

Election Timing | Atmosphere | Law & Order and  
Expectations Towards the Interim Government

# People's Election Pulse Survey (PEPS) Round 2 - Part 1

September 21, 2025

A social research initiative of Innovison Consulting |

**INN VISION**  
Research | Technical Assistance | Project Management

In Association with



## Team

Md. Rubaiyath Sarwar, **Lead**  
Mahmudur Rahman, Statistician  
Yasin Shafi, Tools  
Fardin Araf, Research Associate  
Parvez Mahmud, Analyst  
Mostafa Tarafder, Field Manager  
Afifa Mahjabeen, Visual Story Teller  
Nafisa Tarannum, Communications  
Fayed Arnab, Graphics

## Advisors

Sadrudin Imran, CEO, Innovision Consulting  
Shahed Ferdous, Country Director, Bangladesh, Innovision Consulting  
Shafiqur Rahman, Executive Director, BRAIN  
Fahim Mashroor, Joint Convener, Voice for Reform

Jyoti Rahman, Independent Observer  
Zafar Sobhan, Independent Observer  
Towfiqul Islam Khan, Independent Observer  
Aaqib Md. Shatil, Independent Observer  
Taukir Aziz, Independent Observer  
Islamul Haque, Independent Observer

Innovision Consulting acknowledges the work of the enumerators around the country. We deeply acknowledge the support provided by the independent observers in designing the survey and analysing the results.

## Contact

Md. Rubaiyath Sarwar  
Managing Director, Innovision Consulting  
Plot 26 Road 6 Block J Baridhara Pragati Sarani Dhaka 1212, Bangladesh  
Rubaiyyath.sarwar@innovision-bd.com  
[info@innovision-bd.com](mailto:info@innovision-bd.com)

# Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of the second round, Part 1 of the People's Election Pulse Survey (PEPS), a nationwide poll conducted in September 2025 by Innovision Consulting. The survey, which included 10,413 adult citizens (9,398 household respondents and 1,015 university students) across all 8 divisions and 64 districts of Bangladesh, focuses on public sentiment regarding the interim government, election atmosphere, law and order, and electoral reform in the part 1.

Key findings include:

- **Public Confidence in Government:** 39.5% of the respondents reported the performance as good and 39.2% reported moderate. However, approval ratings are lower among younger, more educated, and urban demographics.
- **Impartial Election & Voter Safety:** The public is largely confident in the government's ability to hold a free and fair election, with 69.9% expressing a positive outlook. A similar majority (77.5%) believes they can vote safely and without fear. Despite this, skepticism about the impartiality of police and administration is higher among younger, educated, and urban residents.
- **Law & Order:** A majority of respondents (56.6%) feel that extortion has increased in the past six months. This perception is more pronounced among urban residents, younger generations, and those with higher education and income levels. Social media is the primary source of information on this issue for a significant portion of the population, particularly for younger and more educated individuals.
- **Election Timing & Turnout:** An overwhelming 86.5% of respondents agree that the election should be held in February 2026 as planned, and 94.3% intend to vote. However, students, educated individuals, and some professionals show higher levels of disapproval regarding the timing and lower intention to vote.
- **Upper House PR:** Public awareness of Proportional Representation (PR) in an upper house of parliament is low, with 56% of respondents unfamiliar with the concept. Among those who are aware, there is more support for the system than opposition. Awareness and support for PR are highest among younger generations and those with higher education.

The findings show that younger generation have discontent about the political environment. Gen Zs are less favorable about police/administration's impartiality during the vote. Higher-educated respondents are less favorable on IG performance, are more likely to report increase in extortion, and are more aware/positive about PR. Students show lower turnout intent to vote than household respondents, are more likely to disagree with the February 2026 timing, and are more likely to say extortion worsened in last 6 months.

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. About INNOVISION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.1 Background .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Methodology .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Findings.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1 Public Confidence in Governance.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.2 Public Confidence Regarding an Impartial Election .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.3 Perceived Impartiality of Police &amp; Administration during Election .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.4 Perception about Voter Safety &amp; Risks .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.5 Voter Safety &amp; Risk: Likelihood of Political Clashes or Violence During Election.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.6 Current Law &amp; Order Situation .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>3.7 Law &amp; Order Situation: Sources of Information on Extortion.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3.8 Election Timing &amp; Turnout Intentions .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>3.9 Election Timing &amp; Turnout Intentions: Intention to Vote if Election is Held Next February..</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3.10 Views on Electoral Reform .....</b>	<b>22</b>

# 1. About INNOVISION

INNOVISION is an international advisory and management consulting firm. We are working on transforming the world's trade, investment, finance and socio-economic systems. We offer research, technical assistance, and project management services to support government, private sector actors, international development partners, multilateral organizations, and civil society organizations in designing, implementing, and evaluating inclusive and systemic solutions. Our work spans across regions, fostering South-South and South-North cooperation to identify and overcome barriers to inclusive market, equitable trade and shared prosperity.

We are the largest in Bangladesh in undertaking research and management consulting services on national economic and social development challenges. INNOVISION is highly regarded in Bangladesh for its leadership in administering research during crisis and post emergency period. During COVID 19 shutdown INNOVISION was the first organization in Bangladesh to introduce phone call based rapid surveys to bring to light the challenges of low-income earning households. To date, INNOVISION has delivered more than 500 assignments in 22 countries across South and South East Asia, Middle East and North Africa (MENA), East Africa, Southern Africa and West Africa.

## 1.1 Background

The political landscape of Bangladesh underwent a profound shift following the fall of the Awami League-led government on August 5, 2024. This period of transition created a need to understand the public mood and to provide a platform for citizens' voices to be heard.

