

Attitudes of Electoral Agents on the Administration of the 2017 General Election

Justin Fisher (Brunel University London) & Yohanna Sällberg (Brunel University London)

FINAL REPORT

Executive Summary

- Levels of satisfaction with electoral administration among electoral agents were high and improved compared with 2015.
- Agents expressed limited levels of concern about electoral fraud.
- Agents expressed very high levels of satisfaction with all aspects of the nominations process.
- Agents were satisfied with the provision of information to aid their understanding of their responsibilities.
- Agents were very satisfied with both the clarity and efficiency in respect of the verification and the count, representing a significant improvement compared with 2015.
- There were high levels of satisfaction in respect of clarity of the rules on election spending and donations. These were improved compared with 2015, though again, there was variation by agent experience.
- There were high levels of satisfaction in the rating of the Electoral Commission as a useful source of advice and guidance, again representing an improvement compared with 2015.
- Those agents who contacted the Electoral Commission directly were generally satisfied with their experience.

27th September 2017

Methodology

A series of questions co-designed by the Electoral Commission and Professor Fisher were included in a larger survey of election agents at the 2017 general election. The survey was distributed immediately after polling day to 2,371 agents of the Conservative Party, Labour Party, Liberal Democrats, Plaid Cymru, Scottish National Party and UKIP for 631 constituencies in Great Britain¹. Due to budgetary constraints, it was not possible to include agents from the Green Party in this distribution. However, the Electoral Commission, in a separate project surveying Parliamentary candidates, enclosed a questionnaire with the same questions as added to Professor Fisher's survey in all surveys to Green Party candidates in England. An accompanying letter explained the views of agents were being sought, and requested the enclosed agent survey be passed on (or if a candidate was their own agent, be completed). Whilst this approach means we do not know how many surveys reached Green Party agents, 17 were returned in time for reporting. The data reported here are based on 973 valid responses received by 31st of August 2017, as well as 17 responses collected directly by the Electoral Commission. These consist of responses from 178 Conservative agents, 321 Labour agents, 311 Liberal Democrat agents, 28 Plaid Cymru agents, 23 SNP agents, 112 UKIP and 17 Green agents. Overall, 61% of agents had previously organised a campaign, compared with 39% who had not. There was some variation by party in terms of agent experience: Conservative, Plaid Cymru, SNP, Liberal Democrat and UKIP agents were more experienced, with 74%, 66%, 64%, 62% and 60% respectively having organised a campaign previously. The same was true of 55% of Labour agents and 53% of Green party agents.

For each question, there are three tables: a simple frequency and then the findings disaggregated by party and by agent experience - whether the agent had previously organised a general election campaign or not. Further analyses of the age and sex of the agents were carried out, and these are included where responses differed between groups. The majority of agents responding were men (77%), which largely corresponded with the distribution within the parties, except for UKIP where 84% of agents were male. The age groups used are based on the distribution of respondent ages into four similar sized groups: up to 50 years old, 50-62 years old, 63-69 years old and over 70 years old. In the disaggregated tables, response categories are combined (i.e. Agree and Tend to Agree) for ease of interpretation together with a Net Score for Agree minus Disagree. Percentages will not always add up to 100 due to rounding.

Results

The Administration of the Election

There were good levels of satisfaction with the administration of the election (**Tables 1, 2 & 3**). Some 76% were satisfied overall, with 7% dissatisfied. This represented a small improvement on 2015, when 71% of agents reported satisfaction.² While satisfaction rates were high across the board, agents from Liberal Democrat, Plaid Cymru and UKIP had lower levels of net satisfaction. Agents with more experience were more satisfied in net terms. Overall, among the 8% of respondents who expressed dissatisfaction, the most prevalent reason given was the nomination process. Disquiet was also expressed in respect of the

¹ Only one questionnaire was sent to agents in Buckingham (the Speaker's seat) as from our surveyed parties, only UKIP fielded a candidate. No questionnaires were sent to the agents in Kingswood constituency as the local authority (South Gloucestershire) did not publish details of the electoral agents.

² Fisher, J., Cutts, D., Fieldhouse, E. & Rottweiler, B. (2015) *Attitudes of Electoral Agents on the Administration of the 2015 General Election*.

See: https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0008/192572/Brunel-UKPGE-2015-agents-survey.pdf

management of postal voting, the election count and the 'snap election', with its proximity to the local authority elections. Agents aged 50-62 years were most likely to be satisfied (83%) with the administration of the election. The least satisfied group was those aged 70 and over (67%).

