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## 1. Background

Since the first open democratic elections in South Africa in 1994, the ANC Alliance has steadily increased its majority in general elections to the point that it has appeared to have unassailable dominance of parliament and South Africa has come to be regarded as a clear example of a one party dominant system.

Single party dominance for a protracted period, particularly where the dominance is such as to ensure a two-thirds majority in parliament with the power to change entrenched clauses in the constitution, is likely to erode the vitality of any democracy. The morale of opposition voters is understandably depressed and the relative lack of leverage of opposition parties threatens their electoral credibility and capacity to mobilise both material and human resources.

In recent months in South Africa, three developments have occurred that might signal possibilities of the power imbalance becoming ameliorated and of the initiative beginning to shift towards alternatives to one-party dominance. The first factor has been the surfacing of disunity in the governing Alliance accompanying the success of Mr. Jacob Zuma in being elected as President of the ANC and ushering in a change of key office bearers to challenge the influence of personnel associated with the leadership of the outgoing President of the country. The tensions within the governing Alliance and associated policy difference could well signal the dilution of the liberation solidarity that has given the ANC formidable coherence since 1994.

The second development has been the quickening descent of neighbouring Zimbabwe into political chaos and economic crisis, along with a surge of refugees across the borders and anti-foreigner violence in South Africa that has punished economic confidence in the economy. These developments might for South Africans provide a warning of the consequences of political domination by a party impervious to legitimate challenges to its control.

A third factor has been interest among key South Africa opposition parties in the possibilities of augmenting their influence by collaborating in some form of alliance,
possibly as an electoral alliance for the next general elections in 2009 or possibly thereafter in coalition form in the legislative process at all three tiers of government.

This political opinion survey is intended to shed light on the reactions of voters to the events and possibilities briefly sketched above and the further possibilities emerging after the next general election.

## 2. The Survey

MarkData, an opinion polling and strategic research company that has operated as an independent private sector organisation since its separation from the statutory Human Sciences Research Council in 1996-1997, regularly undertakes surveys of political support patterns in South Africa and other African countries. Its political opinion surveys are based on two-stage stratified probability samples of adult voters in households in all communities throughout the country in both rural and urban areas, using census enumerator areas as a sampling frame.

The current survey, which covers 2415 adult South Africans, is slightly larger than the 2250 of previous surveys and also incorporates a modified design intended to strengthen the sample size and reliability of results in opposition constituencies without sacrificing the relevance of results for the electorate as a whole. Hence, in the first stage of sampling, constituencies more likely to include opposition voters were given a slightly higher chance of being randomly selected than those that typically contain dominant majorities of governing party supporters, but subsequent to the completion of fieldwork the sampling results were re-weighted using appropriate post-weighting software in order to provide estimates of the overall national support patterns of political parties.

The post-weighting controlled for the following variables to ensure a representative outcome:

- Gender balance
- Proportions according to race
- Age
- Dwelling and residential area categories: rural farming/rural traditional/urban, informal/ low cost and middle class housing areas/ hostels and collective dwellings/ metropolitan areas versus smaller towns.

Figure 1. Sample distribution by province (Weighted)


Figure 2. Sample distribution by age, gender and race (Weighted)


Thus the results are statistically comparable with those of previous surveys but allow generalisations to be made in opposition constituencies with greater confidence than would be the case in a standard sample of the electorate. This refinement is indicated in situations where a single party in the past has captured over two-thirds of the results leaving sample sizes in opposition constituencies small by comparison.

The un-weighted (non-rectified) sampling outcome in terms of the governing party versus collective opposition versus non-choice responses in the current survey was as follows:

| ANC-SACP Alliance: | 1100 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Other political parties: | 885 |
| No choice: (uncertain, will not vote, etc.): | 430 |
| TOTAL SAMPLE: | 2415 |

The survey results that follow, however, will reflect the proportionate breakdowns of estimates after computer weighting and rectification. The breakdown above, however, indicates that samples sizes for non-governing Alliance supporters are sufficiently generous to allow relatively confident statistical generalisations.

The fieldwork was carried out by regular field teams employed by MarkData, consisting of experienced interviewers long accustomed to carrying out political studies. The field executives have been in the employ of the company for over a decade and some for considerably longer. Face-to-face personal interviews were conducted followed by a $15 \%$ back-check on accuracy of selection procedures and questions posed. All respondents were assured of the utter confidentiality of their replies.

In the report that follows tabulations will be presented on critical findings. In some cases, for the sake of easier reading, however, lengthy tabulations are avoided in favour of shorter summaries or discussion in the text. The readers who wish to consult the detailed tabulations of the survey output can consult Appendix B (tabulations according to political party) in consultation with Appendix $\mathbf{A}$ (the complete questionnaire applied in the field).

## 3. The Results: weighted and rectified

## Party Support Patterns

The following breakdown of party strengths emerged from the standard open-ended question posed: "Which political party will you vote for in the general election in 2009?" The results are presented in the table below compared with results in two previous surveys by MarkData.

Table 1. Current strength of political parties compared with two previous surveys
(The percentages in parenthesis exclude respondents not intending to vote or not responding in order to approximate an election outcome)

| Political party <br> supported | May <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ |  | March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |  | March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{( \% )}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{( \% )}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{( \% )}$ |
| ANC/SACP | 59,6 | $(70,5)$ | 62,0 | $(76,8)$ | 52,3 | $(73,7)$ |
| PAC | 0,6 | $(0,7)$ | 0,7 | $(0,9)$ | 0,9 | $(1,3)$ |
| NNP | - | - | 0,6 | $(0,7)$ | 2,0 | $(2,8)$ |
| DA | 17,4 | $(20,6)$ | 9,9 | $(12,3)$ | 7,9 | $(11,2)$ |
| ID | 2,0 | $(2,4)$ | 1,4 | $(1,7)$ | 3,3 | $(4,7)$ |
| UDM | 1,0 | $(1,2)$ | 0,5 | $(0,6)$ | 0,7 | $(1,0)$ |
| IFP | 2,1 | $(2,5)$ | 3,2 | $(4,0)$ | 2,7 | $(3,8)$ |
| FF+ | 0,5 | $(0,6)$ | 0,4 | $(0,5)$ | 0,2 | $(0,3)$ |
| ACDP | 0,9 | $(1,0)$ | 0,5 | $(0,6)$ | 0,7 | $(1,0)$ |
| Right wing parties | - | - | 0,2 | $(0,2)$ | - | - |
| AZAPO | 0,4 | $(0,5)$ | 0,3 | $(0,4)$ | - | - |
| Other | 0,4 | $(0,4)$ | 1,1 | $(1,3)$ | 0,2 | $(0,2)$ |
| (Total of party <br> choices) | $(100,4)$ |  | $(100,0)$ |  | $(100,0)$ |  |
| No choice <br> (undecided, will not <br> vote, not registered, <br> not interested in <br> politics, refuse) | 15,5 | - | 19,2 |  | 29,1 |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deviations from 100 due to rounding |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Comparisons of party strength have to be based on the second set of estimates for each year (the figures in brackets) that allow standardised comparisons with the uncertain voters removed. These figures also approximate election outcomes (it is a common procedure in electoral research to remove the uncertain voters and those who refuse to give a choice in order to estimate election outcomes).

Hence, as voter attitudes stand at the moment, what may be predicted from these results is that the ANC majority in the next election will decline slightly to just over $70 \%$ and that the DA will consolidate its position as the major opposition to government, with results like the following:

## Party outcomes 2009:

| - | ANC/SACP: | $\mathbf{7 0 - 7 1 \%}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| - | DA: | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1 \%}$ |
| - | ID: | $\mathbf{2 - 3 \%}$ |
| - | IFP: | $\mathbf{2 - 3 \%}$ |
| - | UDM: | $+-\mathbf{1 \%}$ |
| - | ACDP: | $+-\mathbf{1 \%}$ |
| - | PAC: | $<\mathbf{1 \%}$ |
| - | FF+: | $<\mathbf{1 \%}$ |
| - | AZAPO: | $<\mathbf{1 \%}$ |
| - | Others: | $<1 \%$ |

Broadly what the results in table 1 show is that the level of uncertainty among voters has declined from 2004. Currently only some $16 \%$ of the electorate does not make choices between parties in the survey interviews. There is a challenge for opposition parties, however, in that the motivation to vote among their supporters is slightly lower than that among ANC supporters:

Table 2. Motivation to vote among party supporters

| Party | Voter motivation: <br> Will definitely/probably vote* | Total \% of party <br> Supporters |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ANC | $80 \%+13 \%$ | $93 \%$ |
| ID | $52 \%+37 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| DA | $67 \%+20 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| ACDP | $67 \%+19 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| UDM | $74 \%+7 \%$ | $81 \%$ |
| Other parties | $54 \%+21 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| IFP | $55 \%+18 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| FF+ | $29 \%+41 \%$ | $70 \%$ |

* "Definitely" or "probably" is taken as a firmer intention to vote than other responses like will "possibly" vote or will probably or possibly not vote

It is clear from the table above that the ANC has a motivational advantage, not necessarily because of enthusiasm among supporters but because of what is by now an established habit of high voter turnout amidst the boredom of life in the mass
townships. The opposition parties are going to have to work on strengthening the motivation to go to the polls among their supporters.

The results in table 1 broadly show that:

- The ANC/SACP: while it strengthened up to 2007, its support has now fallen back slightly to some $71 \%$ in an election outcome. It may be seen as surprising that it has maintained its support at so high a level despite the lack of service delivery for many supporters and the turbulence in the party but it should be expected for the following reasons:
- The disagreements over leadership in the party have kept it very firmly in the news, and publicity is a first requirement in the maintenance of party support - "any news is good news" as it were.
- The leaders of different support groups in the party are all inside the party, hence not only villains but the heroes as well are ensconced in key party structures.
- The prospects of a new leader in the person of Mr. Jacob Zuma, notwithstanding his controversial position, is a source of hope for the poorest, most aspirant and most numerous section among the party supporters.
- Among ANC supporters in our survey results, President Mbeki has a $53 \%$ "admiration" rating, but Mr. Zuma's rating is higher at $60 \%$. The current Deputy President Mlambo-Nguka's admiration rating is a mere $35 \%$ and Blade Nzimande of the SACP gets only $21 \%$. Some $22 \%$ of ANC supporters positively dislike Mr. Zuma. If Mr. Zuma takes over as Party Leader the level of disaffection therefore will not be very high somewhere between 10 and $20 \%$.

It is therefore more probable than not that the support for the ANC will consolidate around Zuma if he assumes the leadership, and that the party will strengthen slightly before the next elections. "Centrist" supporters that dislike Zuma and who will feel less comfortable in the party, will not exceed $10-20 \%$. There will thus be rather limited gains for the opposition if

Zuma succeeds Mbeki, but small gains from a very large party could nonetheless be significant for a smaller opposition party.

If Mr. Zuma does not assume the leadership due to the legal charges pending against him, the party will be thrown into disarray because there is no alternative candidate with a sufficiently prominent profile to unite the party at short notice. Under these conditions the support for the party will weaken, perhaps significantly. This is not to say that the ANC will lose its dominant position. Opposition parties are also not likely to gain from disaffection among Zuma loyalists. But there will be some potential gains for opposition parties.

It is very difficult to say which one of the two scenarios for the ANC holds most promise for increased opposition support.

- The Democratic Alliance has strengthened since 2004, most particularly since 2007, and now could capture some $21 \%$ of the vote in an election, the highest level any opposition party has achieved in any MarkData survey since 1994. This support is significantly multiracial: $21 \%$ African, $17 \%$ coloured, $8 \%$ Asian and $54 \%$ white.

The DA's growth prospects at this stage are somewhat limited by considerable hostility to it among African voters: $65 \%$ dislike the DA leader and $14 \%$ admire her. It is not because of her race - African voters have almost exactly the same reaction to Bantu Holomisa, Patricia de Lille and Mangosutho Buthelezi of the UDM, the ID and the IFP respectively. The hostility is significantly due to what one could call liberation solidarity -- a tendency among ANC activists and spokespeople to vilify and stereotype any leader outside the ANC Alliance. While the vilifications are usually no more than very loose rhetoric, like all stereotypes their effects are remarkably persistent.

- In the Western Cape the DA and the ANC receive exactly the same level of support. Western Cape support levels are as follows:

ANC 36,3\%, DA 35,9\%, ID 5,5\%, UDM 2,3\%, ACDP 1,2\% and all the other parties below $1 \%$.

Figure 3: Western Cape support levels


If these results are right, the DA could win the province with either the ID and, or the UDM as coalition or electoral alliance partners. The ANC, on the other hand, would have a problem finding a significant partner because all Western Cape parties with support levels above $1 \%$ would lose significant numbers of their supporters in a coalition or electoral alliance with the ANC.

- Support for other opposition parties is at a low level. The ID has recovered marginally but its support is still well below its high point in 2004. The UDM does not seem to be going anywhere, and nor are the IFP and the FF+.

Therefore it seems at this stage that the DA is the only opposition party that has a record of recent growth. This does not mean to say that other opposition parties will remain static from now on. The further growth of opposition in general, however, is made difficult by the political polarisation in the electorate that makes many if not most African voters hostile to any opposition, irrespective of its composition.

This is notwithstanding the fact that among ANC supporters:

- Nearly $40 \%$ are highly or partially dissatisfied with the performance of the government
- Nearly $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ feel that their quality of life is bad
- Some $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ feel that the country is moving in the wrong direction
- $47 \%$ would most like to support a party that is free of corruption clearly not an attribute of the current ANC

Aside from the exaggerated sense of solidarity in ANC ranks, and notwithstanding lip service to democratic principles, when asked what kind of opposition they would most like to see, ANC supporters respond as follows:

- 44\% would like a "cooperative" opposition that sometimes criticises but more often helps and supports the government
- $22 \%$ would like no opposition at all
- And when asked to identify things that ensure that a governing party keeps on doing its best for its supporters, only $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ prioritise an opposition party that criticises government and can attract support away from it.

The ANC has clearly done very well in discrediting the principle of opposition and along with it a tradition of pluralism and dissent.

It can be argued that opposition parties, therefore, have a dual responsibility. Not only should they promote the policies that they consider most desirable for the country and its people but they also have to defend and promote the principles of political pluralism, checks and balances, freedom of dissent and the rights and role opposition in democracy.

It is in this latter respect that there is a very great need for opposition parties to work together. It is also often said that the image liabilities of the opposition parties within the ANC camp and its stakeholder groups would be ameliorated if opposition parties were to operate in some form of wider Alliance. This challenge will be explored on the basis of other findings of this survey.

The growth potential of existing political parties

In order to assess the zone of possible expansion among political parties, two additional questions were posed about voting preferences in order to estimate the "closet" support that parties enjoy. The respondents were also asked:

1. What party "most" deserves to be supported
2. What other parties also deserve to be supported

In response to the first additional question the following pattern emerged:

## Party most deserving of support:

- $\mathbf{2 \%}$ of ANC support selects the DA
- $6 \%$ of DA support selects the ANC
- $12 \%$ of IFP support selects the ANC
- 2\% of IFP support selects the DA
- $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ of ID support selects the ANC
- 6\% of ID support selects the DA
- $28 \%$ of ACDP support selects the DA
- $2 \%$ of ACDP support selects the FF+
- $12 \%$ of $F F+$ support selects the DA
- $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ of UDM support selects the ANC
- 3\% of UDM support selects the IFP

The key issue, however, is how much overall "closet" support within other parties each party enjoys. This closet support represents a potential for expansion by a political party. In table 3 an estimate is calculated of the overall amount of potential support within other parties that each political party enjoys.

Table 3. The overall amount of hidden support within other parties that each political party enjoys (selected parties only)
Based on the parties that respondents consider:

1. To be most deserving of support
2. To be also deserving of support

| Political <br> party | Base support based <br> on party <br> respondents would <br> vote for in an <br> election (q.23) | Additional \%* of <br> hidden support <br> because party is <br> considered to be <br> "most" deserving of <br> support | Further \%* of <br> additional support <br> because party is <br> considered "also" <br> deserving of support |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANC/SACP | $\mathbf{7 1 , 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 5 \%}$ |
| DA | $\mathbf{2 0 , 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 4 \%}$ |
| IFP | $\mathbf{2 , 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 0 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 8 \%}$ |
| ID | $\mathbf{2 , 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 0 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 1 \%}$ |
| UDM | $\mathbf{1 , 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 0 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 2 \%}$ |
| FF+ | $\mathbf{0 , 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 0 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 6 \%}$ |
| ACDP | $\mathbf{1 , 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 0 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 8 \%}$ |
| * Additional \% is to the base of total support for parties excluding non-response |  |  |  |

In analysing the table, each party has to be considered separately because a gain for one means a loss for another and here the focus is only on potential gains. Summing up what table 3 tells us is that, due to hidden or "closet" support, under favourable circumstances, a better election campaign than all other parties and high supporter turnout, the potential for expansion in support for the following parties could be as follows (rounded \%s):

- ANCP/SACP: 70,5\% plus 9\%-15\% = 81\% - 86\%
- DA: $\quad 20,6 \%$ plus $\mathbf{4 \%}-\mathbf{1 8 \%}=\mathbf{2 5 \%}-\mathbf{3 9 \%}$
- IFP: $2,5 \%$ plus $1 \%-6 \%=4 \%-9 \%$
- ID: $2,4 \%$ plus $1 \%-10 \%=3 \%-12 \%$
- UDM: $\quad 1,2 \%$ plus $1 \%-6 \%=2 \%-7 \%$
- FF+: $\quad 0,6 \%$ plus $0 \%-4 \%=1 \%-5 \%$
- ACDP: $\quad 1,0 \%$ plus $0 \%-3 \%=0 \%-4 \%$

These outcomes are of course possibilities rather than probabilities but they reflect the maximum potential of each party given the extent of hidden sympathy and support, which may very well remain hidden. It certainly might be an incentive for certain parties like the DA and the ID, for example, to keep up the struggle for additional support and to seek potential alliance or coalition partners.

## The Issue of an Election Alliance or Coalition

The respondents in the survey were asked a general question about a coalition - loosely defined as parties that agree on basic principles not competing against each other but putting forward a shared list of candidates and operating together thereafter:

- Remarkably, $69 \%$ of the respondents felt that this was a very good or fairly good idea
- It was however endorsed more strongly by opposition parties, excluding the IFP, than by ANC supporters

Certain attributes or functions of a coalition were put to all respondents and the proportions considering that the attributes were essential or a good thing were as follows:

- A coalition should be a rainbow coalition with prominent people from all groups: 70\% support
- A coalition should strengthen opposition to the ANC: $58 \%$ overall support, rising to over $75 \%$ among opposition parties excluding the IFP.
- A coalition should draw together the best expertise in running the country irrespective of race: 72\% support
- A coalition should only include parties that believe in the same economic principles: $65 \%$ support
- A coalition should only include parties that believe in the same political and democratic principles: $66 \%$ support

It would seem, therefore that the principle of coalition and cooperation across party lines is rather overwhelmingly endorsed. One must be very cautious in this respect, however - people just love the idea of cooperation and consensus and the replies above may be a reflection of uncritical political sentimentality, very much like our collective enthusiasm for "reconciliation" and "ubuntu" when our actual behaviour is more often than not exactly the opposite.

A far more valid test of the acceptance of political cooperation is to specify the participants in a coalition or alliance and then test voter reaction. The following concrete examples were given and the proportions indicating that they would actually vote for such an alliance were as follows -- first the general response and then the response among ANC supporters and finally the reactions of opposition supporters. See table 4.

Table 4. Reactions to three alternative coalition options

| Composition <br> of coalition | Percentage that would definitely or probably vote for the coalition <br> or seriously consider supporting it <br> All Voters |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ANC supporters | All opposition supporters |  |
| The DA, ID <br> and the UDM | $58 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| The DA, ID, <br> UDM and IFP | $55 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| The DA, ID, <br> UDM and the <br> FF+ | $49 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $87 \%$ |

Figure 4. Reactions to three alternative coalition options


The support among ANC voters is remarkable and probably reflects not only the sentimental attractions of cooperation but also the quite substantial perception among many (but not all) ANC supporters that there should be a stronger and critical opposition to government (34\%). While they would probably not actually vote for such
a coalition, the ANC supporters in their responses above are possibly responding to genuine enthusiasm for better government.

The first option is clearly the optimal composition in terms of potential support in general and it is very clearly the optimal coalition composition for opposition party supporters.

One notes from a comparison of the options that while the addition of the Freedom Front Plus depresses support it does so most among all voters and among the ANC supporters and relatively less among opposition party supporters. Among the latter it is the second most attractive alternative.

The addition of the IFP also depresses potential support in all categories but most significantly among opposition party supporters.

As an opposition approach, therefore, a coalition comprising the DA, ID and UDM is clearly the most advantageous, with the addition of the IFP least attractive to opposition supporters.

Another perspective on the composition of the cooperating alliance or coalition is seen in the extent to which certain parties are rejected as participants.

