

VOTE



ရွေးကောက်ပွဲဆိုင်ရာ
ပြည်သူ့လှုပ်ရှားမှုအဖွဲ့
PEOPLE'S ALLIANCE FOR CREDIBLE ELECTIONS

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

July, 2019

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

July 2019



14, San Yeik Nyein Street 5, Kamayut Township, Yangon
www.pacemyanmar.org



E d i t o r

Win Nyi Nyi Zaw, Khin Nyein Chan

C o v e r D e s i g n

Myint Maung Kyaw

P h o t o g r a p h y

Pe Yar dwe

D e s i g n g r o u p

Treasure Publishing House

No. 142, 1st Floor, 47th Street,
Botahtaung Township, Yangon.

P r e s s

U Kyaw Htay Min

Aung Thein Than Printing House

No. 138, Bogyoke Aung San Road,
Yangon

B i n d i n g

Ko Tin Aye (Hlaing)

Content

About PACE	10
Acknowledgements	11
A. Introduction	12
B. Executive Summary	15
1. Civic and Political Engagement	19
1.1 Interest in Politics	19
1.2 Participation in civic activities	20
1.3 Political participation	26
2. Interpersonal Trust and Trust in Institutions	35
2.1 Interpersonal Trust	35
2.2 Trust in Institutions	37
3. Perception of the Current Situation of Myanmar	53
3.1 Right or wrong direction (Township)	53
3.2 Right or wrong direction (States/Regions)	54
3.3. Right or wrong direction (Country)	55
3.4 Reasons of right direction (Country)	56
3.5 Reasons of wrong direction (Country)	57
4. Performance of Hluttaws and the Representatives	59
4.1 Responsibility for introducing laws	59
4.2 Performance of Union Level Hluttaws	60
4.2.1 Oversight the works of government ministries	61
4.2.2 Passing legislation	62
4.2.3 Seeking advice of citizen and experts on legislation	63
4.2.4 Amending restrictive laws	64
4.2.5 Changing laws for businesses to operate easier	65
4.3 Performance of state/region Hluttaws	66
4.3.1 Oversight the works of government ministries	67
4.3.2 Passing legislation	68
4.3.3 Seeking advice of citizen and experts on legislation	69
4.3.4 Amending restrictive laws	70
4.3.5 Changing laws for businesses to operate easier	71

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

4.4	Performance of Pyithu Hluttaw MPs	72
4.4.1	Participation in parliament session	72
4.4.2	Introducing legislation in parliament	73
4.4.3	Cooperation with other MPs	73
4.4.4	Asking questions to the relevant ministers	74
4.4.5	Seeking advice from citizens and experts on legislation	74
4.4.6	Visiting constituency on a regular basis	75
4.4.7	Mobilizing development activities in the constituency	75
4.4.8	Citizens' expectations of Pyithu Hluttaw MPs	76
4.5	Performance of states/regions Hluttaw MPs	77
4.5.1	Participation in parliament sessions	78
4.5.2	Introducing legislation in parliament	78
4.5.3	Cooperation with other MPs	79
4.5.4	Asking questions to the relevant ministers	79
4.5.5	Seeking advice to citizens and experts on legislation	80
4.5.6	Visiting their constituency on a regular basis	81
4.5.7	Mobilizing development activities in the constituency	81
4.5.8	Citizens' expectations of state/region Hluttaws MPs	82
5.	Political Parties and their Performance	83
5.1	Political parties closer to citizens	83
5.2	Attitude towards political parties	88
5.2.1	National League for Democracy Party (NLD)	89
5.2.2	Union Solidarity and Development Party (USDP)	90
5.2.3	Shan Nationalities League for Democracy Party (SNLD)	91
5.2.4	Arkan National Party (ANP)	92
5.2.5	Mon National Party (MNP)	93
5.2.6	People's Party (PP)	84
5.3	Choice of candidates and political party	94
5.3.1	A woman candidate	95
5.3.2	A Younger candidate	96
5.3.3	A candidate with different religion	97
5.3.4	A candidate with different ethnicity	98
5.3.5	A candidate who was not living in the same township	99
5.4	Expectation on political parties	101
5.5	Tolerance toward the supporters of political parties	102
5.5.1	NLD party's supporters	102
5.5.2	USDP's supporters	103

5.5.3	SNLD party's supporters	104
5.5.4	ANP's supporters	105
5.5.5	AMP's supporters	106
5.5.6	People's party's supporters	107
6.	Elections	109
6.1	Voting in 2015 general elections	109
6.2	Intention to vote	109
6.3	Factors taken into consideration to vote for candidates	111
6.4	Factors preventing from voting	113
7.	IT Devices and Information Source of Government and Political News	117
7.1	IT Possession of Devices	117
7.2	Information source of government and political information	120
7.3	Most watched television channels	124
7.4.	Most read newspaper	128
7.5	Most listened radio channels	132
7.6	Most browsed online sources	136
8.	Demographics	139
9.	Methodology	141
10.	Survey Implementation	145
10.1	Recruitment and Training	145
10.2	Deployment	145
	Appendix	147
	Code of conduct	147
	Questionnaire	149
	Spot-checker form	173
	List of Table	56
	Table 1. Reasons of right direction in country	56
	Table 2. Reasons of wrong direction in country	58
	List of Figures	
	Fig. 1. Level of interest in politics (2015-19)	19
	Fig. 2. Interest in politics	20
	Fig 3. Civic participation over the last year	21
	Fig. 4. Citizens who participated in at least one activity over the last year	22
	Fig. 5. Level of civic engagement over the last three years	23
	Fig. 6. Level of participation in the activities of social service associations/groups	23

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Fig. 7. Level of participation in the activities of worker associations/groups	24
Fig. 8. Level of participation in activities of cultural groups	25
Fig. 9. Level of participation in activities of the sports groups	26
Fig. 10. Level of participation in political activities over the last year	27
Fig. 11. Citizens who participated at least in one political activity	28
Fig. 12. Level of political engagement over the last three years	28
Fig. 13. Citizens' participation in community gatherings	29
Fig. 14. Citizens' participation in meetings with government representatives/MPs	30
Fig. 15. Citizens' participation in civic education meetings or workshops last year	31
Fig. 16. Citizens' participation in signing petitions	32
Fig. 17. Citizens' participation in demonstrations and protests	33
Fig. 18. Interpersonal trust	35
Fig. 19. Level of interpersonal trust (2016–2019)	36
Fig. 20. Level of interpersonal trust	36
Fig. 21. Level of trust in different institutions	38
Fig. 22. Net confidence in institutions	39
Fig. 23. Level of trust in institutions (2016–2019)	40
Fig. 24. Trust in the State Counselor	41
Fig. 25. Trust in the President	41
Fig. 26. Trust in ward/village tract authorities	42
Fig. 27. Trust in township authorities	42
Fig. 28. Trust in religious leaders	43
Fig. 29. Trust in the Union-level Hluttaws	44
Fig. 30. Trust in the state/region Hluttaws	44
Fig. 31. Trust in the Military (Tamadaw)	45
Fig. 32. Trust in civil society organizations	46
Fig. 33. Trust in the Union Election Commission	46
Fig. 34. Trust in the Myanmar Police Force	47
Fig. 35. Trust in political parties	47
Fig. 36. Trust in United Nations	48
Fig. 37. Trust in Myanmar National Human Rights Commission	48
Fig. 38. Trust in the Anti-corruption Commission	49
Fig. 39. Trust in state-owned media	49
Fig. 40. Trust in private media	50
Fig. 41. Trust in the Courts	50
Fig. 42. Trust in Ethnic Armed Group Organizations	51
Fig. 43. Trust in Facebook	52
Fig. 44. Perception at the township level	53

Fig. 45. Perception at the state/region level	54
Fig. 46. Perception at the country level	55
Fig. 47. Who should be responsible for introducing legislation	59
Fig. 48. Perception of the performance of Union-level Hluttaws	60
Fig. 49. Union-level Hluttaws' performance overseeing the work of government ministries	61
Fig 50. Union-level Hluttaws' performance passing legislation that is good for Myanmar	62
Fig 51. Union-level Hluttaw's performance seeking advice of citizens and experts on legislation	63
Fig 52. Union-level Hluttaws' performance amending or abolishing restrictive laws	64
Fig 53. Performance of Union-level Hluttaw's performance changing laws to make it easier for business to operate	65
Fig. 54. Perception of the performance of state/region Hluttaws	66
Fig. 55. Performance of state/region Hluttaws overseeing the work of government	67
Fig 56. Performance of state/region Hluttaws passing law good for states/regions	68
Fig 57. Performance of state/region Hluttaws seeking advice from citizens and experts on legislation	69
Fig 58. Performance of state/region Hluttaws amending or abolishing restrictive laws	70
Fig. 59. Performance of state/region Hluttaws changing laws to make it easier for businesses to operate	71
Fig 60. Pyithu MP performance participating in Parliament session	72
Fig. 61. Pyithu MP performance participating introducing legislation in parliament	73
Fig. 62. Pyithu MP performance cooperating with other MPs	73
Fig. 63. Pyithu MP performance asking questions to the relevant ministers (Pyithu Hluttaw MPs)	74
Fig. 64. Pyithu MP performance seeking advice from citizens and experts	74
Fig. 65. Pyithu MP performance visiting their constituency on a regular basis	75
Fig. 66. Pyithu MP performance mobilizing development activities in the constituency	75
Fig. 67. Areas to be improved by Pyithu Hluttaw MPs	76
Fig. 68. Perception of the performance of Pyithu Hluttaw MPs (2017–19)	77
Fig. 69. State/region MP performance participating in parliament sessions	78
Fig. 70. State/region MP performance introducing legislation	78
Fig. 71. State/region MP performance cooperating with other MPs	79
Fig. 72. State/region MP performance asking questions to relevant ministers	79

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Fig. 73. State/region MP performance seeking advice from citizens and experts	80
Fig. 74. State/region MP performance visiting their constituency on a regular basis	81
Fig. 75. State/region MP performance mobilizing development activities	81
Fig. 76. Areas to be improved by state/region MPs	82
Fig. 77. Political parties that best represent citizens' interests (All Myanmar)	84
Fig. 78. Political parties that best represent citizens' interests (urban and rural)	85
Fig. 79. Political parties best representing citizens' interests (states and regions)	86
Fig. 80. Political parties best representing citizens' interests (Shan state)	87
Fig. 81. Political parties best representing citizens' interests (Yangon city)	87
Fig. 82. Citizen's attitudes toward different political parties	88
Fig. 83. Attitudes toward the National League for Democracy Party	89
Fig. 84. Attitudes toward the Union Solidarity and Development Party	90
Fig. 85. Attitudes toward the Shan Nationalities League for Democracy Party	91
Fig. 86. Attitudes toward the Arakan National Party	92
Fig. 87. Attitudes toward the Mon National Party	93
Fig. 88. Attitudes toward the People's Party	94
Fig. 89. Willingness to vote for a woman candidate by citizens who feel represented by political parties	95
Fig. 90. Willingness to vote for a younger candidate by citizens who feel represented by political parties	96
Fig. 91. Willingness to vote for a candidate with a different religion by citizens who feel represented by political parties	97
Fig. 92. Willingness to vote for a candidate with different ethnicity by citizens who feel represented by political parties	98
Fig. 93. Willingness to vote for a candidate not living in the same township by citizens who feel represented by political parties	99
Fig. 94. Citizens' overall willingness to vote for a party based on the nominated candidate	100
Fig. 95. Citizens' expectations of political parties	101
Fig. 96. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the National League for Democracy Party	102
Fig. 97. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the Union Solidarity and Development Party	103
Fig. 98. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the Shan Nationalities League for Democracy Party	104
Fig. 99. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the Arakan National Party	105
Fig. 100. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the Mon National Party	106

Fig. 101. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the People's Party	107
Fig. 102. Vote for Pyithu Hluttaw and other races during the 2015 elections	109
Fig. 103. Intention to vote	110
Fig. 104. Factors taken into consideration when decide to vote	111
Fig. 105. Top 10 factors taken into consideration for voting in the future (states vs. regions)	112
Fig. 106. The 10 most mentioned factors preventing citizens from voting (All Myanmar)	113
Fig. 107. Factors preventing citizens from voting (urban vs rural)	114
Fig. 108. Most mentioned factors preventing citizens from voting (states vs regions)	115
Fig. 109. Phone possession and internet accessibility (All Myanmar)	117
Fig 110. Phone possession and internet accessibility (urban and rural)	118
Fig 111. Phone possession and internet accessibility (states and regions)	118
Fig 112. Phone possession and internet accessibility (Yangon city)	119
Fig. 113. Most mentioned information sources for government and political news (All Myanmar)	120
Fig 114. Most mentioned information sources for government and political news (urban and rural)	121
Fig. 115. Most mentioned information sources of government and politics (states and regions)	122
Fig.116. Top five information sources for government and political news (Yangon city)	123
Fig 117. Most watched television channels (All Myanmar)	124
Fig 118. Most watch television channel (urban and rural)	125
Fig 119. Most watched television channel (States and regions)	126
Fig 120. Most watched television channels (Yangon city)	127
Fig 121. Most read newspaper (All Myanmar)	128
Fig 122. Most read newspaper (Urban and Rural)	129
Fig 123. Most read newspapers (States and Regions)	130
Fig 124. Most read newspaper (Yangon city)	131
Fig 125. Most listened radio channels (All Myanmar)	132
Fig 126. Most listened radio channels (Urban and Rural)	133
Fig 127. Most listened radio channels (States Vs Regions)	134
Fig 128. Most listened radio channels (Yangon)	135
Fig 129. Most browsed online source (All Myanmar)	136
Fig 130. Most browsed online source	137
Fig 131. Most browsed online source (States and Regions)	138
Fig 132. Most browsed online source	138

About PACE

The People's Alliance for Credible Elections (PACE) is an independent, non-partisan, non-government domestic election observer group founded in 2014 to strengthen democratic institutions in Myanmar through safeguarding citizen rights and promoting public participation in the electoral process. To promote transparency, accountability and inclusiveness in the electoral process, PACE works on civic and voter education, election observation and electoral reform.

Upholding the principles enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, PACE conducts its work regardless of race, religion and gender. Moreover, PACE has signed the Declaration of Global Principles for Nonpartisan Observation and Monitoring by Citizen Organizations,¹ which has been endorsed by more than 251 organization from 89 countries and territories, and is a member of the Global Network of Domestic Election Monitors (GNDEM).

For additional information, please visit www.pacemyanmar.org.

¹<http://www.gndem.org/declaration-of-global-principles>

Acknowledgements

PACE would like to express its deepest gratitude towards all enumerators and spot-checkers, who did a tremendous job throughout the whole survey process. Without the incredible effort of the 17 state and region coordinators, these operations would have not been possible. PACE also would like to extend its appreciation to the data center volunteers for their precision and carefulness, which allowed PACE to release these findings with confidence.

PACE would like to thank the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID/ UKaid) for its financial support, which allowed PACE to conduct this survey. PACE also would like to thank the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) for its incredible support, both technical and financial, which allowed PACE to conduct this survey in a timely manner.