Table 1. Administration of the election

<i>How satisfied were you with the administration of the general election in your constituency?</i>	<i>%</i>
Very Satisfied	34
Fairly Satisfied	42
Neither	16
Fairy Dissatisfied	5
Very Dissatisfied	2

Table 2. Administration of the election by party

<i>%</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Net</i>
Conservative	83	10	7	+76
Labour	81	13	6	+75
Liberal Democrat	72	21	7	+65
Plaid Cymru	61	32	7	+55
SNP	96	0	4	+92
UKIP	60	24	17	+43
Green	100	0	0	+100

Table 3. Administration of the election by experience

<i>%</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Net</i>
Previous Experience	78	16	6	+72
No Experience	73	18	9	+64

Perceptions of Electoral Fraud

Overall, there was a low level of perception of electoral fraud (**Tables 4, 5 & 6**). Only 10% perceived there to be *A Little* or *A Lot*. Fully 40% were of the view that there was *None at All*, and if *Don't Knows* are excluded, that figure rises to 61%. Analysing these data by party shows that UKIP agents were most likely to perceive there to be fraud, with 25% responding *A Little* or *A Lot*. And in comparison with the other main GB parties, Conservative agents were more likely to perceive some fraud than those from Labour or the Liberal Democrats. There was no perceptible variation by agent experience, though less experienced agents were less likely to offer an opinion.

Table 4. Perceptions of electoral fraud

<i>How much, if at all, do you think that electoral fraud took place at elections in your area?</i>	<i>%</i>
A Lot	3
A Little	7
Hardly at All	17
None at All	40
Don't Know	34

Table 5. Perceptions of electoral fraud by party

%	A Lot	A Little	Hardly at All	None at All	Don't Know
Conservative	4	14	20	35	28
Labour	1	3	16	48	33
Liberal Democrat	2	3	16	47	33
Plaid Cymru	0	11	18	32	40
SNP	0	13	22	39	26
UKIP	14	11	17	13	47
Green	0	12	6	29	53

Table 6. Perceptions of electoral fraud by experience

%	A Lot	A Little	Hardly at All	None at All	Don't Know
Previous Experience	3	7	19	41	30
No Experience	2	5	13	40	40

The Nomination Process

92% of agents found the nomination process to be straightforward. There was minor variation by party, with UKIP and Labour agents least likely to agree that this was the case. SNP, Green and Conservative agents were most likely to find the process straightforward, whilst there were only minor differences between agents in terms of prior experience, with inexperienced agents very slightly less likely to find the process straightforward (**Tables 7, 8 & 9**). Agents were also of the view that they received sufficient information on the Nomination Process (**Tables 10, 11 & 12**). Fully 91% felt that they had received sufficient information, with little variation by party; Labour and UKIP agents being least likely to agree that this was the case. Less experienced agents were slightly less likely to perceive that they received sufficient information. Finally, there were also strong levels of satisfaction (91%) with the running of the nomination process (**Tables 13, 14 & 15**). Labour and UKIP agents were least likely to be happy with the nomination process, as were less experienced agents.

Table 7. The nomination process was straightforward

<i>Nomination process was straightforward</i>	%
Agree	78
Tend to Agree	14
Neither	3
Tend to Disagree	3
Disagree	2

Table 8. The nomination process was straightforward by party

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Net
Conservative	98	1	1	+97
Labour	91	5	5	+86
Liberal Democrat	95	3	2	+93
Plaid Cymru	96	0	4	+92
SNP	100	0	0	+100
UKIP	90	7	3	+87
Green	100	0	0	+100

Table 9. The nomination process was straightforward by experience

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Net
Previous Experience	95	2	3	+92
No Experience	92	5	3	+89

Table 10. Receipt of sufficient information on nomination process

<i>I received sufficient information from the RO/election staff on the nomination process</i>	%
Agree	79
Tend to Agree	12
Neither	4
Tend to Disagree	2
Disagree	3

Table 11. Received sufficient information by party

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Net
Conservative	95	2	3	+92
Labour	88	7	6	+82
Liberal Democrat	93	3	4	+89
Plaid Cymru	96	0	4	+92
SNP	100	0	0	+100
UKIP	87	6	7	+80
Green	94	6	0	+94

Table 12. Received sufficient information by experience

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Net
Previous Experience	93	4	3	+90
No Experience	89	5	6	+83