Rejection of party participation in an association, by other parties:

- The ANC is rejected by:
- FF+: $\quad \mathbf{8 7 \%}$ of supporters
- DA: 73\%
- ACDP: 71\%
- ID: 57\%
- UDM: 43\%
- IFP: 40\%
- The DA is rejected by:
- ANC: 35\%
- UDM: 17\%
- IFP: 14\%
- ACDP: 7\%
- ID: 5\%
- FF+: 4\%
- The ID is rejected by:
- ANC: 42\%
- UDM: 33\%
- IFP: 20\%
- FF+ 17\%
- ACDP: 13\%
- DA: 12\%
- The UDM is rejected by:
- ANC: 34\%
- The FF+ 33\%
- DA 28\%
- IFP 23\%
- ACDP 21\%
- ID 13\%
- The IFP is rejected by:
- ANC: 44\%
- ID: 30\%
- ACDP: 30\%
- DA: 28\%
- FF+: 21\%
- UDM: 13\%
- The FF+ is rejected by
- ANC: 53\%
- UDM: 45\%
- DA: 28\%
- ID: 26\%
- IFP: 24\%
- ACDP: 20\%

There are certainly few signs of racial patterns in the levels of rejection of one another by parties. The supposedly white dominated DA is rejected less by the supposedly black dominated ANC than the less "white" ID and the black IFP. There is clearly a
mindset opposed to the former right wing stance of the $\mathrm{FF}+$ and a strong residue of the tensions between the ANC and the IFP. Hence there is a mix of ideological and leadership factors involved in rejection of parties, as is quite normal in party politics.

Because the notion of inter-party cooperation is to increase the likelihood of drawing support from across the spectrum of parties, and particularly from black voters, it is useful to consider the overall levels of rejection of particular parties among opposition supporters, all voters and black voters. The patterns are given in table 5:

Table 5. Overall level of rejection of political parties as coalition partners among opposition supporters and voters at large

| Political <br> party | Level of rejection <br> as partner by <br> opposition <br> supporters | Level of rejection as <br> partner by all <br> respondents | Level of rejection by <br> all BLACK <br> respondents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANC | $55 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| FF+ | $46 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| IFP | $39 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| ID | $33 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| UDM | $31 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| DA | $30 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $32 \%$ |

In looking at these figures one must bear in mind that particularly among ANC supporters, respondents who are not interested in a coalition with any party are part of the rejection levels. This distortion applies mainly to the answers by ANC supporters in respect of the ANC. The other figures for rejection levels are almost all rejection of a party as a coalition partner.

The ANC might be the largest party in a dominant position but outside of its large support base it is not popular at all. Despite all the loose or subtle accusations of "racist" intention by ANC leaders and activists, the DA is the least disliked party both in the electorate as a whole and among opposition supporters and black voters. Fortunately the activist denunciation of the DA as neo-liberal or racist has little effect on mass sentiment.

The IFP has a poor image in both the electorate at large and among opposition supporters, and the same can be said of the FF+. The ID and the UDM are in a relatively favourable position with levels of rejection only slightly higher than that of the DA.

The issue of the race of candidates that a coalition should field was also explored and the results appear in table 6 according to the main prospects for coalition membership.

Table 6. Types of candidates that a coalition of parties should field

| Types of candidates | ANC | DA | ID | UDM | FF+ | ACDP | All <br> Respondents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Broad quotas for different <br> races | 32 | 30 | 21 | 48 | 58 | 39 | 33 |
| People with the greatest <br> knowledge and ability | 52 | 67 | 76 | 49 | 42 | 54 | 56 |
| Anyone but NOT whites | 12 | 2 | 3 | 3 | - | 7 | 8 |

If one considers the practices of affirmative action, BEE and candidate selection by the ANC, the results in this table could be from a different country.

We note that the DA and the ID supporters have distinctly similar views on the desirability of knowledge and ability in the selection of candidates. This is a powerful unifying factor in coalition politics. The other opposition parties are rather more inclined to favour racially based quotas for candidate selection, a problematic preference in democracy. Only the ANC, however, has a significant minority of supporters that favour the exclusion of whites altogether, fortunately small at some $12 \%$ of ANC supporters.

Another issue relating to candidates that could be extremely divisive relates to a code of conduct as a basis of candidate acceptance, and the implied exclusion of candidates who are not above reproach. The results of a question on this are summarised in table 7.

Table 7. Strict adherence to a code of conduct for candidates, versus relaxations on the basis of popularity or race

| Adherence <br> versus <br> exceptions | ANC | DA | ID | UDM | ACDP | IFP | FF+ | All <br> Respondents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Strict <br> adherence <br> to code | 50 | 79 | 70 | 54 | 86 | 48 | 83 | 57 |
| Exceptions <br> on the <br> basis of <br> popularity <br> or race | 50 | 21 | 30 | 46 | 14 | 52 | 17 | 43 |

The supporters of the DA, the ID, the ACDP, and the FF+ are strongly in favour of strict adherence to a code of conduct whereas the UDM and the IFP supporters tend to be rather similar to those of the ANC, who equivocate on the issue.

One should also consider the compatibility of party supporters on issues of policy and socio-political attitudes. Questions were posed with multiple items and the results need not be presented in full. The results will be summarised below but interested readers are referred to Appendix B for the full detail ( $\mathrm{q} 3-7,10$ ).

Broadly the results suggest the following:

## Government performance

- Intense dissatisfaction with government performance is present among $40 \%$ of more of supporters of all opposition parties. Intense dissatisfaction falls to just over $20 \%$ among ANC support. There is thus considerable opposition consensus
- Some $70 \%$ or more of all opposition supporters feel that the country is heading in the wrong direction, as opposed to $40 \%$ in the ANC
- Generally only somewhat more than a third of all voters and those in both government and opposition parties feel that their quality of life is bad or very bad. Among IFP and FF+ supporters, however, this rises to over $60 \%$.

Quality of life, however, is not necessarily closely linked to government performance.

- Some $70 \%$ or more of ANC supporters feel that government tries its best to provide a better life, and this view is shared by $45 \%$ of ID, $40 \%$ of ACDP and $63 \%$ of UDM supporters. In the DA, the IFP and the FF+ less than a third of supporters make this concession. In this respect the opposition is divided.


## Social and political policy

- Not surprisingly, with the exception of the FF+ which is cynical about state action, all party supporters, ANC included, are broadly agreed on the following policy priorities:
- Assistance to people in poverty
- Investment for growth
- Combating crime and abuse
- Fighting corruption
- Improved basic service delivery
- The need for a more efficient public service
- Improved education and training
- Improved health and HIV/Aids policies
- Improved public housing delivery
- Changing labour laws to combat unemployment (except among ACDP and FF+ supporters). The respondents' agreement was elicited more by the concern over unemployment than a desire to change labour laws, however.
- There is somewhat less general enthusiasm, but broad inter-party consensus on and support for:
- Protecting workers' rights (the FF+ disagrees)
- The protection of language and cultural rights
- Achieving racial harmony and reconciliation (except the FF+)
- There is, however, divergence of views on the following issues:
- State appointments on merit and ability irrespective of race. Only half of ANC supporters support merit appointments whereas majorities of all opposition parties, particularly the ID, the UDM and the DA support merit.
- The ID, the ACDP and the FF+ are fairly strongly opposed to transformation policies to overcome the effects of Apartheid. The ANC, the DA and the other opposition party supporters are, however, lukewarm in their support. This policy was once more widely supported but it has been partially discredited by promoting the interests of a new elite.
- There is only lukewarm support or less for policies to reduce inequality between rich and poor of any race, even in the ANC. While the inequality is condemned government intervention is mistrusted, except among IFP supporters, who see themselves as the poorest of the poor.
- There is fairly lukewarm support for Affirmative Action and Empowerment policies, but moderate opposition to these policies by DA, ID, ACDP, and FF+ supporters, once again because government has misapplied the policies.
- For the very same reason there is even more lukewarm support for restitution policies to compensate for Apartheid

Conclusions on the issue of coalitions will be drawn at the end of this report.

## 4. Leadership Image

In table 8 the proportions of all voters and of opposition voters who either admire or dislike the country's leaders are presented.

Table 8. Admiration versus dislike of political leaders

| Leaders | All voters, ANC included |  | Opposition supporters |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Admire | Dislike | Admire | Dislike |  |
| ANC Alliance | $\mathbf{\% - >}$ | $\mathbf{\%}->$ | $\mathbf{\%}->$ | $\mathbf{\%}->$ |  |
| Thabo Mbeki | 38 | 37 | 17 | 57 |  |
| Jacob Zuma | 46 | 36 | 25 | 58 |  |
| Phumzile M-Nguka | 28 | 46 | 18 | 57 |  |
| Blade Nzimande | 17 | 58 | 11 | 62 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Opposition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Helen Zille | 25 | 51 | 48 | 31 |  |
| Mangos. Buthelezi | 14 | 62 | 19 | 53 |  |
| Patricia de Lille | 20 | 53 | 34 | 39 |  |
| Pieter Mulder | 8 | 68 | 15 | 60 |  |
| Bantu Holomisa | 14 | 60 | 12 | 59 |  |

These results are remarkable. Only Jacob Zuma is admired more than he is disliked among all voters, the majority of whom are ANC. Mbeki is admired and disliked in equal measure and the other leaders of the ruling Alliance are disliked more than they are liked. There is a leader-appeal vacuum among the governing elite, and even Zuma is disliked by well over a third of all voters.

As expected, opposition leaders are disliked much more than they are liked among all voters, but Helen Zille and Patricia de Lille are disliked least.

Among opposition voters, Helen Zille is admired most and disliked least, followed by Patricia de Lille. The other opposition leaders clearly do not have a following outside their own parties. Helen Zille is the leader most likely to find support outside her own party.

## 5 Broad Conclusions

## Party strength:

The ANC/SACP Alliance is still clearly the dominant force in the electorate. It has, however, weakened slightly after sustained growth since 1994. The end of a trend and the peaking of support always signals possibilities of a change of direction and opposition parties should take heart from these signals.

At the same time, however, there will be some consolidation of ANC support during the 2009 election campaign under a new leader, and the effects of the peaking of underlying support may not be very clearly evident until after the elections. The consolidation of support will not be as powerful as it has been in past election campaigns, however, because never before has the ANC gone into elections with a leader whose popularity is not universal in the party.

In the past opposition parties have perceived the effects of the ANC party activists playing the race card to consolidate black support against the opposition. Whether the exploitation of race has been the main consolidating factor is debateable, however. Other possible factors are the effects on voters of overblown and over-optimistic promises of a "better life" (detailed results in Appendix B show how susceptible mass voters are to such promises) as well as the pervasive pressure of politics in public life. In response to question 8 (see Appendix A) it may be noted that black and so-called coloured voters are most likely to find it very difficult to hold political opinions different to those of the people around them (around 20\%), and this diffuse pressure certainly helps the consolidation of parties dominant in specific areas. Racial solidarity, in this author's interpretation of trends in the results, not as powerful a factor as it has been in the past. Among rank-and-file black voters it is less powerful than it is among new elites and among a fairly distinctive African nationalist core within the ANC, which is less than $20 \%$ of ANC support. This leads to the second theme in these conclusions.

More so than in very many survey results in the past, the significance of the racial factor in itself is rather muted. In the patterns of popularity or dislike of leaders and in a variety of direct probes, rank-and-file voters of the ANC and other parties are either disinterested in or firmly reject "race" as a criterion for acceptance. They perceive the complexities and contradictions in behaviour around them and generally see through the racial stereotypes peddled by activists, both black and white.

The DA as a political party is the best example of this. It has been commonplace for semi-"progressive" opinion leaders to hint or allege that the DA has a "neo-liberal" (i.e. new conservative) ideology and to imply that its agenda is racist. Yet the results in the survey show that, while there is minority based racial antipathy for the DA in the ANC, DA communication is more generally accepted as bona-fide and that there is considerable covert sympathy for its stance among rank-and-file black voters. The fact that this sympathy has not yet been translated into open electoral support, in this writers view, is due more to the barrage of promises that the ANC makes of a better life for the poor, a relative lack of healthy cynicism about politics and that the government does get its message through that, all its capacity failures notwithstanding, it is "trying its best" to improve the lives of the rank-and-file poor.

Race can never be discounted in South Africa, but at the same time, open democracy is still fairly new, and the judicious caution and indeed the cynicism about promissory rhetoric that effective democracy requires is not yet well-developed among the mass of voters. However disappointed they are, these voters still play it safe and support the party that most consistently promises that it is "on their side". Lavish promises are also in the nature of a short-term "fix" for disillusionment among all people. We should know how often unscrupulous partners get away with delinquency by promising undying love and fidelity thereafter. Political promises can have the same effect, and the respondents give a clear indication of this in the results of this survey (see the detailed results of q 11 in Appendix B).

Hence while opposition politics faces huge challenges in South Africa's segmented democracy, there is no reason to believe that the factor of majority-based racial solidarity is so overwhelming as to render the task of political education through effective communication at grass roots level hopeless. Certain opposition parties can
look forward to steady, if slow, gains in the future, and once a tipping point is reached, gains could be significant. And in the 2009 elections, unless the country is hugely disrupted by the economic downturn that will last through 2009, opposition parties collectively can look forward to increasing their share of the vote.

The DA in particular could look forward to quite significant gains as the major opposition party, taking its support to around the $20 \%$ mark.

## Cooperation, alliances and coalitions:

There is also very substantial popular support for political cooperation between opposition parties and interest in such cooperation among substantial minorities in the ANC support base.

The supporter interest in a coalition of parties is most significant in opposition ranks, however, and a well-crafted election alliance and or post election coalition could consolidate opposition strength.

From the perspective and preferences of the supporters, the cooperation would be most appropriate between the DA, the ID and the UDM and it is this combination that would optimise support levels. The addition of any other party would decrease the overall appeal.

On the basis of policy preferences and political orientations of supporters across racial categories, cooperation between the DA and the ID would be most appropriate, because other opposition parties have rather stronger elements of racial nationalism, black or otherwise, that will make cooperative action after the elections difficult.

The question arises, however, as to whether or not it will be important to include a party with a black leader. Yes and no.

As far as the general image and media profile of the cooperation is concerned, it will be an obvious advantage to have a prominent black leader in the ranks. As far as delivering votes in the short run, however, the effects will not be dramatic. Among
black voters at large, none of the possible black participants have public profiles and popularity levels that will deliver very significant numbers of extra votes. Full interracial cooperation will deliver medium term rather than short run benefits.

As in most countries aside from the highly developed few, the largest underlying challenge for democracy in South Africa is the level of independence and sophistication of voter choices, across racial categories. Although its current political and economic stresses may disguise it, South Africa is making progress. To that extent the results of this research are encouraging.

## Appendix A. Questionnaire

## RESPONDENTS AGED 18 YEARS AND OLDER AND ELIGIBLE TO VOTE RESPONDENTE OUDERDOM 18 JAAR EN OUER EN STEMGEREGTIG



MARKDATA (PTY.) LIMITED


SUBSTITUTE ADDRESS
SUBSTITUUT ADRES. $\qquad$

FIELDWORK CONTROL/VELDWERKKONTROLE

| FO CONTROL VO KONTROLE | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { YES } \\ \text { JA } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NO } \\ \text { NEE } \end{gathered}$ | REMARKS OPMERKINGS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PERSONAL/Persoonlik |  |  |  |  |
| TELEPHONIC/Telefonies |  |  |  |  |
| NAME/Naam | SIGNATURE/Handtekening: |  |  |  |
| ............................. | DATE/Datum .................../................/................ 2008 |  |  |  |

$\mathrm{YES}=1 / \mathrm{NO}=2$
$\mathrm{JA}=1 / \mathrm{NEE}=2$ $\square$ 7
8

O M N I B U S
APRIL 2008

| SUBSTITUTIONS SUBSTITUSIES | REASON FOR SUBSTITUTION REDE VIR SUBSTITUSIE | NUMBER OF TIMESHOEVEEL KEER |  | 9-10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LEFT/Links | RIGHT/Regs |  |
|  | NOBODY HOME AFTER 3 VISITS Niemand tuis na 3 besoeke |  |  |  |
|  | EMPTY PREMISES/HOUSE <br> Vakante perseel/huis |  |  | 11-12 |
|  | REFUSAL/Weiering |  |  | 13-14 |
|  | NOBODY QUALIFIES Niemand kwalifiseer nie |  |  | 15-16 |
|  | OTHER/Ander |  |  | 17-18 |
|  | TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTITUTES Totale aantal substitute |  |  | 19-20 |

Name of interviewer/Naam van onderhoudvoerder
Number of Interviewer/Nommer van Onderhoudvoerder Fieldwork organiser number/Veldwerk organiseerder nommer Checked by/Nagesien deur
Socio-Economic Category/Sosio-Ekonomiese Kategorie
Province/Provinsie
Magisterial District/Landdrosdistrik
EA Number/OG Nommer
Project Number/Projeknommer



## OMNIBUS SURVEY April 2008

MARKDATA regularly undertakes studies on a wide range of social matters amongst all population groups, for example research on family planning, education, unemployment, the problems of the aged, and Image studies.

This questionnaire covers a variety of subjects, which are currently being investigated to obtain additional information. Apart from biographical data, subjects being covered are: Social and Political

Political parties are beginning to get ready for the next general election in 2009. I am from MarkData, a private research company that regularly does research on economic, social and political issues. There have been many recent developments affecting political parties, and various organisations have encouraged MarkData to undertake research on how voters feel about what has been happening before the elections next year.

The area in which you live, as well as you personally have been selected randomly for the purpose of this survey. The fact that you have been chosen is thus quite coincidental. Your name will not be written anywhere on the questionnaire and you need not sign the questionnaire or any other documents. The information you provide will be treated as confidential. It will be processed by computer in such a way that no personal identification is possible.

## OMNIBUSOPNAME April 2008

MARKDATA doen gereeld ondersoeke onder alle bevolkingsgroepe oor ' n wye reeks maatskaplike aangeleenthede, byvoorbeeld: navorsing oor gesinsbeplanning, opvoeding, werkloosheid, die probleme van bejaardes, en Beeld studies.

Hierdie vraelys dek ' $n$ verskeidenheid onderwerpe wat tans ondersoek word ten einde addisionele inligting te bekom. Benewens biografiese data, word die volgende onderwerpe gedek: Sosiaal en Polities

Politieke partye begin hulself gereed kry vir die volgende algemene verkiesing in 2009. Ek is van MarkData, 'n privaat navorsingsmaatskappy wat gereeld navorsing doen oor ekonomiese, maatskaplike en politieke aangeleenthede. Daar was in die afgelope tyd talle ontwikkelinge wat politieke partye raak en verskeie organisasies het MarkData aangemoedig om voor die verkiesing volgende jaar navorsing te doen oor kiesers se gevoelens oor wat gebeur het.

Die gebied waarin u woon, en uself, is vir die doeleindes van hierdie opname op ' $n$ ewekansige wyse geselekteer. Die feit dat $u$ by die steekproef ingesluit is, is heeltemal toevallig. Dus sal u naam nêrens op die vraelys geskryf word nie en daar word ook nie van u verwag om die vraelys of enige ander dokumente te onderteken nie. Die inligting wat u verskaf word vertroulik hanteer. Dit sal deur ' n rekenaar op sodanige wyse verwerk word dat geen persoonlike identifisering moontlik is nie.