A. Introduction

As the term of the current Hluttaws will expire on January 31, 2021, Myanmar is expected to conduct the next general elections in late 2020. Given the existing electoral legal framework, there is still need for legal reform if the elections are to meet democratic standards. For instance: the full election calendar, including election-day and other election related information such as candidates information and result, should be accessible to the public; citizen's participation, especially as election observers, should be legally protected; the Union Election Commission (UEC) should be independent; campaign regulations and campaign finance should be more specific and detailed; there should be greater transparency to ensure that the voter lists are updated and correct; and the advance voting process should be transparent and accessible to observers, party agents and the media.

The upcoming general elections will also be a political turning point in the country's political transition for multiple reasons. First, these will be the first elections held under the government led by the National League for Democracy (NLD), which was Myanmar's main opposition for the last three decades. Achieving successful and credible elections in 2020 would be the next step forward in Myanmar's democratic transition. Second, states-based political parties are merging into larger, more attractive parties, and other political actors are forming political parties. This would indicate that more political actors accept elections as the legitimate mechanism to gain political power. In the meantime, NLD's spokesperson announced that President U Win Myint and State Counsellor Daw Aung San Su Kyi will contest in the 2020 general elections. Given these circumstances, the upcoming 2020 elections are expected to be more competitive than the previous two national elections.

Even though this survey is related to the upcoming general elections, it is not a traditional pre-election poll. It is more about citizens' perception of the current situation in Myanmar, their expectations of the Hluttaws and MPs, their views and expectations of political parties, and their intention to vote. The People's Alliance for Credible Elections (PACE) conducted interviews based on a random nationwide sample covering all 14 states and regions. In addition, PACE conducted additional interviews in states to provide a more accurate picture of how opinions and expectations differ compared with people living in regions.

It is clear that Yangon city has a unique social, political and economic environment compared to other parts of the country. Therefore, in this survey, to be able to disaggregate Yangon city, PACE also drew an oversample in the 33 townships that comprise the Yangon municipal area. Similarly, among Myanmar's seven states, Shan has a more ethnically and politically diverse population, and a very different social and political situation than the rest of the states and regions. PACE also drew an oversample in Shan state to be able to gain a better understanding of its residents' opinions. However, because of the existing armed conflict in the state, five townships (Mongmao, Pangwaun, Narphan, Pangsang and Mongla) were not included in the oversample. In addition, there are also 35 locations where PACE's enumerators were not able to conduct interviews for security reasons. PACE included these findings as they might be useful to the government, political parties, civil society and other actors working in Shan state, with the caveat that readers to be careful when interpreting Shan state's findings given these limitations in data collection.

Chapters 1 and 2 include questions related to social capital, such as civic and political participation, interpersonal trust (generalized trust) and trust in institutions. In chapter 3, PACE probed citizens' perceptions of the current situation at the township, state/region and country level. Citizens were asked if they thought things at those three levels were heading in the right direction or wrong direction. PACE also asked citizens to explain the reasons why they thought things in Myanmar were going in the right or wrong direction. Chapter 4 covers the role and performance of both Union level Hluttaws and state/region Hluttaws, and the perception of the performance of Pyithu Hluttaw legislators and state/region MPs.

In chapter 5, PACE asked citizens if they could identify any political party that best represents their interests, as well as their perception of a subset of Myanmar's political parties. PACE also assessed whether their willingness to vote for a party would change depending on whom the party nominates as candidates. It would have been impractical to gauge citizens' views on the close than 100 parties registered with the UEC. For the purpose of this survey, PACE selected six parties, including those with more than five seats in Union-level Hluttaws, the two largest parties in state/region Hluttaws, and one politically unique party, as detailed in the table below. In this chapter, PACE also examined the level of citizens' political tolerance towards supporters of different political parties.

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Party	More than Five Seats in Union Hluttaws	Two Largest Parties in Regional Hluttaws	Political Background
National League for Democracy (NLD)	✓	✓	
Union Solidarity and Development Party(USDP)	✓	✓	
Shan Nationalities League for Democracy(SNLD)	✓	✓	
Arakan National Party (ANP)	✓	✓	
Mon National Party (MNP)		✓	
People's Party (PP)			✓

Chapter 6 focuses on citizens' intention to vote and their opinions on candidate qualifications. Chapter 7 explores how citizens obtain information on government and political news.

This is PACE's fifth nationwide public opinion survey since 2015. The purpose of conducting this kind of opinion polls is to aggregate and amplify the voices of ordinary citizens who would generally not be highlighted in the media. PACE believes that this information will be useful for government officials, political leaders, civil society organizations and international organizations to develop or formulate policies and implement projects in Myanmar.

B. Executive Summary

In March 2019, PACE conducted its fifth nationwide public opinion poll, Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020, covering 511 wards/villages in 233 townships. A total of 511 enumerators conducted 2,978 face-to-face interviews, including 782 in states, 544 in Yangon city and 428 in Shan state.²

As the country is one and half years away from the 2020 general elections, the survey questionnaire was designed to probe citizens' opinions or perceptions concerning the upcoming elections, such as citizens' preferences of candidates both in past and future elections, perceptions of different political parties, and the parties that best represent their interests. Moreover, the survey also assesses citizens' perceptions of the performance of both Union-level and state/region Hluttaws and MPs, and citizens' perceptions of the current general situation in Myanmar. The survey also includes core questions that PACE has asked since 2015, such as citizens' civic and political participation, their level of interest in politics, the level of interpersonal trust and trust in institutions.

Compared with the previous four surveys, there were more locations in states that PACE enumerators were unable to access to conduct interviews. Especially in Shan state, PACE could not access more than 10 locations during the fieldwork. Most of the time, the reason was an outbreak of armed conflict. There also were more locations where wards or village authorities initially did not allow PACE's enumerators to conduct the survey. However, in coordination with PACE's state/region coordinators, the enumerators eventually were able to conduct the interviews in some places. However, PACE was unable to conduct interviews in some locations.

² Five conflict-affected townships in Shan states (Mongma, Aungwaun, Marphan, Pangsang and Mongla) were not included in the Shan state oversampling.

The following sections include a summary of the survey findings.

Civic and political participation

To probe if there was any change in the level of citizens' interest in politics, PACE asked the same battery of questions as in previous surveys. About one third (34%) of citizens answered that they were interested in politics. Except from 2016, there was no significant change in the level of interest in politics over the last five years. To assess citizens' associational life and the level of participation in civic and political activities, PACE asked Myanmar citizens if they were involved in different groups of civic and political activities. Out of four types of civic activities -- cultural groups, sports groups, worker associations and social service groups -- more than half (56%) of citizens indicated that they participated in at least in one civic activity last year. There was no significant change in the level of civic participation over the last three years. The activities with most citizen engagement were those related to social service groups/associations.

Overall, nearly half (47%) of citizens indicated that they participated in at least one political activity over the last year, a level consistent with the last three years. Among political activities, attending community gatherings to seek solutions to the problems were the most popular with citizens (32%) over the last year. As in previous years, women were less likely to report having participated in civic and political activities.

Interpersonal trust and trust in institutions

Except for 2016, when there was a post-election increase, there have been no significant changes in the level of interpersonal trust in Myanmar. About one fourth (25%) of citizens indicated that they believed peoples can be trusted and, which is similar to the 2014 level of trust (21%) measured by The Asia Foundation³ in 2014.

Besides the interpersonal (generalized) trust, PACE also assessed the level of trust in different political institutions, leaders and entities. Citizens had the highest level of trust in the State Counsellor (70%) and the President (69%). Facebook (18%) had the least level of trust, followed by the ethnic armed organizations (EAOs) (21%). Compared with PACE's 2016 survey,⁴ the level of trust in religious leaders dropped significantly from 80% (2016) to 48% (2019). Except from a few institutions, there was a high frequency of "don't know" responses. Among those, the highest percentage of "don't know" responses were related to the National Human Rights Commission (50%).

³The Asia Foundation. 2014. MYANMAR 2014: Civic Knowledge and Values in a Changing Society

⁴People's Alliance for Credible Elections. 2016. Elections and Expectations of New Government

Perception of the current situation in Myanmar

People were more positive about the outlook in their immediate vicinity such as townships than in their states/regions or in Myanmar as a whole. While nearly half (44%) of the citizens stated that their townships were going in the right direction, only one third said the same regarding their states/regions (38%) and the country (37.3%).

Among those who expressed a positive view of the current situation in the country, citizens were most likely to credit improvements in infrastructure and government services (42%), better administration and governance (30%) and an improved economy (16%). Only 3% mentioned that rights and freedoms have improved, and less than 1% percent indicated that there is increased safety and security. Interestingly, those who indicated that the country was going in the wrong direction also pointed at weak infrastructure and government services (39%), issues with administration and governance (30%), a weak economy (17%) and issues related to peace and conflict (10%).

Performance of Hluttaws and legislators

Currently, most of Myanmar's legislation originates in the executive branch. However, half of the citizens (50%) indicated that *Parliament should be responsible for introducing and passing laws in consultation with government ministries, citizens and experts.* Only 8% supported the executive branch taking the lead.

However, only about one fourth to one third of citizens showed their satisfaction with the work of both Union-level and state/region Hluttaws as they carry out their fundamental tasks, with fewer people expressing satisfaction with the performance of state/region Hluttaws. However, there was a high rate of "don't know" responses to Hluttaw-related questions.

Most citizens expected their Union-level and state/region MPs to put more effort to understand their community issues and to ensure the quality of the development projects in their constituencies.

Political parties and their performance

The NLD (33%) was the most mentioned political party when citizens were asked to identify the party that best represented their interests and voice. However, more than half (51%) responded either "don't know" or that no party represented their interests. In states and regions, only 18% mentioned the NLD, but it was still the most mentioned political party.

When PACE asked citizens, what was their perception of each of the six parties included in the survey, more citizens expressed positive views toward the NLD (52%) than the other five political parties (ANP, MNP, PP, SNLD and USDP). Half of the citizens responded "don't know" when asked to rate their perception of ANP, MNP, PP and SNLD.

PACE also found that citizens were more sensitive to candidates' religion, ethnicity or lack of residency in the township than their age or gender. Citizens expected that political parties would "represent citizens' interests" (44%), "fulfill campaign promises" (27%) and "contribute to the peace process" (26%).

In terms political tolerance, citizens did not express much resistance towards neighbors with different political affiliation. However, more citizens indicated they are comfortable with strong NLD supporter as a neighbor (46%) than with supporters of other parties. Almost one-fifth of citizens (19%) expressed they would not feel comfortable living next to a strong USDP supporter.

Elections

About one fourth of citizens (23%) who reported having voted in 2015 indicated that they split their vote for different races among different political parties. About half of citizens showed that they would definitely vote if there general elections were conducted the following weekend, compared to an actual turnout of (69%) in the 2015 general elections, (37%) in the 2017 by-elections and (42%) in the 2018 by-elections. When deciding which candidate to vote for, voters were more likely to indicate that they would look at abstract qualities like ethics (49%) and involvement in social and public affairs (45%), rather than education, policies (10%) or political experience (14%). About one-fifth (19%) indicated that they would decide mostly based on their political party.

Among those who indicated that they might not vote in the 2020 elections, apathy (busy, not interested) was the main reason mentioned (30%). However, a small portion of the population mentioned that they would not vote because they did not have an ID (11%), they are not on the voter list (14%), or their assigned polling stations are too far to travel (8%).

IT related equipment and sources of government and political information news

While more than half of citizens (59%) responded that they possessed smart phone, 15% said they did not have mobile phone and internet access. Almost half of the citizens (47%) indicated that television was the main information source for government and political news, followed by radio (23%) and Facebook (20%). Newspapers and journals (15%) were the fourth mentioned information source for government and political news. It appears that the government news outlets were the most dominant information source for citizens to receive political news. MRTV, Myanmar National Radio and the New Light of Myanmar/The Mirror were the most mentioned government and political information sources, followed by DVB, BBC and 7 Days newspaper/journal. There was a considerable portion of the population who indicated that they don't watch TV (32%), listen to the radio (56%) or read newspapers (67%).

A large crowd of people is seen from behind, looking towards a bright area in the distance. The crowd is diverse in age and clothing, with some wearing hats and others carrying bags. The scene is outdoors, and the lighting suggests it might be a sunny day. The crowd is dense, and the perspective is from within the crowd, looking forward.

OPINION 1

Civic and Political Engagement

1. Civic and Political Engagement

1.1 Interest in politics

To identify any change in the level of citizens' interest in politics, PACE asked respondents the same question as in previous surveys. Respondents were asked to rate their level of interest in politics from “1” to “4,” where “1” is “not interested at all,” “2” is “somewhat not interested,” “3” is “somewhat interested” and “4” is “very interested.” About one third of the respondents (34%) indicated “interested” (10% “very interested” and 24% “somewhat interested”) (Fig. 1). There was no difference between urban (33%) and rural (35%) areas, but people from regions expressed more interest (37%) than those in states (29%). A same level of interest was recorded for people in Yangon city (31%). Men (42%) were more likely to indicate “interested” than women (27%) (Fig. 2).




Fig. 1. Level of interest in politics (2015–19)




Fig. 2. Interest in politics

1.2 Participation in civic activities

PACE has been measuring civic and political participation in Myanmar since 2015. To allow PACE to track any trends or changes over time, starting from 2017 respondents have been asked the same battery of questions. These include whether they participated in different types of civic groups' activities over the past year, such as cultural groups, sport groups, worker associations, and social services organizations or associations Fig. 3). Overall, more than half (56%) indicated that they participated in at least one of these activities over the last year (Fig. 4). The level of participation in civic activities did not change much over the last three years (Fig. 5).




Fig 3. Civic participation over the last year




Fig. 4. Citizens who participated in at least one activity over the last year




Fig. 5. Level of civic engagement over the last three years

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they had participated in the activities of social service groups over the last year, 39% of the respondents said "yes". There was no difference between urban (40%) and rural (39%) areas, or between states (36%) and regions (40%) (Fig. 6).




Fig. 6. Level of participation in the activities of social service associations/groups

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they had participated in the activities of workers groups over the last year, 24% of the respondents said "yes". There was no difference between urban (22%) and rural (25%) areas, or between states (22%) and regions (24%) (Fig. 7).




Fig. 7. Level of participation in the activities of worker associations/groups

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they had participated activities of cultural groups over the last year, 21% of the respondents said "yes". There was no difference between urban (19%) and rural (22%) areas, but participants from states (26%) reported a slightly higher level of participation than that from regions (20%). Men (24%) were more slightly likely to say "yes" than women (18%). While the same response of "yes" in Shan State (26%) was recorded, very few respondents (9%) from Yangon city said "yes" (Fig. 8).




Fig. 8. Level of participation in activities of cultural groups

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they had participated in activities of sports groups over the last year, 19% of the respondents said "yes". While, respondents from urban (24%) areas were more likely to indicate "yes" than those from rural (16%) areas, there was no difference between states (19%) and regions (18%). A similar response was recorded in respondents from Yangon city (14%). Younger respondents (18–35 years) (25%) were more likely to say "yes" than older respondents (above 35 years) (16%). Men (24%) were more likely to indicate that they participated in activities of sport groups than women (14%) (Fig. 9).