Table 13. The running of the nomination process

<i>The nomination process was well run</i>	<i>%</i>
Agree	76
Tend to Agree	15
Neither	5
Tend to Disagree	2
Disagree	3

Table 14. The nomination process was well run by party

<i>%</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Net</i>
Conservative	92	3	5	+87
Labour	86	7	7	+79
Liberal Democrat	93	4	3	+90
Plaid Cymru	93	4	4	+89
SNP	100	0	0	+100
UKIP	86	9	6	+80
Green	100	0	0	+100

Table 15. The nomination process was well run by experience

<i>%</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Net</i>
Previous Experience	92	5	3	+89
No Experience	87	6	7	+80

Understanding of Agents' Responsibilities

There were strong levels of satisfaction in respect of agents' understanding of their responsibilities. 90% of agents felt they were provided with sufficient information to manage their responsibilities (**Tables 16, 17 & 18**), with some minor variation by party and experience; UKIP (83%) and less experienced agents (net score +80 compared with +88) being least likely to respond positively.

Table 16. Sufficiency of information to manage responsibilities

<i>I received sufficient information from the RO/election staff to help me manage my responsibilities as an agent.</i>	<i>%</i>
Agree	73
Tend to Agree	17
Neither	6
Tend to Disagree	3
Disagree	2

Table 17. Sufficient information to manage responsibilities by party

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Net
Conservative	93	4	3	+90
Labour	89	5	6	+83
Liberal Democrat	91	6	3	+88
Plaid Cymru	96	4	0	+96
SNP	87	4	9	+78
UKIP	83	9	8	+75
Green	88	12	0	+88

Table 18. Sufficient information to manage responsibilities by experience

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Net
Previous Experience	91	5	3	+88
No Experience	87	6	7	+80

Verification and the Count

In respect of clarity during the verification and counting process, 92% were satisfied; an improvement of eleven percentage points compared with 2015.³ UKIP agents were slightly less likely to be satisfied. The same was true for the less experienced agents (net score +83 compared with +90) (**Tables 19, 20 & 21**). An identical proportion (92%) was satisfied with the efficiency of the verification and ballot counting process (**Tables 22, 23 & 24**), with only 4% dissatisfied. UKIP agents (87%) were slightly less likely to be positive in regards to the efficiency of the verification and count process.

Table 19. Clarity during verification and counting of ballot papers

<i>It was clear what was happening during the verification and counting of ballot papers</i>	%
Agree	75
Tend to Agree	17
Neither	3
Tend to Disagree	3
Disagree	2

Table 20. Clarity during verification and counting of ballot papers by party

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Net
Conservative	95	1	4	+91
Labour	93	4	4	+89
Liberal Democrat	91	4	6	+85
Plaid Cymru	96	0	4	+92
SNP	91	4	4	+87
UKIP	89	5	7	+82

³ Fisher, J., Cutts, D. Fieldhouse, E. & Rottweiler, B. (2015) *Attitudes of Electoral Agents on the Administration of the 2015 General Election*.
See: https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/192572/Brunel-UKPGE-2015-agents-survey.pdf

Table 21. Clarity during verification and counting of ballot papers by experience

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Net
Previous Experience	94	2	4	+90
No Experience	89	5	6	+83

Table 22. Efficiency of the verification and count process

<i>Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with how efficiently the verification and count process was run?</i>	%
Very Satisfied	65
Fairly Satisfied	27
Neither	4
Fairly Dissatisfied	3
Very Dissatisfied	1

Table 23. Efficiency of the verification and count process by party

%	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Net
Conservative	94	1	5	+89
Labour	93	3	4	+89
Liberal Democrat	91	4	4	+87
Plaid Cymru	96	4	0	+96
SNP	96	0	4	+92
UKIP	87	8	5	+82
Green	100	0	0	+100

Table 24. Efficiency of the verification and count process by experience

%	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Net
Previous Experience	93	3	4	+89
No Experience	91	5	4	+87

Rules on Election Spending and Donations

In respect of election spending and donations, 81% of agents agreed that the rules were clear; an improvement of four percentage points compared with 2015 (**Tables 25, 26 & 27**). There was some variation by party and agent experience. Conservative, SNP and Plaid Cymru agents were most likely to find the rules clear, while Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green agents were least likely to do so. 24% of Green agents were of the view that the rules were unclear, a view shared by 12% on the less experienced agents, where the net score differed significantly (+76 compared with +64) from that of experienced agents (as it did in 2015). Older agents were happier with the clarity of rules compared with younger ones, with 87% of over 69 year olds agreeing compared with 74% of those aged 50 or below.