PARTICULARS OF VISITS/BESONDERHEDE VAN BESOEKE


| * TIME/TYD | **OUTCOME/UITKOMS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Interview completed/Onderhoud voltooi. | $=$ | 01 |
| Morning till 12:00 | Revisit/Herbesoek |  |  |
| Voormiddag tot 12:00 $=1$ | Appointment made/Afspraak gemaak. | $=$ | 02 |
|  | Selected respondent not at home/ Geselekteerde respondent nie tuis nie. | = | 03 |
| 12:00-13:59 = 2 | No one home/Niemand tuis nie. | = | 04 |
| 14:00-14:59 = 3 | Do not qualify/Kwalifiseer nie |  |  |
| 15:00-15:59 = 4 | Vacant house/flat/stand/not a house or flat / Vakante huis/woonstel/perseel/nie huis of woonstel nie.. | $=$ | 05 |
| 16:00-16:59 = 5 | No person qualifies according to specifications for the survey. |  |  |
| 17:00-17:59 = 6 | Geen persoon kwalifiseer volgens spesifikasies vir die opname nie. | = | 06 |
| 18:00-18:59 = 7 | Respondent cannot communicate with interviewer because of language./ |  |  |
| 19:00-19:59 $=8$ | Respondent kan a.g.v. taal nie met OHV kommunikeer nie. | = | 07 |
| 20:00-20:59 = 9 | Respondent is physically/mentally not fit to be interviewed/. |  |  |
| 21:00-24:00 $=0$ | Respondent is fisies/geestelik nie in staat om ' $n$ onderhoud te voer nie. Refusals/Weierings | $=$ | 08 |
|  | Contact person refused/Kontakpersoon weier. | $=$ | 09 |
|  | Interview refused by selected respondent/Onderhoud geweier deur geselekteerde respondent. | = | 10 |
|  | Interview refused by parent/Onderhoud geweier deur ouer. | $=$ | 11 |
|  | OFFICE USE/KANTOORGEBRUIK |  |  |
|  | Used wrong respondent/address/Verkeerde respondent/adres gebruik. | $=$ | 12 |

GRID TO SELECT (a) HOUSEHOLD AND (b) RESPONDENT RUITENET OM (a) HUISHOUDING EN (b) RESPONDENT TE SELEKTEER

| NUMBER <br> OF <br> QUESTION- <br> NAIRE/ <br> NOMMER <br> VAN <br> VRAELYS |  |  | NUMBER OF PERSONS FROM WHICH (a) HOUSEHOLD AND (b) THE RESPONDENT MUST BE DRAWN AANTAL PERSONE WAARUIT (a) HUISHOUDING EN (b) RESPONDENT GETREK MOET WORD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| 1 | 26 | 51 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 19 | 19 | 13 | 21 | 13 | 24 | 25 |
| 2 | 27 | 52 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 15 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 16 | 14 | 22 | 19 |
| 3 | 28 | 53 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 10 | 16 | 16 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 29 | 54 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 16 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 18 |
| 5 | 30 | 55 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 5 | 18 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 20 | 11 | 5 | 24 |
| 6 | 31 | 56 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 14 | 8 | 2 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 22 | 10 | 3 | 14 |
| 7 | 32 | 57 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 13 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 14 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 20 | 4 |
| 8 | 33 | 58 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 4 | 17 | 5 | 17 | 8 |
| 9 | 34 | 59 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 12 |
| 10 | 35 | 60 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 15 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 1 |
| 11 | 36 | 61 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 2 |
| 12 | 37 | 62 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 20 | 7 | 13 | 22 | 12 | 16 |
| 13 | 38 | 63 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 1 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 12 | 15 | 21 | 13 | 7 |
| 14 | 39 | 64 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 16 | 13 | 16 | 11 | 18 | 18 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 23 |
| 15 | 40 | 65 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 8 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 20 | 19 | 11 |
| 16 | 41 | 66 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 5 | 6 | 21 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 15 |
| 17 | 42 | 67 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 18 | 9 | 16 | 10 | 17 | 16 | 20 |
| 18 | 43 | 68 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 20 | 19 | 9 | 19 | 21 | 13 |
| 19 | 44 | 69 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 10 | 19 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 15 | 7 | 6 |
| 20 | 45 | 70 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 13 | 4 | 15 | 1 | 7 | 22 | 15 | 21 |
| 21 | 46 | 71 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 18 | 5 | 19 | 14 | 9 |
| 22 | 47 | 72 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 17 | 4 | 17 | 21 | 16 | 3 | 5 |
| 23 | 48 | 73 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 11 | 11 | 16 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 23 | 6 | 22 |
| 24 | 49 | 74 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 1 | 14 | 8 | 14 | 6 | 15 | 9 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 17 |
| 25 | 50 | 75 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 17 | 11 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 10 |

HAS FIELDWORK CONTROL BEEN DONE FROM MARKDATA OFFICE?
Is veldwerkkontrole deur MarkData kantoor gedoen?

| YES <br> Ja | PHYSICAL/Fisies | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| NO/Nee | TELEPHONIC/Telefonies | 2 |

COPYRIGHT/KOPIEREG: MARKDATA (PTY.) LIMITED

| 1. INTERVIEWER ONDERHOUDVOERDER | IDENTIFY NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS ON PREMISES/ AT VISITING POINT <br> Identifiseer die aantal huishoudings op die standplaas/ erf of by besoekpunt | 77 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IF MORE THAN ONE HOUSEHOLD, Indien meer as een huishouding, maak s | KE SKETCH ON THE BACK OF QUESTIONNAIRE. op die agterblad van die vraelys. |  |
| 2. $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { USE GRID } \\ & \text { Gebruik ruitenet }\end{aligned}$ | NUMBER OF THE SELECTED HOUSEHOLD Nommer van geselekteerde huishouding | 78 |

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS CODES/ Huidige werkstatus kodes

| UNEMPLOYED, NOT LOOKING FOR WORK/ Werkloos, soek nie werk nie | 01 |
| :--- | :--- |
| UNEMPLOYED, LOOKING FOR WORK/ Werkloos, soek werk | 02 |
| WORK IN INFORMAL SECTOR, NOT LOOKING FOR PERMANENT WORK/ Werk in informele sektor, soek nie permanente werk nie | 03 |
| WORK IN INFORMAL SECTOR, LOOKING FOR (PERMANENT) WORK / Werk in informele sektor, soek (permanente) werk | 04 |
| PENSIONER (AGE/RETIRED/SICK/DISABLED, ETC)/ Pensionaris (ouderdom/afgetree/siekte/onbevoeg, ens) | 05 |
| HOUSEWIFE, NOT WORKING AT ALL, NOT LOOKING FOR WORK/Huisvrou, werk glad nie, soek nie werk nie | 06 |
| HOUSEWIFE, LOOKING FOR WORK/ Huisvrou, soek werk | 07 |
| STUDENT/SCHOLAR/ Student/Skolier | 08 |
| SELF-EMPLOYED - FULL TIME/ Eie besigheid - voltyds | 09 |
| SELF-EMPLOYED - PART TIME/ Eie besigheid - deeltyds | 10 |
| EMPLOYED PART TIME (IF NONE OF THE ABOVE)/ Werk deeltyds (indien geen van bogenoemde nie) | 11 |
| EMPLOYED FULL TIME/ Werk voltyds | 12 |
| OTHER (SPECIFY)/Ander (Spesifiseer).......................................................................................................................... | 13 |

RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD CODES/Verwantskap met hoof van huishouding kodes

| RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD CODES/Verwantskap met hoof van huishouding kodes |
| :--- |
| HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD / Hoof van huishouding 01 <br> HUSBAND/WIFE/PARTNER/ Man/vrou/Maat 02 <br> SON/DAUGHTER/ Seun/dogter 03 <br> BROTHER/SISTER/ Broer/Suster 04 <br> PARENT OR PARENT IN LAW/Ouer of skoonouer 05 <br> GRAND/ GREAT GRAND PARENT/ Oupa/Ouma/ Grootjie 06 <br> GRAND/GREAT GRAND CHILD/ Kleinkind/ Agter kleindkind 07 <br> SON/DAUGHTER-IN-LAW/ Skoonseun/dogter 08 <br> BROTHER/SISTER-IN-LAW/ Swaer/ Skoonsuster 09 <br> OTHER RELATIVE/ Ander familie 10 <br> NON-RELATED PERSON/ Nie-verwante persoon 11 |

3. HOUSEHOLD SCHEDULE Huishouding skedule


HOUSEHOLD MEMBER NUMBERS AND REASONS WHY PERSONS DO NOT QUALIFY OR ARE NOT AVAILABLE. Huishoudinglidnommers en redes waarom persone nie kwalifiseer of beskikbaar is nie.


REASON NOT AVAILABLE OR NOT QUALIFYING
Rede hoekom nie beskikbaar of kwalifiseer nie
4. WITH REGARD TO EACH OF THE HOUSEHOLDS MENTIONED ABOVE, INDICATE THE FOLLOWING
Met betrekking tot elk van bogenoemde huishoudings dui asseblief die volgende aan:


CODING LIST FOR QUESTIONS 4c AND 5a/ KODELYS VIR VRAE 4c EN 5a

| 1 | FORMAL SINGLE HOUSE <br> Formele enkele huis |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | FLAT (IN FLAT BUILDING) Woonstel (in woonstelgebou) |
| 3 | FLAT (ON SAME STAND AS HOUSE) Woonstel (op dieselfde perseel as huis) |
| 4 | TOWN HOUSE, CLUSTER HOUSE, SEMI-DETACHED HOUSE/MAISONETTE/ DUETTE Meenthuis /trosbehuising/skakelhuis/maisionette/ duet huis |
| 5 | RETIREMENT DWELLING IN A RETIREMENT VILLAGE/COMPLEX Aftreewoning in ' n aftree-oord/kompleks |
| 6 | ROOM OR SUITE IN AN OLD AGE HOME <br> Kamer of suite in 'n ouetehuis |
| 7 | TRADITIONAL DWELLING (HUT) Tradisionele woning (hut) |
| 8 | SHACK (INCLUDING TEMPORARY PRE-FABRICATED STRUCTURES) Pondok (insluitend tydelike voorafvervaardigde strukture) |
| 9 | BOARDING HOUSE/RESIDENTIAL HOTEL/HOSTEL/COMPOUND Losieshuis/residensiële hotel/hostel/kampong |
| 0 | OTHER: PLEASE SPECIFY <br> Ander:Spesifiseer asb. |

INTERVIEWER: (REFER TO ANSWER ON QUESTION 1, PAGE 4).
IF THERE ARE MORE THAN FOUR HOUSEHOLDS ON THE PREMISES, ASK THE FOLLOWING:
ONDERHOUDVOERDER: (VERWYS NA VRAAG 1, BL. 4). INDIEN DAAR MEER AS VIER HUISHOUDINGS OP DIE PERSEEL IS, VRA DIE VOLGENDE:

HOW MANY PEOPLE IN TOTAL LIVE IN THE REMAINING HOUSEHOLDS MENTIONED ABOVE? Hoeveel mense in totaal bly in die bogenoemde oorblywende huishoudings?
$\qquad$

6. HOW MANY PEOPLE WHO WORK FOR THE SELECTED HOUSEHOLD ARE LIVING ON THE PREMISES?

Hoeveel mense wat vir die geselekteerde huishouding werk, woon op die perseel?


| 7. | INTERVIEWER | USE GRID TO IDENTIFY RESPONDENT <br> RESPONDENT NUMBER <br> Gebruik ruitenet om respondent te identifiseer <br> Nommer van respondent |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | ONDERHOUDVOERDER |  |  |

## BIOGRAPHICAL DATA BIOGRAFIESE GEGEWENS

1. 


2. GENDER OF RESPONDENT

Geslag van respondent

| MALE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Manlik | 1 |
| FEMALE <br> Vroulik | 2 |

3. WHAT IS YOUR AGE IN COMPLETED YEARS?

Wat is u ouderdom in voltooide jare?
YEARS/Jare

4. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT MARITAL STATUS?

Wat is u huidige huwelikstaat?

| MARRIEDGetroud | CIVIL (CHURCH OR MAGISTRATE) <br> Siviel (kerk of magistraat) | WITH CHILDREN/Met kinders | 01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | WITHOUT CHILDREN/ Sonder kinders | 02 |
|  | TRADITIONAL <br> (LOBOLA/BOGADI/OTHER) <br> Tradisioneel (lobola /bogadi/ander) | WITH CHILDREN/Met kinders | 03 |
|  |  | WITHOUT CHILDREN/ Sonder kinders | 04 |
|  | CIVIL AND TRADITIONAL Siviel en tradisioneel | WITH CHILDREN/Met kinders | 05 |
|  |  | WITHOUT CHILDREN/ Sonder kinders | 06 |
| BETROTHED AND LIVING TOGETHER Verloof en woon saam |  | WITH CHILDREN/Met kinders | 07 |
|  |  | WITHOUT CHILDREN/ Sonder kinders | 08 |
| LIVE TOGETHER |  | WITH CHILDREN/Met kinders | 09 |
| Bly saam |  | WITHOUT CHILDREN/ Sonder kinders | 10 |
| DIVORCED/ESTRANGED Geskei/ vervreemd |  | WITH CHILDREN/Met kinders | 11 |
|  |  | WITHOUT CHILDREN/ Sonder kinders | 12 |
| WIDOWER/ WIDOW Wewenaar/weduwee |  | WITH CHILDREN/Met kinders | 13 |
|  |  | WITHOUT CHILDREN/ Sonder kinders | 14 |
| NEVER MARRIED <br> Nooit getroud nie |  | WITH CHILDREN/Met kinders | 15 |
|  |  | WITHOUT CHILDREN/ Sonder kinders | 16 |
| OTHER (PLEASE DESCRIBE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED) Ander (Beskryf asseblief in die spasie voorsien) |  |  | 17 |

WHAT IS YOUR HIGHEST COMPLETED EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION?
Wat is u hoogste voltooide opvoedkundige kwalifikasie?

| NONE <br> Geen | 01 |
| :---: | :---: |
| GRADE 1 AND 2 (SUB A AND B) Graad 1 en 2 (Sub A en B) | 02 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { GRADE 3/ STD } 1 \\ & \text { Graad 3/ St. } 1 \end{aligned}$ | 03 |
| GRADE 4/ STD 2 <br> Graad 4/ St. 2 | 04 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { GRADE 5/ STD } 3 \\ & \text { Graad 5/ St. } 3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 05 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { GRADE 6/ STD } 4 \\ & \text { Graad 6/ St. } 4 \end{aligned}$ | 06 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { GRADE 7/ STD } 5 \\ & \text { Graad 7/ St. } 5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 07 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { GRADE 8/ STD 6 (FORM 1) } \\ & \text { Graad 8/ St. } 6 \text { (Vorm 1) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 08 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { GRADE 9/ STD } 7 \text { (FORM II) } \\ & \text { Graad 9/ St. } 7 \text { (Vorm II) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 09 |
| GRADE 10/ STD 8 (FORM III, NTC I) Graad 10/ St. 8 (Vorm III, NTS I) | 10 |
| GRADE 11/ STD 9 (FORM IV, NTC II) Graad 11/ St. 9 (Vorm IV, NTS II) | 11 |
| GRADE 12/ STD 10 (FORM V, NTC III) Graad 12/ St. 10 (Vorm V, NTS III) | 12 |
| GRADE 12/STD $10+$ COLLEGE DIPLOMA Graad 12/ St. 10 + Kollege Diploma | 13 |
| TECHNIKON DIPLOMA Technikon Diploma | 14 |
| TECHNIKON HIGHER DIPLOMA Technikon Hoër Diploma | 15 |
| B. DEGREE/HONOURS DEGREE Baccalaureus- / Honneursgraad | 16 |
| MASTER'S DIPLOMA IN TECHNOLOGY Meestersdiploma in Tegnologie | 17 |
| MASTER'S DEGREE Magistergraad | 18 |
| LAUREATUS IN TECHNOLOGY Laureatus in Tegnologie | 19 |
| DOCTOR'S DEGREE (NON-MEDICAL) <br> Doktorsgraad (nie medies) | 20 |
| OTHER (SPECIFY) <br> Ander <br> (spesifiseer) | 21 |

6. WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU SPEAK AT HOME MOST OF THE TIME?

Watter taal praat u die meeste tuis?

| AFRIKAANS/AFRIKAANS |  | 01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ENGLISH/Engels |  | 02 |
| BOTH AFRIKAANS AND ENGLISH / Beide Afrikaans en Engels |  | 03 |
| EUROPEAN LANGUAGE / Europese taal |  | 04 |
| ORIENTAL / INDIAN LANGUAGE / Oosterse / Indiese taal |  | 05 |
| SOTHO | SOUTHERN SOTHO/ Suid Sotho / Sesotho | 06 |
|  | WESTERN SOTHO (TSWANA)/ Wes-Sotho (Tswana) / Setswana | 07 |
|  | NORTHERN SOTHO (PEDI)/ Noord-Sotho (Pedi) / Sepedi | 08 |
| NGUNI | Swazi/ Siswati | 09 |
|  | Ndebele/ isiNdebele | 10 |
|  | Xhosa/ isiXhosa | 11 |
|  | Zulu/ isiZulu | 12 |
| TSONGA/ Xitsonga |  | 13 |
| VENDA/LEMBA/ Tshivenda |  | 14 |
| OTHER AFRICAN LANGUAGE / Ander Afrikataal |  | 15 |
| OTHER (SPECIFY) <br> Ander (spesifiseer) |  |  |

## COPYRIGHT/KOPIEREG: MARKDATA (PTY.) LIMITED

7a. WHAT IS THE AVERAGE JOINT INCOME FOR THIS HOUSEHOLD PER MONTH (GROSS INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES)?
Wat is die gemiddelde gesamentlike inkomste vir hierdie huishouding per maand (bruto uit alle bronne)?

7b. WHAT IS YOUR AVERAGE PERSONAL GROSS INCOME PER MONTH?
Wat is u gemiddelde persoonlike bruto inkomste per maand?

|  | 7a | 7b |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO INCOME/Geen inkomste | 01 | 01 |
| R1-R99 | 02 | 02 |
| R100-R299 | 03 | 03 |
| R300-R499 | 04 | 04 |
| R500 - R799 | 05 | 05 |
| R800-R999 | 06 | 06 |
| R1000-R2399 | 07 | 07 |
| R2400 - R4999 | 08 | 08 |
| R5000 - R9999 | 09 | 09 |
| R10 000 - R15 999 | 10 | 10 |
| R16 000-R19 999 | 11 | 11 |
| R20 000 - R24 999 | 12 | 12 |
| R25 000-R29 999 | 13 | 13 |
| R30 000 - R39 999 | 14 | 14 |
| R40 000 - R49 999 | 15 | 15 |
| R50 000 - R69 999 | 16 | 16 |
| R70 000-R99 999 | 17 | 17 |
| R100 000 - R119 999 | 18 | 18 |
| R120 000 - R149 999 | 19 | 19 |
| R150 000 - R199 999 | 20 | 20 |
| R200 000 - + | 21 | 21 |
| REFUSE TO ANSWER/ Weier om te antwoord | 22 | 22 |
| UNCERTAIN /DON'T KNOW/Onseker /Weet nie | 23 | 23 |

7c. WHAT IS THE MAIN SOURCE OF INCOME FOR THIS HOUSEHOLD?: (MARK ONE)
Wat is die hoof bron van inkomste vir hierdie huishouding?: (Merk een)
MONTHLY SALARY/Maandelikse salaris
WEEKLY WAGE/Weeklikse besoldiging 2
INCOME FROM OWN BUSINESS/Inkomste uit eie besigheid 3
FEES EARNED/Fooie verdien 4
OCCASIONAL INCOME/Inkomste per geleentheid 5
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { INVESTMENTS/Beleggings } & 6\end{array}$
PRIVATE PENSION/Privaat pensioen 7
GOVERNMENT PENSION OR GRANTS/Regerings pensioen of toelae 8
OTHER (SPECIFY)/Ander (Spesifiseer)
8a. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS (WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES YOUR PRESENT WORK SITUATION)?
Wat is $u$ huidige werkstatus (Watter van die volgende beskryf $u$ huidige werksituasie die beste)?

| UNEMPLOYED, NOT LOOKING FOR WORK <br> Werkloos, soek nie werk nie | 01 |
| :--- | :---: |
| UNEMPLOYED, LOOKING FOR WORK <br> Werkloos, soek werk | 02 |
| WORK IN INFORMAL SECTOR, NOT LOOKING FOR PERMANENT WORK <br> Werk in informele sektor, soek nie permanente werk nie | 03 |
| WORK IN INFORMAL SECTOR, LOOKING FOR PERMANENT WORK <br> Werk in informele sektor, soek permanente werk | 04 |
| PENSIONER (AGE/RETIRED/SICK/DISABLED, ETC.) <br> Pensionaris (ouderdom/afgetree/siekte/onbevoeg, ens.) | 04 |
| HOUSEWIFE, NOT WORKING AT ALL, NOT LOOKING FOR WORK <br> Huisvrou, werk glad nie, soek nie werk nie | 06 |
| HOUSEWIFE, LOOKING FOR WORK <br> Huisvrou, soek werk | 07 |
| STUDENT/SCHOLAR <br> Student/Skolier | 08 |
| SELF-EMPLOYED - FULL TIME <br> Eie besigheid - voltyds | 09 |
| SELF-EMPLOYED - PART TIME <br> Eie besigheid - deeltyds | 10 |
| EMPLOYED PART TIME (IF NONE OF THE ABOVE) <br> Werk deeltyds (indien geen van bogenoemde nie) | 09 |
| EMPLOYED FULL TIME <br> Werk voltyds | 11 |
| OTHER (SPECIFY)/Ander (Spesifiseer) <br> $\ldots . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ 13 |  |

8b. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT OCCUPATION? (DETAILS PLEASE e.g GOVERNMENT DEPARMENT OR ORGANISATION, PRIVATE COMPANY, OWN BUSINESS, CONSULTANCY, NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION, SELF-EMPLOYED, OTHER DOING WHAT)?
Watter beroep beoefen u tans? (Besonderhede asb. bv. Regeringsdepartement of organisasie, privaat maatskappy, eie besigheid, konsultant, nie regeringsorganisasie, in eie diens, ander wat doen $u$ )?


8c. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL (E.G. MANAGERIAL, CLERICAL)?
Wat is u huidige beroepsvlak (bv. bestuur, klerklik)?


IF UNEMPLOYED (CODES 01 OR 02 OR 04 OR 07) / Indien werkloos (kodes 01 of 02 of 04 of 07 ):
8d. DO YOU:
Verrig u:

| HAVE SOME REGULAR EARNING ACTIVITY? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Een of ander vorm van aktiwiteit waaruit u 'n inkomste verdien? | 1 |
| WORK FOR YOUR FAMILY/FARM OR SOMEONE ELSE WITHOUT PAY (PAYMENT IN KIND)? <br> Werk by u familie/plaas of iemand anders sonder betaling (ruilbetaling)? |  |
| HAVE NO EARNING ACTIVITY AT ALL? <br> Geen aktiwiteit waaruit u 'n inkomste verdien nie? | 3 |
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8e. IF UNEMPLOYED: HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN UNEMPLOYED? Indien werkloos: Hoe lank is u reeds werkloos?