Fig. 9. Level of participation in activities of the sports groups

1.3 Political participation

PACE also measured the level of citizens' participation in different political activities. Since 2017, PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they participated in different political activities, such as community gatherings, meetings with government representatives or MPs, civic education meetings, signing petitions, or protests and demonstrations. Overall, 47% of the respondents indicated that they were involved at least in one of these activities over the last year (Fig. 9).

The level of participation in political activities also has not changed much over the last three years (Fig. 11).




Fig. 10. Level of participation in political activities over the last year




Fig. 11. Citizens who participated at least in one political activity




Fig. 12. level of political engagement over the last three years

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they had participated in a gathering to seek solutions to community problems, 32% said "yes". While there was no difference between states (36%) and regions (31%), respondents from rural areas (35%) were more likely to indicate "yes" than from those from urban areas (27%). Men (41%) were more likely to indicate that they had participated in community gatherings than women (23%). 20% of the respondents from Yangon city said they attended a community gathering over the last year (Fig. 13).




Fig. 13. Citizens' participation in community gatherings

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they had attended a meeting with government representatives or MPs over the last year, 25% answered "yes". Respondents from rural areas (27%) were more likely to answer "yes" than those from urban areas (19%), but there was no difference between states (22%) and regions (25%). Older respondents (above 35 years) (27%) were more likely to indicate "yes" than younger respondents (18–35 years) (18%), and men (30%) were more likely to say "yes" than women (19%). Only few respondents (13%) from Yangon city said they attended a meeting with government officials or MPs over the last year (Fig. 14).




Fig. 14. Citizens' participation in meetings with government representatives/MPs

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they had attended a civic education meeting, training or workshop over the last year, 13% answered "yes". There was no difference between urban (12%) and rural (14%) areas, or between states (16%) and regions (12%). There was no difference between younger respondents (18–35 years) (13%) and older ones (above 35 years) (13%). Men (15%) were slightly more likely to respond "yes" than women (11%). Only few respondents (9%) from Yangon city said they attended a civic education event over the last year (Fig. 15).



Fig. 15. Citizens' participation in civic education meetings or workshops last year

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they signed a petition over the last year, 11% answered "yes". There was no difference between urban (10%) and rural (12%) areas, or between states (12%) and regions (11%). There was no difference between younger respondents (18–35 years) (9%) and older respondents (above 35 years) (12%). Men (15%) were more likely to indicate "yes" than women (8%). Only few respondents (6%) from Yangon city said they signed petitions over the last year (Fig. 16).



Fig. 16. Citizens' participation in signing petitions

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they joined a protest or demonstration the previous year, very few respondents (6%) answered "yes". There was no difference between urban (7%) and rural (5%) areas, or between states (7%) and regions (5%). There also was no difference between younger respondents (18–35 years) (6%) and older respondents (above 35 years) (6%). Men (8%) were slightly more likely to respond "yes" than women (4%). Respondents in Yangon reported the same level of participation (5%) than regions in general (Fig. 17).




Fig. 17. Citizens' participation in demonstrations and protests



OPINION 2

Interpersonal Trust and Trust in Institutions

2. Interpersonal Trust and Trust in Institutions

2.1 Interpersonal trust

PACE has been measuring the level of interpersonal trust within Myanmar society since 2015. In this survey, one fourth of the respondents (25%) indicated that “most people can be trusted,” while majority of the respondents (66%) said they needed to be very careful when dealing with people (Fig. 18). The level of interpersonal trust slightly increased in this year (25%) compared to 2017 and 2018. However, trust is still below the level found in 2016, following the 2015 general elections (Fig. 19). There was no statistical difference between respondents in urban (22%) and rural (26%) areas. Men (27%) are more likely to indicate that “most people can be trusted” than women (22%), but there was no statistically significant different in the responses from those aged between 18 and 35 (23%) and older respondents (26%). There was no difference between respondents from states (27%) and from regions (24%), but respondents from Yangon (18%) were less likely to respond that people can be trusted (Fig. 20).




Fig. 18. Interpersonal trust




Fig. 19. Level of interpersonal trust (2016–2019)




Fig 20. Level of interpersonal trust

2.2 Trust in institutions

PACE also measured the level of citizens' trust in different State leaders and institutions, including the president and state counsellor, Hluttaws, courts, Union Election Commission, military (Tatmadaw) and police. PACE also captured citizens' trust in non-State actors, including ethnic armed organizations (EAOs), political parties, civil society organizations (CSOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs), religious Leaders and the media.

The persons or positions in which citizens had most confidence were the State Counsellor (70% "confidence", 10% "no confidence" and the President (69% "confidence", 10% "no confidence"), followed by ward/village administrators (59% "confidence", 20% "no confidence"), township administrator (49% "confidence", 19% "no confidence"), religious leaders (48% "confidence", 14% "no confidence"), Union-level Hluttaws (47% "confidence", 12% "no confidence"), state/region Hluttaws (46% "confidence", 13% "no confidence"), military (Tatmadaw) (44% "confidence", 22% "no confidence") and CSOs/CBOs (43% "confidence", 17% "no confidence").

Facebook was the institution with the lowest level of citizen confidence (18% "confidence" 37% "no confidence"), followed by EAOs (21% "confidence" 35% "no confidence")) and courts (30% "confidence" 35% "no confidence") (Fig. 20). The most recorded "don't know" responses were the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission (50%), the United Nations (48%), the Union Election Commission (47%) and the Anti-Corruption Commission (46%).

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020




Fig 21. Level of trust in different institutions




Fig. 22. Net confidence in institutions

Compared with PACE's 2016 survey, overall the level of confidence in different institutions dropped. For example, confidence in religious leaders dropped from 68% to 43%, in CSOs/CBOs from 59% to 35%, in the United Nations from 63% to 25%, in the Union Election Commission (58% to 38%), in political parties from 54% to 36%, in Union-level Hluttaws from 63% to 47%, in the police from 43% to 38% and in the President ⁵ from 79% to 69% (Fig. 23).




Fig. 23. Level of trust in institutions (2016–2019)

⁵ At that time of the 2016 survey, the President was U Htin Kyaw. U Win Myint was president when fieldwork was conducted for this survey.




Fig. 24. Trust in the State Counsellor




Fig. 25. Trust in the President




Fig. 26. Trust in ward/village tract authorities




Fig. 27. Trust in township authorities




Fig. 28. Trust in religious leaders




Fig. 29. Trust in the Union-level Hluttaws




Fig. 30. Trust in the state/region Hluttaws




Fig. 31. Trust in the Military (Tamadaw)




Fig. 32. Trust in civil society organizations




Fig. 33. Trust in the Union Election Commission




Fig. 34. Trust in the Myanmar Police Force




Fig. 35. Trust in political parties




Fig. 36. Trust in United Nations




Fig. 37. Trust in Myanmar National Human Rights Commission




Fig. 38. Trust in the Anti-corruption Commission




Fig. 39. Trust in state-owned media




Fig. 40. Trust in private media




Fig. 41. Trust in the Courts




Fig. 42. Trust in Ethnic Armed Group Organizations




Fig. 43. Trust in Facebook

OPINION 3

Perception of the Current Situation of Myanmar

3. Perception of the Current Situation of Myanmar

3.1 Right or wrong direction (Township)

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if things in their townships were heading in the right or wrong direction, nearly half (44%) said things were heading in the right direction, a small percentage (9%) responded "wrong direction" and around half (44%) responded "don't know." While there was no difference between "right direction" responses in urban (40%) and rural (46%) areas, urban respondents (13%) were slightly higher to say "wrong direction" than rural ones (7%). In Yangon city, while 39% responded "right direction", 11% answered "wrong direction" and 47% answered "don't know." There was no much difference between states (41% "right direction", 12% "wrong direction") and regions (45% "right direction", 8% "wrong direction") (Fig. 44).




Fig. 44. Perception at the township level

3.2 Right or wrong direction (states/regions)

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if things in their states or regions were heading in the right or in the wrong direction, about one-third (38%) responded "right direction" and 8% said "wrong direction." However, about half (51%) answered "don't know." Those in states (32% "right direction" and 11% "wrong direction") were slightly more pessimistic than those in regions (40% "right direction" and 7% "wrong direction"). When it comes to Yangon city, 37% of the respondents indicated "right direction" and 10% indicated "wrong direction" (Fig. 45).




Fig. 45. Perception at the state/region level

3.3. Right or wrong direction (country)

When respondents were asked whether they thought things in the country were heading in the right direction or in the wrong direction, about one third (37%) indicated “right direction,” 8% said “wrong direction” and half (50%) answered “don’t know.” Compared with surveys conducted by IRI in 2014 and 2017, there was a significant drop in the percentage of citizens’ who perceive that Myanmar is going in the right direction (88% indicated “right direction” in 2014⁶, 75% indicated “right direction” in 2017).⁷ Respondents in urban areas (37%) were as likely as those in rural areas (37%) to say that things were going in the right direction. However, citizens in urban areas (12%) were more likely to state that things were going in the wrong direction than those in rural areas (7%). Respondents from states (28%) were less likely to indicated “right direction” than from the regions (40%), and slightly more likely to indicate that things are going in the “wrong direction” (12% in states and 7% in regions) (Fig. 46).




Fig 46. Perception at the country level

⁶International Republican Institute, 2014, Survey of Burma Public Opinion

⁷International Republican Institute, 2017, Survey of Burma Public Opinion

3.4 Reasons of right direction (country)

PACE's enumerators asked those who indicated Myanmar is going in the right direction the reasons why. A large percentage (42%) indicated "infrastructure and government services," 30% "administration and governance" and 16% "economy." Smaller percentages said "peace and conflict" (4%), and rights and freedoms (3%). Less than one percent mentioned the constitution (0.6%) and security and safety (0.5%), and 32% said "don't know" (Table.1).

Infrastructure and Services	42%
Better education	36%
Better infrastructure	13%
Better healthcare	2%
Administration and Governance	30%
Good governance	10%
More decentralization	5%
Good leadership	5%
Government accountability	4%
Rule of law	3%
Good policies	3%
Decreased corruption	2%
Increased federalism	1%
Good administration	1%
Economy	16%
Local-level development	9%
Economic development	4%
Good job opportunities	2%
Peace and Conflict	4%
Peace	4%
Rights and Freedoms	3%
More freedom of expression	1%
More labor and minority rights	1%
Security and Safety	1%
Less crime	1%
Other	11.0%
Don't know	32%

Table 1. Reasons of right direction in country

3.5 Reasons of wrong direction (country)

PACE's enumerators asked those who responded that things are going in the wrong direction the reasons why. A significant percentage (39%) of the respondents said "bad infrastructure", 30% said "administration and governance", 17% said "economy", 10% said "peace and conflict", 3% said "constitution", 2% said "rights and freedoms" and "security and safety," and 23% said "don't know" (Table.2).

Infrastructure and Services	39%
Bad education	39%
Bad infrastructure	5%
Bad healthcare	1%

Administration and Governance	30%
No rule of law	8%
No government accountability	7%
Bad governance	6%
No discipline	5%
Bad leadership	3%
No federalism	3%
Higher corruption	3%
Bad administration	3%
Centralization	3%
Partisan bias	2%
Bad policies	1%

Economy	17%
Lower economic development	7%
No local development	5%
Fewer job opportunities	2%
Increased taxes	1%
Decreased agriculture	1%
Not good at human resources	1%
Land grabbing	1%

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Peace and Conflict	10%
Increased conflict	7%
No peace	3%

The 2008 Constitution	3%
-----------------------	----

Rights and Freedoms	2%
Less freedom of expression	1%
Less freedom of religion	1%
Fewer labor and minority rights	1%

Security and Safety	2%
Higher crime	2%

Other	11%
Don't know	23%

Table 2. Reasons of wrong direction in country

OPINION 4

Performance of Hluttaws and the Representatives

4. Performance of Hluttaws and Legislators

4.1 Responsibility for introducing laws

PACE's enumerators read two statements regarding who should be responsible for introducing laws and asked which statement they agreed with the most; "Government ministries should be responsible for introducing laws, and parliament should pass them with minimal changes" or "Parliament should be responsible for introducing and passing laws in consultation with government ministries, citizens and experts." Half of the respondents (50%) indicated that "parliament should be responsible for introducing laws" and a significant percentage (39%) responded "don't know" (Fig. 47).




Fig. 47. Who should be responsible for introducing legislation

4.2 Performance of Union Level Hluttaws

PACE's enumerators presented respondents different tasks of Union-level Hluttaws, such as overseeing the work of government ministries, passing legislation that is good for Myanmar, seeking the advice of citizens and experts on legislation, amending or abolishing laws that restrict civil and political rights, and changing laws to make it easier for business to operate. Enumerators asked respondents for their perception of the Hluttaws' performance by rating it from "1" to "5," where "1" is "very poor" and "5" is "very good". While about one third to one fourth of the respondents considered that Hluttaws performed "well," less than 10% rated their performance as "poor". However, one third to about half of the respondents answered "don't know" indicating low awareness of the work of parliament among citizens (Fig. 48),.




Fig. 48. Perception of the performance of Union-level Hluttaws

4.2.1 Oversight of the work of government ministries

When respondents were asked to rate the level of performance of the Union-level Hluttaws in overseeing the work of government ministries, 31% answered “good” and 9% rated “poor”. More than half did not give their rating (22% “neither” and 37% “don’t know”). There was no difference between urban (33% “good”, 10% “poor”) and rural (30% “good”, 8% “poor”) areas, but rural respondents (41%) were more likely to say “don’t know” than urban ones (29%). Respondents from states were less likely to indicated “good” (24%) and more likely to answer “don’t know” (45%) than respondents from regions (34% “good” and 34% “don’t know”) (Fig. 49).




Fig. 49. Union-level Hluttaws’ performance overseeing the work of government ministries

4.2.2 Passing legislation

When respondents were asked to rate how good or poor the performance of Union-level Hluttaws was in terms of passing legislation that is good for Myanmar, 28% of the respondents rated “good”, 10% rated “poor” and 42% answered “don’t know”. There was no difference between urban (28% “good”, 12% “poor”) and rural (28% “good”, 9% “poor”) areas, but rural respondents (45%) were more likely to say “don’t know” than urban ones (35%). Respondents from states were less likely to indicate “good” (20%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (49%) than from regions (31% “good” and 39% “don’t know”). In Yangon city, one-third (34%) of the respondents rated “good” and 30% answered “don’t know” (Fig. 50).




Fig 50. Union-level Hluttaws' performance passing legislation that is good for Myanmar

4.2.3 Seeking advice of citizens and experts on legislation

When respondents were asked to rate the performance of Union-level Hluttaws to seek advice of citizens and experts on legislation, 29% of the respondents rated “good”, 9% rated “poor” and nearly half (44%) answered “don’t know”. There was no difference between those rating the Hluttaw’s performance as “good” in urban (29%) and rural (28%) areas. However, those from urban areas (11%) are slightly more likely to rate the performance as “poor” than those from rural areas (8%), while rural respondents (48%) were more likely to say “don’t know” than urban ones (37%). Respondents from states were less likely to indicate “good” (21%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (52%) than from regions (31% “good” and 42% “don’t know”). In Yangon city, one-third (34%) of the respondents rated the performance “good” and 33% answered “don’t know” (Fig. 51).