Table 25. Clarity of rules on election spending and donations

<i>I found the rules on election spending and donations clear</i>	%
Agree	55
Tend to Agree	26
Neither	9
Tend to Disagree	7
Disagree	4

Table 26. Rules on election spending and donations clear by party

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Net
Conservative	87	3	8	+79
Labour	79	11	9	+70
Liberal Democrat	78	10	12	+65
Plaid Cymru	89	0	11	+78
SNP	87	4	9	+78
UKIP	82	10	8	+74
Green	53	24	24	+29

Table 27. Rules on election spending and donations clear by experience

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Net
Previous Experience	84	7	8	+76
No Experience	76	12	12	+64

The Usefulness of Electoral Commission Advice, Guidance and Information

Overall, 68% viewed the Electoral Commission as a useful source of advice; an improvement of three percentage points compared with 2015⁴ (**Table 28**), while 78% thought Electoral Commission guidance was clear and easy to use – an improvement of seven percentage points (**Table 31**). 66% thought Electoral Commission written information on the verification and count was clear and easy to use – again, an improvement of five percentage points compared with 2015. (**Table 34**).

There was some variation by party. Plaid Cymru, UKIP and Conservative agents were least likely to view the Electoral Commission as a useful source of advice, while Green and Liberal Democrat agents were most likely to do so (**Table 29**). In terms of guidance, Conservative, Plaid Cymru and UKIP agents were less likely to find the Commission's work to be useful (**Table 32**). Finally, there was also variation in respect of attitudes towards the Commission's written information on the verification and count (**Table 35**). Green, SNP and Labour agents were slightly more likely to find it clear and easy to use compared with the agents from the Plaid Cymru, Conservative, UKIP and Liberal Democrat parties, all of whom registered net scores below +65.

In terms of agent experience, there was no systematic variation in any of the three areas. However, the responses in the *Don't/Know/Didn't Use* category suggests that the less experienced agents were slightly more likely to seek information from the Electoral

⁴ Fisher, J., Cutts, D. Fieldhouse, E. & Rottweiler, B. (2015) *Attitudes of Electoral Agents on the Administration of the 2015 General Election*
See: https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/192572/Brunel-UKPGE-2015-agents-survey.pdf

Commission in respect of verification and the count (**Table 36**). 74% of 63-69 year old agents found the Electoral Commission to be a useful source of advice, compared with 65% agents 50 or younger, 68% of agents aged 50-62 years and 67% of agents over 69. 73% of female agents agreed that the Electoral Commission was a useful resource, compared with 67% of male agents.

Table 28. Electoral Commission as a useful source of advice

<i>Overall, the Electoral Commission was a useful source of advice and guidance during the campaign</i>	<i>%</i>
Agree	39
Tend to Agree	29
Neither	16
Tend to Disagree	4
Disagree	2
Don't Know/Did Not Use	10

Table 29. Electoral Commission was a useful source of advice by party

<i>%</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Don't Know/ Didn't Use</i>	<i>Net</i>
Conservative	65	16	8	11	+57
Labour	67	19	4	10	+63
Liberal Democrat	74	10	6	10	+68
Plaid Cymru	64	18	11	7	+53
SNP	70	9	13	9	+57
UKIP	63	23	6	8	+57
Green	82	18	0	0	+82

Table 30. Electoral Commission was a useful source of advice by experience

<i>%</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Don't Know/ Didn't Use</i>	<i>Net</i>
Previous Experience	68	16	6	10	+62
No Experience	69	16	6	9	+63

Table 31. Electoral Commission guidance as being clear and easy to use

<i>Overall, the Electoral Commission's written guidance for candidates and agents was clear and easy to use</i>	<i>%</i>
Agree	43
Tend to Agree	35
Neither	8
Tend to Disagree	5
Disagree	2
Don't Know/Did Not Use	7

Table 32. Electoral Commission guidance was clear and easy to use by party

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Don't Know/ Didn't Use	Net
Conservative	73	8	9	10	+64
Labour	79	9	9	4	+70
Liberal Democrat	77	8	8	6	+69
Plaid Cymru	68	18	7	7	+61
SNP	74	9	13	4	+61
UKIP	71	16	7	6	+64
Green	82	12	6	0	+76