In response, INNOVISION launched “Bangladeshspeaks.com,” an online micro-polling site, to capture people's immediate reactions to the evolving political landscape. This early attempt to see public sentiment was soon followed by a more structured national poll in September 2024, which focused specifically on voting intentions, who people might vote for in a future election. The insights from these efforts confirmed the value of such work and revealed a clear demand for more systematic and in-depth analysis of public opinion.

This led to the creation of our **flagship initiative, the “People’s Election Pulse Survey” (PEPS)**. PEPS was one of the first national-level polls of its kind in Bangladesh, moving beyond simple voting intentions. The survey aimed to explore public sentiment on the performance of the interim government, citizen’s expectations from the next government, people’s voting choice and preferences and voting behaviors. It also explained voter's media usage behaviour on voting choice. On March 8, 2025, INNOVISION released insights from the first round of PEPS survey undertaken on 10,696 voting age respondents from all 64 districts of Bangladesh.

We understand that public opinion is fluid, shaped by ongoing events and the actions of political actors. INNOVISION intends to undertake several rounds of this survey between February 2025 and February 2026 to track these evolving sentiments. The poll carried out in February–March 2025 is treated as Round 1 of this series.

As a direct continuation, **INNOVISION has conducted the second round of PEPS**. This report presents the findings from Round 2 of our nationwide survey, conducted in September 2025. This ground breaking survey is designed and undertaken by INNOVISION with technical support from Bangladesh's finest political analysts, observers and is led by Bangladesh's best pollsters. PEPS is a national level face to face CAPI survey on households. The 10413-sample survey is the largest and the most rigorous in terms of methodological rigor in Bangladesh. PEPS is undertaken in association with the think tank Bangladesh Research Analytics and Information Network (BRAIN) and Voice for Reform.

The second round is divided into **two** parts.

1. The first part, focuses on Election Timing, Atmosphere, Law & Order and Expectations Towards the Interim Government.

2. And the second part focuses more on people's political choices.

This report consists of summary of the findings of the first part.

This second round has followed the same cross-sectional design and methodology adopted for the first round. This report thus provide a valuable comparative lens for analyzing how the nation's political pulse has changed.

## 2. Methodology

The People's Election Pulse Survey (PEPS) Round 2 employed a rigorous methodology to ensure a representative assessment of public opinion. A **two-stage stratified cluster sampling design** was implemented using the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics' Population and Housing Census 2011 as the sampling frame, as the complete enumeration area database from the 2022 census is not yet publicly available.

The survey captured the perceptions of **10,413 adult citizens** (18+ years of age) across the eight divisions of Bangladesh, with stratification by urban and rural areas. The initial target sample of 10,000 was allocated proportionally across these strata. **Primary Sampling Units (PSUs)**—defined as mohallas/paras for urban areas and mouzas/villages for rural areas—**were selected using a Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) method.**

The final data collection covered **521 PSUs**, with each PSU comprising approximately 20 interviews. To ensure the representation of voting-age students, the survey included both door-to-door household interviews and interviews conducted at university-level educational institutions. A total of **9,398 interviews were conducted in households**, while **1,015 interviews were conducted with students** at educational institutions.

Individual respondents within households were selected using a randomization grid programmed into the survey software. For institutional surveys, students were selected randomly on-site. Data collection was conducted through **Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI)** using the Kobo Toolbox platform to ensure accuracy and efficiency.

A multi-tiered quality assurance process was implemented to maintain data integrity, including on-field checks by supervisors, accompaniments during initial fieldwork, and a dedicated team that checked **100% of the audio recordings** of the interviews. Ethical considerations were strictly followed, ensuring informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary participation for all respondents.

The survey was executed over **14 days** (September 2–15, 2025) by a trained team of **108 enumerators and 12 supervisors**. The data was cleaned and analyzed using SPSS and STATA, with results disaggregated by key demographic and geographic variables to provide valuable insights into national public opinion.

**Sampling Method:** Two-stage stratified cluster sampling design.

- **Sample Size:** 10,413 voters
- **Sampling Units:** 8 divisions, 64 districts, 521 PSUs
- **Data Collection Method:** Computer-Aided Personal Interviewing (CAPI)

### Sample Distribution

- **Total Households Sampled:** 9,398 (door-to-door surveys)
- **Total University/Institute Samples:** 1,015
- **Total Samples:** 10,413

### Stratification:

- Rural vs. Urban: 69.5% rural, 30.5% urban
- Gender: 54.2% Male, 45.4% Female, 0.4% Third Gender

**Generational Cohorts:**

- 37.6% Gen Z
- 33.4% Millennials
- 19.8% Gen X
- 6.6% Boomers II
- 1.8% Boomers I\*
- 0.9% Post War and WWII

**Religious Affiliation:**

- 88.1% Islam
- 10.2% Hindu
- 1.4% Buddha
- 0.3% Christian

**Ethnic Representation:**

- 98.1% Bengali
- 1.9% Other ethnic groups

**Geographic Distribution of Samples**

- Dhaka Division: 25.6%
- Chattogram Division: 20.5%
- Rajshahi Division: 13.0%
- Khulna Division: 11.2%
- Rangpur Division: 11.0%
- Mymensingh Division: 7.1%
- Sylhet Division: 6.2%
- Barishal Division: 5.3%

## 3. Findings

### 3.1 Public Confidence in Governance

#### Performance of the Interim Government

When the respondents were asked how well the interim government under Dr. Yunus is running the country, 39.5% rated it 'Good', 39.2% 'Moderate', and 17.2% 'Bad' (Table 1).