Fig 51. Union-level Hluttaw’s performance seeking advice of citizens and experts on legislation

4.2.4 Amending restrictive laws

When respondents were asked to rate the performance of Union-level Hluttaws to amend or abolish laws that restrict civil and political rights, 24% of the respondents rated “good”, 9% rated “poor” and about half (47%) answered “don’t know.” There was no difference between urban (25% “good”, 11% “poor”) and rural (23% “good”, 8% “poor”), but rural respondents (51%) were more likely to say “don’t know” than urban ones (39%). Respondents from states were less likely to indicate “good” (17%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (55%) than from regions (26% “good” and 45% “don’t know”). In Yangon city, a quarter (27%) of respondents rated “good” and 35% answered “don’t know” (Fig. 52).




Fig 52. Union-level Hluttaws’ performance amending or abolishing restrictive laws

4.2.5 Changing laws making it easier for businesses to operate

When respondents were asked to rate the performance of Union-level Hluttaws to change laws that make it easier for businesses to operate, 28% of the respondents rated “good”, 10% rated “poor” and 43% answered “don’t know.” Urban (26%) and rural (29%) respondents were equally likely to rate the Hluttaws’ performance as “good”, but those in urban areas (13%) were slightly more likely to rate it as “poor” compared to those in rural areas (9%). Rural respondents (46%) were more likely to say “don’t know” than urban ones (36%). Respondents from states were less likely to indicate “good” (21%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (50%) than from regions (31% “good” and 40% “don’t know”). In Yangon city, one-third (31%) of the respondents rated the performance of the Union-level Hluttaws as “good” and 32% answered “don’t know” (Fig. 53).




Fig 53. Performance of Union-level Hluttaw’s performance changing laws to make it easier for business to operate

4.3 Performance of state/region Hluttaws

PACE's enumerators presented the respondents different tasks of state/region level Hluttaws, such as overseeing the work of state/region governments, passing legislation that is good for the states and regions, seeking advice from citizens and experts on legislation, amending or abolishing laws that restrict civil and political rights, and changing laws to make it easier for business to operate. The enumerators asked respondents to rate the Hluttaws' performance "1" to "5," where "1" is "very poor" and "5" is "very good". While about one third to one fourth of the respondents rated "good" and less than 10% rated "poor", one third to about half of the respondents answered "don't know" (Fig. 54).




Fig. 54. Perception of the performance of state/region Hluttaws

4.3.1 Oversight of the work of government ministries

When respondents were asked to rate the performance of state/region Hluttaws overseeing the work of the state/region governments, 28% of the respondents rated “good”, 11% rated “poor” and 40% answered “don’t know.” There was no difference between urban (28% “good”, 11% “poor”) and rural (27% “good”, 10% “poor”), but respondents from rural areas (44%) were more likely to say “don’t know” than those from urban areas (33%). Respondents from states were less likely to indicate “good” (21%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (46%) than those from regions (30% “good” and 38% “don’t know”). In Yangon city, 31% of the respondents rated “good” and 31% answered “don’t know”. In Shan state, 14% of the respondents rated “good” and 56% answered “don’t know” (Fig. 55).




Fig. 55. Performance of state/region Hluttaws overseeing the work of government

4.3.2 Passing legislation

When respondents were asked to rate the performance of states/regions Hluttaw to pass a legislation that was good for states and regions, 24% of the respondents rated “good”, 9% rated “poor” and nearly half (46%) answered “don’t know.” There was no difference between those rating the Hluttaws’ performance as “good” in urban (24%) and rural (25%) areas, but respondents from rural were less likely to say “poor” (8%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (50%) than urban ones (12% “poor”, 38% “don’t know”). Respondents from states were less likely to indicate “good” (18%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (52%) than from regions (27% “good” and 44% “don’t know”). In Yangon city, 29% of the respondents rated “good” and 35% answered “don’t know”. In Shan state, 13% of the respondents rated “good” and 60% answered “don’t know”. In Yangon city, 29% of the respondents rated “good” and 35% answered “don’t know”. In Shan state, 13% of the respondents rated “good” and 60% answered “don’t know” (Fig. 56).




Fig 56. Performance of state/region Hluttaws passing law good for states/regions

4.3.3 Seeking advice from citizens and experts on legislation

When respondents were asked to rate the performance of states/regions Hluttaws seeking advice from citizens and experts on legislation, 26% of the respondents rated “good”, 8% rated “poor” and nearly half (47%) answered “don’t know.” There was no difference in those who rated the Hluttaws’ performance as “good” between urban (25%) and rural (26%) areas. However, rural respondents were less likely to say “poor” (7%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (50%) than urban ones (11% “poor”, 40% “don’t know”). Respondents from states were less likely to indicate “good” (19%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (52%) than from the regions (29% “good” and 45% “don’t know”). In Yangon city, 30% of the respondents rated “good” and 36% answered “don’t know”. In Shan state, 15% of the respondents rated “good” and 59% answered “don’t know” (Fig. 57).




Fig 57. Performance of state/region Hluttaws seeking advice from citizens and experts on legislation

4.3.4 Amending restrictive laws

When respondents were asked to rate the performance of state/region Hluttaws amending or abolishing laws that restrict civil and political rights, 23% of the respondents rated “good”, 9% rated “poor” and about half (48%) answered “don’t know.” There was no difference between urban (22% “good”, 11% “poor”) and rural (23% “good”, 8% “poor”) areas, but respondents from rural (53%) were more likely to say “don’t know” than those from urban areas (40%). Respondents from states were less likely to indicate “good” (17%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (55%) than those from regions (25% “good” and 46% “don’t know”). In Yangon city, 24% of the respondents rated “good” and 38% answered “don’t know”. In Shan state, 12% of the respondents rated “good” and 60% answered “don’t know” (Fig. 58).




Fig 58. Performance of state/region Hluttaws amending or abolishing restrictive laws

4.3.5 Changing laws making it easier for businesses to operate

When respondents were asked to rate the performance of state/region Hluttaws to change laws that make it easier for businesses to operate, 28% of the respondents rated “good”, 9% rated “poor” and 44% answered “don’t know”. There was no difference in those responding “good” in urban (26%) and rural (28%) areas. However, rural respondents were less likely to respond “poor” (8%) and more likely to respond “don’t know” from rural (47%) than urban ones (12% “poor”, 38% “don’t know”). Respondents from states were less likely to indicate “good” (21%) and more likely to say “don’t know” (50%) than those from regions (30% “good” and 42% “don’t know”). In Yangon city, 28% of the respondents rated “good” and 36% answered “don’t know”. In Shan state, 15% of the respondents rated “good” and 57% answered “don’t know” (Fig. 59).




Fig 59. Performance of state/region Hluttaws changing laws to make it easier for businesses to operate

4.4 Performance of Pyithu Hluttaw MPs

PACE's enumerators read the respondents different tasks of Pyithu Hluttaw MPs, such as “actively participate in parliament sessions”, “introduce legislation in parliament”, “cooperate with other MPs”, “ask questions to the relevant ministers and other members of the executive”, “seek the advice of citizens and experts on legislation”, “visiting their constituency” and “mobilizing development activities in the constituency.” The enumerators asked respondents to rate the MP's performance from “1” to “5”, where “1” is “very poor” and “5” is “very good”).

4.4.1 Participation in parliament session




Fig 60. Pyithu MP performance participating in Parliament session

4.4.2 Introducing legislation in parliament




Fig. 61. Pyithu MP performance participating introducing legislation in parliament

4.4.3 Cooperation with other MPs




Fig. 62. Pyithu MP performance cooperating with other MPs

4.4.4 Asking questions to the relevant ministers




Fig 63. Pyithu MP performance asking questions to the relevant ministers (Pyithu Hluttaw MPs)

4.4.5 Seeking advice from citizens and experts on legislation




Fig 64. Pyithu MP performance seeking advice from citizens and experts

4.4.6 Visiting constituency on a regular basis




Fig. 65. Pyithu MP performance visiting their constituency on a regular basis

4.4.7 Mobilizing development activities in the constituency




Fig. 66. Pyithu MP performance mobilizing development activities in the constituency

4.4.8 Citizens' expectations of Pyithu Hluttaw MPs

PACE's enumerators also asked the respondents if they thought there were areas where their Pyithu Hluttaw MPs could improve to meet citizens' expectations. Almost half (47%) of the respondents indicated their MP "should do more to understand community issues", 30% said "they should inspect the development projects", 24% said "do more to understand national issues", 18% said "visiting constituency" and 12% mentioned "do more to understand lawmaking process" (Fig. 67).




Fig. 67. Areas to be improved by Pyithu Hluttaw MPs




Fig. 68. Perception of the performance of Pyithu Hluttaw MPs (2017-19)

4.5 Performance of state/region Hluttaw MPs

PACE's enumerators read the respondents different tasks of state/region Hluttaw MPs, such as "actively participate in the parliament session", "introduce legislation in parliament", "cooperate with other MPs", "ask questions to the relevant ministers and other members of the executive", "seek the advice of citizens and experts on legislation", "visit the constituency" and "mobilize development activities in the constituency." The enumerators asked respondents to rate their state/region MP's performance from "1" to "5", where "1" is very poor" and "5" is "very good").

4.5.1 Participation in parliament sessions




Fig. 69. State/region MP performance participating in parliament sessions

4.5.2 Introducing legislation in parliament




Fig. 70. State/region MP performance introducing legislation

4.5.3 Cooperation with other MPs




Fig 71. State/region MP performance cooperating with other MPs

4.5.4 Asking questions to the relevant ministers




Fig. 72. State/region MP performance asking questions to relevant ministers

4.5.5 Seeking advice to citizens and experts on legislation




Fig. 73. State/region MP performance seeking advice from citizens and experts

4.5.6 Visiting their constituency on a regular basis




Fig. 74. State/region MP performance visiting their constituency on a regular basis

4.5.7 Mobilizing development activities in the constituency




Fig. 75. State/region MP performance mobilizing development activities

4.5.8 Citizens' expectations of state/region Hluttaws MPs

PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they thought there were areas where their state/region Hluttaws MPs could improve to meet citizens' expectations. Almost half (46%) of the respondents indicated that they "should do more to understand community issues", 34% said that "they should inspect the development projects", 22% said they "do more to understand national issues", 17% said they should "visit their constituency" and 11% mentioned that they should "do more to understand the lawmaking process" (Fig. 76).




Fig. 76. Areas to be improved by state/region MPs

OPINION 5

Political Parties and their Performance

5. Political Parties and Their Performance

5.1 Political parties closer to citizens

Currently, there are more than 90 political parties registered with the Union Election Commission. In this survey, to understand the perception of citizens toward those political parties, PACE's enumerators asked the respondents to identify a political party which they thought best represents their interests, and to rate how likely they would vote for different candidates nominated by the parties closer to them.

When respondents were asked if there was a political party that best represents their interests, about half (50% where 16.3% responded "no party" and 34.5% "don't know") could not name any political party representing their interests. One-third (32.9%) mentioned the National League for Democracy, followed by the Union Solidarity and Development Party-USDP (5.5%), the Arakan National Party (1.8%) and Shan Nationalities League for Democracy (0.5%). An additional 15 parties were mentioned by less than 1.8% of respondents (Fig.77).

When it comes to urban (34% NLD, 4% USDP, 2% ANP), and rural (32% NLD, 6% USDP, 2% ANP and 1% SNLD) areas, the same political parties were mentioned except for SNLD, which got almost no mentions in urban areas (Fig.78).

There were differences in responses from states and regions. In states, besides the political parties mentioned in the national sample (NLD 18%, USDP 3.6%, SNLD 2.3%, ANP 6%), respondents mentioned more non-Bamar ethnic parties, such as PNO (1%), MNP (0.8%) and KPP (0.5%). In regions, only NLD (40%) and USDP (6.3%) received significant mentions. This reflects a significant difference in citizens who feel represented by the NLD in regions (39%) and states (18%). The same percentage of people in states (16%) and regions (16%) responded that no party represents their interests, but those in states (43%) were more likely to respond "don't know" than those in regions (32%) (Fig. 79).




Fig. 77. Political parties that best represent citizens' interests (All Myanmar)




Fig. 78. Political parties that best represent citizens' interests (urban and rural)




Fig. 79. Political parties best representing citizens' interests (states and regions)

In Shan state, the proportion of people who feel best represented by the NLD (16%) and USDP (4%) was similar as for states in general. However, the proportion of people in Shan who felt best represented by SNLD (8%) was higher. More than half (61%) did not mention any political party representing their interests (where 9% “no political party” and 53% “don’t know”) (Fig. 80). In Yangon city, only NLD (44%) and USDP (4%) were mentioned as political parties representing citizens' interests. Nearly half (47%) did not indicate any political party representing their interests (where 21% responded “no political party” and 26% “don’t know”) (Fig. 81).




Fig. 80. Political parties best representing citizens' interests (Shan state)




Fig. 81. Political parties best representing citizens' interests (Yangon city)

5.2 Attitude toward political parties

To understand citizens' perception of political parties, independently of which they feel best represents their interests, PACE asked citizens how they would rate their attitude towards six political parties from "1" to "5," where "1" is "very negative" and "5" is "very positive." PACE selected these among the 97 registered by focusing on those that won more than five seats in Union-level Hluttaws and the two biggest political parties in state/region Hluttaws. This list includes the NLD⁸, USDP⁹, SNLD¹⁰, ANP¹¹ and Mon National Party (MNP)¹². PACE also included the People's Party's (PP) given its unique political history and background (Fig. 82).




Fig 82. Citizen's attitudes toward different political parties

⁸ NLD won 255 seats in Pyithu Hluttaw and 135 seats in Amyotha Hluttaw

⁹ USDP won 30 seats in Pyithu Hluttaw and 11 seats in Amyotha Hluttaw

¹⁰ SNLD won 12 seats in Pyithu Hluttaw and 3 seats in Amyotha Hluttaw

¹¹ ANP won 12 seats in Pyithu Hluttaw and 10 seats in Amyotha Hluttaw

¹² MNP won 2 seats in Mon State Hluttaw

5.2.1 National League for Democracy Party (NLD)

When respondents were asked to rate their attitude toward NLD, about half (52%) indicated “positive,” 22% “neither positive nor negative” and very few (7%) rated “negative.” Respondents from regions (58%) were more likely to indicate “positive” than those from states (39%). When it comes to Yangon city, two-thirds (65%) of the respondents showed a “positive” attitude towards the NLD (Fig. 83).




Fig. 83. Attitudes toward the National League for Democracy Party

5.2.2 Union Solidarity and Development Party (USDP)

When respondents were asked to rate their attitude toward USDP, 26% of the respondents indicated “positive”, 19% said “negative” and 29% said “neither.” There were no differences between states (23% “positive”, 18% “negative”) and regions (27% “positive” and 19% “negative”). The respondents from Yangon city had similar responses (25% “positive”, 23% “negative”) (Fig. 84).