Table 33. Electoral Commission guidance was clear and easy to use by experience

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Don't Know/ Didn't Use	Net
Previous Experience	79	7	7	8	+72
No Experience	78	9	7	6	+71

Table 34. Electoral Commission written information in respect of the verification and count as being clear and easy to use

<i>The Electoral Commission's written information on what to expect at the verification and count was clear and easy to use</i>	%
Agree	38
Tend to Agree	28
Neither	12
Tend to Disagree	2
Disagree	2
Don't Know/Did Not Use	17

Table 35. Electoral Commission written information in respect of the verification and count was clear and easy to use by party

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Don't Know/ Didn't Use	Net
Conservative	66	8	5	21	+61
Labour	69	14	4	14	+65
Liberal Democrat	64	10	3	23	+61
Plaid Cymru	64	14	7	14	+57
SNP	74	4	9	13	+65
UKIP	66	20	4	11	+62
Green	82	12	0	6	+82

Table 36. Electoral Commission written information in respect of the verification and count was clear and easy to use by experience

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Don't Know/ Didn't Use	Net
Previous Experience	66	11	4	19	+62
No Experience	68	14	4	15	+64

Experience of Contacting the Commission for Direct Advice

Just over a fifth of agents had cause to contact the Commission. In both areas (electoral administration, spending and donations) the experience was largely positive. (**Tables 37 & 40**). Indeed, in a subsequent question on other areas of direct feedback, some agents responded saying that direct contact was not required as the information provided on the Commission's website was excellent. If those respondents who did not contact the Commission are removed from the analyses, some 72% were satisfied in respect of the Commission's guidance and advice on electoral administration and some 70% on donations and spending. When disaggregated by party (**Tables 38 & 41**), there are few patterns of note,⁵ Labour, SNP and Liberal Democrat agents were slightly less likely to be satisfied overall and UKIP and Plaid Cymru more likely to be satisfied overall. SNP, Labour and Liberal Democrat agents had a net score of below 10 for satisfaction in terms of the Commission's advice on donations and spending. If *Don't Know/Did Not Use* is excluded, Labour (22%) and Liberal Democrat agents (14%) were most likely to disagree that the direct advice on spending and donations was clear.

In respect of agent experience (**Tables 39 & 42**), agents without experience were slightly more positive in terms of direct advice and guidance from the Commission. 23% of female agents found the advice and guidance on electoral administration easy to understand compared with 14% of male agents. Similarly, 21% of female agents found advice and guidance on spending and donations clear, whilst the proportion amongst male agents was 15%.

Table 37. The clarity of Electoral Commission advice and guidance on electoral administration

<i>Direct advice or guidance on electoral administration was clear and easy to understand</i>	%
Agree	12
Tend to Agree	4
Neither	3
Tend to Disagree	1
Disagree	1
Did not use	78

⁵ Low numbers of respondents who contacted the Commission for these questions mean that percentages for the disaggregated tables need to be treated with caution

Table 38. Electoral Commission advice and guidance on electoral administration was clear and easy to understand by party

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Did not use	Net
Conservative	20	3	1	76	+19
Labour	15	2	5	79	+10
Liberal Democrat	9	2	2	88	+7
Plaid Cymru	29	6	0	65	+29
SNP	16	5	5	74	+11
UKIP	29	12	1	58	+28
Green	0	0	0	100	0

Table 39. Electoral Commission advice and guidance on electoral administration was clear and easy to understand by experience

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Did not use	Net
Previous Experience	14	4	2	80	+12
No Experience	19	3	3	75	+16

Table 40. The clarity of Electoral Commission advice and guidance on spending and donations

<i>Direct advice or guidance on spending and donations was clear and easy to understand</i>	%
Agree	11
Tend to Agree	5
Neither	4
Tend to Disagree	2
Disagree	1
Did Not Use	77

Table 41. Electoral Commission advice and guidance spending and donations was clear and easy to understand by party

%	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Did not use	Net
Conservative	20	4	3	74	+17
Labour	14	3	5	79	+9
Liberal Democrat	11	4	2	84	+9
Plaid Cymru	29	6	0	65	+29
SNP	17	6	9	78	+8
UKIP	29	12	0	60	+29
Green	13	0	0	88	+13

Table 42. Electoral Commission advice and guidance spending and donations was clear and easy to understand by experience

% experience	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Did not use	Net
Previous Experience	15	4	2	79	+13
No Experience	18	5	3	73	+15