**Table 1: Performance Rating of the Interim Government (Overall)**

Response	Percentage
Good	39.5%
Moderate	39.2%
Bad	17.2%
I can't say	4.1%
(n)	10413

The interim government has less favorable rating from students. Of the student samples from Universities, 54.1% rated the government's performance as moderate and 23.88% rated it as good while in household survey, 37.6% rated the interim government's performance as moderate and 41.2% rated it as good (Table 2).

**Table 2: Performance Rating of IG (by Type of Respondent)**

Type of the respondent	Bad	Moderate	Good	I can't say	(n)
Household survey	17.0%	37.6%	41.2%	4.2%	9398
University / Institute survey	18.9%	54.1%	23.8%	3.2%	1015

Approval ratings of the interim government generally increase with age. Gen Z provided the lowest 'Good' rating while the oldest generations provided the highest (Table 3).

**Table 3: Performance Rating of IG (by Age Group)**

Age group	Bad	Moderate	Good	I can't say	(N)
Gen Z	16.7%	45.0%	34.7%	3.6%	3914
Millennials	17.6%	36.8%	41.3%	4.2%	3475
Gen X	18.0%	34.8%	42.9%	4.3%	2059
Boomers II	16.8%	34.5%	44.1%	4.7%	685
Boomers I*	17.3%	31.9%	47.1%	3.7%	191
Post War and WWII	9.0%	30.3%	52.8%	7.9%	89

The positive approval rating is highest in Mymensingh (52.5% Good) and Rajshahi (49.0% Good). Dhaka showed the highest disapproval (24.2% Bad) (Table 4).



**Table 4: Performance Rating of IG (by Division)**

Division	Bad	Moderate	Good	I can't say	(N)
Barishal	20.0%	42.4%	36.2%	1.4%	556
Chattogram	17.5%	42.5%	37.0%	2.9%	2137
Dhaka	24.2%	39.0%	34.0%	2.8%	2661
Khulna	15.1%	41.1%	35.4%	8.4%	1169
Mymensingh	14.4%	27.5%	52.5%	5.7%	743
Rajshahi	12.0%	36.3%	49.0%	2.7%	1353
Rangpur	13.7%	38.7%	43.1%	4.5%	1146
Sylhet	9.1%	43.2%	40.3%	7.4%	648

In terms of education, there is a clear trend: the lower the education level, the better the approval rating of the interim government is (Table 5).

**Table 5: Performance Rating of IG (by Education Level)**

Education	Bad	Moderate	Good	I can't say	(n)
No education or Pre-School	17.0%	30.7%	46.2%	6.1%	1534
Some schooling but did not complete Primary	17.1%	35.0%	42.7%	5.2%	1020
Completed Primary but did not complete Secondary	16.0%	36.2%	43.8%	4.0%	3383
Secondary	16.9%	40.9%	38.5%	3.6%	1378
Higher Secondary	18.6%	47.8%	30.4%	3.2%	1873
Vocational	20.0%	50.9%	29.1%	0.0%	55
Bachelor's	20.4%	45.3%	31.2%	3.0%	794
Master's	16.3%	47.6%	34.2%	1.9%	374

Muslims are most likely to say “Good”; Hindus/Christians lean more towards “Bad” (Table 6).

**Table 6: Performance Rating of IG (by Religion)**

Religion	Bad	Moderate	Good	I can't say	(n)
Islam	16.2%	38.6%	41.5%	3.7%	9174
Hindu	25.8%	41.8%	25.1%	7.4%	1060
Christian	29.0%	41.9%	25.8%	3.2%	31
Buddha	15.6%	55.8%	25.9%	2.7%	147

## 3.2 Public Confidence Regarding an Impartial Election

Majority of the voting age population are confident about the IG’s ability to hold a free and fair election. When asked if the current government will be able to organize an impartial election, 69.9% said 'Yes', and 16.6% said 'No' (Table 7).

**Table 7: Confidence in the Government's Ability to Organize an Impartial Election**

Response	Percentage
Yes	69.9%
No	16.6%
I can't say/I don't want to say	13.5%
<b>(n)</b>	<b>10413</b>

Respondents from educational institutions are more skeptical (24.4% responded No) than household respondents (15.8% responded No) (Table 8).

**Table 8: Confidence in Organizing Impartial Election (by Type of Respondent)**

Type of the respondent	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Household survey	15.8%	70.8%	13.4%	9398
University / Institute survey	24.4%	61.4%	14.2%	1015

Higher percentage of voting age population in Rajshahi (76.9%) and Rangpur (73.7%) divisions have responded in favour of the IG's ability to hold a free and fair election. The rating is lowest in Barishal division (65.5%).

**Table 9: Confidence in Organizing Impartial Election (by Division)**

Division	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(N)
Barishal	21.0%	65.5%	13.5%	556
Chattogram	17.7%	69.3%	13.0%	2137
Dhaka	21.3%	66.1%	12.7%	2661
Khulna	14.3%	66.1%	19.6%	1169
Mymensingh	14.1%	73.4%	12.5%	743
Rajshahi	13.6%	76.9%	9.5%	1353
Rangpur	12.7%	73.7%	13.6%	1146
Sylhet	10.3%	73.1%	16.5%	648

Educated voting age population are more skeptic about IG's ability to hold a free and fair election (Table 10).

**Table 10: Confidence in Organizing Impartial Election (by Education Level)**

Education	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(N)
No education or Pre-School	13.4%	69.8%	16.8%	1534
Some schooling but did not complete Primary	15.6%	68.8%	15.6%	1020
Completed Primary but did not complete Secondary	14.3%	72.8%	12.8%	3383
Secondary	14.8%	73.1%	12.0%	1378
Higher Secondary	21.6%	66.6%	11.8%	1873
Vocational	7.3%	78.2%	14.5%	55
Bachelor's	23.2%	62.7%	14.1%	794
Master's	22.2%	65.8%	12.0%	374

Muslim respondents showed higher confidence than Hindu and Christian respondents in the IG's ability to hold a free and fair election (Table 11).