Months/Maande. $\qquad$

9. DO YOU READ A DAILY NEWSPAPER REGULARLY, THAT IS, AT LEAST FOUR OUT OF SIX ISSUES A WEEK OR DO YOU READ A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER REGULARLY, THAT IS, AT LEAST THREE ISSUES PER MONTH? Lees u gereeld ' $n$ dagblad, d.w.s, ten minste vier uit elke ses koerantuitgawes per week of lees $u$ ' $n$ weeklikse koerant gereeld, d.w.s, ten minste drie uitgawes per maand?

| YES/Ja | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| NO/Nee | 2 |

10. DO YOU HAVE A TELEVISION SET IN YOU HOUSE?

Het $u$ ' $n$ televisiestel in $u$ huis?

| YES/Ja | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| NO/Nee | 2 |

11. DO YOU HAVE A WORKING TELEPHONE AT HOME (LANDLINE)?

Het $u$ ' $n$ werkende telefoon tuis (landlyn)?

| YES/Ja | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| NO/Nee | 2 |

12. DO YOU HAVE ACCESS TO A COMPUTER FOR PERSONAL OR BUSINESS USE?

Het $u$ toegang tot ' n rekenaar vir persoonlike of besigheidsgebruik?

| PERSONAL USE |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Persoonlike gebruik | 1 |
| BUSINESS USE <br> Besigheidsgebruik | 2 |
| BOTH <br> Albei | 3 |
| NONE <br> Geen | 4 |

13. DO YOU PERSONALLY HAVE A CELL PHONE FOR PERSONAL OR BUSINESS USE?

Het u persoonlik ' $n$ seltelefoon vir persoonlike of besigheidsgebruik?

| PERSONAL USE/ Persoonlike gebruik | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| BUSINESS USE/Besigheidsgebruik | 2 |
| BOTH/Albei | 3 |
| NONE/Geen | 4 |

14. WHICH CHURCH DO YOU BELONG TO OR TO WHICH FAITH/RELIGION DO YOU SUBSCRIBE?

Aan watter kerk of aan watter geloof/godsdiens behoort u?

| INTERVIEWER | PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CHURCH OR RELIGIOUS GROUP FULLY, I.E. NOT ONLY |
| :--- | :--- |
| ONDERHOUDVOERDER | AN ABBREVIATION OR CONGREGATION NAME <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Beskryf asseblief die kerk of godsdiensgroep volledig, m.a.w. nie slegs ' $n$ afkorting of die <br> naam van die gemeente nie. |

NAME OF CHURCH/FAITH
Naam van kerk/geloof. $\qquad$
$\square$

## 15. LSM (LIVING STANDARD MEASURE / LEWENSTANDAARDMAATSTAF)

| WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, IN WORKING ORDER, DOES YOUR HOUSEHOLD HAVE? <br> Watter van die volgende items, wat in werkende toestand is, het u huishouding? |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | YES/ JA | NO/NEE |
| A FRIDGE OR FRIDGE/FREEZER COMBINATION ' $n$ Yskas of ' $n$ yskas/vrieskas kombinasie | 1 | 2 |
| A DEEP FREEZER <br> ' n Vrieskas | 1 | 2 |
| A WASHING MACHINE 'n Wasmasjien | 1 | 2 |
| A TUMBLE DRYER <br> ' n Tuimeldroër | 1 | 2 |
| DISHWASHER <br> 'n Skottelgoedwasser | 1 | 2 |
| A SEWING MACHINE <br> 'n Naaldwerk masjien | 1 | 2 |
| A FLOOR POLISHER OR VACUUM CLEANER ' n Vloer poleerder of stofsuier | 1 | 2 |
| A MICROWAVE OVEN ' n Mikrogolfoond | 1 | 2 |
| AN ELECTRIC STOVE OR HOTPLATE ' n Elektriese stoof of warmplaat | 1 | 2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { A TV } \\ & \text { 'n TV } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 |
| A HI-FI OR MUSIC CENTRE (RADIO EXCLUDED) ' n Hoëtroustel of musieksentrum (radio uitgesluit) | 1 | 2 |
| TWO OR MORE RADIO SETS <br> Twee of meer radio's | 1 | 2 |
| A VIDEO CASSETTE RECORDER 'n Video kasset opnemer | 1 | 2 |
| A CELLPHONE <br> ' n Selfoon | 1 | 2 |
| A PERSONAL /HOME COMPUTER (PC) <br> 'n Persoonlike of tuisrekenaar | 1 | 2 |
| A HOME SECURITY SERVICE <br> ' n Tuis sekuriteitsdiens | 1 | 2 |
| A M NET/MULTICHOICE DSTV SUBSCRIPTION 'n M Net/Multichoice DSTV intekenaar | 1 | 2 |
| ONE OR MORE CARS Een of meer motors | 1 | 2 |
| DO YOU HAVE THE FOLLOWING IN YOUR HOME? Het u die volgende in u huis? |  |  |
| WATER PIPED TO STAND OR DWELLING Water aangelê na erf of huis | 1 | 2 |
| HOT RUNNING WATER Warm lopende water | 1 | 2 |
| ELECTRICITY <br> Elektrisiteit | 1 | 2 |
| A DOMESTIC SERVANT 'n Huishulp | 1 | 2 |
| A FLUSH TOILET (inside or outside house) ' n Spoeltoilet (binne of buite huis) | 1 | 2 |
| A BUILT-IN KITCHEN SINK ' n Ingeboude wasbak in die kombuis | 1 | 2 |
| INTERVIEWER RECORD Onderhoudvoerder dui aan |  |  |
| GAUTENG PROVINCE | 1 | 2 |
| WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE | 1 | 2 |
| RURAL IN ALL PROVINCES EXCLUDING GAUTENG OR WESTERN CAPE | 1 | 2 |
| HUT DWELLER Hutbewoner | 1 | 2 |
|  | RESPONDENT LSMRespondent LSM |  |

## Political Cooperation / Politieke Samewerking

1. TALKING ABOUT ELECTIONS, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING ARE YOU:
$\quad$ Watter een van die volgende is jy, wanneer ons van verkiesings praat?
A REGISTERED VOTER AND ON THE VOTERS ROLL?
'n Geregistreerde kieser op die kieserslys?
NOT REGISTERED BUT WILL BE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE AND CAN REGISTER
Nie geregistreer nie, maar sal stemgeregtig wees en kan registreer?
WILL NOT BE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN $2009 ?$ / Sal nie stemgeregtig wees in 2009 nie?
(If 1.3 - re-select a respondent who is eligible as instructed)
(Indien 1.3 - selekteer ' $n$ respondent wat stemgeregtig is soos opgedra)
2. WHAT ARE THE TWO MOST SERIOUS PROBLEMS THAT GOVERNMENT SHOULD ATTEND TO URGENTLY AFTER THE NEXT ELECTIONS?
Wat is die twee ernstigste probleme waaraan die regering na die volgende verkiesing dringend aandag moet skenk?
3. 

$\qquad$

2. $\qquad$
$\qquad$


3. HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH WHAT THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT HAS
ACHIEVED SINCE THE LAST ELECTIONS IN 2004? ARE YOU: / Hoe tevrede is jy
met wat die huidige regering sedert die vorige verkiesing in 2004 bereik het? Is jy:

VERY SATISFIED? / Baie tevrede?

PARTLY SATISFIED? / Gedeeltelik tevrede? 02
PARTLY DISSATISFIED? / Gedeeltelik ontevrede? 03
VERY DISSATISFIED? / Baie ontevrede? 04
OTHER COMMENT - SPECIFY.
4. $\begin{aligned} & \text { IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF PEOPLE LIKE YOU } \\ & \text { THESE DAYS? IS IT: / Wat, na jou mening, is die kwaliteit van lewe van mense soos jy } \\ & \text { deesdae? Is dit: } \\ & \text { VERY GOOD / Baie goed }\end{aligned}$ 1

GOOD / Goed 2
NOT GOOD OR BAD / Nie goed of sleg 3
BAD / Sleg 4
VERY BAD / Baie sleg 5
5. SOME PEOPLE SAY THAT DESPITE PROBLEMS, THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT
TRIES ITS BEST TO IMPROVE THE LIVES OF PEOPLE LIKE YOURSELF: DO
YOU: / Sommige mense sê dat die huidige regering, ten spyte van probleme, sy bes
probeer om die lewens van mense soos jy te verbeter: Stem jy:
AGREE STRONGLY? / Sterk saam?

AGREE TO SOME EXTENT? / Tot 'n mate saam? 02
DISAGREE TO SOME EXTENT? / Nie tot ' n mate saam nie? 03
DISAGREE STRONGLY? / Glad nie saam nie? 04
OTHER - SPECIFY:
6. IN GENERAL, IS THE COUNTRY MOVING IN THE RIGHT OR THE WRONG DIRECTION? / Oor die algemeen gesien, is die land besig om in die regte of die verkeerde rigting te beweeg?
RIGHT DIRECTION / Regte rigting ..... 1
WRONG DIRECTION / Verkeerde rigting ..... 2
7. WHAT SORT OF OPPOSITION TO THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE? / Watter soort opposisie tot die huidige regering sal jy graag wil sien? NO OPPOSITION AT ALL / Geen opposisie nie ..... 01
A COOPERATIVE OPPOSITION THAT SOMETIMES CRITICISES BUT OFTEN HELPS AND SUPPORTS THE GOVERNMENT ..... 02
'n Samewerkende opposisie wat soms kritiseer maar dikwels help en die regering ondersteunAN OPPOSITION THAT STRONGLY CRITICISES THE GOVERNMENT WHEN IT03DOES NOT PERFORM WELL' n Opposisie wat die regering kwaai kritiseer wanneer hy nie goed presteer nieOTHER: SPECIFYAnder: spesifiseer
8. HOW EASY OR DIFFICULT IS IT FOR A PERSON LIKE YOU TO HAVE POLITICAL OPINIONS THAT ARE DIFFERENT TO THOSE OF THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE AND WORK AROUND YOU? / Hoe moeilik of maklik is dit vir iemand soos jy om politieke menings te hê wat anders is as dié van mense wat om jou lewe en werk?
VERY EASY / Baie maklik ..... 1
FAIRLY EASY / Redelik maklik ..... 2
SOMETIMES DIFFICULT / Soms moeilik ..... 3
VERY DIFFICULT / Baie moeilik ..... 4
9. WHAT KIND OF POLITICAL PARTY WOULD YOU MOST LIKE TO VOTE FOR IN AN ELECTION - CHOOSE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: A PARTY: Watter soort politieke party sou jy die graagste voor stem in ' $n$ verkiesing - kies een van die volgende: ' $n$ Party:
THAT IS HONEST AND WITHOUT CORRUPTION ..... 01
Wat eerlik is en sonder korrupsie
THAT HAS PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES YOU SUPPORT ..... 02
Wat beginsels en beleide het wat jy steun
THAT REPRESENTS PEOPLE OF YOUR RACE GROUP ..... 03
Wat die mense van my rassegroep verteenwoordig
THAT IS ACTIVE AND WELL-KNOWN IN YOUR COMMUNITY ..... 04
Wat aktief is en goed bekend is in my gemeenskap
THAT HAS THE KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE TO RUN A GOVERNMENT ..... 05
Wat die kennis en ervaring het om 'n regering te bestuur
THAT REPRESENTS PEOPLE OF YOUR LANGUAGE AND CULTURE ..... 06Wat die mense van my taal en kultuur verteenwoordig
OTHER: SPECIFY
Ander: spesifiseer
10. AS THE NEXT ELECTION DRAWS NEAR, POLITICAL PARTIES WILL START TALKING ABOUT THEIR POLICIES. I WILL READ YOU A RANGE OF POLICY GOALS. FOR EACH OF THESE GOALS TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THAT IT IS: ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL, VERY NECESSARY, FAIRLY NECESSARY, UNNECESSARY OR AN UNDESIRABLE GOAL: (SHOW CARD)
Soos die volgende verkiesing nader kom sal politieke partye begin praat oor hulle beleide. Ek sal vir jou 'n verskeidenheid van hierdie doelwitte lees. Vir elkeen van hierdie doelwitte moet jy vir my sê of jy dink dat dit: absoluut noodsaaklik is, baie noodsaaklik is, redelik noodsaaklik is, onnodig is of ' n ongewensde doelwit is: (Toonkaart)

| POLICY <br> Beleid | ABSOLUTE ESSENTIAL <br> Absoluut noodsaaklik | VERY <br> NECESSARY <br> Baie noodsaaklik | FAIRLY NECESSARY Redelik noodsaaklik | UN- <br> NECESSARY <br> Onnodig | UNDESIRABLE Ongewens |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ASSISTING PEOPLE IN POVERTY <br> Hulp aan mense in armoede | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ENCOURAGING INVESTMENT AND NEW INDUSTRIES / Aanmoediging van beleggings en nuwe nywerhede | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| COMBATING CRIME, DRUGS AND ABUSE Bekamping van misdaad, dwelms en mishandeling | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| FIGHTING CORRUPTION IN GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS / Bekamping van korrupsie in die regering en besigheid | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| APPOINTING THE MOST ABLE PEOPLE IRRESPECTIVE OF RACE OR POLITICAL CONNECTIONS / Die aanstel van die mees bekwame mense ongeag ras of politieke kontakte | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| COMPENSATING VICTIMS OF APARTHEID Vergoeding van slagoffers van apartheid | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| PROTECTING WORKERS' RIGHTS Beskerming van werkerregte | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| IMPROVING THE DELIVERY OF ELECTRICITY, WATER AND OTHER BASIC SERVICES / Verbetering van die voorsiening van elektrisiteit, water en ander basiese dienste | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| RESPECTING LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL RIGHTS / Respek vir taal en kultuurregte | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| AN EFFICIENT PUBLIC SERVICE THAT DELIVERS / 'n Effektiewe staatsdiens wat diens lewer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| IMPROVING EDUCATION AND TRAINING Verbetering van onderrig en opleiding | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| TRANSFORMATION TO GET RID OF ALL EFFECTS OF APARTHEID / Transformasie om ontslae te raak van al die gevolge van apartheid | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| CHANGING ECONOMIC AND LABOUR REGULATIONS TO MAKE JOB CREATION EASIER / Verandering van ekonomiese en arbeidsregulasies om werkskepping te vergemaklik | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| IMPROVING HEALTH POLICY, INCLUDING HIV/AIDS / Verbetering van gesondheidsbeleid, insluitende MIV/VIGS | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| IMPROVING THE DELIVERY OF HOUSING FOR NEEDY FAMILIES / Verbetering van die voorsiening van behuising aan behoeftige gesinne | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| COMBATING GROWING INEQUALITY BETWEEN RICH AND POOR PEOPLE OF ANY COLOUR / Bekamping van toenemende ongelykheid tussen ryk en arm mense van enige kleur | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| WORKING FOR HARMONY AND RECONCILIATION BETWEEN THE RACES <br> Werk vir harmonie en versoening tussen die rasse | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND <br> EMPOWERMENT FOR PEOPLE <br> PREVIOUSLY DISADVANTAGED <br> Regstellende aksie en bemagtiging vir voorheen benadeelde mense | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

11. WHICH ONE OF THE FOLLOWING IS MOST IMPORTANT TO ENSURE THAT A GOVERNING PARTY, AFTER ELECTIONS, KEEPS ON DOING ITS BEST FOR THE PEOPLE IN A COUNTRY?
Watter een van die volgende is die belangrikste om te verseker dat die regerende party, na die verkiesing, aanhou om sy beste vir die mense van die land te doen?

THE PARTY'S HISTORY OF STRUGGLE FOR THE PEOPLE? 1
Die party se geskiedenis van stryd vir die bevolking?
THE PROMISES IT MADE DURING ELECTIONS?
Die beloftes wat hy tydens die verkiesing gemaak het?
A STRONG OPPOSITION THAT CRITICISES GOVERNMENT AND CAN ATTRACT DISAPPOINTED VOTERS?
'n Sterk opposisie wat die regering kritiseer en teleurgestelde kiesers kan werf?
THE NEEDS OF ORDINARY MEMBERS AND SUPPORTERS OF THE PARTY?
Die behoeftes van gewone lede en ondersteuners van die party?
WHAT THE PARTY SAYS ABOUT ITS PRINCIPLES AND WHAT IT BELIEVES IN?
Uitsprake van die party oor sy beginsels en waarin hy glo?
12. WHAT POLITICAL PARTY MOST DESERVES TO BE SUPPORTED DURING THE NEXT ELECTIONS IN 2009?
Watter politieke party verdien dit die meeste om tydens die volgende verkiesing in 2009 onderseurn te word?

| ACDP | 01 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ANC | 02 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SACP } \\ & \text { SAKP } \end{aligned}$ | 03 |
| AZAPO | 04 |
| DA | 05 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IFP } \\ & \text { IVP } \end{aligned}$ | 06 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { FF+ } \\ & \text { VF+ } \end{aligned}$ | 07 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ID } \\ & \text { OD } \end{aligned}$ | 08 |
| PAC | 09 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { UDM } \\ & \text { VDB } \end{aligned}$ | 10 |
| OTHER <br> Ander | 11 |
| NONE <br> Geen | 12 |
| SPECIFY OTHER PARTY: <br> Spesifiseer ander party |  |

13. WHAT OTHER PARTY ALSO DESERVES TO DO WELL IN THE ELECTIONS?

Watter ander party verdien dit ook om tydens die verkiesing goed te presteer?

| ACDP | 01 |
| :--- | :---: |
| ANC | 02 |
| SACP <br> SAKP | 03 |
| AZAPO | 04 |
| DA | 05 |
| IFP <br> IVP | 06 |
| FF+ <br> VF+ | 07 |
| ID | 08 |
| PAC | 09 |
| UDM <br> VDB | 10 |
| OTHER <br> Ander | 11 |
| NONE <br> Geen | 12 |
| SPECIFY OTHER PARTY:....................................................................... |  |

14. THINKING OF THE NEXT GENERAL ELECTION, WOULD IT BE A GOOD IDEA OR NOT FOR POLITICAL PARTIES THAT AGREE WITH EACH OTHER ON BASIC PRINCIPLES, TO COOPERATE IN THE ELECTION BY NOT COMPETING WITH EACH OTHER AND PUTTING FORWARD A SHARED LIST OF CANDIDATES? IN OTHER WORDS THIS WOULD BE AN ELECTION COALITION.
Wanneer jy aan die volgende algemene verkiesing dink, sou dit 'n goeie idee wees vir politieke partye wat met mekaar saamstem oor basiese beginsels om saam te werk tydens die verkiesing deur nie met mekaar te wedywer en 'n gesamentlike lys van kandidate voor te hou of nie? Met ander woorde, dit sou' $n$ verkiesingskoalisie wees.

| A VERY GOOD IDEA <br> n Baie goeie idee | 01 |
| :--- | :---: |
| A FAIRLY GOOD IDEA <br> 'n Redelike goeie idee | 02 |
| NOT GOOD NOT BAD <br> Nie goed of sleg nie | 03 |
| A FAIRLY BAD IDEA <br> n Redelike swak idee | 04 |
| A VERY BAD IDEA <br> n Baie swak idee | 05 |
| OTHER ANSWERS-SPECIFY:.................................................................................. |  |

15. WHY DO YOU FEEL THIS WAY? (OPEN ANSWERS)

Waarom voel jy so? (Oop antwoorde)

16. IF SUCH A COALITION OF PARTIES WERE TO BE FORMED FOR THE NEXT ELECTIONS, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS ABOUT SUCH A COALITION WOULD YOU SEE AS ESSENTIAL, OR A GOOD THING THAT YOU WOULD SUPPORT, OR SOMETHING YOU WOULD ACCEPT OR SOMETHING YOU WOULD NOT SUPPORT:
Indien so 'n partykoalisie vir die volgende verkiesing gesluit word, watter van die volgende dinge omtrent so ' $n$ koalisie beskou jy as noodsaaklik, of as 'n goeie ding wat jy sou ondersteun, of iets wat jy sou aanvaar of iets wat jy nie sou steun nie:
16.1 A COALITION SHOULD BE A "RAINBOW COALITION" WITH PROMINENT PEOPLE FROM ALL POPULATION GROUPS:
'n Koalisie behoort 'n "reënboog koalisie" met prominente mense uit alle bevolkingsgroepe te wees:

| ESSENTIAL | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Noodsaaklik |  |
| A GOOD THING <br> 'n Goeie ding | 2 |
| SOMETHING YOU COULD ACCEPT <br> Iets wat jy sou aanvaar | 3 |
| SOMETHING YOU WOULD NOT SUPPORT <br> Iets wat jy nie sou steun nie | 4 |