Fig. 84. Attitudes toward the Union Solidarity and Development Party

5.2.3 Shan Nationalities League for Democracy Party (SNLD)

When it comes to the SNLD party, 12% of the respondents indicated “positive”, 9% “negative” and 28% “neither.” Nearly half (48%) said “don’t know.” Respondents from states (positive 16%, neither 24%, negative 7%) were more likely to rate their attitude toward the SNLD as positive, while those in regions (positive 10%, neither 30%, negative 10%) were more likely to say “negative” or “neither”. In Shan state, a quarter of respondents (23%) rated SNLD as “positive” and 5% rated it “negative.” This rating was more positive and less negative than in states in general. Nearly half (44%) responded “don’t know,” similar to the rating in all states (Fig. 85).




Fig. 85. Attitudes toward the Shan Nationalities League for Democracy Party

5.2.4 Arakan National Party (ANP)

When it comes to ANP, 11% of the respondents indicated “positive”, 11% “negative” and about half (49%) said “don’t know.” The respondents from states were more likely to indicate “positive” (20%) and less likely to show negative attitude (6%) than from regions (7% “positive” and 13% “negative”). Responses from Yangon city (9% “positive”, 14% “negative”) were consistent with those from regions as a whole (Fig. 86).




Fig. 86. Attitudes toward the Arakan National Party

5.2.5 Mon National Party (MNP)

Nationally, 10% of the respondents answered “positive” and 10% said “negative” towards MNP, but half of the respondents (50%) said “don’t know”. Respondents from states were more slightly likely to say “positive” (13%) and less likely to say “negative” (7%) than those from regions (8% “positive”, 11% “negative”) (Fig. 87).




Fig. 87. Attitudes toward the Mon National Party

5.2.6 People's Party (PP)

Overall, 14% of the respondents answered “positive,” 7% indicated “negative” and almost half (49%) said “don’t know”. There were no differences between states (15% “positive”, 6% “negative”) and regions (14% “positive”, 8% “negative”). However, respondents from states (53%) were more likely to say “don’t know” than those from regions (47%). The positive (15%) and negative (9%) from Yangon city were consistent with regions as a whole. However, there seemed to be more awareness of the party in Yangon, as respondents were less likely to answer “don’t know” (34%) and more likely to have a neutral attitude (40%) (Fig. 88).




Fig. 88. Attitudes toward the People's Party

5.3 Choice of candidates and political parties

To those respondents who could identify a party that represented their interests, PACE asked a series of follow up questions to gauge whether they would be more or less likely to vote for that party depending on who they nominated as candidates. PACE included questions on potential candidates that were women, under 40 years of age, subscribing to a different religion, belonging to a different ethnicity, and residing in a different township. The respondents were asked to assess their likelihood to vote for those candidates between “1” and “5”, where “1” is “definitely would not vote” and “5” is “definitely would vote”.

5.3.1 A woman candidate

A vast majority of respondents (71%, where 37% “definitely would vote” and 34% “likely to vote”) said they would vote for a woman candidate nominated by the party they supported. Only 10% of respondents (where 6% “definitely would not vote” and 4% “likely would not vote”) said they would not vote, and 12% responded “undecided”. There were no differences between urban (76% “would vote”, 9% “would not vote”) and rural (69% “would vote”, 11% “would not vote”), or between men (72% “would vote”, 12% “would not vote”) and women (71% “would vote”, 8% “would not vote”). Respondents with high school or higher (81%) were more likely to say “would vote” than respondents with no high school (69%) (Fig. 89).




Fig. 89. Willingness to vote for a woman candidate by citizens who feel represented by political parties

5.3.2 A younger candidate

When the respondents were asked how likely they would be to vote if the party they felt represented by nominated a candidate under 40 years of age, two-thirds (69%) indicated “would vote” and 10% indicated “would not vote”. There were no differences in responses between urban (72% “would vote”, 10% “would not vote”) and rural (67% “would vote”, 10% “would not vote”), men (71% “would vote”, 12% “would not vote”) and women (67% “would vote”, 7% “would not vote”). Respondents with high school or more were more likely to respond “would vote” (77%), but equally likely to respond “would not vote” (9%) as those with no high school (67% “would vote”, 10% “would not vote”) (Fig. 90).




Fig. 90. Willingness to vote for a younger candidate by citizens who feel represented by political parties

5.3.3 A candidate with a different religion

When respondents were asked to rate how likely they would vote for the party they supported if it nominated a candidate with a different religion, about one fourth of the respondents (29%) indicated that they would vote (where 12% “definitely would vote” and 16% “likely would vote”) and about half (52%) responded that they would not vote (where 43% “definitely would not vote” and 9% “likely would not vote”). Respondents from urban areas were less likely to say “would not vote” (38%) and more likely to say “would vote” (43%) than rural respondents (59% “would not vote”, 22% “would vote”). There was no difference between men (49% “would not vote”, 32% “would vote”) and women (55% “would not vote”, 25% “would vote”). There was a significant gap between respondents with less than high school and with more than high school. While more than half (58%) of the respondents with less than high school said they would not vote for a candidate with a different religion and 22% said they would vote, about one third (32%) of respondents with more than high school said they would not vote for and half (52%) indicated that they “would vote” (Fig. 91).




Fig. 91. Willingness to vote for a candidate with a different religion by citizens who feel represented by political parties

5.3.4 A candidate from a different ethnicity

When respondents were asked to rate how likely they would be to vote for the party that represents them if it nominated a candidate from a different ethnicity, nearly half (46%) indicated 'would vote' (where 20% "definitely would vote", 27% "likely would vote") and about one third (33%) indicated "would not vote" (where 25% "definitely would not vote", 8% "likely would not vote"). Respondents from urban areas were less likely to say "would not vote" (23%) and more likely to say "would vote" (58%) than respondents from rural areas (37% "would not vote" and 40% "would vote"). There were no differences between states (37% "would not vote", 44% "would vote") and regions (32% "would not vote", 46% "would vote"). In Yangon city, 18% of the respondents from Yangon city indicated "would not vote" and almost two-thirds (62%) responded "would vote." There were no differences between Bamar respondents (32% "would not vote", 48% 'would vote") and non-Bamar respondents (34% "would not vote", 44% "would vote"). Respondents with no high school were more likely to say "would not vote" (38%) and less likely to say "would vote" (40%) than respondents with high school education (17% "would not vote", 66% "would vote") (Fig. 92).




Fig. 92. Willingness to vote for a candidate with different ethnicity by citizens who feel represented by political parties

5.3.5 A candidate not living in the same township

When PACE's enumerators asked respondents how likely they would vote for the party they feel represented by if it nominated a candidate who was not living in the same township, nearly half (45%) said that they would vote (where 19% "definitely would vote", 26% "likely would vote") and 29% indicated "would not vote" (where 22% "definitely would not vote", 7% "likely would not vote"). There was no difference between respondents from urban areas (51% "would vote", 25% "would not vote" and from rural areas (42% "would vote", 30% "would not vote"), or between those who responded "would vote" in states (42%) and regions (45%) but respondents from states (34%) are more likely to say "would not vote" than regions (29%). When it comes to respondents from Yangon city, almost two-thirds (61%) indicated "would vote" and 16% said "would not vote," indicating a higher willingness in Yangon to vote for those from other locations compared to regions in general (Fig. 93).




Fig. 93. Willingness to vote for a candidate not living in the same township by citizens who feel represented by political parties




Fig 94. Citizens' overall willingness to vote for a party based on the nominated candidate

5.4 Citizens' expectations of political parties

During the survey, PACE's enumerators showed several activities to the respondents and asked if, in their opinion, political parties in Myanmar were engaged in or conducting those activities, and whether they should do those (Fig. 95).




Fig. 95. Citizens' expectations of political parties

5.5 Tolerance toward the supporters of different political parties

Since 2017, PACE has included questions aimed to measuring the level of tolerance among Myanmar's citizens towards different groups of people. In its 2017¹³ survey, PACE asked respondents how comfortable they would be if their boss, or neighbor or the spouse of one of their siblings were Buddhist, Christian, Hindu or Muslim. In its 2018 survey¹⁴, PACE asked respondents if there were groups of peoples they would not want to have as neighbors, from drug addicts, alcoholics, and persons with criminal records to homosexuals or people with different religion or ethnicity.

This year's survey measures the level of political tolerance by asking how comfortable they would be if their neighbors were strong supporters of different political parties. Given the large number of registered political parties, PACE focused on the same six parties described in section 5.2 above: the NLD, the USDP, the SNLD, the ANP, the MNP and the PP.

5.5.1 Strong supporters of the National League for Democracy Party

During the interview, PACE's enumerators asked respondents how comfortable they would be if their neighbors were strong supporters of the NLD. Nearly half of the respondents (46%) said "comfortable" (where 24% of very comfortable, 22% of somewhat comfortable, 22% "neither"). While 35% of the respondents from states indicated "comfortable", 14% "not comfortable" and 29% "don't know", about half of the respondents (51%) from regions indicated "comfortable" (Fig 96).




Fig. 96. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the National League for Democracy Party

¹³People's Alliance for Credible Elections, 2017; Citizens' Democratic Aspirations

¹⁴People's Alliance for Credible Elections, 2018; Citizens' Mid-term Perception on Government Performance

5.5.2 Strong supporters of the Union Solidarity and Development Party

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents how comfortable they would be if their neighbors were strong supporters of USDP, about one fourth of the respondents (27% where 12% "very comfortable" and 16% "somewhat comfortable") said they were "comfortable" and 19% (12% not comfortable at all, 7% somewhat uncomfortable) responded "uncomfortable". Respondents from regions (29%) were more likely to say "comfortable" than those from states (23%) (Fig. 97).




Fig.97. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the Union Solidarity and Development Party

5.5.3 Strong supporters of the Shan Nationalities League for Democracy Party

When it comes to having strong supporters of SNLD party as neighbors, 16 % of respondents (6% “very comfortable” and 10% “somewhat comfortable”) said “comfortable”, 13% indicated “not comfortable” (9% “not at all comfortable” and 4% “somewhat uncomfortable”) and nearly half (45%) said “don’t know”. There was no difference between responses from states (18% “comfortable” and 15% “not comfortable”) and regions (16% “comfortable” and 14% “not comfortable”). As the SNLD is based in Shan state, more respondents (25%) from Shan state indicated “comfortable.” However, there was a still a sizable response of “don’t know” (46%) from Shan state (Fig.98).




Fig. 98. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the Shan Nationalities League for Democracy Party

5.5.4 Strong supporters of the Arkan National Party (ANP)

When respondents were asked to rate how comfortable they would be if their neighbors were strong supporter of ANP, 15% indicated ‘comfortable’ (where 6% “very comfortable” and 9% “somewhat comfortable”), 14% indicated “not comfortable” (where 10% “not at all comfortable” and 4% “somewhat uncomfortable”) and nearly half (47%) responded “don’t know.” There were no differences between respondents from states (19% “comfortable” and 13% “uncomfortable”) and regions (14% “comfortable” and 15% ‘uncomfortable’). While 13% of the respondents from Yangon city indicated “comfortable”, 19% indicated “not comfortable” (Fig. 99).




Fig. 99. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the Arakan National Party

5.5.5 Strong supporters of the Mon National Party (MNP)

When it comes to the MNP, 15% of the respondents indicated “comfortable” (where 6% “very comfortable” and 9% “somewhat comfortable”), 14% “not comfortable” (where 10% “not at all comfortable” and 4% “somewhat uncomfortable”), and almost half (48%) “don’t know.” There were no differences between respondents from states (16% “comfortable” and 15% “not comfortable”) and regions (15% “comfortable” and 14% “not comfortable”) (Fig. 100).




Fig. 100. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the Mon National Party

5.5.6 Strong supporter of the People's party (PP)

When it comes to the PP, 19% of the respondents indicated “comfortable” (where 8% “very comfortable” and 11% “somewhat comfortable”), 11% “not comfortable” (where 7% “not at all comfortable” and 4% “somewhat uncomfortable”), and almost half (47%) “don’t know.” There were no different between the respondents from states (19% “comfortable” and 13% “not comfortable”) and regions (20% “comfortable” and 10% “not comfortable”) (Fig. 101).




Fig. 101. Level of comfort with strong supporters of the People's Party

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020



OPINION 6

Elections

6. Elections

6.1 Voting in the 2015 general elections

When PACE's enumerators asked the respondents if they had voted in the 2015 general elections, 77% said they did. More than half (59%) of those who said they'd voted also indicated they cast their vote for the same party in all races, and nearly one fourth (23%) said they did not vote the same party in other race as they did for Pyithu Hluttaw (Fig. 102).




Fig 102. Vote for Pyithu Hluttaw and other races during the 2015 elections

6.2 Intention to vote

In the last two by-elections, the voter turnouts were much less than in the 2015 general elections (37% in 2017 and 42% in 2018). To understand citizens' intention to vote in 2020, PACE's enumerators asked citizens how likely they would be to vote if there were general elections the following weekend. Respondents were asked to rate their vote intention from "1" to "5", where "1" is "would definitely not vote" and "5" is "definitely would vote". Prior research in other countries indicates that taking into consideration those who respond they would definitely vote are a better predictor of actual turnout than including those who are not certain.

Around half (48%) of survey respondents indicated that they “would definitely vote.” While there was no difference between the “would definitely vote” responses from urban (50%) and rural (47%) areas, respondents from states (32%) were less likely to say “definitely would vote” than those from regions (53%). There was no difference in “definitely would vote” responses from Men (52%) were more likely to indicated that they definitely would vote than women (45%). Responses from Yangon city (51% would definitely vote) were consistent with those of regions in general; similarly, responses from Shan state (30% definitely would vote) were consistent with states in general. (Fig. 103).




Fig. 103. Intention to vote

6.3 Factors taken into consideration when selecting a candidate

PACE's enumerators asked the respondents what were the main factors taken into consideration when deciding which candidates to vote for in 2015 and the factors they would take consideration if they were to vote in the future (Fig 104).




Fig. 104. Factors taken into consideration when decide to vote




Fig. 105. Top 10 factors taken into consideration for voting in the future (states vs. regions)

6.4 Factors preventing citizens from voting

When the PACE's enumerators asked those respondents who did not have intention to vote in the future what factors would cause them not to vote, the following were the top 10 factors preventing them from voting (Fig. 106).




Fig 106. The 10 most mentioned factors preventing citizens from voting (All Myanmar)




Fig. 107. Factors preventing citizens from voting (urban vs rural)





Fig. 108. Most mentioned factors preventing citizens from voting (states vs regions)

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020



OPINION 7

IT Devices and Information Source of Government and Political News

7. IT Devices and Information Sources of Government and Political News

7.1 Possession of IT Devices

When PACE’s enumerators asked the respondents if they possessed devices to connect to the internet. More than half (59%) answered that they possessed smart phone, 17% indicated feature-phone, 3% said they had internet access at their home, 2% said they can access internet in their community, and 15% of the respondents indicated that they did not possessed any of these devices (Fig. 117).