**Table 11: Confidence in Organizing Impartial Election (by Religion)**

Religion	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Islam	16.1%	71.2%	12.6%	9174
Hindu	19.5%	59.4%	21.0%	1060
Christian	25.8%	54.8%	19.4%	31
Buddha	22.4%	67.3%	10.2%	147

### 3.3 Perceived Impartiality of Police & Administration during Election

When asked if the police and administration will perform their duties impartially, 68.2% said 'Yes' and 20.6% said 'No' (Table 12).

**Table 12: Perceived Impartiality of Police and Administration**

Response	Percentage
Yes	68.2%
No	20.6%
I can't say/I don't want to say	11.22%
(n)	10413

Respondents from educational institutions are more skeptical about the impartiality of the Police and Administration during the election than the household respondents (Table 13).

**Table 13: Perceived Impartiality of Police and Administration (by Type of Respondent)**

Type of the respondent	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Household survey	18.4%	70.7%	10.9%	9398
University / Institute survey	41.0%	45.8%	13.1%	1015

Male respondents (23.7% No) are more skeptical than female respondents (16.7% No) about the impartiality of the Police and Administration during the election (Table 14).

**Table 14: Perceived Impartiality of Police and Administration (by Gender) (Table 14)**

Gender	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Male	23.7%	65.2%	11.1%	5639
Female	16.7%	72.0%	11.3%	4729
Transgender	37.8%	55.6%	6.6%	45

Respondents from urban areas are more skeptical about the impartiality of the Police and Administration during the election than the respondents from rural areas (Table 15).

**Table 15: Perceived Impartiality of Police and Administration (by Geographic Area)**

Geographic Area	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Urban	26.8%	61.2%	11.9%	3177
Rural	17.9%	71.3%	10.8%	7236

Perception about the impartiality of police and administration tend to improve with the age of the respondents (Gen Z 64.5%; Millennials 69.4%, Gen X 70.4%, Boomers II 74.3%) (Table 16).

**Table 16: Perceived Impartiality of Police and Administration (by Age Group)**

Age group	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(N)
Gen Z	24.0%	64.5%	11.5%	3914
Millennials	19.7%	69.4%	10.9%	3475
Gen X	18.2%	70.4%	11.4%	2059

Boomers II	15.5%	74.3%	10.2%	685
Boomers I*	15.7%	73.8%	10.5%	191
Post War and WWII	10.1%	79.8%	10.1%	89

Perception about the police and administration performing their duties impartially, is highest in Mymensingh (79.0%), Rangpur (77.1%), Rajshahi (75.9%); lower in Chattogram (61.2%) and Sylhet (62.0%) (Table 17).

**Table 17: Perceived Impartiality of Police and Administration (by Division)**

Division	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Barishal	26.4%	65.1%	8.4%	556
Chattogram	24.9%	61.2%	13.9%	2137
Dhaka	24.4%	65.7%	9.9%	2661
Khulna	16.5%	67.6%	15.9%	1169
Mymensingh	15.1%	79.0%	5.9%	743
Rajshahi	16.2%	75.9%	7.9%	1353
Rangpur	12.7%	77.1%	10.2%	1146
Sylhet	22.8%	62.0%	15.1%	648

Skepticism about the impartiality of police and administration increases with education. 32.5% of those with a Bachelor's degree said 'No', compared to 13.3% of those with no education (Table 18).

**Table 18: Perceived Impartiality of Police and Administration (by Education Level)**

Education	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
No education or Pre-School	13.3%	77.4%	9.2%	1534
Some schooling but did not complete Primary	18.1%	69.2%	12.6%	1020
Completed Primary but did not complete Secondary	17.1%	72.5%	10.5%	3383
Secondary	18.1%	70.5%	11.4%	1378
Higher Secondary	30.1%	58.0%	11.9%	1873
Vocational	12.7%	69.1%	18.1%	55
Bachelor's	32.5%	53.9%	13.6%	794
Master's	26.7%	62.8%	10.5%	374

## 3.4 Perception about Voter Safety & Risks

### Ability to Vote Safely & Without Fear

Respondents were asked if people will be able to go to the polling centers and cast their vote safely and without fear. 77.5% responded 'Yes', while 12.9% responded 'No' (Table 19).

**Table 19: Expectation of a Safe and Fearless Voting Environment**

Response	Percentage
Yes	77.5%
No	12.9%
I can't say/I don't want to say	9.6%
<b>(n)</b>	<b>10413</b>

Respondents from educational institutions are less confident, with 24.1% saying 'No', compared to 11.7% of household respondents (Table 20).

**Table 20: Perception on Safe Voting Environment (by Type of Respondent)**

Type of the respondent	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Household survey	11.7%	79.0%	9.4%	9398
University / Institute survey	24.1%	63.7%	12.1%	1015

Urban respondents expressed more concern (17.0% No) than rural respondents (11.1% No).

**Table 21: Perception on Safe Voting Environment (by Geographic Area)**

Geographic Area	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Urban	17.0%	73.2%	9.8%	3177
Rural	11.1%	79.4%	9.5%	7236

Gen Z expressed less confidence regarding safety, while the confidence generally increased with age of the respondents (Table 22).