### 16.2 A COALITION SHOULD STRENGTHEN OPPOSITION TO THE ANC:

'n Koalisie behoort die opposisie tot die ANC te versterk:

| ESSENTIAL <br> Noodsaaklik | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| A GOOD THING <br> 'n Goeie ding | 2 |
| SOMETHING YOU COULD ACCEPT <br> Iets wat jy sou aanvaar | 3 |
| SOMETHING YOU WOULD NOT SUPPORT <br> Iets wat jy nie sou steun nie | 4 |

16.3 A COALITION SHOULD DRAW TOGETHER THE BEST EXPERTISE IN RUNNING A COUNTRY IRRESPECTIVE OF RACE GROUPS:
' $n$ Koalisie behoort die beste kundigheid in die bestuur van ' $n$ land saam te snoer, ongeag die ras groepe:

| ESSENTIAL <br> Noodsaaklik | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| A GOOD THING <br> 'n Goeie ding | 2 |
| SOMETHING YOU COULD ACCEPT <br> Iets wat jy sou aanvaar | 3 |
| SOMETHING YOU WOULD NOT SUPPORT <br> Iets wat jy nie sou steun nie | 4 |

### 16.4 A COALITION SHOULD ONLY INCLUDE PARTIES THAT BELIEVE IN THE SAME POLITICAL AND DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES:

' $n$ Koalisie behoort slegs partye in te sluit wat in dieselfde politieke en demokratiese beginsels glo:

| ESSENTIAL | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Noodsaaklik |  |
| A GOOD THING <br> 'n Goeie ding | 2 |
| SOMETHING YOU COULD ACCEPT <br> Iets wat jy sou aanvaar | 3 |
| SOMETHING YOU WOULD NOT SUPPORT <br> Iets wat jy nie sou steun nie | 4 |

### 16.5 A COALITION SHOULD ONLY INCLUDE PARTIES THAT BELIEVE IN THE SAME ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES: <br> ' $n$ Koalisie behoort slegs partye in te sluit wat in dieselfde ekonomiese beginsels glo:

| ESSENTIAL | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Noodsaaklik |  |
| A GOOD THING <br> 'n Goeie ding | 2 |
| SOMETHING YOU COULD ACCEPT <br> Iets wat jy sou aanvaar | 3 |
| SOMETHING YOU WOULD NOT SUPPORT <br> Iets wat jy nie sou steun nie | 4 |

16.6 WHAT OTHER THINGS ARE NECESSARY IN A COALITION? (SPECIFY)

Wat anders is nodig in ' $n$ koalisie (spesifiseer)
17. THINK OF THIS COALITION OF PARTIES THAT YOU HAVE IN MIND. I WILL READ YOU THE NAMES OF POLITICAL PARTIES. FOR EACH, WILL YOU SAY WHETHER IT:

- SHOULD DEFINITELY BE PART OF THE COALITION
- WHETHER YOU WOULD ACCEPT IT IN SUCH A COALITION, OR
- WHETHER IT SHOULD NOT BE PART OF THE COALITION

Dink aan die koalisiepartye wat jy in gedagte het. Ek sal vir jou die name van die politieke partye lees. Vir elkeen van hulle moet jy sê of dit

- Definitief deel moet wees van so 'n koalisie
- Of dit sou aanvaar in so 'n koalisie, of
- Dit nie deel moet wees van die koalisie nie

|  | DEFINITELY IN <br> COALITION <br> Definitief in koalisie | WOULD ACCEPT IN <br> COALITION <br> Sou aanvaar in koalisie | NOT BE PART <br> OF COALITION <br> Nie deel wees <br> van koalisie nie |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANC | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| DA | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| ID <br> OD | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| UDM <br> VDB | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| IFP <br> IVP | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| FF+ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| VF + | 1 | 2 | 3 |

18. IS THERE ANY PARTY I HAVE NOT MENTIONED THAT YOU FEEL SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN SUCH A COALITION?
Is daar enige party wat ek nie genoem het nie wat jy voel deel moet wees van so ' n koalisie?

19. IN SUCH A COALITION: SHOULD THE MAJORITY OF CANDIDATES BE PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT WHITE, SHOULD THERE BE BROAD QUOTAS OF PEOPLE OF DIFFERENT GROUPS OR SHOULD THE MAJORITY SIMPLY BE PEOPLE WITH THE BEST KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE WITHOUT CONSIDERING THEIR GROUP?
In so ' n koalisie: behoort die meerderheid van die kandidate mense te wees wat nie wit is nie, behoort daar breë kwotas van mense van verskillende groepe te wees of behoort die meerderheid eenvoudig mense te wees met die beste kennis en ervaring sonder inagneming van hulle groep?

| THE MAJORITY SHOULD NOT BE WHITE | 01 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Die meerderheid behoort nie wit te wees nie | 02 |
| THERE SHOULD BE BROAD QUOTAS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS <br> Daar behoort breë kwotas van mense van verskillende groepe te wees |  |
| THE MAJORITY SHOULD BE THE PEOPLE WITH THE BEST KNOWLEDGE AND <br> EXPERIENCE WITHOUT CONSIDERING THEIR GROUP <br> Die meerderheid behoort eenvoudig mense te wees met die beste kennis en ervaring sonder <br> inagneming van hulle groep | 03 |
| OTHER (SPECIFY)................................................................................................................... |  |

20. HOW NECESSARY WOULD IT BE FOR SUCH A COALITION TO HAVE A STRICT CODE OF CONDUCT FOR CANDIDATES TO EXCLUDE PEOPLE WITH ANY RECORD OF CORRUPTION, CRIME, BAD MANAGEMENT, DEBT OR POOR PERFORMANCE OR BEHAVIOUR? WOULD YOU:
Hoe noodsaaklik sou dit vir so ' $n$ koalisie wees om 'n streng gedragskode vir kandidate te hê om mense met enige geskiedenis van korrupsie, misdaad, swak bestuur, skuld of swak resultate of gedrag uit te sluit? Sou jy:
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|c|}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { STRONGLY SUPPORT A STRICT CODE } \\
\text { ' } n \text { Streng gedragskode sterk ondersteun }\end{array} & 1 \\
\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { SUPPORT THE CODE BUT VERY POPULAR CANDIDATES SHOULD BE }\end{array}
$$ \& 2 <br>
CONSIDERED ANYWAY \& <br>

Die kode ondersteun, maar baie gewilde kandidate behoort in elk geval oorweeg te word\end{array}\right]\)| SUPPORT THE CODE BUT IF NECESSARY SOME PEOPLE SHOULD BE INCLUDED |
| :--- |
| TO GET THE RIGHT BALANCE OF GROUPS |
| Die kode ondersteun, maar indien noodsaaklik moet sommige mense ingesluit word om die <br> regte balans van groepe te bereik |
| FEEL THAT SUCH A CODE IS NOT REALLY NECESSARY <br> Voel dat so ' $n$ gedragskode nie regtig nodig is nie |

21. WHICH KINDS OF CANDIDATES STANDING FOR A PARTY IN ELECTIONS ARE YOU MOST LIKELY TO WANT TO SUPPORT? CHOOSE TWO OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS I WILL READ OUT (SHOW CARD):
Watter soort kandidate wat in 'n verkiesing vir 'n party staan sal jy die waarskynlikste steun? Kies twee van die volgende items wat ek sal lees (Toonkaart):

| CANDIDATES THAT KNOW MOST ABOUT POLICIES AND GOVERNANCE | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Kandidate wat die meeste omtrent beleide en regering weet | 2 |
| CANDIDATES THAT BELONG TO YOUR LANGUAGE GROUP <br> Kandidate wat aan jou taalgroep behoort | 3 |
| CANDIDATES THAT CAN INSPIRE YOU TO SUPPORT THEM <br> Kandidate wat jou kan aanmoedig om hulle te ondersteun | 4 |
| CANDIDATES FROM YOUR LOCAL COMMUNITY <br> Kandidate uit jou plaaslike gemeenskap | 5 |
| CANDIDATES THAT BELONG TO THE PARTY YOU NORMALLY SUPPORT <br> Kandidate wat aan die party behoort wat jy normaalweg ondersteun | 6 |
| CANDIDATES THAT WILL WORK VERY HARD TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR <br> PEOPLE LIKE YOU <br> Kandidate wat hard sal werk om toestande vir mense soos jy te verbeter | 7 |
| CANDIDATES THAT BELONG TO THE MOST POWERFUL PARTY <br> Kandidate wat aan die sterkste party behoort | 8 |
| CANDIDATES THAT ARE OF YOUR RACE GROUP <br> Kandidate van jou eie rassegroep | 2 |

22. HOW LIKELY ARE YOU TO VOTE IN THE NEXT ELECTION IN 2009 - WILL YOU:
Hoe waarskynlik is dit dat jy in die volgende verkiesing in 2009 sal stem - sal jy:

| MOST DEFINITELY VOTE? | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Definitief stem? | 2 |
| PROBABLY VOTE? | 2 |
| Waarskynlik stem? | SEE HOW THINGS ARE AND POSSIBLY VOTE? |
| Sien hoe dinge verloop en moontlik stem? | 3 |
| PROBABLY NOT VOTE? <br> Waarskynlik nie stem nie? | 4 |
| DEFINITELY NOT VOTE? <br> Definitief nie stem nie? | 5 |
| NOT SURE? <br> Nie seker nie? | 6 |

23. IF YOU VOTE, WHICH POLITICAL PARTY WOULD YOU VOTE FOR IN 2009? (OPEN ANSWER)
Indien jy stem, vir watter party sal jy in 2009 stem (oop antwoord)
24. WE HAVE SPOKEN ABOUT A COALITION OF PARTIES FOR THE GENERAL ELECTION NEXT YEAR. IF THERE IS A COALITION OF PARTIES CONSISTING OF THE DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE (DA), THE INDEPENDENT DEMOCRATS (ID) AND THE UNITED DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT (UDM), WILL YOU:
Ons het oor ' n partykoalisie vir volgende jaar se verkiesing gepraat. Indien daar ' n partykoalisie is bestaande uit die Demokratiese Alliansie (DA), die Onafhanklike Demokrate (OD) en die Verenigde Demokratiese Beweging (VDB), sal jy:

| DEFINITELY VOTE FOR SUCH A COALITION? <br> Definitief vir so ' $n$ koalisie stem? | 01 |
| :--- | :---: |
| PROBABLY VOTE FOR THE COALITION? <br> Waarskynlik vir die koalisie stem? | 02 |
| SERIOUSLY CONSIDER VOTING FOR THE COALITION? <br> Dit ernstig oorweeg om vir die koalisie te stem? | 03 |
| NOT VOTE FOR THE COALITION BUT FOR SOME OTHER PARTY? <br> Nie vir die koalisie stem nie maar vir 'n ander party? | 04 |
| OTHER (VERBATIM:.............................................................................................. <br> Ander (verbatim: |  |
| WILL PROBABLY NOT VOTE OR WILL NOT VOTE IN THE ELECTION AT ALL <br> Sal waarskynlik nie stem nie of sal glad nie stem in die verkiesing nie | 05 |

25. IF THERE IS A COALITION OF PARTIES CONSISTING OF THE DA, THE ID, THE UDM AND THE INKATHA FREEDOM PARTY (IFP), WILL YOU:
Indien daar ' $n$ partykoalisie bestaande uit die DA, die OD, die VDB en die Inkhata Vryheids Party (IVP) is, sal jy:

| DEFINITELY VOTE FOR SUCH A COALITION? | 01 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Definitief vir so 'n koalisie stem? |  |
| PROBABLY VOTE FOR THE COALITION? <br> Waarskynlik vir die koalisie stem? | 02 |
| SERIOUSLY CONSIDER VOTING FOR THE COALITION? <br> Dit ernstig oorweeg om vir die koalisie te stem? | 03 |
| NOT VOTE FOR THE COALITION BUT FOR SOME OTHER PARTY? <br> Nie vir die koalisie stem nie maar vir 'n ander party? | 04 |
| OTHER (VERBATIM:...........................................................................................) |  |
| WILL PROBABLY NOT VOTE OR WILL NOT VOTE IN THE ELECTION AT ALL <br> Sal waarskynlik nie stem nie of sal glad nie stem in die verkiesing nie | 05 |

26. | IF THERE IS A COALITION OF PARTIES CONSISTING OF THE DA, THE ID, |
| :--- |
| THE UDM AND THE FREEDOM FRONT PLUS WILL YOU: |
| Indien daar 'n partykoalisie bestaande uit die DA, die OD, die VDB en die |
| Vryheidsfront Plus is, sal jy: |

| DEFINITELY VOTE FOR SUCH A COALITION? <br> Definitief vir so 'n koalisie stem? | 01 |
| :--- | :---: |
| PROBABLY VOTE FOR THE COALITION? <br> Waarskynlik vir die koalisie stem? | 02 |
| SERIOUSLY CONSIDER VOTING FOR THE COALITION? <br> Dit ernstig oorweeg om vir die koalisie te stem? | 03 |
| NOT VOTE FOR THE COALITION BUT FOR SOME OTHER PARTY? <br> Nie vir die koalisie stem nie maar vir 'n ander party? | 04 |
| OTHER (VERBATIM.........................................................................................). |  |
| WILL PROBABLY NOT VOTE OR WILL NOT VOTE IN THE ELECTION AT ALL <br> Sal waarskynlik nie stem nie of sal glad nie stem in die verkiesing nie | 05 |

27. WHAT KIND OF PERSON WOULD YOU SEE AS BEST FOR THE LEADERSHIP OF THE COALITION WE HAVE DISCUSSED? WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WOULD YOU SUGGEST - YOU MAY CHOOSE ONE OR TWO OF THE FOLLOWING:
Watter tipe persoon sal jy as die beste beskou vir die leierskap van die koalisie wat ons bespreek het? Watter van die volgende sou jy voorstel - jy mag een of twee uit die volgende kies:

| A LEADER WITH PERSONALITY WHO CAN INSPIRE PEOPLE <br> 'n Leier met persoonlikheid wat mense kan inspireer | 01 |
| :--- | :---: |
| A LEADER WHO CAN ATTRACT PEOPLE AMONG THE MAJORITY OF SOUTH | 02 |
| AFRICANS |  |
| 'n Leier wat mense uit die meerderheid Suid-Afrikaners kan aantrek |  |
| A LEADER WITH SOUND EXPERIENCE IN POLITICS, GOVERNMENT OR SERVICE <br> TO THE PEOPLE <br> 'n Leier met goeie ervaring in politiek, regering of diens aan die volk | 03 |
| AN INTELLIGENT LEADER WITH NEW IDEAS ON SOLVING PROBLEMS IN THE <br> COUNTRY <br> 'n Intelligente leier met nuwe idees oor die oplossing van landsprobleme | 04 |
| A LEADER WHO HAS SYMPATHY FOR PEOPLE AND WHO CARES ABOUT THE <br> CONDITIONS THAT PEOPLE FACE <br> 'n Leier wat simpatie het met die mense en wat omgee oor die toestande wat hulle beleef | 05 |

OTHER (SPECIFY:........................................................................................)
28. WE WOULD LIKE YOU NOW TO THINK OF LEADERS OF POLITICAL PARTIES. HOW MUCH DO YOU ADMIRE OR DISLIKE THE PRESENT LEADERS OF PARTIES? PLEASE GIVE YOUR ANSWERS IN SCORES OUT OF 5, WITH 5 BEING A LEADER YOU ADMIRE STRONGLY, 4 FOR A LEADER YOU ADMIRE, DOWN TO 1 FOR A LEADER YOU STRONGLY DISLIKE, AND WITH SCORES IN BETWEEN. WHAT SCORE OUT OF FIVE WOULD YOU GIVE TO:
Ons wil hê dat jy nou dink aan die leiers van politieke partye. Tot watter mate bewonder jy of hou jy nie van die huidige leiers van politieke partye nie? Gee jou antwoorde asb in 'n punt uit 5, met 5 as 'n leiers wat jy baie bewonder, 4 vir 'n leier wat jy bewonder, tot by 1 vir 'n leier van wie jy glad niks hou nie, met punte tussenin. Watter punt uit vyf sou jy gee aan:

| THABO MBEKI OF THE ANC | $\ldots . / 5$ | DK |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Thabo Mbeki van die ANC <br> HELEN ZILLE OF THE DA <br> Helen Zille van die DA | $\ldots . / 5$ | 9 |
| MANGOSUTHO BUTHELEZI OF THE IFP <br> Mangosutho Buthelezi van die IVP | $\ldots . / 5$ | 9 |
| JACOB ZUMA OF THE ANC <br> Jacob Zuma van die ANC | $\ldots . / 5$ | 9 |
| PATRICIA DE LILLE OF THE ID <br> Patricia de Lille van die OD | $\ldots . / 5$ | 9 |
| PIETER MULDER OF THE FREEDOM FRONT PLUS <br> Pieter Mulder van die Vryheidsfront Plus | $\ldots . / 5$ | 9 |
| BANTU HOLOMISA OF THE UDM <br> Bantu Holomisa van die VDB | $\ldots . . / 5$ | 9 |
| BLADE NZIMANDE OF THE SACP <br> Blade Nzimande van die SAKP | $\ldots . . / 5$ | 9 |
| PHUMZILE MLAMBO-NGCUKA OF THE ANC <br> Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka van die ANC | $\ldots . / 5$ | 9 |

## APPENDIX B TABLES

## APPENDIX B

P1 Talking about elections, which of the following are you:

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| A registered voter and on the voters roll | 1,101 | 76.5\% | 323 | 76.9\% | 30 | 59.0\% | 33 | 70.3\% | 17 | 79.8\% | 8 | 67.1\% | 21 | 87.3\% | 18 | 69.7\% | 257 | 68.7\% | 1,809 | 74.9\% |
| Not registered but will be eligible to vote and can register | 338 | 23.5\% | 97 | 23.1\% | 21 | 41.0\% | 14 | 29.7\% | 4 | 20.2\% | 4 | 32.9\% | 3 | 12.7\% | 8 | 30.3\% | 117 | 31.3\% | 606 | 25.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P2 Two most serious problems government should attend to after the next elections

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Unemployment/joblessness/create jobs | 650 | 45.1\% | 128 | 30.5\% | 18 | 34.1\% | 21 | 45.1\% | 7 | 31.6\% | 2 | 21.1\% | 11 | 46.8\% | 17 | 63.1\% | 154 | 41.1\% | 1,007 | 41.7\% |
| Crime (all forms except below) | 283 | 19.7\% | 274 | 65.3\% | 11 | 22.0\% | 25 | 52.4\% | 11 | 49.3\% | 8 | 71.6\% | 7 | 31.0\% | 7 | 24.7\% | 134 | 35.7\% | 759 | 31.4\% |
| Housing provision/subsidized housing | 336 | 23.3\% | 38 | 9.2\% | 10 | 19.7\% | 10 | 20.3\% | 2 | 10.7\% | 0 | 3.2\% | 7 | 29.7\% | 6 | 23.9\% | 80 | 21.5\% | 491 | 20.3\% |
| Services - electricity | 200 | 13.9\% | 30 | 7.0\% | 19 | 36.5\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 2 | 8.6\% |  |  | 3 | 12.0\% | 4 | 13.7\% | 50 | 13.4\% | 308 | 12.7\% |
| Services - water | 179 | 12.4\% | 2 | 0.4\% | 12 | 22.8\% | 1 | 1.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 4.4\% | 209 | 8.7\% |
| Basic service provision (general/all services) | 134 | 9.3\% | 25 | 6.0\% | 3 | 5.2\% | 2 | 3.5\% |  |  | 0 | 3.0\% | 3 | 12.3\% | 4 | 15.7\% | 24 | 6.3\% | 195 | 8.1\% |
| Services - roads/rural roads/untarrred roads | 147 | 10.2\% | 11 | 2.5\% | 2 | 3.5\% |  |  | 1 | 6.8\% |  |  | 1 | 6.0\% |  |  | 14 | 3.9\% | 177 | 7.3\% |
| Poverty, helping poor, etc. | 89 | 6.2\% | 33 | 8.0\% | 3 | 5.8\% | 4 | 7.9\% | 3 | 12.7\% | 0 | 2.3\% | 1 | 3.5\% | 5 | 18.7\% | 30 | 8.0\% | 168 | 7.0\% |
| Services sewerage/sanitation/toilets | 85 | 5.9\% | 3 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 5.2\% | 4 | 13.7\% | 7 | 1.9\% | 99 | 4.1\% |
| Lower/curb food costs | 45 | 3.1\% | 23 | 5.4\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 1 | 2.0\% | 3 | 13.2\% | 2 | 15.2\% |  |  | 1 | 4.9\% | 14 | 3.7\% | 91 | 3.8\% |
| Education - free education/cheaper education | 63 | 4.4\% | 8 | 1.8\% | 1 | 2.2\% | 1 | 1.5\% | 1 | 5.7\% | 0 | 4.2\% |  |  | 1 | 4.3\% | 9 | 2.5\% | 84 | 3.5\% |
| Poverty relief (food vouchers, subsidies etc.) | 63 | 4.4\% | 10 | 2.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 2.8\% | 84 | 3.5\% |
| Corruption/fraud (general) | 21 | 1.5\% | 32 | 7.6\% | 1 | 1.1\% | 3 | 5.6\% |  |  | 0 | 4.2\% | 3 | 10.7\% | 0 | 1.6\% | 16 | 4.2\% | 75 | 3.1\% |
| Education - better schools/qualified teachers | 38 | 2.7\% | 13 | 3.1\% | 0 | 0.8\% | 4 | 7.8\% | 1 | 3.5\% | 1 | 10.4\% | 0 | 1.7\% |  |  | 12 | 3.3\% | 70 | 2.9\% |
| More/better clinics | 27 | 1.9\% | 11 | 2.7\% | 2 | 4.0\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 1 | 4.0\% |  |  | 1 | 4.5\% |  |  | 11 | 2.9\% | 55 | 2.3\% |
| More state grants (all types) | 42 | 2.9\% | 2 | 0.4\% | 1 | 2.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 2.3\% | 53 | 2.2\% |
| Services - water and electricity | 45 | 3.2\% | 2 | 0.4\% | 1 | 2.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1.3\% | 53 | 2.2\% |


| No power-cuts/no load shedding | 31 | 2.1\% | 12 | 2.9\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 2 | 8.5\% | 0 | 3.8\% | 0 | 1.9\% | 1 | 2.8\% | 5 | 1.2\% | 51 | 2.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