Fig. 109. Phone possession and internet accessibility (All Myanmar)




Fig 110. Phone possession and internet accessibility (urban and rural)




Fig 111. Phone possession and internet accessibility (states and regions)




Fig 112. Phone possession and internet accessibility (Yangon city)

7.2 Information sources of government and political information

When PACE's enumerators asked respondents they usually receive information on government and politics, around half (47%) indicated "Television," followed by "Radio" (23%), "Facebook" (20%) and "Newspapers/Journals" (15%) (Fig. 113).




Fig. 113. Most mentioned information sources for government and political news (All Myanmar)




Fig 114. Most mentioned information sources for government and political news (urban and rural)




Fig. 115. Most mentioned information sources of government and politics (states and regions)




Fig.116. Top five information sources for government and political news (Yangon city)

7.3 Most watched television channels




Fig 117. Most watched television channels (All Myanmar)




Fig 118. Most watch television channel (urban and rural)




Fig 119. Most watched television channel (States and regions)




Fig 120. Most watched television channels (Yangon city)

7.4 Most read newspaper




Fig 121. Most read newspaper (All Myanmar)




Fig 122. Most read newspaper (Urban and Rural)




Fig 123. Most read newspapers (States and Regions)




Fig 124. Most read newspaper (Yangon city)

7.5 Most listened radio channels




Fig 125. Most listened radio channels (All Myanmar)




Fig 126. Most listened radio channels (Urban and Rural)




Fig 127. Most listened radio channels (States Vs Regions)




Fig 128. Most listened radio channels (Yangon)

7. 6 Most browsed online sources




Fig 129. Most browsed online source (All Myanmar)




Fig 130. Most browsed online source




Fig 131. Most browsed online source (States and Regions)




Fig 132. Most browsed online source



Demographics

8. Demographics

Gender	National	Yangon	Shan
Men	50%	49%	50%
Women	50%	51%	50%

Area	National	Yangon	Shan
Urban	32 %	91%	26%
Rural	68%	9%	74%

Geography	National	Yangon	Shan
States	28%	0%	100%
Regions	72%	100%	0%


Age	National	Yangon	Shan
18-35	28%	29%	37%
36+	72%	71%	63%

Ethnicity	National	Yangon	Shan
Bamar	68%	87%	10%
Other Ethnicities	32%	13%	90%

Religion	National	Yangon	Shan
Buddhist	91%	94%	86%
Other Religions	9%	6%	14%

Education	National	Yangon	Shan
No High School	77%	51%	87%
High School or More	23%	49%	13%

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020



Methodology

9. Methodology

To better understand public opinion on citizen's political preferences for 2020, PACE surveyed citizens of Myanmar who were 18 and above at the time of the survey. To capture the opinions across Myanmar, PACE conducted the survey in all states and regions. The survey was conducted in a total of 511 villages and wards in 233 townships. The survey involved face-to-face interviews with 2,978 respondents in total, including 2,320 from the national sample, 782 respondents from the states sample, 544 from the Yangon city sample and 428 from the Shan State sample.

The survey was conducted according to internationally recognized methods of random statistical sampling as detailed below.

Step 1: Stratification by township. Using data from the 2018 population projection by Myanmar Population and Housing Census, PACE calculated the proportion of adult population in each township and allocated the same proportion of survey locations in that township.

Step 2: Stratification by urban and rural. Using population information described above, PACE calculated the proportion of urban and rural population within each township. Based on the proportion within each township, PACE allocated the same proportion of survey locations between urban wards and rural villages.

Step 3: Random sample of villages and wards. Based on the allocations for each township and allocations for urban and rural locations, PACE selected wards and villages using simple random sampling. PACE used a list of wards and villages in each township compiled by the Myanmar Information Management Unit (MIMU) as a sampling frame. A total of 562 villages and wards were selected as target survey locations for the sample, including 417 in the nationwide sample, and an additional 145 in oversamples in states, Yangon city and Shan State.

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Sample	National Sample	States Oversample	Yangon City Oversample	Shan State Oversample	Total Locations
National	417				417
States	115	52			167
Yangon City	50		51		101
Shan State	41	18		42	101
Overall	417	52	51	42	562

Step 4: Random household selection. Trained enumerators traveled to survey locations where they randomly selected households using a random walk sampling method beginning in a randomly selected starting point. Enumerators selected every 10th residence in rural locations (villages) and every 20th residence in urban locations (wards).

Step 5: Random respondent selection. Once a household had been selected, PACE enumerators randomly selected a resident (male and female alternatively) of that household who was over 18 and a citizen of Myanmar. Respondents were selected using the “lucky draw” method. In total, each PACE enumerator was tasked to interview five (6) respondents in each village/ward location.

Step 6: Analysis. Following data collection, the data was weighted by non-response in state/region and rural/urban to bring the realized sample in line with the actual distribution in Myanmar. PACE was unable to conduct 6% of the planned interviews, mainly due to lack of access to conflict areas in, Kachin, Karen, Rakhine, Mon, and eastern and northern Shan states. There may be slight variation between numbers presented due to rounding where the difference is never greater than one percent.

PACE SURVEY OVERVIEW	
Estimated adult population in Myanmar(2018 population projection)	35,936,740
Number of Interviews for Analysis	National Sample: 2,320 States sample: 782 Yangon city sample: 544 Shan State sample: 428
Maximum Margin of Error (national sample) (at 95% level of confidence)	National sample: +/- 2.1% State sample: +/- 3.5% Yangon sample: +/- 4.2% Shan sample: +/- 4.8%
Deployment	March 1 to 3, 2019

The maximum margin of error will increase for any sub-groups analysis: +/- 3.5 percent for state/region responses; +/- 3.5 percent for urban/rural, and +/- 2.9 percent for gender. The actual margin of error is different for each question and option.

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020



Survey Implementation

10. Survey Implementation

10.1 Recruitment and Training

The 2019 survey on “Citizen’s Political Preferences for 2020” was the fifth nationwide survey conducted by PACE. To carry out the survey, PACE recruited and trained 511 volunteers to carry out the survey by randomly selecting households, conducting interviews and returning questionnaires to PACE. Twenty-one enumerator trainings were conducted in seven locations; Lashio, Mandalay, Mawlamyine, Sittwe, Tachileik, Taunggyi as well as Yangon, and included interview role-plays and practical exercises in household and respondent selection.

Additionally, 17 state/region coordinators were assigned to oversee the work of enumerators. PACE has recruited 50 spot-checkers, trained for one day in Yangon and deployed March 4 to 5, 2019 to assess the quality of the interviews.

All PACE survey volunteers signed a Code of Conduct and confidentiality pledge.

10.2 Deployment

PACE enumerators deployed to conduct the survey on March 1 to 3, 2019. During deployment, PACE enumerators were supervised and assisted by 17 PACE state and regional coordinators around the country and by PACE’s core team in Yangon.

In nearly all locations, PACE was able to deploy with little difficulty. However, in 51 locations PACE enumerators were unable to deploy or conduct surveys according to the procedures. In 42 locations (three in Kachin, one in Karen, one in Mon, five in Rakhine, and thirty-two in Shan), this was due to security concerns. Out of nine locations, in five locations, local authorities did not allow PACE’s enumerators to conduct the interviews, in one case, the village no longer existed, and in three locations, enumerators did not conduct the interviews.

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

A gray vertical bar is positioned on the left side of the page. A dark gray rectangular label is attached to the right side of this bar, with its top-left corner folded over. The word "Appendix" is written in white, bold, sans-serif font on the label.

Appendix

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Code of Conduct



Code of Conduct and Statement of Confidentiality

I, _____ (print name), agree to work as an enumerator for the PACE Survey of Citizens' Political Preference for 2020" and hereby pledge to work on in accordance with the guidelines and restrictions specified as follow:

1. I will attend all part of training sessions, participate in the fieldwork, and fully understand my duties as an enumerator;
2. I will not engage in any activities that could be construed as interest for a political party, either directly or indirectly;
3. I will execute my duties professionally, impartially, accurately and timely;
4. That I will not write or speak out or violate any discrimination against race, religion, gender via social media while conducting my PACE duties
5. I agree to treat as confidential all information obtained while working on this survey and I will keep information confidential during and after my assignment
To fulfill confidentiality obligations, I will:
 - a. Only discuss confidential survey information with authorized PACE staff
 - b. Store and safeguard confidential survey information as specified by survey protocols
 - c. Not photocopy or record by any other means any confidential survey
 - d. Not in any way compromise the confidentiality of survey participants
 - e. Not allow access to any confidential survey information to unauthorized persons
 - f. I will report any lost or misplaced of confidential survey information to my Coordinator immediately.
6. That I further vow to resign from my role as an enumerator if I should develop any conflicts of interest that would hinder me from fulfilling impartially, accurately and in a timely manner my activities or in case of breaching the PACE Code of Conduct.

I understand that compliance with the terms of this agreement is a condition of my employment agreement with PACE and that failure to comply with these terms may result in termination of the employment agreement between me and the PACE.

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Date: _____

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Questionnaire



PACE Survey Questionnaire Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

To be completed by PACE Office:

Form Number					

Data Clerk 1	

Data Clerk 2	

To be completed by Enumerator

B	Enumerator Name				G	Township	
C	Enumerator Phone Number				H	Ward/ Village tract	
D	Enumerator ID				I	Village	
E	Location type	Urban (1)	Rural (2)		K	PACE Location ID	
F	State/Region				M	Respondent No. (1-6)	

Household Visits	HH 1	HH 2	HH 3	HH 4	HH 5	HH 6	HH 7
Numbers from the interval process	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Completed interview	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Partly completed interview	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Reason for failure:							
Refused to be interviewed	99	99	99	99	99	99	99
Person selected was never at home after at least two visits	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Household/ premises empty for survey period after at least two visits	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Not a citizen/ spoke only a foreign language	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Deaf/ did not speak a survey language	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
No adults in household	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Other [specify] _____	8	8	8	8	8	8	8

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Step 1: Verifying the selected village or ward

- Please make sure that you arrived at the right village or ward.

Step 2: Selecting a starting point in the village

- Know the boundaries of your assigned village or ward, draw a sketch of it. You are not allowed to interview people from outside/ different village or ward.
- Know your starting point. If your PACE Location ID is an odd number (1, 3, 5, 7, 9), pick a start location from the boundaries (edge of the village/ward). If your PACE Location ID is an even number (0, 2, 4, 6, 8), start from the landmark at the center of the village/ward.
- Mark the starting point with a large X on the village/ward map sheet and write down the exact address of the landmark where you started in the map information form.

Step 3: Selecting a random household:

- It is your job to select a random household. A household is a group of people who presently eat together from the same pot.
- Stand facing the landmark building, turn to your right side and begin walking. Start counting houses/residences using intervals. Use a 10 (for rural village) or 20 (for urban ward) interval pattern to select a household. Make sure to count each house and residence from both the left and the right of the road.
- Draw a sketch map of your walk & buildings in the map information form. Identify the houses that you have selected and write down the address.
- If you reach the boundary of the village/ward and there are no more houses, turn to your right and keep walking, continuing to count until finding the tenth or twentieth dwelling, depending on the interval you're using. If there is no right turn, then turn left.

Step 4: Approach the household and introduce yourself

The household accepts the introduction;

When you find a household with someone home, please introduce yourself using the following script. You must learn this introduction so that you can say it exactly as it is written below.

Good day. My name is _____, I am from the People's Alliance for Credible Elections (PACE), a non-partisan civil society organization. I do not represent the government or any political party. We are doing a survey of Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020. We would like to ask a few questions to a member of your household to get his or her opinions. This survey should take about 45 minutes to complete.

Every person in the country has an equal chance of being included in this study. All information will be kept confidential. Your responses will be put together with the responses of over 3,300 other people we are talking to, to get an overall picture of people's opinions throughout the country. It will be impossible to pick you out from what you say, so please feel free to tell us what you think. There is no penalty for refusing to participate and you can refuse to answer any question if you want to or stop the interview at any time. There are no direct benefits to taking part but no risks either, or we hope that by contributing to this survey you will contribute to Myanmar's transition to democracy. There are no right or wrong answers. Do you wish to proceed? Your household has been chosen by chance, and we would like to choose an adult 18 years and above from your household also by chance. Would you help us pick one?

If participation is refused, or a visit is unsuccessful, walk away from the household, write your interval and circle the correct code in the table "Household Visits" in your questionnaire. Go to the next household using the interval to select the next household.

If consent is secured, proceed to Step 5 Respondent Selection.

Step 5: Identifying eligible respondents

Interviewer: Within the household, it is your job to randomly select an individual who is 18 years or older. This individual becomes the interview Respondent. Ask for the names of adults in the household by saying:

N	This interview must be with a If this is your first interview in this location, please follow the instructions from the packet	Male (1)	Female (2)	N
---	---	-------------	---------------	---

Please tell me the names of all adult males/ females [select correct gender] who are citizens of Myanmar, and who presently live in this household. I only want the names of males/ females [select correct gender] who are 18 years and older (including yourself). Please tell me their names even if they are not currently home but who will return to the house later in today or by tomorrow March 2 or the day after tomorrow March 3.

A household is a group of people who presently eat together from the same pot. Could you please list those adults from oldest to youngest?

[Interviewer: If this interview must be with a female, list only women's names. If this interview is with a male, list only men's names. List all eligible household members of this gender who are 18 years or older, even those not presently at home but will return to the house during your deployment period. The name of the head of the household will be used for back-check.]

Name of the Head of Household:	
Names	
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

Step 6: Asking permission for an interview

If the selected respondent is the same person that you first met, start the interview

If the selected respondent is not the same person that you first met, repeat Introduction:

if the selected respondent is not at the home by that time, please ask "Will this person return here at any time today [or tomorrow or the day after tomorrow]? then make appointment in convenient time and return the household again when he/she come back.

if this respondent will not come back during the survey period, circle the correct code in the table "Household Visits" in your questionnaire. Go to the next household using the interval to select the next household.

To continue with the interview, the person must give his or her informed consent by answering positively.

P Date of interview

[Interviewer: Enter day and month. Here is an example how to enter in. If the interview is on 5 November 2017, then you enter 05 in day and 11 in month. Please use English numbers.]

Day		Month	

Q Time when the interview started

[Interviewer: Enter hour and minutes, use 12 hr. format and be exact. Please use English numbers]

Hour		Minute			
				☐	AM
				☐	PM

R Male/Female

[Interviewer: Do not ask. Enter whether respondent is male or female.]

Male	Female
(1)	(2)

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Please fill out the questions S and T, then immediately Send the SMS to 09#####.

S Write down the total number of intervals of the household you interviewed

[interviewer: how many interval households did you count to choose the respondent?]

T Respondent No. (1-6)

Each SMS starts with letter K and PACE Location ID						S (up to 3 digits)			T (1-6)	
K						S			T	

Example: K123456S80T2

START THE INTERVIEW

Civic Participation

Here is a list of community groups and organizations. Could you please tell me if you have participated in meetings or activities of any of these groups over the past year?