**Table 22: Perception on Safe Voting Environment (by Age Group)**

Age Group	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Gen Z	16.0%	73.9%	10.0%	3914
Millennials	11.4%	78.4%	10.2%	3475
Gen X	11.2%	80.2%	8.6%	2059
Boomers II	9.1%	82.8%	8.2%	685
Boomers I*	11.5%	81.7%	6.8%	191
Post War and WWII	4.5%	87.6%	7.9%	89

Respondents from Barishal were found to be more pessimistic while Rangpur and Rajshahi were more on the optimistic side on safe voting environment (Table 23).

**Table 23: Expectation of Safe Voting Environment (by Division)**

Division	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Barishal	21.6%	70.3%	8.1%	556
Chattogram	15.6%	72.0%	12.4%	2137
Dhaka	14.5%	77.7%	7.8%	2661
Khulna	11.4%	73.8%	14.8%	1169
Mymensingh	11.0%	81.6%	7.4%	743
Rajshahi	11.5%	83.1%	5.4%	1353
Rangpur	5.9%	85.7%	8.4%	1146
Sylhet	9.7%	76.7%	13.6%	648

Concern regarding voting safety increases sharply with education levels. Only 7.2% of those with no education said 'No', compared to 20.7% of those with a Bachelor's degree (Table 24).

**Table 24: Expectation of Safe Voting Environment (by Education Level)**

Education	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
No education or Pre-School	7.2%	85.1%	7.8%	1534
Some schooling but did not complete Primary	9.1%	79.8%	11.1%	1020
Completed Primary but did not complete Secondary	10.4%	81.1%	8.5%	3383
Secondary	12.7%	77.9%	9.4%	1378
Higher Secondary	20.0%	68.7%	11.3%	1873
Vocational	3.6%	78.2%	18.2%	55
Bachelor's	20.7%	67.6%	11.7%	794
Master's	19.0%	71.1%	9.9%	374

### 3.5 Voter Safety & Risk: Likelihood of Political Clashes or Violence During Election

The survey assessed the perceived likelihood of clashes or violence between political parties in the respondent's area. Overall, 38.4% felt there would be 'None at all', while 14.2% felt the likelihood was 'High' and 19.7% felt it was 'Moderate' (Table 25).

**Table 25: Perceived Likelihood of Clashes or Violence During the Election**

Response	Percentage
None at all	38.4%
Low	21.3%
Moderate	19.7%
High	14.2%
I don't know/I don't want to say	6.4%
<b>(n)</b>	<b>10413</b>

Respondents from educational institutions are expecting higher occurrence of clashes or violence during the election. Students perceive the likelihood of "None at all" at only 16.8%, while this rate is 40.7% for household respondents (Table 26).

**Table 26: Likelihood of Clashes or Violence (by Type of Respondent)**

Type of the respondent	High	Moderate	Low	None at all	I don't know/I don't want to say	(N)
Household survey	13.0%	18.5%	21.5%	40.7%	6.4%	9398
University / Institute survey	25.6%	31.2%	19.5%	16.8%	6.8%	1015

Gen Z perceives the highest risk. And the perception of clash reduces as age increases (Table 27).

**Table 27: Likelihood of Clashes or Violence (by Age Group)**

Age Group	High	Moderate	Low	None at all	I don't know/I don't want to say	(n)
Gen Z	17.5%	23.8%	21.9%	30.0%	6.8%	3914
Millennials	13.8%	19.3%	21.3%	39.7%	5.9%	3475
Gen X	11.3%	16.0%	20.7%	44.9%	7.0%	2059
Boomers II	9.1%	10.8%	19.9%	55.5%	4.8%	685
Boomers I*	8.9%	17.3%	19.9%	48.2%	5.8%	191
Post War and WWII	4.5%	12.4%	25.8%	50.6%	6.7%	89

“High” perceived likelihood of clashes or violence is comparatively higher in Chattogram (21.4%) and Barishal (19.6%); while “None at all” is highest in Mymensingh (53.6%) (Table 28). The perception of risk of clash increases with education (Table 29).

**Table 28: Likelihood of Clashes or Violence (by Division)**

Division	High	Moderate	Low	None at all	I don't know/I don't want to say	(n)
Barishal	19.6%	31.1%	21.8%	20.9%	6.7%	556
Chattogram	21.4%	26.0%	18.4%	26.8%	7.3%	2137
Dhaka	16.1%	19.1%	22.7%	37.2%	5.0%	2661
Khulna	10.4%	17.5%	24.6%	42.1%	5.5%	1169
Mymensingh	7.9%	18.3%	13.1%	53.6%	7.1%	743
Rajshahi	11.2%	12.6%	24.6%	46.7%	5.0%	1353
Rangpur	7.9%	14.1%	24.4%	49.0%	4.5%	1146
Sylhet	9.6%	22.1%	15.4%	36.7%	16.2%	648

**Table 29: Likelihood of Clashes or Violence (by Education Level)**

Education	High	Moderate	Low	None at all	I don't know/I don't want to say	(n)
No education or Pre-School	9.2%	12.5%	18.6%	52.2%	7.5%	1534
Some schooling but did not complete Primary	12.6%	16.6%	23.7%	40.1%	7.0%	1020
Completed Primary but did not complete Secondary	12.3%	17.1%	22.1%	42.7%	5.8%	3383
Secondary	12.8%	21.0%	22.4%	38.6%	5.2%	1378
Higher Secondary	19.4%	25.4%	21.1%	27.7%	6.5%	1873
Vocational	16.4%	34.5%	16.4%	27.3%	5.5%	55
Bachelor's	21.7%	27.6%	19.5%	24.3%	6.9%	794
Master's	19.5%	29.4%	19.8%	22.5%	8.8%	374

## 3.6 Current Law & Order Situation

### Level of Extortion

Our survey also inquired about the situation of extortion in the last 6 months. A majority (56.6%) felt it had 'Increased', while 22.0% felt it had 'Decreased' (Table 30).