P2 Two most serious problems government should attend to after the next elections - Continues

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Education - more schools/more teachers | 34 | 2.3\% | 2 | 0.4\% | 8 | 15.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1.5\% | 49 | 2.0\% |
| Improvement of Medical services (all) | 26 | 1.8\% | 8 | 1.9\% | 0 | 0.8\% | 2 | 4.7\% | 1 | 4.5\% |  |  | 1 | 5.7\% |  |  | 9 | 2.3\% | 47 | 2.0\% |
| Corruption/fraud (government) | 12 | 0.9\% | 19 | 4.5\% |  |  | 2 | 3.5\% |  |  | 2 | 17.4\% | 5 | 20.2\% |  |  | 6 | 1.6\% | 46 | 1.9\% |
| Better quality housing | 31 | 2.1\% | 1 | 0.2\% | 1 | 2.8\% | 0 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 2.8\% | 43 | 1.8\% |
| Permanent jobs/jobs with salaries, wages, security, etc. etc | 29 | 2.0\% | 5 | 1.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.0\% | 38 | 1.6\% |
| Control entry of foreigners | 20 | 1.4\% | 7 | 1.6\% |  |  | 2 | 4.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 1.9\% | 36 | 1.5\% |
| Combat inflation | 12 | 0.9\% | 14 | 3.2\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 1 | 1.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 2.1\% | 35 | 1.5\% |
| Support for elderly/better pensions | 22 | 1.5\% | 5 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.5\% | 0 | 1.0\% | 0 | 1.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1.3\% | 33 | 1.4\% |
| Lower cost of living | 14 | 1.0\% | 9 | 2.2\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 5.6\% | 1 | 7.1\% |  |  | 0 | 1.3\% | 8 | 2.1\% | 33 | 1.4\% |
| Services - community amenities/facilitites | 16 | 1.1\% | 4 | 0.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 2.9\% | 30 | 1.3\% |
| More recreation facilities for young people/entertainment | 23 | 1.6\% | 5 | 1.2\% |  |  | 1 | 1.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 30 | 1.2\% |
| Other | 12 | 0.8\% | 3 | 0.8\% | 2 | 4.2\% | 2 | 3.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1.4\% | 24 | 1.0\% |
| Moral values/fewer teenage pregnancies | 16 | 1.1\% | 3 | 0.7\% |  |  | 4 | 7.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4.6\% |  |  | 24 | 1.0\% |
| Prevent exploitation of workers/by employers/workers rights | 18 | 1.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 2.9\% |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.1\% | 22 | 0.9\% |
| Legal system/courts/prison, etc. | 3 | 0.2\% | 17 | 4.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3\% | 22 | 0.9\% |
| Cut fuel costs/lower government fuel taxes | 3 | 0.2\% | 9 | 2.2\% | 1 | 2.9\% |  |  | 0 | 1.8\% | 0 | 4.0\% |  |  | 0 | 1.1\% | 5 | 1.4\% | 20 | 0.8\% |
| Improve race relations/less discrimination | 8 | 0.5\% | 6 | 1.4\% |  |  | 1 | 2.0\% | 0 | 2.3\% | 0 | 3.2\% | 1 | 3.0\% |  |  | 3 | 0.9\% | 20 | 0.8\% |
| Abuse (child/women/family) | 7 | 0.5\% | 8 | 1.8\% |  |  | 1 | 2.9\% | 1 | 3.5\% | 0 | 3.9\% |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.5\% | 19 | 0.8\% |
| Better hospital services | 8 | 0.5\% | 1 | 0.3\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0.5\% | 1 | 3.3\% |  |  | 1 | 2.9\% | 0 | 1.4\% | 5 | 1.4\% | 17 | 0.7\% |
| Higher economic growth | 7 | 0.5\% | 4 | 1.0\% |  |  | 2 | 4.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.7\% | 16 | 0.7\% |
| Politicians should keep promises/be more accountable | 6 | 0.4\% | 2 | 0.4\% |  |  | 2 | 3.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.1\% | 13 | 0.6\% |
| Lower/no charges for services/free services | 10 | 0.7\% | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.4\% | 12 | 0.5\% |
| Improve government efficiency/cut | 0 | 0.0\% | 7 | 1.7\% |  |  | 0 | 0.8\% | 1 | 5.0\% | 1 | 8.4\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 11 | 0.4\% |

```
misspending/underspending/
Less affirmative action/merit
```

appointments

P2 Two most serious problems government should attend to after the next elections - Continues

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| More Tertiary education | 8 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.1\% | 9 | 0.4\% |
| More/better skills training/learnerships, apprenticeships, e | 4 | 0.3\% | 2 | 0.6\% |  |  | 0 | 1.0\% | 0 | 1.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.3\% |
| Lower taxes | 1 | 0.1\% | 4 | 0.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4.6\% | 1 | 0.4\% | 8 | 0.3\% |
| Cheaper Tertiary education | 5 | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.9\% |  |  | 2 | 0.4\% | 7 | 0.3\% |
| Lower interest rates | 1 | 0.0\% | 5 | 1.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.5\% | 7 | 0.3\% |
| "Equal rights" | 1 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.0\% | 6 | 0.3\% |
| None | 3 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.7\% | 6 | 0.2\% |
| More top experts in Government | 2 | 0.1\% | 2 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3\% | 5 | 0.2\% |
| Assistance to farmers/support for agriculture |  |  | 3 | 0.7\% | 1 | 2.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.2\% |
| Combat inequality |  |  | 2 | 0.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.5\% | 3 | 0.1\% |
| Help for small (black) farmers | 2 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Combat price fixing/profiteering by business |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 8.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.1\% |
| More affirmative action | 2 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Combat Global warming |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3\% | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Medical costs/medical aid costs |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Encourage foreign skills |  |  | 0 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0\% |
| More/speedier land redistribution |  |  | 0 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

## P3 How satisfied are you with what the present Government has achieved since the last elections in 2004

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Very satisfied | 279 | 19.4\% | 10 | 2.3\% | 3 | 5.2\% | 2 | 3.4\% |  |  |  |  | 2 | 10.1\% | 6 | 24.2\% | 37 | 10.0\% | 339 | 14.0\% |
| Partly satisfied | 626 | 43.5\% | 96 | 22.9\% | 7 | 13.6\% | 16 | 34.5\% | 8 | 37.0\% | 2 | 13.8\% | 6 | 24.8\% | 7 | 27.3\% | 116 | 31.1\% | 885 | 36.6\% |
| Partly dissatisfied | 201 | 13.9\% | 107 | 25.5\% | 10 | 19.4\% | 10 | 21.2\% | 4 | 18.2\% | 3 | 26.1\% | 1 | 3.3\% | 3 | 12.0\% | 77 | 20.6\% | 416 | 17.2\% |
| Very dissatisfied | 328 | 22.8\% | 207 | 49.3\% | 32 | 61.8\% | 19 | 40.9\% | 10 | 44.8\% | 7 | 60.1\% | 15 | 61.8\% | 10 | 36.6\% | 141 | 37.9\% | 768 | 31.8\% |
| Neutral/neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 6 | 0.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.4\% | 8 | 0.3\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P4 In your opinion, what is the quality of life of people like you these days

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | DM |  | ther |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 95 | 6.6\% | 17 | 4.1\% | 1 | 1.8\% | 3 | 5.4\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.6\% |  |  | 23 | 6.1\% | 139 | 5.8\% |
| 483 | 33.5\% | 122 | 29.0\% | 2 | 4.4\% | 12 | 25.6\% | 6 | 29.0\% | 0 | 3.7\% | 10 | 41.4\% | 8 | 28.6\% | 81 | 21.7\% | 724 | 30.0\% |
| 316 | 21.9\% | 130 | 31.0\% | 15 | 29.7\% | 18 | 38.6\% | 8 | 38.5\% | 3 | 28.6\% | 3 | 11.8\% | 4 | 13.9\% | 99 | 26.5\% | 597 | 24.7\% |
| 416 | 28.9\% | 113 | 26.9\% | 19 | 36.8\% | 12 | 25.1\% | 5 | 22.5\% | 7 | 56.1\% | 3 | 11.1\% | 9 | 35.0\% | 118 | 31.6\% | 701 | 29.0\% |
| 129 | 9.0\% | 38 | 9.0\% | 14 | 27.2\% | 3 | 5.3\% | 2 | 10.1\% | 1 | 11.6\% | 8 | 33.2\% | 6 | 22.4\% | 51 | 13.7\% | 252 | 10.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.4\% | 2 | 0.1\% |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P5 Some people say that despite problems, the present Government tries its Best to improve the lives of people like yourself

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Agree strongly | 336 | 23.3\% | 16 | 3.8\% | 0 | 0.9\% | 0 | 1.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 7.4\% | 42 | 11.1\% | 397 | 16.4\% |
| Agree to some extent | 715 | 49.7\% | 119 | 28.4\% | 13 | 25.2\% | 21 | 43.9\% | 8 | 39.5\% | 1 | 7.7\% | 15 | 63.0\% | 12 | 44.1\% | 123 | 32.9\% | 1,027 | 42.5\% |
| Disagree to some extent | 183 | 12.7\% | 104 | 24.9\% | 8 | 15.8\% | 11 | 23.8\% | 6 | 28.5\% | 3 | 21.6\% | 6 | 26.2\% | 7 | 27.6\% | 77 | 20.6\% | 406 | 16.8\% |
| Disagree strongly | 202 | 14.0\% | 180 | 42.9\% | 30 | 58.1\% | 15 | 31.3\% | 7 | 31.9\% | 8 | 70.7\% | 3 | 10.8\% | 6 | 21.0\% | 132 | 35.3\% | 582 | 24.1\% |
| Not answered / Do not know | 4 | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.2\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P6 In general is the country moving in the right or the wrong direction

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | , | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Right direction | 876 | 60.8\% | 92 | 22.0\% | 9 | 17.0\% | 14 | 29.1\% | 7 | 31.6\% | 0 | 4.0\% | 6 | 26.2\% | 11 | 41.5\% | 149 | 40.0\% | 1,164 | 48.2\% |
| Wrong direction | 564 | 39.2\% | 323 | 77.0\% | 43 | 83.0\% | 34 | 70.9\% | 15 | 68.4\% | 11 | 96.0\% | 18 | 73.8\% | 15 | 58.5\% | 223 | 59.8\% | 1,245 | 51.6\% |
| Don't know | 0 | 0.0\% | 4 | 1.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3\% | 5 | 0.2\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P7 What sort of opposition to the present Government would you like to see

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |  | \% | n | \% |
| No opposition at all | 319 | 22.1\% | 17 | 4.0\% | 4 | 7.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.9\% | 0 | 1.1\% | 48 | 12.9\% | 388 | 16.1\% |
| A cooperative opposition that sometimes criticises but often helps and supports the government | 629 | 43.7\% | 150 | 35.7\% | 19 | 37.5\% | 16 | 34.1\% | 16 | 72.9\% | 5 | 41.2\% | 17 | 71.6\% | 20 | 75.7\% | 150 | 40.0\% | 1,021 | 42.3\% |
| An opposition that strongly criticices the Government when it does not perform well | 483 | 33.5\% | 252 | 60.1\% | 28 | 54.9\% | 31 | 65.9\% | 6 | 27.1\% | 7 | 58.8\% | 6 | 25.5\% | 6 | 23.2\% | 170 | 45.4\% | 989 | 40.9\% |
| Honesty/no corruption |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Cares for the poor/needy people |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.4\% | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Don't know | 10 | 0.7\% | 1 | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.1\% | 15 | 0.6\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P8 How easy or difficult is it for a person like you to have political opinions

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | , | \% | n | \% |
| Very easy | 410 | 28.5\% | 79 | 18.7\% | 14 | 27.6\% | 5 | 11.5\% | 8 | 35.2\% | 5 | 42.1\% | 4 | 17.1\% | 9 | 34.1\% | 127 | 34.1\% | 661 | 27.4\% |
| Fairly easy | 379 | 26.3\% | 153 | 36.4\% | 17 | 32.3\% | 16 | 33.9\% | 4 | 19.4\% | 3 | 24.0\% | 2 | 9.9\% | 5 | 17.6\% | 102 | 27.2\% | 680 | 28.2\% |
| Sometimes difficult | 396 | 27.5\% | 118 | 28.1\% | 16 | 30.3\% | 13 | 26.7\% | 9 | 40.4\% | 1 | 10.8\% | 6 | 26.3\% | 4 | 15.7\% | 88 | 23.7\% | 651 | 26.9\% |
| Very difficult | 254 | 17.6\% | 70 | 16.7\% | 5 | 9.8\% | 13 | 27.9\% | 1 | 5.1\% | 3 | 23.1\% | 11 | 46.7\% | 9 | 32.6\% | 56 | 15.1\% | 422 | 17.5\% |
| Not answered / Do not know | 2 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P9 What kind of political party would you most like to vote for in an election

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| That is honest and without corruption | 679 | 47.2\% | 233 | 55.6\% | 24 | 46.8\% | 17 | 35.3\% | 14 | 64.2\% | 7 | 59.1\% | 7 | 27.4\% | 15 | 58.3\% | 179 | 48.0\% | 1,175 | 48.7\% |
| That has principles and policies you support | 185 | 12.9\% | 45 | 10.7\% | 3 | 6.7\% | 5 | 9.5\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 1 | 11.0\% | 5 | 22.8\% | 4 | 15.2\% | 55 | 14.6\% | 308 | 12.8\% |
| That represents people of you race group | 53 | 3.7\% | 9 | 2.1\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 2 | 4.2\% |  |  | 1 | 7.8\% | 3 | 10.8\% | 1 | 2.4\% | 10 | 2.6\% | 80 | 3.3\% |
| That is active and well-known in your community | 94 | 6.5\% | 15 | 3.6\% | 3 | 5.8\% | 7 | 14.7\% |  |  |  |  | 3 | 12.2\% | 3 | 9.8\% | 11 | 3.0\% | 136 | 5.6\% |
| That has the knowledge and experience to run a Government | 386 | 26.8\% | 108 | 25.7\% | 17 | 33.1\% | 17 | 35.4\% | 3 | 14.1\% | 2 | 16.9\% | 6 | 26.8\% | 2 | 8.6\% | 110 | 29.5\% | 652 | 27.0\% |
| That represents people of your Language and culture | 37 | 2.6\% | 9 | 2.2\% | 2 | 3.0\% | 0 | 0.9\% |  |  | 1 | 5.2\% |  |  | 2 | 5.8\% | 8 | 2.1\% | 58 | 2.4\% |
| Other | 5 | 0.3\% | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 6 | 0.3\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_1 Range of policy goals: Assisting people in poverty

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 1,171 | 81.4\% | 320 | 76.2\% | 46 | 88.9\% | 41 | 87.0\% | 17 | 78.3\% | 7 | 59.1\% | 17 | 70.3\% | 23 | 86.5\% | 293 | 78.4\% | 1,934 | 80.1\% |
| Very necessary | 232 | 16.1\% | 70 | 16.7\% | 6 | 11.1\% | 5 | 11.0\% | 4 | 16.7\% | 3 | 27.7\% | 6 | 26.7\% | 4 | 13.5\% | 59 | 15.8\% | 389 | 16.1\% |
| Fairly necessary | 22 | 1.5\% | 28 | 6.7\% |  |  | 0 | 1.0\% | 1 | 5.0\% | 2 | 13.3\% | 1 | 3.0\% |  |  | 20 | 5.2\% | 74 | 3.1\% |
| Unnecessary | 9 | 0.6\% | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  | 0 | 1.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.7\% | 12 | 0.5\% |
| Undesirable | 4 | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.2\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 1 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_2 Range of policy goals: Encouraging investment and new industries

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 731 | 50.7\% | 258 | 61.4\% | 23 | 44.8\% | 35 | 73.8\% | 10 | 44.6\% | 3 | 27.6\% | 9 | 39.3\% | 17 | 64.4\% | 196 | 52.5\% | 1,282 | 53.1\% |
| Very necessary | 519 | 36.0\% | 121 | 29.0\% | 23 | 44.8\% | 11 | 23.0\% | 7 | 30.9\% | 6 | 50.8\% | 9 | 38.8\% | 8 | 29.2\% | 128 | 34.3\% | 832 | 34.5\% |
| Fairly necessary | 137 | 9.5\% | 33 | 7.8\% | 4 | 6.8\% | 2 | 3.3\% | 5 | 24.5\% | 2 | 13.2\% | 0 | 1.7\% | 2 | 6.4\% | 40 | 10.7\% | 224 | 9.3\% |
| Unnecessary | 31 | 2.2\% | 7 | 1.7\% | 2 | 3.6\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 8.4\% | 5 | 20.2\% |  |  | 9 | 2.4\% | 55 | 2.3\% |
| Undesirable | 19 | 1.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 0.8\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 2 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_3 Range of policy goals: Combating crime, drugs and abuse

| 速 | ANC | SACP |  | A |  | FP |  | ID |  | CDP |  | FF |  | DM |  | her |  | sponse |  | tal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 1,021 | 70.9\% | 367 | 87.4\% | 42 | 81.1\% | 42 | 89.5\% | 18 | 82.8\% | 9 | 78.6\% | 14 | 60.4\% | 15 | 55.0\% | 303 | 81.0\% | 1,830 | 75.8\% |
| Very necessary | 371 | 25.8\% | 45 | 10.7\% | 7 | 14.4\% | 5 | 9.9\% | 2 | 10.7\% | 2 | 21.4\% | 9 | 39.6\% | 12 | 45.0\% | 55 | 14.6\% | 509 | 21.1\% |
| Fairly necessary | 27 | 1.8\% | 8 | 1.8\% | 0 | 0.9\% | 0 | 0.6\% | 1 | 6.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 4.1\% | 52 | 2.1\% |
| Unnecessary | 7 | 0.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3\% | 8 | 0.3\% |
| Undesirable | 13 | 0.9\% |  |  | 2 | 3.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 0.6\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 2 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_4 Range of policy goals: Fighting corruption in government and business
Absolute Essential
Very necessary
Fairly necessary
Unnecessary
Undesirable
Not interested/Not answered
Total

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 930 | 64.6\% | 355 | 84.6\% | 30 | 58.7\% | 37 | 79.0\% | 16 | 74.1\% | 9 | 78.6\% | 17 | 72.8\% | 14 | 53.7\% | 262 | 70.0\% | 1,670 | 69.2\% |
| 414 | 28.7\% | 51 | 12.1\% | 18 | 34.4\% | 6 | 13.5\% | 4 | 19.4\% | 2 | 21.4\% | 6 | 27.2\% | 12 | 46.3\% | 87 | 23.3\% | 601 | 24.9\% |
| 75 | 5.2\% | 11 | 2.6\% | 4 | 6.8\% | 4 | 7.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 | 5.7\% | 115 | 4.7\% |
| 9 | 0.6\% | 3 | 0.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.0\% | 16 | 0.7\% |
| 10 | 0.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 6.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 0.5\% |
| 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.1\% |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_5 Range of policy goals: Appointing the most able people irrespective of race or political connections
Absolute Essential
Very necessary
Fairly necessary
Unnecessary
Undesirable
Not interested/Not answered
Total

| ANC | SACP | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | CDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 704 | 48.9\% | 297 | 70.9\% | 32 | 61.5\% | 38 | 79.8\% | 13 | 61.5\% | 6 | 51.6\% | 17 | 71.9\% | 19 | 70.9\% | 218 | 58.2\% | 1,343 | 55.6\% |
| 493 | 34.3\% | 86 | 20.5\% | 17 | 33.9\% | 9 | 19.0\% | 8 | 38.5\% | 3 | 27.2\% | 7 | 28.1\% | 4 | 14.7\% | 101 | 27.1\% | 729 | 30.2\% |
| 168 | 11.7\% | 32 | 7.7\% | 2 | 4.6\% | 1 | 1.3\% |  |  | 2 | 21.2\% |  |  | 4 | 14.4\% | 47 | 12.7\% | 257 | 10.6\% |
| 49 | 3.4\% | 3 | 0.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 1.9\% | 60 | 2.5\% |
| 23 | 1.6\% | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 25 | 1.0\% |
| 2 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.1\% |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_6 Range of policy goals: Compensating victims of apartheid