AC	Cultural groups	Yes (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	AC	
AD	Sports groups	Yes (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	AD	
AE	Worker associations	Yes (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	AE	
AF	Social service organizations / associations	Yes (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	AF	
AG	Other community group	Yes (1) [Specify] _____		No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	AG

Political Participation

BD	How interested would you say you are in politics? (interviewer: Read Choices. Circle correct	Not interested at all (1)	(2)	(3)	Very interested (4)	Don't Know (98)	Refused to answer (99)	BD
----	---	------------------------------	-----	-----	------------------------	--------------------	---------------------------	----

People's Alliance for Credible Elections – PACE

<i>response number</i>						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Here is a list of different political activities. Could you please tell me if you have participated in any of these over the past year?

BE	Attend a gathering to seek solutions to community problems	Yes (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	BE
BF	Attend a meeting with government representative/MPs	Yes (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	BF
BG	Attend a civic education meeting	Yes (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	BG
BH	Sign a petition	Yes (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	BH
BJ	Participate in a protest or demonstration	Yes (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	BJ
BK	Participate in another political activity	Yes (1) <i>[Specify]</i> _____	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	BK

Interpersonal Trust and Political Tolerance

CA	Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted OR that you need to be very careful in dealing with people? <i>[Circle correct response number]</i>	CA
	Most people can be trusted	1
	Need to be very careful	2
	Do not know <i>[Do not read]</i>	98
	Refused to answer <i>[Do not read]</i>	99

How comfortable would you be if your neighbor were a strong supporter of...?
[Show scale card]

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

		Not at All (1)	←————→			Very comfortable (5)	Don't Know (98)	Refused to Answer (99)	
CE	... NLD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	CE
CF	... USDP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	CF
CG	... SNLD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	CG
CH	... ANP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	CH
CJ	... MNP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	CJ
CK	... the People's Party	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	CK

2015 Voting History

DA	In the 2015 elections, some people voted, and some people did not for various reasons. Can you please tell me if you voted or not Pyithu Hlutaw race? [1 - Continue to "DB"] [2, 98, 99 - Go to "EA"]	Yes (1) Don't know (98) [→ EA]	No (2) [→ EA] Refused to answer (99) [→ EA]	DA
DB	Did you vote in this township for Pyithu Hlutaw Race?	Yes (1) Don't know (98)	No (2) Refused to answer (99)	DB

DF	For Pyithu Hlutaw race, can you tell me which party you vote in 2015 general elections? [Do not read out the answers and choose only ones]	DF																
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td>National League for Democracy (NLD)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Union Solidarity and Development Party (USDP)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SNLD</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ANP</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MNP</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (Specify) _____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Don't Know (Do not read)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Refused to answer (Do not read)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">99</td> </tr> </table>			National League for Democracy (NLD)	1	Union Solidarity and Development Party (USDP)	2	SNLD	3	ANP	4	MNP	5	Other (Specify) _____	6	Don't Know (Do not read)	98	Refused to answer (Do not read)	99
National League for Democracy (NLD)	1																	
Union Solidarity and Development Party (USDP)	2																	
SNLD	3																	
ANP	4																	
MNP	5																	
Other (Specify) _____	6																	
Don't Know (Do not read)	98																	
Refused to answer (Do not read)	99																	

DG Did you vote the same party for other races too?	Yes (1)	No (2)	DG
	Don't know (98)	Refused to answer (99)	

DH What were the main factors you took into consideration when deciding which candidate to vote for in the 2015 election? I am reading the main factors, please choose only 3 priorities out of them, **DH**
[Use the show cards of the main factors]

Good ethics	1
Involvement in social and public affairs	2
Policies and electoral campaign promises	3
Level of education	4
Age	5
Gender	6
Religion	7
Ethnicity	8
Political background and experience	9
Military experience	10
Business experiences	11
Residence in this township	12
Membership of political party I support	13
None of above factors applied	14
Don't Know (Do not read)	98
Refused to answer (Do not read)	99

Perception of the current situation of Myanmar

EA In general, would you say that things in this township are heading in the right direction or that they are heading in the wrong direction? **EA**

Right direction	1
Wrong direction	2
Don't Know (Do not read)	98
Refused to answer (Do not read)	99

EB In general, would you say that things in this state or region are heading in the right direction or that they are heading in the wrong direction?

Right direction	1
Wrong direction	2
Don't Know (Do not read)	98
Refused to answer (Do not read)	99

EB

EC In general, would you say that things in the country are heading in the right direction or that they are heading in the wrong direction?

[1 - Continue to EG']

[2, - Go to "EH"]

[98, 99 - Go to "FA"]

Right direction	1
Wrong direction	2 [-> EH]
Don't Know (Do not read)	98 [-> FA]
Refused to answer (Do not read)	99 [-> FA]

EC

EG Why do say that things in the country are going in right direction? Please tell me briefly.

[Write down the verbatim answer of respondent's answers. Accept up to three answers. If respondent offers more than three options, ask "Which three of these are the most important? If respondent offers one or two answers, ask "Is there anything else?"

EG

(1) First Answer		Don't know (98)	Refused to answer (99)
(2) Second Answer		Don't know (98)	Refused to answer (99)
(3) Third Answer		Don't know (98)	Refused to answer (99)

[FOR RESPONDENTS WHO ANSWERED QUESTION EG, GO TO QUESTION FA]

EH Why do you say that things in the country are going in wrong direction? Please tell me briefly.

[Write down the verbatim answer of respondent's answers. Accept up to three answers. If respondent offers more than three options, ask "Which three of these are the most important? If respondent offers one or two answers, ask "Is there anything else?"

EH

(1) First Answer		Don't know (98)	Refused to answer (99)
(2) Second Answer		Don't know (98)	Refused to answer (99)
(3) Third Answer		Don't know (98)	Refused to answer (99)

The Performance of Hluttaws and Representatives

How would you rate the performance of Union Level Hluttaws (Amyothar Hluttaw and Pyi thu Hluttaw) after the 2015 elections in each of the following areas? [1] is very poor and [5] is very good.

[Show scale card]:

		Very Poor	←————→				Very Well	Don't Know	Refused to answer	
FA	Overseeing the work of the government ministries	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		FA
FB	Passing legislation that is good for Myanmar	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		FB
FC	Seeking the advice of citizens and experts on legislation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		FC
FD	Amending or abolishing laws that restrict civil and political rights	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		FD
FH	Changing laws to make it easier for businesses to operate	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		FH

How would you rate the performance of Regional/State Hluttaws after the 2015 elections in each of the following areas? [1] is very poor and [5] is very well.

[Show scale card]:

		Very Poor	←————→				Very Well	Don't Know	Refused to answer	
FJ	Overseeing the work of the Region/State government	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		FJ
FK	Passing legislation that is good for the Region/State	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		FK
FM	Seeking the advice of citizens and experts on legislation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		FM
FN	Amending or abolishing laws that restrict civil and political rights	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		FN
FP	Changing laws to make it easier for businesses to operate	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		FP

FQ I am reading two different statements now. Which of the following statements do you agree with most?
[Read options. Select only one]

FQ

Government ministries should be responsible for introducing laws, and parliament should pass them with minimal changes	1
Parliament should be responsible for introducing and passing laws in consultation with government ministries, citizens and experts	2
Don't Know (Do not read)	98
Refused to answer (Do not read)	99

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

How would you rate the performance of your representative in the Pyithu Hluttaw in each of the following areas? [1] is very poor and [5] is very good.
[Show scale card]:

		Very Poor	←————→			Very Well	Don't Know	Refused to answer	
FR	Actively participate in the Parliament sessions	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	FR
FS	Introducing legislation in Parliament	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	FS
FT	Cooperating with other MPs about an issue	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	FT
FU	Asking questions to the relevant ministers and other members of the executive	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	FU
FV	Seeking the advice of citizens and experts on legislation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	FV
FW	Visiting the constituency on regular basis to hear concerns of the constituents	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	FW
FY	Mobilizing development activities in the constituency	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	FY

FZ In your opinion, how could your representative in the Pyithu Hluttaw improve his or her work to fulfill your expectations? (You can mention more than one answer)
[Interviewer: Do not read response. Try to match response to one of these categories. Otherwise, use "other"]

FZ

Nothing	1	
Seek to better understand the issues of the community	2	
Seek to better understand national issues	3	
Better understanding of lawmaking process	4	
Better use of social media	5	
Inspecting the development projects	6	
Seek the advice of citizens and experts on legislation	7	
Visiting the constituency more often and listening to citizens' concerns	8	
Opening a field office in the constituency	9	
Other [specify: _____]	10	
Do not know [Do not read]	98	
Refused to answer [Do not read]	99	

How would you rate the performance of your representative in the Region/State Hluttaw in each of the following areas? [1] is very poor and [5] is very good.
[Show scale card]:

		Very Poor	←-----→				Very Well	Don't Know	Refused to answer	
GA	Actively participate in the Parliament sessions	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		GA
GB	Introducing legislation in Parliament	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		GB
GC	Cooperating with other MPs about an issue	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		GC
GD	Asking questions to the relevant ministers and other members of the executive	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		GD
GE	Seeking the advice of citizens and experts on legislation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		GE
GJ	Visiting the constituency on regular basis to hear concerns of the constituents	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		GJ
GK	Mobilizing development activities in the constituency	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)		GK

GM	In your opinion, how could your representative in the Region/State Hluttaw improve his or her work to fulfill your expectations? (You can mention more than one answer) [Interviewer: Do not read response. Try to match response to one of these categories. Otherwise, use "other"]	GM
	Nothing	1
	Seek to better understand the issues of the community	2
	Seek to better understand national issues	3
	Better understanding of lawmaking process	4
	Better use of social media	5
	Inspecting the development projects	6
	Seek the advice of citizens and experts on legislation	7
	Visiting the constituency more often and listening to citizens' concerns	8
	Opening a field office in the constituency	9
	Other [specify: _____]	10
	Do not know [Do not read]	98
	Refused to answer [Do not read]	99

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Voting Desires in Elections

In elections, some people vote, and some people do not for various reasons.

HA If there were general elections happening in this area this coming weekend, please tell me how likely you would be to vote in a scale from 1 to 5. [1] is would definitely not vote and [5] is definitely would vote. <i>[Show scale card]:</i> [1, 2, 3, 4 - Continue to "HB"] [5, - Go to "HC"] [98, 99 Go to "JA"]	Would not vote (1)	Likely would not vote (2)	Not sure if would vote or not (3)	Likely would vote (4)	Definitely would vote (5) [→ HC]	HA
			Don't Know (98) [→ JA]	Refused to answer (99) [→ JA]		

HB What would be the factors that would prevent you from voting? (up to three reasons) <i>[Do not read the answers; Try to match response to one of these categories. Otherwise, use "other"]</i>	HB
Concerns about personal security	1
Ineligible to vote (e.g. monk, non-citizen)	2
No national ID or voting document	3
Not in the voter list	4
Busy/illness/need to travel	5
Unsure of how/where to vote	6
The polling station is too far	7
Have a disability and the polling station is hard to reach	8
Materials are not in my language	9
Not interested	10
Don't trust the elections commissions	11
No party or candidate represents me	12
Don't trust parties/candidates	13
Other <i>[specify: _____]</i>	14
Don't know	98
Refused to answer	99

HC If you were to vote, what would be the main factors you would take into consideration when deciding which candidate to vote for? I am reading the main factors, please choose only 3 priorities out of them. <i>[Use the show cards of the main factors]</i>	HC
Good ethics	1
Involvement in social and public affairs	2
Policies and electoral campaign promises	3

Level of education	4
Age	5
Gender	6
Religion	7
Ethnicity	8
Political background and experience	9
Military experience	10
Business experiences	11
Residence in this township	12
Membership of political party / support	13
None of the above factors apply	14
Don't Know (Do not read)	98
Refused to answer (Do not read)	99

Expectations on political parties

JA In general, which of the following do parties do in Myanmar?
[Read options, allow more than one]

JA

Represent citizens' interests	1
Represent the interests of business elites	2
Fulfill the promises they make	3
Engage in favoritism or nepotism	4
Promote citizens' rights and democratic values	5
Engage in corruption	6
Promote social harmony	7
Encourage social divisions	8
Contribute to the peace process	9
Promote the participation of women in politics	10
Promote the participation of youth in politics	11
Contribute to free and fair elections	12
Work towards constitutional reform	13
Not doing any of the above things	14
Don't know [Do not read]	98
Refused to answer [Do not read]	99

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

JB In general, which of the following would you like political parties to do in Myanmar?
[Read options, allow more than one]

JB

Represent citizens' interests	1
Represent the interests of business elites	2
Fulfill the promises they make	3
Engage in favoritism or nepotism	4
Promote citizens' rights and democratic values	5
Engage in corruption	6
Promote social harmony	7
Encourage social divisions	8
Contribute to the peace process	9
Promote the participation of women in politics	10
Promote the participation of youth in politics	11
Contribute to free and fair elections	12
Work towards constitutional reform	13
Not doing any of the above things	14
Don't know [Do not read]	98
Refused to answer [Do not read]	99

Views on political parties

KA Which party would you say most closely represents your voice/interests?

[Write down the answer of the respondent exactly and ask the respondent to answer a name of one party only]

1, - Continue to KB]
[2, 98, 99, - Go to "KG"]

Respondent provides party
name
(Name of party)

(1)

No party represents me
(2)
[--> KG]

Don't know
(98)
[--> KG]

Refused to answer
(99)
[--> KG]

[Ask questions KB to KF only to those who provided a party name (response 1) in question KA]

If this party fielded the following people as Pyithu Hluttaw candidates in your township, how likely would you be to vote for them on a scale from 1 to 5. [1] is not would definitely not vote for them and [5] would definitely vote for them.

[Show the scale card of voting]:

		Definitely would not vote	Likely would not vote	Not sure if would vote or not	Likely would vote	Definitel y would vote	Don't know	Refused to answer	
KB	A woman	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KB

KC	Someone under 40 years old	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KC
KD	Someone with a different religion than you	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KD
KE	Someone with a different race/ethnicity than you	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KE
KF	Someone not living in your township [Go to "KQ"]	(1) [→ KQ]	(2) [→ KQ]	(3) [→ KQ]	(4) [→ KQ]	(5) [→ KQ]	(98) [→ KQ]	(99) [→ KQ]	KF

[Ask questions KG to KP only to those who responded "No party Represents me (2), "Don't Know (98)" or "Refuse to Answer (99) to question KA"

If the following people ran as Pyithu Hluttaw candidates in your township, how likely would you be to vote for them on a scale from 1 to 5. [1] is not would definitely not vote for them and [5] would definitely vote for them.

[Show the scale card of voting]:

		Definitely would not vote	Likely would not vote	Not sure if would vote or not	Likely would vote	Definitely would vote	Don't know	Refused to answer	
KG	A woman	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KG
KH	Someone under 40 years old	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KH
KM	Someone with a different religion than you	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KM
KN	Someone with a different race/ethnicity than you	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KN
KP	Someone not living in your township	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KP

There are currently more than 90 registered political parties in Myanmar. Could you tell me what is your attitude towards the following parties today in a scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 is very negative and 5 is very positive)?