**Table 30: Perception about extortion situation in last 6 months**

Response	Percentage
Increased	56.6%
Decreased	22.0%
Remained the same	11.5%
I can't say	10.0%
<b>(n)</b>	<b>10413</b>

Respondents from educational institutes reported extortion to have “Increased” more (66.5%) than household respondents (55.5%) (Table 31).

**Table 31: Situation of Extortion (by Type of Respondent)**

Type of the respondent	Increased	Decreased	Remained the same	I can't say	(N)
Household survey	55.5%	23.0%	11.2%	10.3%	9398
University / Institute survey	66.5%	12.7%	14.0%	6.8%	1015

Higher proportion of urban respondents reported increase in extortion (61.6%) than rural respondents (54.4%) (Table 32).

**Table 32: Perception about extortion situation (rural vs urban)**

Geographic Area	Increased	Decreased	Remained the same	I can't say	(n)
Urban	61.6%	17.1%	12.8%	8.5%	3177
Rural	54.4%	24.1%	10.9%	10.6%	7236

Younger generations perceive the extortion situation as worsening more than older generations (Table 33).

**Table 33: Situation of Extortion (by Age Group)**

Age Group	Increased	Decreased	Remained the same	I can't say	(n)
Gen Z	62.3%	17.6%	11.6%	8.6%	3914
Millennials	56.4%	22.1%	11.5%	9.9%	3475
Gen X	51.1%	26.1%	11.5%	11.3%	2059
Boomers II	46.1%	31.2%	10.9%	11.7%	685
Boomers I*	51.3%	26.7%	7.9%	14.1%	191
Post War and WWII	32.6%	30.3%	13.5%	23.6%	89

Perception about “Increased” extortion is highest in Barishal (62.6%), Dhaka (62.5%), Chattogram (59.1%); lower in Sylhet (48.3%) and Rangpur (49.1%). “Decreased” is highest in Rajshahi (33.3%) (Table 34).

**Table 34: Situation of Extortion (by Division)**

Division	Increased	Decreased	Remained the same	I can't say	(n)
Barishal	62.6%	21.6%	8.1%	7.7%	556
Chattogram	59.1%	17.9%	14.0%	9.0%	2137
Dhaka	62.5%	18.6%	11.3%	7.7%	2661
Khulna	59.4%	19.8%	10.0%	10.8%	1169
Mymensingh	51.7%	26.1%	8.1%	14.1%	743
Rajshahi	49.4%	33.3%	8.5%	8.9%	1353
Rangpur	49.1%	24.9%	11.8%	14.2%	1146
Sylhet	48.3%	19.6%	18.8%	13.3%	648

The perception that extortion has increased rises significantly with the level of education of the respondents. 46.2% of those with no education said it increased, compared to 65.5% of those with a Master’s degree (Table 35). Similarly, the higher the income, the more likely respondents were to say extortion has increased (Table 36).



**Table 35: Situation of Extortion (by Education Level)**

Education	Increased	Decreased	Remained the same	I can't say	(N)
No education or Pre-School	46.2%	28.1%	9.9%	15.8%	1534
Some schooling but did not complete	50.9%	27.4%	10.5%	11.3%	1020
Primary					
Completed Primary but did not complete	54.7%	23.8%	10.7%	10.8%	3383
Secondary					
Secondary	58.6%	21.2%	12.1%	8.1%	1378
Higher Secondary	65.3%	15.1%	12.8%	6.8%	1873
Vocational	65.5%	20.0%	10.9%	3.6%	55
Bachelor's	63.5%	16.8%	13.5%	6.3%	794
Master's	65.5%	14.4%	13.9%	6.1%	374

**Table 36: Situation of Extortion (by Income Range)**

Range of Family Income	Increased	Decreased	Remained the same	I can't say	(n)
2000 to 12000	50.3%	23.5%	11.1%	15.1%	2379
12000 to 20000	55.6%	23.7%	10.8%	9.8%	3619
20000 to 30000	57.6%	22.5%	11.6%	8.3%	1797
30000 to 1000000	60.8%	21.0%	11.5%	6.7%	1603

### 3.7 Law & Order Situation: Sources of Information on Extortion

Among those who provided a perception on extortion (10413), the primary source of information was Social Media (41.1%), followed by Private TV channels (20.0%) and experiences of friends/relatives (19.9%) (n=9373) (Table 37).

**Table 37: Sources of Information Regarding Extortion**

Source	Percentage
Social media	41.1%
Private TV channels	20.0%
Experiences of friends/relatives	19.9%
Personal experience	13.4%
Newspapers	4.1%
Don't want to say	1.2%
Others	0.4%
<b>(n)</b>	<b>9373</b>

Respondents from educational institutions overwhelmingly rely on social media as a source (63.6%). Household respondents have more diverse sources, including social media (38.5%), TV (21.0%), and friends/relatives (21.4%) (Table 38).

**Table 38: Sources of Information Regarding Extortion (by Type of Respondent)**

Type of the respondent	Newspapers	Social media	Personal experience	Private TV channels	Experiences of friends/relatives	Don't want to say	Others	(N)
Household survey	3.7%	38.5%	13.6%	21.0%	21.4%	1.3%	0.4%	8427
University / Institute survey	7.1%	63.6%	11.6%	10.6%	5.9%	0.7%	0.4%	946

Respondents from urban areas use social media more than those from rural areas. It is interesting to see that personal experience of extortion is higher in urban areas (Table 39).