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | CDP |  | FF |  | DM |  | her |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | , | \% | n | \% |
| 510 | 35.4\% | 143 | 34.2\% | 21 | 40.8\% | 20 | 42.9\% | 7 | 30.5\% | 2 | 13.5\% | 7 | 29.8\% | 11 | 43.1\% | 126 | 33.7\% | 847 | 35.1\% |
| 498 | 34.6\% | 103 | 24.6\% | 19 | 36.7\% | 9 | 19.3\% | 2 | 8.6\% | 1 | 5.6\% | 8 | 35.0\% | 13 | 48.3\% | 115 | 30.9\% | 769 | 31.8\% |
| 255 | 17.7\% | 77 | 18.4\% | 9 | 16.7\% | 11 | 23.5\% | 8 | 36.6\% | 4 | 32.2\% | 2 | 7.4\% | 0 | 1.7\% | 82 | 21.9\% | 447 | 18.5\% |
| 127 | 8.8\% | 69 | 16.5\% | 2 | 4.6\% | 4 | 9.5\% | 4 | 17.9\% | 5 | 40.2\% | 2 | 7.6\% | 1 | 4.6\% | 38 | 10.1\% | 253 | 10.5\% |
| 46 | 3.2\% | 26 | 6.1\% |  |  | 2 | 4.9\% | 1 | 6.4\% | 1 | 8.6\% | 5 | 20.2\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 11 | 3.0\% | 93 | 3.8\% |
| 4 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.1\% | 1 | 1.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.4\% | 7 | 0.3\% |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_7 Range of policy goals: Protecting workers

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 869 | 60.4\% | 247 | 58.9\% | 46 | 88.5\% | 32 | 67.3\% | 13 | 60.0\% | 3 | 27.6\% | 14 | 57.2\% | 16 | 60.4\% | 221 | 59.1\% | 1,460 | 60.5\% |
| Very necessary | 446 | 31.0\% | 114 | 27.2\% | 3 | 5.5\% | 13 | 27.4\% | 7 | 32.7\% | 6 | 54.9\% | 7 | 31.0\% | 9 | 32.7\% | 112 | 29.9\% | 717 | 29.7\% |
| Fairly necessary | 92 | 6.4\% | 52 | 12.5\% | 3 | 6.0\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 2 | 14.6\% | 2 | 10.1\% | 2 | 6.9\% | 36 | 9.7\% | 192 | 8.0\% |
| Unnecessary | 11 | 0.7\% | 6 | 1.4\% |  |  | 0 | 0.9\% | 1 | 3.3\% | 0 | 2.9\% |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.9\% | 21 | 0.9\% |
| Undesirable | 15 | 1.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 16 | 0.6\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 8 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1.7\% |  |  | 0 | 0.1\% | 9 | 0.4\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_8 Range of policy goals: Improving the delivery of electricity, water and other basic services

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 1,119 | 77.7\% | 352 | 84.0\% | 49 | 94.4\% | 40 | 83.5\% | 16 | 75.4\% | 9 | 79.7\% | 16 | 67.0\% | 22 | 84.9\% | 294 | 78.7\% | 1,918 | 79.4\% |
| Very necessary | 265 | 18.4\% | 56 | 13.4\% | 3 | 5.6\% | 5 | 11.0\% | 5 | 22.4\% | 2 | 20.3\% | 7 | 30.0\% | 4 | 15.1\% | 56 | 15.1\% | 404 | 16.7\% |
| Fairly necessary | 47 | 3.2\% | 11 | 2.5\% |  |  | 3 | 5.4\% | 0 | 2.3\% |  |  | 1 | 3.0\% |  |  | 22 | 5.8\% | 83 | 3.4\% |
| Unnecessary | 2 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3\% | 3 | 0.1\% |
| Undesirable | 6 | 0.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.1\% | 6 | 0.3\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_9 Range of policy goals: Respecting language and cultural rights

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 693 | 48.1\% | 232 | 55.4\% | 40 | 76.8\% | 27 | 57.5\% | 9 | 42.6\% | 7 | 62.0\% | 12 | 51.3\% | 12 | 46.2\% | 185 | 49.4\% | 1,218 | 50.4\% |
| 511 | 35.5\% | 124 | 29.6\% | 11 | 21.9\% | 13 | 26.6\% | 9 | 44.0\% | 2 | 16.7\% | 11 | 46.9\% | 13 | 47.5\% | 115 | 30.7\% | 809 | 33.5\% |
| 185 | 12.9\% | 57 | 13.6\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 4 | 9.2\% | 2 | 10.2\% | 2 | 21.3\% | 0 | 1.8\% | 2 | 6.3\% | 64 | 17.1\% | 318 | 13.2\% |
| 34 | 2.3\% | 5 | 1.2\% |  |  | 3 | 6.7\% | 1 | 3.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 2.2\% | 51 | 2.1\% |
| 12 | 0.8\% | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.6\% | 15 | 0.6\% |
| 4 | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.2\% |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

Absolute Essential
Very necessary
Fairly necessary
Unnecessary
Undesirable
Not interested/Not answered
Total

P10_10 Range of policy goals: An efficient public service that delivers

|  | ANC | ACP |  | A |  | P |  | ID |  | CDP |  | F |  | M |  | ther |  | sponse |  | tal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 838 | 58.2\% | 304 | 72.5\% | 30 | 58.8\% | 42 | 88.8\% | 14 | 65.4\% | 6 | 49.8\% | 15 | 64.0\% | 15 | 57.9\% | 233 | 62.4\% | 1,498 | 62.0\% |
| Very necessary | 460 | 31.9\% | 88 | 20.9\% | 18 | 34.8\% | 4 | 7.9\% | 6 | 30.1\% | 5 | 42.9\% | 7 | 30.0\% | 8 | 31.9\% | 94 | 25.1\% | 690 | 28.6\% |
| Fairly necessary | 118 | 8.2\% | 25 | 5.9\% | 3 | 6.4\% | 2 | 3.3\% | 1 | 4.5\% | 1 | 7.3\% | 1 | 6.0\% | 3 | 10.1\% | 44 | 11.7\% | 197 | 8.2\% |
| Unnecessary | 13 | 0.9\% | 2 | 0.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 16 | 0.7\% |
| Undesirable | 4 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.6\% | 6 | 0.2\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 7 | 0.5\% | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 0.3\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_11 Range of policy goals: Improving education and training

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 1,001 | 69.5\% | 328 | 78.2\% | 45 | 87.7\% | 40 | 85.0\% | 18 | 84.0\% | 5 | 43.8\% | 20 | 84.8\% | 14 | 52.8\% | 292 | 78.1\% | 1,764 | 73.0\% |
| Very necessary | 361 | 25.1\% | 76 | 18.2\% | 6 | 10.8\% | 6 | 11.8\% | 3 | 16.0\% | 7 | 56.2\% | 4 | 15.2\% | 11 | 41.3\% | 60 | 16.0\% | 533 | 22.1\% |
| Fairly necessary | 62 | 4.3\% | 15 | 3.6\% | 1 | 1.5\% | 0 | 1.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 | 5.9\% | 100 | 4.1\% |
| Unnecessary | 5 | 0.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 0.2\% |
| Undesirable | 4 | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.2\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 7 | 0.5\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 5.9\% |  |  | 9 | 0.4\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_12 Range of policy goals: Transformation to get rid of all effects of apartheid

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 572 | 39.7\% | 192 | 45.7\% | 30 | 58.0\% | 16 | 34.2\% | 6 | 27.7\% |
| 563 | 39.1\% | 89 | 21.2\% | 17 | 32.6\% | 18 | 38.0\% | 7 | 30.8\% |
| 221 | 15.3\% | 85 | 20.3\% | 2 | 4.8\% | 8 | 16.6\% | 6 | 27.3\% |
| 58 | 4.0\% | 41 | 9.8\% | 2 | 4.6\% | 5 | 10.2\% | 3 | 14.1\% |
| 20 | 1.4\% | 13 | 3.1\% |  |  | 0 | 1.0\% |  |  |
| 6 | 0.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% |


|  | FF | UDM |  | Other |  |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{n}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{n}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{n}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{n}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{n}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |
| 3 | $28.1 \%$ | 10 | $42.4 \%$ | 8 | $31.6 \%$ | 165 | $44.2 \%$ | 1,002 | $41.5 \%$ |  |
| 2 | $16.0 \%$ | 7 | $31.3 \%$ | 16 | $61.5 \%$ | 106 | $28.2 \%$ | 825 | $34.1 \%$ |  |
| 2 | $20.6 \%$ | 1 | $4.7 \%$ | 1 | $4.6 \%$ | 71 | $19.0 \%$ | 398 | $16.5 \%$ |  |
| 3 | $27.0 \%$ | 5 | $21.6 \%$ | 1 | $2.3 \%$ | 22 | $5.8 \%$ | 140 | $5.8 \%$ |  |
| 1 | $8.4 \%$ |  |  |  |  | 9 | $2.4 \%$ | 43 | $1.8 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | $0.4 \%$ | 8 | $0.3 \%$ |  |
| 12 | $100.0 \%$ | 24 | $100.0 \%$ | 26 | $100.0 \%$ | 374 | $100.0 \%$ | 2,415 | $100.0 \%$ |  |

Absolute Essential
Very necessary
Fairly necessary
Unnecessary
Undesirable
Not interested/Not answered
Total
,440 $\quad 100.0 \% \quad 419 \quad 100.0 \% \quad 52 \quad 100.0 \% \quad 47 \quad 100.0 \% \quad 21 \quad 100.0 \%$
10_13 Range of policy goals: Changing economic and labour regulations to make job creation easier

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 922 | 64.1\% | 277 | 66.1\% | 48 | 92.1\% | 34 | 71.8\% | 8 | 35.5\% | 5 | 42.2\% | 15 | 62.1\% | 14 | 51.7\% | 243 | 65.0\% | 1,565 | 64.8\% |
| Very necessary | 402 | 28.0\% | 111 | 26.4\% | 3 | 5.8\% | 10 | 20.4\% | 12 | 55.5\% | 6 | 47.7\% | 9 | 37.9\% | 8 | 28.6\% | 93 | 25.0\% | 653 | 27.0\% |
| Fairly necessary | 74 | 5.1\% | 28 | 6.7\% | 0 | 0.9\% | 4 | 7.9\% | 1 | 5.7\% | 1 | 10.1\% |  |  | 5 | 19.7\% | 34 | 9.1\% | 148 | 6.1\% |
| Unnecessary | 22 | 1.5\% | 2 | 0.5\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.9\% | 28 | 1.1\% |
| Undesirable | 19 | 1.3\% | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 0.8\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  | 1 | 1.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_14 Range of policy goals: Improving health policy, including HIV/Aids

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 1,065 | 74.0\% | 322 | 76.8\% | 47 | 91.8\% | 36 | 77.1\% | 15 | 69.1\% | 5 | 42.2\% | 18 | 73.4\% | 15 | 57.5\% | 287 | 76.8\% | 1,810 | 75.0\% |
| Very necessary | 336 | 23.3\% | 71 | 16.9\% | 4 | 8.2\% | 9 | 19.5\% | 5 | 22.3\% | 3 | 26.2\% | 6 | 26.6\% | 11 | 40.2\% | 62 | 16.6\% | 507 | 21.0\% |
| Fairly necessary | 31 | 2.2\% | 26 | 6.2\% |  |  | 2 | 3.5\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 4 | 31.6\% |  |  | 1 | 2.3\% | 23 | 6.1\% | 88 | 3.6\% |
| Undesirable | 6 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 0.3\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 2 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.5\% | 3 | 0.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_15 Range of policy goals: Improving the delivery of housing for needy families

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 1,104 | 76.7\% | 297 | 70.9\% | 42 | 80.9\% | 38 | 79.8\% | 13 | 62.5\% | 3 | 26.7\% | 20 | 84.3\% | 10 | 37.5\% | 275 | 73.7\% | 1,802 | 74.6\% |
| 285 | 19.8\% | 94 | 22.5\% | 10 | 18.5\% | 7 | 13.9\% | 4 | 16.7\% | 7 | 60.0\% | 4 | 15.7\% | 11 | 42.7\% | 68 | 18.2\% | 489 | 20.3\% |
| 42 | 2.9\% | 25 | 6.0\% | 0 | 0.5\% | 3 | 6.3\% | 4 | 20.8\% | 1 | 10.4\% |  |  | 5 | 19.8\% | 28 | 7.4\% | 109 | 4.5\% |
| 1 | 0.1\% | 2 | 0.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3.0\% |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.5\% | 5 | 0.2\% |
| 6 | 0.4\% | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 0.3\% |
| 2 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 3 | 0.1\% |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_16 Range of policy goals: Combating growing inequality between rich and poor people of any colour

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 755 | 52.5\% | 202 | 48.1\% | 38 | 73.7\% | 23 | 48.5\% | 6 | 29.7\% | 3 | 26.9\% | 12 | 48.5\% | 15 | 56.4\% | 211 | 56.5\% | 1,265 | 52.4\% |
| Very necessary | 464 | 32.3\% | 119 | 28.3\% | 13 | 24.5\% | 18 | 37.6\% | 7 | 30.8\% | 2 | 16.2\% | 5 | 21.0\% | 11 | 41.3\% | 103 | 27.4\% | 741 | 30.7\% |
| Fairly necessary | 174 | 12.1\% | 67 | 16.0\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 5 | 10.6\% | 6 | 28.6\% | 5 | 45.9\% | 1 | 6.0\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 53 | 14.3\% | 314 | 13.0\% |
| Unnecessary | 24 | 1.7\% | 24 | 5.6\% | 0 | 0.5\% | 1 | 2.6\% | 2 | 10.9\% | 1 | 11.0\% | 6 | 23.1\% |  |  | 5 | 1.3\% | 63 | 2.6\% |
| Undesirable | 21 | 1.5\% | 8 | 1.9\% |  |  | 0 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1.4\% |  |  | 1 | 0.3\% | 31 | 1.3\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_17 Range of policy goals: Working for harmony and reconciliation between the races

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Absolute Essential | 705 | 49.0\% | 232 | 55.2\% | 35 | 67.2\% | 22 | 47.1\% | 10 | 47.6\% | 2 | 18.1\% | 18 | 75.6\% | 10 | 37.6\% | 184 | 49.1\% | 1,217 | 50.4\% |
| Very necessary | 511 | 35.5\% | 118 | 28.2\% | 12 | 24.1\% | 17 | 36.1\% | 5 | 22.2\% | 4 | 32.8\% | 5 | 20.8\% | 8 | 30.9\% | 122 | 32.7\% | 803 | 33.2\% |
| Fairly necessary | 162 | 11.3\% | 63 | 15.0\% | 4 | 8.7\% | 7 | 15.8\% | 6 | 30.2\% | 4 | 38.7\% | 0 | 1.7\% | 5 | 18.6\% | 51 | 13.8\% | 305 | 12.6\% |
| Unnecessary | 37 | 2.6\% | 6 | 1.5\% |  |  | 0 | 1.0\% |  |  | 1 | 10.4\% | 0 | 1.8\% | 3 | 12.9\% | 14 | 3.8\% | 63 | 2.6\% |
| Undesirable | 20 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.4\% | 22 | 0.9\% |
| Not interested/Not answered | 4 | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 4 | 0.2\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P10_18 Range of policy goals: Affirmative action and empowerment for people previously disadvantaged

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 695 | 48.3\% | 163 | 38.8\% | 31 | 59.8\% | 18 | 37.5\% | 6 | 28.0\% | 2 | 16.8\% | 10 | 42.1\% | 13 | 50.7\% | 167 | 44.8\% | 1,105 | 45.7\% |
| 490 | 34.0\% | 82 | 19.6\% | 16 | 30.4\% | 16 | 34.6\% | 6 | 29.0\% | 2 | 17.6\% | 5 | 22.7\% | 9 | 33.1\% | 110 | 29.4\% | 737 | 30.5\% |
| 186 | 12.9\% | 75 | 17.9\% | 3 | 5.0\% | 5 | 10.7\% | 5 | 22.1\% | 1 | 8.1\% | 2 | 7.4\% | 4 | 13.9\% | 63 | 16.9\% | 343 | 14.2\% |
| 48 | 3.4\% | 66 | 15.7\% | 2 | 3.6\% | 6 | 12.7\% | 4 | 18.0\% | 5 | 40.7\% | 6 | 26.0\% |  |  | 17 | 4.7\% | 154 | 6.4\% |
| 18 | 1.2\% | 32 | 7.6\% |  |  | 2 | 4.5\% | 1 | 2.8\% | 2 | 16.8\% | 0 | 1.8\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 15 | 4.0\% | 70 | 2.9\% |
| 3 | 0.2\% | 2 | 0.5\% | 1 | 1.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 6 | 0.3\% |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P11 Which one of the following is most important to ensure that a Governing party, after elections, keeps on doing its best for the people in a country
The party's history of struggle for
the people
The promises it made during
elections
A strong opposition that criticises
Government and can attract
disappointed voters
The needs of ordinary members
and supporters of the party
What the party says about its
principles and what it believe
Not answered / Do not know

P12 What political party most deserves to be supported during the next elections in 2009

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| ANC | 1,368 | 95.0\% | 23 | 5.5\% | 6 | 10.8\% | 6 | 11.9\% | 0 | 1.2\% |  |  | 2 | 10.4\% | 7 | 25.5\% | 144 | 38.6\% | 1,556 | 64.4\% |
| DA | 24 | 1.6\% | 363 | 86.6\% | 1 | 1.6\% | 3 | 5.9\% | 6 | 27.8\% | 1 | 12.5\% | 0 | 1.4\% | 2 | 6.2\% | 50 | 13.4\% | 450 | 18.6\% |
| NONE | 16 | 1.1\% | 6 | 1.4\% | 1 | 2.7\% | 0 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  | 3 | 12.3\% |  |  | 99 | 26.5\% | 125 | 5.2\% |
| IFP | 4 | 0.3\% | 4 | 0.9\% | 43 | 82.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.9\% |  |  | 11 | 2.9\% | 62 | 2.6\% |
| ID | 8 | 0.5\% | 2 | 0.4\% |  |  | 37 | 78.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1.2\% | 51 | 2.1\% |
| Not sure | 3 | 0.2\% | 5 | 1.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1.3\% | 25 | 6.8\% | 33 | 1.4\% |
| UDM | 1 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0.3\% |  |  | 0 | 1.0\% |  |  |  |  | 17 | 73.0\% | 0 | 1.7\% | 4 | 1.2\% | 25 | 1.0\% |
| ACDP | 3 | 0.2\% | 2 | 0.5\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0.8\% | 15 | 69.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.5\% | 23 | 1.0\% |
| PAC | 3 | 0.2\% | 2 | 0.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 48.3\% | 1 | 0.2\% | 18 | 0.8\% |
| FF+ |  |  | 3 | 0.6\% | 0 | 0.8\% |  |  | 0 | 1.7\% | 10 | 87.5\% |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.6\% | 16 | 0.7\% |
| SACP | 9 | 0.6\% | 3 | 0.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.2\% | 16 | 0.7\% |
| Refused |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 2.8\% | 10 | 0.4\% |
| OTHER | 1 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 9.2\% | 6 | 1.6\% | 10 | 0.4\% |
| AZAPO |  |  | 5 | 1.3\% |  |  | 1 | 1.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 5.7\% | 3 | 0.7\% | 10 | 0.4\% |
| Political party not specified | 1 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 1.8\% | 8 | 0.3\% |
| Minority Front | 0 | 0.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.2\% |  |  | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Total | ,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

## P13 What other party also deserves to do well in the elections

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| DA | 205 | 14.2\% | 33 | 7.8\% | 6 | 11.0\% | 26 | 54.3\% | 5 | 25.4\% | 9 | 81.2\% | 3 | 11.9\% | 2 | 8.0\% | 36 | 9.5\% | 324 | 13.4\% |
| ANC | 168 | 11.7\% | 39 | 9.3\% | 5 | 8.8\% | 6 | 12.4\% | 1 | 5.6\% |  |  | 6 | 23.7\% | 13 | 49.9\% | 33 | 8.8\% | 271 | 11.2\% |
| ID | 47 | 3.3\% | 109 | 26.0\% | 2 | 3.9\% | 7 | 15.8\% | 3 | 12.5\% | 0 | 2.3\% | 1 | 4.2\% |  |  | 20 | 5.4\% | 190 | 7.9\% |
| IFP | 64 | 4.5\% | 31 | 7.4\% | 13 | 24.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 | 5.9\% | 130 | 5.4\% |
| PAC | 102 | 7.1\% | 7 | 1.8\% |  |  | 2 | 4.7\% |  |  |  |  | 2 | 9.2\% | 2 | 8.4\% | 12 | 3.2\% | 128 | 5.3\% |
| UDM | 87 | 6.1\% | 4 | 0.9\% |  |  | 1 | 2.4\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4.5\% | 5 | 18.9\% | 8 | 2.0\% | 106 | 4.4\% |
| SACP | 73 | 5.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1.6\% | 6 | 1.5\% | 80 | 3.3\% |
| FF+ | 7 | 0.5\% | 57 | 13.7\% | 1 | 2.8\% | 1 | 2.0\% | 1 | 4.5\% | 2 | 16.5\% | 0 | 1.4\% |  |  | 4 | 1.0\% | 73 | 3.0\% |
| ACDP | 33 | 2.3\% | 19 | 4.6\% |  |  |  |  | 6 | 26.6\% |  |  | 1 | 3.3\% |  |  | 4 | 1.1\% | 63 | 2.6\% |
| Not answered / Do not know | 12 | 0.8\% | 4 | 0.9\% |  |  | 0 | 1.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 7.2\% | 24 | 6.4\% | 42 | 1.7\% |
| AZAPO | 33 | 2.3\% | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1.7\% | 40 | 1.7\% |
| OTHER | 20 | 1.4\% | 4 | 1.0\% |  |  | 0 | 1.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.7\% | 27 | 1.1\% |
| Political party not specified | 5 | 0.4\% | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1.4\% | 11 | 0.5\% |
| Refused |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 2.0\% | 7 | 0.3\% |
| Minority Front | 1 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.1\% |
| NONE | 582 | 40.4\% | 109 | 25.9\% | 25 | 48.9\% | 3 | 6.3\% | 5 | 25.3\% |  |  | 10 | 41.9\% | 2 | 6.1\% | 185 | 49.4\% | 921 | 38.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P14 Thinking of the next general election would it be a good idea or not for political parties that agree with each other on basic principles, to cooperate in the election by not competing with each other and putting forward a shared list of candidates? In other words this would be an election coalition.