[Show scale card]:

		Very negative	Somewhat negative	Neither negative nor positive	Somewhat positive	Very positive	Don't know	Refused to answer	
KQ	(NLD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KQ
KR	(USDP)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KR
KS	(SNLD)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KS
KT	(ANP)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KT
KU	(MNP)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KU
KV	People Party	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(98)	(99)	KV

Trust in Institutions								
I am going to name a number of organizations or government offices/positions. For each one, can you tell me how much confidence you have in on as scale from 1 to 5? (where 1 is not confidence at all and 5 is a great deal of confidence) [read out the name of each institution, use the scale card of confident level.]								
		No confidence at all	Not very much confidence	Quite a lot of confidence	Great deal of confidence	Don't know	Refused to answer	
MA	President	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MA
MB	State counsellor	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MB
MC	Union Level Hluttaws	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MC
MD	Region/State Hluttaws	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MD
ME	Courts	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	ME
MF	Ward/Village Tract Administrator	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MF
MG	Township Administrator	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MG
MH	Myanmar National Human Rights Commission	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MH
MJ	Anti-Corruption Commission	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MJ
MK	Union Election Commission	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MK
MP	Military (Tatmadaw)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MP
MQ	Police	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MQ
MR	Ethnic Armed Organizations (EAOs)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MR
MS	Political Parties	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MS
MT	State-Owned Media	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MT
MU	Privately-Owned Media	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MU
MV	Facebook	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MV
MW	CSOs/CBOs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MW
MY	Religious Leaders	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MY
MZ	The United Nations	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(98)	(99)	MZ

NRC Card and Household List**NA** Do you have a national registration card (NRC)?

Yes (1)	No (2)
Don't Know (98)	Refuse to Answer (99)

NA**NB** Is Your household list registered in this township?

Yes (1)	No (2)	I don't have household List (3)
Don't Know (98)		Refuse to Answer (99)

NB**Demographic Information**

Before we end this interview, I want to ask a few questions about your own background. This will help us to make sure that the data we have is representative.

PA Could you please tell me, in what year you were born?

Year of birth

PA

[Interviewer: Enter a four digit number. If they don't know the year of their birth, ask for their age. Don't know= 98 / refused to answer = 99]

--	--	--	--

Age

--	--

Don't know (98)	Refused to answer (99)
--------------------	---------------------------

PB What is the highest level of education you have completed?**PB**

[Code from answer. Do not read options]

Never went to school	1
Informal school	2
Some primary school	3
Primary school completed	4
Middle school completed	5
High school completed	6
Vocational school	7
University completed	8
Post-graduate studies	9
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	98

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Refused to answer <i>[Do not read]</i>	99
--	----

PC What is your current occupation?

[Code from answer. Do not read options]

PC

Unemployed	1
Self-employed	2
Retired	3
Plantation worker	4
Factory worker	5
Restaurant / Tea house staff	6
Fisherman	7
Domestic worker	8
Other unskilled staff	9
School / university teacher	10
Student	11
Housewife	12
Farmer (own land)	13
Farmer (Tenant)	14
Professional (ex. Lawyer, doctor, engineer)	15
NGO/INGO	16
Employed in private sector	17
Animal husbandry	18
Trader	19
Civil servant	20
Military / police	21
Other <i>[specify: _____]</i>	22
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	98
Refused to answer <i>[Do not read]</i>	99

PD What is your marital status?

[Do not read options]

Married (1)	Single (2)	Divorced (3)
	Widowed (4)	Refused to answer <i>[Do not read]</i> (99)

PD

PE What ethnic group or groups do you belong to?

[DO NOT READ OUT. Select all that apply]

PE

Kayah	1
Karen	2
Chin	3
Bamar	4

Mon	5
Rakhine	6
Shan	7
Other <i>[specify: _____]</i>	8
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	9
Refused to answer <i>[Do not read]</i>	98
Kayah	99

PF What is your religion?
[DO NOT READ OUT]

Buddhist (1)	Christian (2)	Hindu (3)
Muslim (4)	Other: _____ (5)	Refused to answer (99)

PF

PG Here is a list of family monthly income categories. Which category comes closer to representing the total income of your household?
[READ OUT OPTIONS]

PG

Less than 50,000 Ks	1
50,000 Ks – 100,000 Ks	2
100,000 Ks – 200,000 Ks	3
200,000 Ks – 300,000 Ks	4
300,000 Ks – 400,000 Ks	5
Over 400,000 Ks	6
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	98
Refused to answer <i>[Do not read]</i>	99

Media and news consumption

QA How do you usually receive information about government and politics?
[Do not read options. Select all that apply.]

QA

Newspaper/ Journals	1
Television	2
Radio	3
Online	4
Facebook	5
SMS	6
Local authority	7
Community Leader	8
Religious Leader	9
Political Leader	10
Friends and Neighbors	11

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Family Member	12
Other 1 <i>[Specify: _____]</i>	13
Other 2 <i>[Specify: _____]</i>	14
Don't Know	99

QB	Which television channel do you turn to most often for news about government and politics? <i>[Do not read options. Select only one.]</i>	QB
----	--	----

MRTV	1
Myawaddy	2
MRTV 4	3
Channel 7	4
DVB	5
Sky Net (Up to date)	6
Other <i>[Specify: _____]</i>	7
I don't watch television	8
Refused to answer	99

QC	Which newspaper or journal do you turn to most often for news about government and politics? <i>[Do not read options. Select only one.]</i>	QC
----	--	----

The New Light of Myanmar/the Mirror	1
7 Days newspaper/Journal	2
Eleven newspaper/journals	3
Democracy Today	4
The Standard Time Journal	5
The Voice newspaper/journal	6
Other <i>[Specify: _____]</i>	7
I don't read newspapers or journals	8
Refused to answer	99

QD	Which radio station do you turn to most often for news about government and politics? [Do not read options. Select only one.]	QD
----	--	----

Myanmar National Radio	1
BBC	2
VOA	3
RFA	4
Shwe FM	5
Mandalay FM	6
Cherry FM	7
Padamya FM	8
Other [Specify: _____]	9
I don't listen to the radio	10
Refused to answer	99

QE	Which source on the internet do you turn to most often for news about government and politics? [Do not read options. Select only one.]	QE
----	---	----

Facebook	1
Irrawaddy Website	2
Mizzima Website	3
Kamayaut Website	4
BBC Website	5
Voice of America (VOA) Website	6
MRTV Website	7
DVB Website	8
Other [Specify: _____]	9
I don't use internet	10
Refused to answer [Do not read]	99

QF	Do you have one or more of the following? [Read options. Select all that apply.]	QF
----	--	----

Feature phone	1
Smartphone	2

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Access to the internet at home	3
Access to the internet in your community (e.g. at work or at the library)	4
None of the above <i>[Do not read]</i>	5
Don't know <i>[Do not read]</i>	98
Refused to answer <i>[Do not read]</i>	99

That completes the interview. I would like to inform you that a spot-checker from PACE may visit you again in the next few days to ask you about the quality of this survey interview.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey.

END THE INTERVIEW

INTERVIEWER ONLY

All subsequent questions should be answered immediately after the interview is concluded. Do NOT ask the respondent the questions below. Complete on your own.

RA	Time when the interview ended <i>[Interviewer: Enter hour and minutes, use 12 hr. format and be exact. Please use English numbers]</i>	Hour		Minute		☐ AM ☐ PM	RA

Please fill out the question RB to RG and immediately Send the SMS to 09#####.

RB	Were there any other people immediately present who might be listening during the interview? <i>[Select all that apply]</i>	No one (1)	Spouse (2)	Children (3)	RB
		A few others (4)	Small crowd (5)		

RC	Did the respondent check with others for information to answer any question?	Yes (1)	No (2)	RC
----	--	------------	-----------	----

RD	Do you think anyone influenced the respondent's answers during the interview?	Yes (1)	No (2)	RD
----	---	------------	-----------	----

RE	Were you approached by community and/or government agents?	Yes (1)	No (2)	RE
----	--	------------	-----------	----

RF	Did you feel intimidated during the interview?	Yes (1)	No (2)	RF
----	--	------------	-----------	----

RG	Were you physically threatened during the interview?	Yes (1)	No (2)	RG
----	--	------------	-----------	----

Each SMS starts with letter K and PACE Location ID					RB (1 or Combination of 2 to 5)					Question RC (1 or 2)		Question RD (1 or 2)		Question RE (1 or 2)		Question RF (1 or 2)		Question RG (1 or 2)	
K					R	B				R	C	R	D	R	E	R	F	R	G

eg. K12345RB23RC1RD2RE2RF1RG2

Please make sure that every single question has an answer circled.

SIGNATURE PAGE

Interviewer: Do you have any other comments on the interview? For an example, did anything else significant happen during the interview?	
Yes, explain:	1
No	2
I hereby certify that this interview was conducted in accordance with instructions received during training. All responses recorded here are those of the respondent who was chosen by the appropriate selection method.	
Enumerator Signature:	

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

Household Spot Check Form



Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020 PACE Household Spot Check Form

To be completed by PACE Office:

Form Number				

Data Clerk No.

To be completed by spot-checkers

[Please answer questions A-G, but do not report over the phone]

A	Spot Checker Name		E	State/Region	
B	Spot Checker Phone Number		F	Township	
C	Spot Checker ID		G	Ward/ Village tract	
D	Location type	Urban (1)	Rural (2)	H	Village

[Please begin your phone report with question J]

J	PACE Location ID		J
----------	------------------	--	----------

K	Respondent Number (1-6)		K
----------	-------------------------	--	----------

XA	Date of spot check [Enter day and month. Here is an example how to enter in. If the interview is on 5 February 2017, then you enter 05 in day and 02 in month]	Day	Month	XA

Information from Enumerator Form

XB	Interval of selected household		XB
-----------	--------------------------------	--	-----------

XC	Exact address/description of selected household		XC
-----------	---	--	-----------

Step 1 - Household Selection Assessment

Go to your assigned ward/ village and find the given landmark used as a starting point.

YA	Was the starting point selected according to the procedure described in your manual?	Yes (1)	No [please explain] (2)	YA
-----------	--	---------	-------------------------	-----------

Begin walking in the same direction chosen by the enumerator and start counting houses/ residences using intervals (10 for rural village or 20 for urban ward) according to the procedures in your manual. Continue counting until you reach the selected household address

YB	What was the interval (count number) of the household from the starting point?		YB
-----------	--	--	-----------

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

YC Does this interval match the number recorded by the enumerator?

Yes (1)	No [please explain] (2)
------------	-------------------------------

YC

YD According to your assessment, was the household selected according to the exact procedures described in your manual?

Yes (1)	No [please explain] (2)	Cannot determine [please explain] (3)
------------	-------------------------------	---

YD

Approach the household. If you are able to speak with someone in the household, go to Step 2. If you are unable to speak with anybody in the household during your time in the village record the reason in the table below.

Household Visits	V1	V2
Completed interview	1	1
Partly completed interview	2	2
Person selected was never at home	3	3
Household/ premises empty	4	4
Not a citizen/ spoke only a foreign language	5	5
Deaf/ did not speak a survey language	6	6
No adults in household	7	7
Other (specify)	8	8
Not applicable	89	89
Refused to be interviewed	99	99

Step 2 - Ask to conduct the interview

When you find a household with someone home, please introduce yourself using the following script. You must learn this introduction so that you can say it exactly as it is written below.

Good day. My name is _____. I am from the People's Alliance for Credible Elections (PACE), a non-partisan civil society organization. I do not represent the government or any political party. We are doing a survey of people's opinions on Government's performances. A couple days ago, our enumerator deployed to collect and interview a random adult in this village/ ward. Every person in the country has an equal chance of being included in this study. I am doing a quality control check on the performance of our enumerator. This survey should take about 10-15 minutes to complete. May I begin the interview now?

If participation is refused, walk away from the household and record this in the above table on "Household Visits". Continue to your next selected assigned household/respondent.

Step 3 - Conduct the interview

ZA Do you know whether your household was included in the PACE survey being conducted this month?
[Do not read choices]
1 - Continue to ZB
2, 3 or 4 - End the interview]

Yes (1)	No [→ END] (2)
Don't know [→ END] (98)	Refused to answer [→ END] (99)

ZA

ZB Were you present at the previous PACE interview?

Yes (1)	No (2)	I did not notice that (3)
------------	-----------	------------------------------

ZB

ZC Could you give me the name of the respondent we interviewed last time? <i>[Name - Continue to ZD]</i> <i>[98 or 99 - End the interview]</i>		ZC
	Don't know [→ END] (98) Refused to answer [→ END] (99)	
ZD Were you the respondent for the previous PACE interview? <i>[1 - Continue to ZH]</i> <i>2 - Continue to ZE</i> <i>99 - End the interview]</i>	Yes [→ ZH] (1) No (2) Refused to answer [→ END] (99)	ZD
ZE Is _____ [insert name] presently available? <i>[1 - Continue to ZF]</i> <i>2 - Go to ZG</i> <i>98 or 99 - End the interview]</i>	Yes (1) No [→ ZG] (2) Don't know [→ END] (98) Refused to answer [→ END] (99)	ZE
ZF May I please interview [insert name] _____ now? <i>[1 - Go to ZH]</i> <i>2 - Continue to ZG</i> <i>99 - End the interview]</i>	Yes [→ ZH] (1) No (2) Refused to answer [→ END] (99)	ZF
ZG What is the main reason that the respondent to the PACE interview is not available? <i>[Do not read choices. End the interview after responding the question.]</i>	He/she is away from the household presently [→ END] (1) He/she is at work [→ END] (2) He/she is ill and cannot respond [→ END] (3) Other [→ END] (4) Refused to answer [→ END] (99)	ZG
ZH How were you selected as the respondent from your household? <i>[Do not read choices.]</i>	The interviewer asked someone to pick a card to select me (1) I was the one that met the interviewer in the first place (2) I was the only one who was available at the time (3) I am the head of household (4) I am the only male/female in the household (5) I am pretty / handsome / attractive (6) I am the oldest / youngest in the household (7) Other (8) My name was chosen, but I don't know how (98) Refused to answer (99)	ZH

Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

ZJ	Were you made aware (or informed) by any means that PACE quality control staff would be coming to your house to do quality checks?	Yes (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (3)	ZJ
ZK	In your opinion, did the enumerator display any bias or preference to any political party during the interview?	Yes [explain] (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (3)	ZK
ZM	Did you feel threatened during and / or after the interview?	Yes [explain] (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (3)	ZM
ZN	Do you have any other comment on the interview? For example, did anything else significant happened during or after the interview?	Yes [explain] (1)	No (2)	Refused to answer (99)	ZN

The interview is now over. Thank you very much for your assistance. We really appreciate your time.



Citizens' Political Preferences for 2020

July, 2019

14, San Yeik Nyein Street 5, Kamayut Township, Yangon, Myanmar.
<https://www.facebook.com/PACEMyanmar>
www.pacemyanmar.org