**Table 39: Sources of Information Regarding Extortion (by Geographic Area)**

Geographic Area	Newspapers	Social media	Personal experience	Private TV channels	Experiences of friends/relatives	Don't want to say	Others	(N)
Urban	5.0%	46.2%	16.4%	17.0%	14.1%	0.9%	0.4%	2906
Rural	3.6%	38.8%	12.1%	21.3%	22.5%	1.4%	0.4%	6467

There is a generational gap regarding social media as a source. 55.9% of Gen Z cited social media as their source. This reliance decreases sharply with age (e.g., Boomers II at 15.7%); older generations rely more on the experiences of friends/relatives (Table 40).

**Table 40: Sources of Information Regarding Extortion (by Age Group)**

Age Group	Newspapers	Social media	Personal experience	Private TV channels	Experiences of friends/relatives	Don't want to say	Others	(N)
Gen Z	4.7%	55.9%	11.7%	14.1%	12.3%	0.9%	0.3%	3579
Millennials	3.4%	38.9%	14.0%	21.0%	21.0%	1.4%	0.3%	3130
Gen X	3.7%	27.4%	14.2%	26.3%	26.5%	1.4%	0.4%	1827
Boomers II	4.3%	15.7%	17.7%	28.9%	30.9%	1.7%	0.8%	605
Boomers I*	5.5%	14.0%	14.6%	25.6%	37.8%	0.6%	1.8%	164
Post War and WWII	1.5%	13.2%	13.2%	20.6%	48.5%	1.5%	1.5%	68

Social media as a source on information on extortion is higher in Sylhet (54.3%) and Chattogram (45.4%); personal experience of extortion is notable in Barisal (22.0%) and Dhaka (17.8%) (Table 41).

**Table 41: Sources of Information Regarding Extortion (by Division)**

Division	Newspapers	Social media	Personal experience	Private TV channels	Experiences of friends/relatives	Don't want to say	Others	(N)
Barishal	2.3%	27.3%	22.0%	16.2%	32.2%	0.0%	0.0%	513
Chattogram	6.4%	45.4%	10.9%	18.8%	16.3%	2.0%	0.2%	1944
Dhaka	4.2%	43.9%	17.8%	18.3%	14.9%	0.6%	0.2%	2457
Khulna	2.1%	40.2%	7.5%	18.7%	28.6%	1.2%	1.8%	1043
Mymensingh	2.5%	42.5%	4.7%	23.7%	25.2%	1.1%	0.3%	638
Rajshahi	2.8%	30.5%	19.0%	24.2%	22.3%	1.1%	0.1%	1233
Rangpur	3.7%	38.3%	12.7%	22.7%	21.1%	1.5%	0.1%	983
Sylhet	5.3%	54.3%	5.2%	18.9%	12.8%	2.5%	1.1%	562

As education levels increase, social media as a source of exposure to information regarding extortion increase notably (Table 42).

**Table 42: Sources of Information Regarding Extortion (by Education Level)**

Education	Newspapers	Social media	Personal experience	Private channels	TV	Experiences of friends/relative	Don't want to say	Others	(N)
No education or Pre-School	2.2%	16.3%	16.6%	27.9%		34.5%	2.2%	0.3%	1291
Some schooling but did not complete Primary	2.2%	24.9%	15.4%	24.3%		30.4%	2.1%	0.8%	905
Completed Primary but did not complete Secondary	2.9%	37.4%	13.5%	20.1%		24.4%	1.1%	0.6%	3016
Secondary	5.2%	46.1%	12.8%	19.9%		14.8%	1.0%	0.2%	1266
Higher Secondary	5.5%	58.7%	11.9%	15.0%		7.9%	0.7%	0.3%	1745
Vocational	1.9%	56.6%	15.1%	18.9%		7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	53
Bachelor's	7.5%	60.3%	10.5%	13.6%		7.3%	0.7%	0.1%	744
Master's	7.1%	56.7%	11.7%	17.4%		6.6%	0.6%	0.0%	351

### 3.8 Election Timing & Turnout Intentions

#### Opinion on Election Timing

The survey respondents were asked if the election should be held in February 2026 as announced by the government, an overwhelming majority (86.5%) agreed, while 9.5% disagreed (Table 43).

**Table 43: Opinion on Holding the Election in February 2026**

Response	Percentage
Yes	86.5%
No	9.5%
I can't say/I don't want to say	4.0%
<b>(n)</b>	<b>10413</b>

Respondents from educational institutes are less in favor of the election being held in February 2026 (74.9%) compared to household respondents (87.7%) (Table 44).

**Table 44: Opinion on Election Timing (by Type of Respondent)**

Type of the respondent	Yes	No	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Household survey	87.7%	8.4%	3.9%	9398
University / Institute survey	74.9%	20.3%	4.8%	1015

A higher proportion of male respondents (12.9%) are not in favor of the election in February compared to female respondents (5.5%) (Table 45).

**Table 45: Opinion on Election Timing (by Gender)**

Gender	Yes	No	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Female	89.8%	5.5%	4.7%	4729
Transgender	86.7%	8.9%	4.4%	45
Male	83.7%	12.9%	3.4%	5639

Younger respondents (Gen Z) showed higher disagreement (11.0%) compared to older generations (e.g., Boomers II, 6.0%) (Table 46).

