion 3:
On the one hand, a significant percentage of voters (17%) are actually residing in a locality different from the one where they have their residency or domicile; on the other hand, 22% do not know they have the right to submit a request to the Precinct Electoral Bureau of the polling station in order to vote in a locality different from the one where they have their residency or domicile.

Recommendation 3:
To intensify dissemination of the information flow about this right among voters; to streamline and facilitate the process of getting the right to vote in a locality different from one's locality of residence.

Conclusion 4:
The level of confidence in the transparency of financing of the electoral candidates and electoral campaigns registered among voters is very low: only 15% believe the financing is transparent.

Recommendation 4:
To strengthen the capacity of the CEC in terms of monitoring and controlling the financing of electoral candidates and electoral campaigns. To make the findings of such oversight available for the public.
Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusion 5:
The CEC has significantly improved its image among voters: the level of confidence in the professionalism, transparency and independence of this institution grew by 18% on average. This level of confidence directly affects the credibility of the election results: the level of confidence in the results of the Presidential Elections was significantly higher (31%) than in the 2019 Parliamentary Elections.

Recommendation 5:
To continue the implementation of the activities to promote the CEC image.

Conclusion 6:
Almost every third respondent who did not vote during elections was prevented from voting because of health problems or having to be at work on the E-day.

Recommendation 6:
To consider possible solutions or to facilitate the voting process in such situations in order to improve the turnout.
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