Appendix

Overall how satisfied were you with the administration of the general election in your constituency? Please put an 'X' in one box only				
<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Fairly satisfied</i>	<i>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</i>	<i>Fairly dissatisfied</i>	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>
34%	42%	16%	5%	2%

If you have ticked Fairly Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied , please give the main reason this using the list below. Please put an 'X' in one box only			
<i>Nomination process</i>	<i>Management of postal voting and verification</i>	<i>Organisation of polling stations</i>	<i>Organisation of the Election count</i>
40%	23%	10%	26%

Other:

- 'Snap' election right after council elections (where we targeted a few seats) meant that we hadn't organised leaflet delivery in some parts
- Agent's family's illness
- All of it
- Assistance from association
- Candidate
- Candidate taken away to other areas
- Dysfunctional LLP
- Election address was delivered after postal vote went out
- Engaged in county election at the same time
- Excellent candidate but low level of helpers
- Freepost
- Funding of election leaflets
- Getting info from LA on expenses etc.
- I assume you're talking about the RO's activities and that of the electoral registration departments (we had to deal with 3 because the constituency includes bits of three local government areas) all abysmal in providing timely and usable data.
- Information provided at count
- Lack of canvassing meant no list of probable voters. Hence no telling or knocking up on the day
- Lack of people/resources/volunteers
- Lack of support from HQ/local party structure
- Local party issues
- Momentum and hard left did not engage
- Neighbouring constituency was target seat so all resource went there
- Not enough time
- Organisation of canvassing/collection of data very ineffective
- Organisation within own party
- Voters fed up with elections
- To call election without candidate
- Targeting of prime wards (none)
- Slowness of count
- Party organisation

How much electoral fraud, if any, do you think took place at elections in your constituency? Please put an 'X' in one box only				
<i>A lot</i>	<i>A little</i>	<i>Hardly at all</i>	<i>None at all</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
3%	7%	17%	40%	34%

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about participating in the election? Please put an 'X' in one box only for each statement						
	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Tend to agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Tend to disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
The nomination process was straightforward	78%	14%	3%	3%	2%	0%
The nomination process was well run	76%	15%	5%	2%	3%	0%
I received sufficient information from the RO/election staff on the nomination process	79%	12%	4%	2%	3%	0%

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about participating in the election? Please put an 'X' in one box only for each statement						
	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Tend to agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Tend to disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
I received sufficient information from the RO/election staff to help me manage my responsibilities as an agent	73%	17%	6%	3%	2%	0%
It was clear what was happening during the verification and counting of ballot papers	75 %	17%	3%	3%	2%	1%
I found the rules on election spending and donations clear	55%	26%	9%	7%	4%	0%

Overall, how satisfied were you with how efficiently the verification and count processes were run (if attended)? Please put an 'X' in one box only				
<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Fairly satisfied</i>	<i>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</i>	<i>Fairly dissatisfied</i>	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>
65%	27%	4%	3%	1%

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the information provided by the Electoral Commission? **Please put an 'X' in one box only for each statement**

	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Tend to agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Tend to disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Overall, the Electoral Commission was a useful source of advice and guidance during the campaign	39%	29%	16%	4%	2%	10%
Overall, the Electoral Commission's written guidance for candidates and agents was clear and easy to use	43%	35%	8%	5%	2%	7%
I found the rules on election spending and donations clear	38%	28%	12%	2%	2%	17%

If you contacted the Commission personally (e.g. by telephone or e-mail) for advice or guidance please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. **Please put an 'X' in one box only for each statement**

	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Tend to agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Tend to disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Did Not Use</i>
Direct advice or guidance on electoral administration was clear and easy to understand	12%	4%	3%	1%	1%	78%
Direct advice or guidance on spending and donations was clear and easy to understand	11%	5%	4%	2%	1%	77%
Direct advice on another area (please state below) was clear and easy to understand	8%	2%	4%	1%	1%	84%

Other:

- Advice an location of agents office
- Advice on which forms needed to be included in the expenses return
- Expenditure
- Guidance for candidates always published late and with circular references
- In fairness to the EC their stuff is good. However only 2 years after the election and with local election consultation tends to be to refresh memory not to train
- On the occasion that I had to leave a voice message no one returned the call
- Website advice on specific questions is VERY difficult to locate quickly
- Would never waste my time doing so [contacting the Commission]
- No need. It is all on the website.