**Table 46: Opinion on Election Timing (by Age Group)**

Age Group	Yes	No	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Gen Z	84.8%	11.0%	4.2%	3914
Millennials	86.6%	9.5%	3.9%	3475
Gen X	88.1%	8.3%	3.6%	2059
Boomers II	90.8%	6.0%	3.2%	685
Boomers I*	87.4%	7.9%	4.7%	191
Post War and WWII	84.3%	5.6%	10.1%	89

Higher proportion of educated respondents have responded negatively on the election timing if compared to less educated respondents (Table 47)

**Table 47: Opinion on Election Timing (by Education Level)**

Education	Yes	No	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
No education or Pre-School	90.2%	4.6%	5.3%	1534
Some schooling but did not complete Primary	89.8%	4.9%	5.3%	1020
Completed Primary but did not complete Secondary	89.7%	6.5%	3.8%	3383
Secondary	86.0%	11.2%	2.8%	1378
Higher Secondary	80.6%	15.2%	4.3%	1873
Vocational	85.5%	10.9%	3.6%	55
Bachelor's	79.6%	17.8%	2.6%	794
Master's	78.9%	18.2%	2.9%	374

Service holders showed higher disapproval of the election timing, notably Teachers and Educators (19.0%), Healthcare Professionals (19.1%), and Government Job holders (17.6%). Students also showed high opposition (16.8%). Conversely, Homemakers (3.6%) and Retailers (3.5%) showed low opposition (Table 48).

**Table 48: Opinion on Election Timing (by Occupation)**

Occupation	Yes	No	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Business	84.4%	12.6%	3.0%	1681
Creative and Performing Artists	84.4%	11.1%	4.4%	45
Farmer	87.3%	8.6%	4.1%	1035
Government Job	80.4%	17.6%	2.0%	102
Healthcare Professionals	78.7%	19.1%	2.1%	47
Homemaker	91.3%	3.6%	5.1%	3427
Labourer	84.9%	10.5%	4.6%	820
Other	88.1%	10.1%	1.8%	336
Private Job and NGOs	85.2%	12.1%	2.7%	593
Retailer	95.3%	3.5%	1.2%	86
Student	79.5%	16.8%	3.8%	1700
Teachers and Educators	78.5%	19.0%	2.5%	121
Unemployed	88.1%	8.1%	3.8%	420

### 3.9 Election Timing & Turnout Intentions: Intention to Vote if Election is Held Next February

Respondents were asked if they will go to vote if the election is held in February. An overwhelming 94.3% said 'Yes' (Table 49).

**Table 49: Intention to Vote in the February Election**

Response	Percentage
Yes	94.3%
No	4.0%
I can't say/I don't want to say	1.8%
<b>(n)</b>	<b>10413</b>

While high overall, intention to vote is lower among University/Institute respondents (84.4% Yes) compared to household respondents (95.3% Yes) (Table 50).

**Table 50: Intention to Vote (by Type of Respondent)**

Type of the respondent	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
Household survey	3.0%	95.3%	1.7%	9398
University / Institute survey	10.7%	84.4%	4.8%	1015

Intention to vote decreases as education level increases. 97.6% of respondents with no education intend to vote, compared to 88.5% of those with a Master's degree (Table 51).

**Table 51: Intention to Vote (by Education Level)**

Education	No	Yes	I can't say/I don't want to say	(n)
No education or Pre-School	1.4%	97.6%	1.0%	1534
Some schooling but did not complete Primary	1.6%	97.1%	1.4%	1020
Completed Primary but did not complete Secondary	2.5%	96.3%	1.3%	3383
Secondary	4.1%	94.5%	1.4%	1378
Higher Secondary	6.7%	90.7%	2.6%	1873
Vocational	7.3%	89.1%	3.6%	55
Bachelor's	7.7%	89.7%	2.6%	794
Master's	7.2%	88.5%	4.3%	374

### 3.10 Views on Electoral Reform

#### Public Knowledge and Opinion on Upper House Proportional Representation (PR)

Respondents were asked if the PR system should be used in the upper house of the Parliament. Responses are dominated by low awareness, a majority (56.0%) had not heard of it or did not know enough to say. Among the rest, views were split (21.8% Yes, 22.2% No). The key takeaway from this analysis is, those who are aware of this system, they are comparatively more in favor of the PR system rather than opposing it (Table 52).

**Table 52: Opinion on Using Proportional Representation (PR) System in the Upper House**

Response	Percentage
I haven't heard of PR or don't know enough about it / can't tell	56.0%
No	22.2%
Yes	21.8%
(n)	10413

Education increases awareness. 69.6% of those with no education were unaware, compared to only 31.0% of those with a Master's degree. Among these respondents with master's degree, who are more aware of PR, 44.4% of them support the PR system compared to 24.6% who do not support it. It implies, awareness improves positive attitude towards upper house PR (Table 53).

**Table 53: Opinion on PR System (by Education Level)**

Education	No	Yes	I haven't heard of PR or don't know enough about it / can't tell	(n)
No education or Pre-School	16.7%	13.7%	69.6%	1534
Some schooling but did not complete Primary	20.0%	14.9%	65.1%	1020
Completed Primary but did not complete Secondary	21.7%	16.9%	61.5%	3383
Secondary	24.2%	23.9%	51.9%	1378
Higher Secondary	26.8%	28.3%	44.9%	1873
Vocational	27.3%	25.5%	47.3%	55
Bachelor's	23.9%	36.8%	39.3%	794
Master's	24.6%	44.4%	31.0%	374

Awareness and support for PR is highest among Gen Z, as compared to the other age groups.

**Table 54: Opinion on PR System (by Age Group)**

Age Group	No	Yes	I haven't heard of PR or don't know enough about it / can't tell	(n)
Gen Z	21.9%	26.9%	51.2%	3914
Millennials	22.3%	19.6%	58.1%	3475
Gen X	23.6%	18.0%	58.4%	2059
Boomers II	21.9%	18.0%	60.1%	685
Boomers I*	18.8%	18.3%	62.8%	191
Post War and WWII	14.6%	13.5%	71.9%	89