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | , | \% | n | \% |
| A very good idea | 600 | 41.7\% | 243 | 58.0\% | 13 | 24.3\% | 30 | 63.0\% | 14 | 64.5\% | 7 | 59.3\% | 13 | 54.7\% | 14 | 52.4\% | 143 | 38.2\% | 1,076 | 44.6\% |
| A fairly good idea | 339 | 23.6\% | 115 | 27.4\% | 16 | 31.2\% | 13 | 27.9\% | 3 | 15.6\% | 3 | 30.1\% | 6 | 26.9\% | 8 | 29.2\% | 85 | 22.8\% | 589 | 24.4\% |
| Not good not bad | 75 | 5.2\% | 26 | 6.2\% | 10 | 18.7\% | 1 | 1.7\% | 3 | 13.8\% | 1 | 6.9\% | 1 | 5.1\% | 1 | 3.7\% | 52 | 13.8\% | 169 | 7.0\% |
| A fairly bad idea | 79 | 5.5\% | 11 | 2.6\% |  |  | 3 | 5.5\% | 1 | 5.1\% | 0 | 3.8\% | 2 | 7.0\% | 4 | 14.6\% | 16 | 4.2\% | 115 | 4.8\% |
| A very bad idea | 340 | 23.6\% | 23 | 5.6\% | 13 | 25.8\% |  |  | 0 | 1.1\% |  |  | 2 | 6.4\% |  |  | 69 | 18.5\% | 448 | 18.5\% |
| Other party | 3 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.1\% |
| Party for blacks only | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Don't know | 3 | 0.2\% | 1 | 0.3\% |  |  | 1 | 1.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 2.5\% | 14 | 0.6\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

## P15-Why do you feel this way

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| More effective delivery of services/more effective governance | 512 | 35.6\% | 137 | 32.8\% | 13 | 24.6\% | 27 | 57.0\% | 4 | 19.5\% | 3 | 30.0\% | 14 | 60.8\% | 5 | 20.6\% | 95 | 25.5\% | 812 | 33.6\% |
| Cooperation/consensus/agreement etc. | 489 | 33.9\% | 132 | 31.6\% | 16 | 31.8\% | 16 | 34.8\% | 3 | 16.3\% | 2 | 19.1\% | 4 | 17.7\% | 12 | 46.7\% | 119 | 31.9\% | 796 | 32.9\% |
| Parties too different in ideas, ideals, ideologies, etc. | 226 | 15.7\% | 29 | 7.0\% | 9 | 18.2\% | 2 | 4.0\% | 1 | 2.9\% | 0 | 3.8\% | 1 | 4.6\% | 3 | 10.4\% | 47 | 12.7\% | 319 | 13.2\% |
| More effective opposition/keeps better check on government/k | 97 | 6.8\% | 128 | 30.6\% | 4 | 7.2\% | 14 | 29.2\% | 10 | 46.1\% | 5 | 46.7\% | 2 | 9.9\% | 3 | 9.9\% | 43 | 11.6\% | 307 | 12.7\% |
| Parties will not waste energy fighting each other | 136 | 9.4\% | 17 | 4.0\% | 2 | 4.6\% | 1 | 2.9\% | 1 | 3.6\% |  |  | 1 | 4.8\% | 0 | 1.4\% | 38 | 10.3\% | 197 | 8.2\% |
| Need unity/single rule/single Rainbow Nation | 132 | 9.1\% | 12 | 3.0\% | 3 | 5.7\% | 6 | 13.3\% | 4 | 16.8\% |  |  | 2 | 6.8\% | 6 | 23.2\% | 21 | 5.6\% | 185 | 7.7\% |
| Greater size = greater strength/more effective/undivided votes | 74 | 5.1\% | 58 | 13.9\% | 3 | 6.1\% | 13 | 27.8\% | 2 | 8.5\% | 2 | 21.5\% | 1 | 4.4\% | 3 | 11.4\% | 25 | 6.8\% | 182 | 7.5\% |
| Politicians/parties too competitive | 134 | 9.3\% | 5 | 1.1\% | 3 | 6.7\% | 1 | 3.1\% | 1 | 5.1\% |  |  | 2 | 9.2\% | 1 | 4.6\% | 17 | 4.5\% | 165 | 6.8\% |
| More opportunity to find consensus strengthen ideals/stronger | 80 | 5.5\% | 27 | 6.4\% | 2 | 3.6\% | 4 | 9.3\% | 1 | 5.7\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4.6\% | 22 | 5.9\% | 137 | 5.7\% |
| Some parties too influent/useless | 89 | 6.2\% | 9 | 2.0\% | 1 | 2.0\% | 0 | 0.7\% | 1 | 6.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 5.2\% | 120 | 5.0\% |

P15 - Why do you feel this way - continues

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 58 | 4.0\% | 5 | 1.1\% | 2 | 3.5\% |  |  | 0 | 1.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 | 6.2\% | 88 | 3.6\% |
| 38 | 2.6\% | 8 | 2.0\% | 3 | 6.3\% | 1 | 2.9\% | 1 | 3.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 | 8.2\% | 82 | 3.4\% |
| 51 | 3.6\% | 5 | 1.1\% |  |  | 2 | 3.5\% | 0 | 2.3\% |  |  | 1 | 3.5\% |  |  | 17 | 4.5\% | 76 | 3.1\% |
| 55 | 3.8\% | 3 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4.3\% | 10 | 2.6\% | 68 | 2.8\% |
| 20 | 1.4\% | 11 | 2.5\% | 1 | 2.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 7.2\% | 6 | 1.5\% | 39 | 1.6\% |
| 11 | 0.8\% | 6 | 1.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1.7\% | 23 | 1.0\% |
| 5 | 0.4\% | 5 | 1.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.7\% | 13 | 0.5\% |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P16_1 A coalition should be a "Rainbow Coalition" with prominent people from all population groups

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | , | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Essential | 388 | 26.9\% | 174 | 41.5\% | 11 | 22.2\% | 14 | 30.2\% | 12 | 56.4\% | 3 | 23.3\% | 12 | 49.8\% | 14 | 51.6\% | 112 | 29.9\% | 740 | 30.6\% |
| A good thing | 596 | 41.4\% | 164 | 39.2\% | 11 | 21.4\% | 28 | 60.1\% | 8 | 37.4\% | 3 | 27.8\% | 8 | 34.5\% | 5 | 18.5\% | 117 | 31.3\% | 941 | 39.0\% |
| Something you could accept | 181 | 12.6\% | 63 | 15.0\% | 21 | 40.5\% | 5 | 9.7\% | 1 | 6.2\% | 5 | 39.9\% | 2 | 7.0\% | 7 | 25.3\% | 82 | 21.9\% | 366 | 15.1\% |
| Something you would not support | 275 | 19.1\% | 18 | 4.3\% | 8 | 15.8\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 8.9\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 1 | 4.6\% | 62 | 16.7\% | 368 | 15.2\% |
| Not answered / Do not know |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P16_2 A coalition should strengthen opposition to the ANC
Essential
A good thing
Something you could accept
Something you would not support
Not answered / Do not know
Total

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 214 | 14.8\% | 223 | 53.1\% | 14 | 27.4\% | 28 | 58.8\% | 13 | 59.0\% | 9 | 76.3\% | 12 | 48.6\% | 8 | 31.2\% | 94 | 25.3\% | 614 | 25.4\% |
| 513 | 35.6\% | 113 | 27.0\% | 16 | 30.4\% | 10 | 21.6\% | 7 | 31.7\% | 1 | 9.8\% | 6 | 24.3\% | 9 | 33.3\% | 107 | 28.5\% | 781 | 32.3\% |
| 209 | 14.5\% | 47 | 11.2\% | 14 | 26.4\% | 7 | 13.9\% |  |  | 0 | 3.2\% | 3 | 11.4\% | 8 | 29.5\% | 74 | 19.8\% | 361 | 14.9\% |
| 505 | 35.1\% | 37 | 8.7\% | 8 | 15.8\% | 3 | 5.7\% | 2 | 9.3\% | 1 | 10.6\% | 4 | 15.7\% | 2 | 6.0\% | 98 | 26.2\% | 659 | 27.3\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2\% | 1 | 0.0\% |
| ,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P16_3 A coalition should draw together the best expertise in running a country irrespective of race groups

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Essential | 391 | 27.1\% | 224 | 53.4\% | 10 | 19.4\% | 24 | 50.5\% | 14 | 63.4\% | 5 | 39.1\% | 11 | 46.1\% | 5 | 19.7\% | 136 | 36.4\% | 819 | 33.9\% |
| A good thing | 596 | 41.4\% | 134 | 32.0\% | 19 | 37.2\% | 20 | 41.6\% | 8 | 36.6\% | 5 | 45.1\% | 9 | 35.9\% | 14 | 52.7\% | 110 | 29.6\% | 915 | 37.9\% |
| Something you could accept | 176 | 12.2\% | 46 | 11.0\% | 18 | 34.2\% | 4 | 7.9\% |  |  | 1 | 12.0\% |  | 11.0\% | 7 | 27.6\% | 69 | 18.6\% | 324 | 13.4\% |
| Something you would not support | 275 | 19.1\% | 15 | 3.6\% | 5 | 9.1\% |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3.8\% | 2 | 7.0\% |  |  | 58 | 15.4\% | 355 | 14.7\% |
| Not answered / Do not know | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P16_4 A coalition should only include parties that believe in the same political and democratic principles

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Essential | 313 | 21.8\% | 157 | 37.5\% | 11 | 21.9\% | 13 | 26.5\% | 7 | 34.9\% | 4 | 37.3\% | 11 | 46.3\% | 9 | 32.4\% | 107 | 28.7\% | 633 | 26.2\% |
| A good thing | 615 | 42.7\% | 162 | 38.6\% | 21 | 40.1\% | 24 | 50.2\% | 8 | 35.4\% | 2 | 19.5\% | 5 | 21.4\% | 5 | 18.8\% | 108 | 29.0\% | 950 | 39.3\% |
| Something you could accept | 224 | 15.6\% | 65 | 15.6\% | 16 | 30.6\% | 11 | 22.4\% | 2 | 9.7\% |  | 8.9\% | 4 | 15.4\% | 9 | 34.2\% | 80 | 21.3\% | 412 | 17.0\% |
| Something you would not support | 286 | 19.9\% | 35 | 8.2\% | 4 | 7.5\% | 0 | 0.9\% | 4 | 20.1\% | 4 | 34.3\% | 4 | 16.9\% | 4 | 14.6\% | 78 | 21.0\% | 419 | 17.4\% |
| Not answered / Do not know | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P16_5 A coalition should only include parties that believe in the same economic principles

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |  | \% | n | \% |
| Essential | 325 | 22.6\% | 152 | 36.2\% | 10 | 18.6\% | 12 | 25.5\% | 7 | 34.9\% | 4 | 31.5\% | 11 | 44.7\% | 5 | 19.4\% | 97 | 26.0\% | 623 | 25.8\% |
| A good thing | 599 | 41.6\% | 163 | 39.0\% | 24 | 45.6\% | 27 | 56.3\% | 8 | 35.4\% | 2 | 20.8\% | 6 | 24.1\% | 7 | 26.1\% | 113 | 30.3\% | 948 | 39.3\% |
| Something you could accept | 212 | 14.7\% | 60 | 14.3\% | 13 | 25.4\% | 8 | 16.9\% | 1 | 6.8\% | 2 | 13.4\% | 4 | 18.2\% | 14 | 52.8\% | 79 | 21.0\% | 393 | 16.3\% |
| Something you would not support | 303 | 21.0\% | 43 | 10.3\% | 5 | 10.4\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 5 | 23.0\% | 4 | 34.3\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 0 | 1.7\% | 82 | 21.9\% | 446 | 18.5\% |
| Not answered / Do not know | 1 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.8\% | 5 | 0.2\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P16_6 What other things are necessary in a coalition

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Mention of various benefits/services/etc. (all together) | 108 | 7.5\% | 23 | 5.4\% | 1 | 2.8\% | 4 | 8.6\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 6.0\% | 1 | 3.3\% | 22 | 5.8\% | 160 | 6.6\% |
| Unity/an urge to be together/common feelings | 89 | 6.2\% | 28 | 6.7\% | 0 | 0.5\% | 1 | 2.7\% |  |  | 1 | 12.7\% | 2 | 9.2\% | 1 | 2.6\% | 24 | 6.3\% | 147 | 6.1\% |
| Trust/honesty/openness | 38 | 2.7\% | 30 | 7.2\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 1 | 3.0\% | 1 | 4.6\% | 1 | 5.4\% | 5 | 22.8\% | 3 | 11.7\% | 18 | 4.9\% | 99 | 4.1\% |
| Co-operation and give and take | 42 | 2.9\% | 17 | 4.1\% | 1 | 2.7\% |  |  | 1 | 5.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1.6\% | 67 | 2.8\% |
| Must include all people in country/all South Africans | 36 | 2.5\% | 8 | 1.9\% |  |  | 2 | 3.3\% | 1 | 3.9\% |  |  | 2 | 7.4\% |  |  | 10 | 2.7\% | 59 | 2.4\% |
| Illuminate crime and corruption | 20 | 1.4\% | 23 | 5.5\% | 1 | 2.8\% | 1 | 2.2\% |  |  | 2 | 13.5\% | 3 | 11.1\% |  |  | 7 | 1.9\% | 56 | 2.3\% |
| Same beliefs/basic values same | 36 | 2.5\% | 4 | 1.1\% | 1 | 1.7\% |  |  | 2 | 9.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 2.2\% | 51 | 2.1\% |
| Concentration on delivery | 22 | 1.5\% | 7 | 1.8\% | 2 | 3.6\% | 3 | 7.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 3.3\% | 47 | 1.9\% |
| Other | 24 | 1.7\% | 5 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.6\% | 0 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3.5\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 10 | 2.6\% | 42 | 1.7\% |
| Equal rights/equality in coalition | 21 | 1.5\% | 4 | 1.0\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3.5\% | 1 | 5.1\% | 1 | 3.3\% | 0 | 1.4\% | 6 | 1.7\% | 34 | 1.4\% |
| Respect/ubuntu | 24 | 1.6\% | 5 | 1.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.2\% | 33 | 1.4\% |
| Community representatives | 23 | 1.6\% | 7 | 1.6\% | 1 | 1.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.6\% | 33 | 1.4\% |
| Strong leader/good leadership | 13 | 0.9\% | 6 | 1.5\% |  |  | 0 | 0.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3.7\% | 10 | 2.7\% | 30 | 1.3\% |
| Democratic/rules of democracy must apply | 13 | 0.9\% | 4 | 1.0\% |  |  | 1 | 1.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.9\% | 22 | 0.9\% |
| Outside experts | 10 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.1\% |  |  | 2 | 3.8\% | 1 | 6.4\% |  |  |  |  | 2 | 5.8\% |  |  | 16 | 0.6\% |
| Strong opposition to criticism of government | 6 | 0.4\% | 4 | 1.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3.0\% |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.0\% | 15 | 0.6\% |
| Avoid all infighting/competitiveness in coalition | 8 | 0.6\% | 3 | 0.7\% |  |  | 1 | 1.9\% | 0 | 1.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.5\% | 14 | 0.6\% |
| Christian values | 4 | 0.2\% | 2 | 0.5\% |  |  |  |  | 2 | 11.3\% |  |  | 0 | 1.4\% |  |  | 4 | 1.1\% | 13 | 0.5\% |
| Don't know / None | 903 | 62.7\% | 237 | 56.4\% | 43 | 82.4\% | 30 | 64.3\% | 12 | 54.7\% | 7 | 60.4\% | 8 | 35.3\% | 18 | 67.3\% | 220 | 59.0\% | 1,478 | 61.2\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P17_1 Think of this coalition of parties, will you say: ANC


P17_2 Think of this coalition of parties, will you say: DA

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Definitely in Coalition | 446 | 31.0\% | 366 | 87.3\% | 21 | 41.3\% | 37 | 77.1\% | 15 | 71.5\% | 11 | 92.1\% | 12 | 50.9\% | 16 | 61.9\% | 165 | 44.2\% | 1,090 | 45.1\% |
| Would accept in Coalition | 487 | 33.8\% | 37 | 8.8\% | 22 | 43.0\% | 9 | 18.3\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 0 | 3.9\% | 8 | 32.1\% | 6 | 23.8\% | 128 | 34.3\% | 702 | 29.1\% |
| Not be part of Coalition | 502 | 34.9\% | 16 | 3.9\% | 7 | 13.6\% | 2 | 4.6\% | 1 | 6.8\% | 0 | 4.0\% | 4 | 17.0\% | 4 | 14.3\% | 78 | 20.9\% | 615 | 25.5\% |
| Don't know/Not answered | 5 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.1\% | 1 | 2.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.5\% | 8 | 0.3\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P17_3 Think of this coalition of parties, will you say: ID

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Definitely in Coalition | 384 | 26.7\% | 236 | 56.3\% | 18 | 35.2\% | 41 | 86.5\% | 11 | 49.2\% | 7 | 60.0\% | 10 | 41.8\% | 10 | 38.0\% | 130 | 34.7\% | 847 | 35.1\% |
| Would accept in Coalition | 448 | 31.1\% | 134 | 32.0\% | 23 | 44.7\% | 6 | 12.2\% | 8 | 37.7\% | 3 | 23.5\% | 6 | 24.7\% | 13 | 49.1\% | 140 | 37.4\% | 780 | 32.3\% |
| Not be part of Coalition | 599 | 41.6\% | 48 | 11.5\% | 10 | 20.1\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 3 | 13.2\% | 2 | 16.6\% | 8 | 33.4\% | 3 | 12.9\% | 103 | 27.5\% | 777 | 32.2\% |
| Don't know/Not answered | 9 | 0.6\% | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.4\% | 11 | 0.5\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

## P17_4 Think of this coalition of parties, will you say: EUDM

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Definitely in Coalition | 413 | 28.7\% | 112 | 26.8\% | 14 | 27.9\% | 18 | 37.0\% | 8 | 37.6\% | 4 | 36.8\% | 21 | 86.9\% | 15 | 57.0\% | 106 | 28.3\% | 711 | 29.5\% |
| Would accept in Coalition | 528 | 36.7\% | 186 | 44.4\% | 25 | 49.2\% | 24 | 50.2\% | 9 | 41.0\% | 3 | 29.9\% | 1 | 3.2\% | 10 | 37.9\% | 150 | 40.1\% | 937 | 38.8\% |
| Not be part of Coalition | 490 | 34.0\% | 118 | 28.2\% | 12 | 22.9\% | 6 | 12.8\% | 5 | 21.4\% | 4 | 33.3\% | 2 | 9.9\% | 1 | 5.2\% | 116 | 31.1\% | 754 | 31.2\% |
| Dont know/Not answered | 8 | 0.6\% | 2 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.6\% | 13 | 0.5\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

## P17 5 Think of this coalition of parties, will you say: IFP

| -17 | ANC | ACP |  | A |  | P |  | ID |  | CDP |  | FF |  | DM |  | ther |  | sponse |  | tal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Definitely in Coalition | 348 | 24.2\% | 157 | 37.4\% | 26 | 49.5\% | 7 | 14.8\% | 12 | 56.5\% | 7 | 56.1\% | 12 | 52.2\% | 8 | 29.0\% | 98 | 26.1\% | 673 | 27.9\% |
| Would accept in Coalition | 452 | 31.4\% | 144 | 34.4\% | 16 | 30.7\% | 26 | 55.2\% | 3 | 13.9\% | 3 | 23.3\% | 8 | 35.0\% | 12 | 46.5\% | 139 | 37.3\% | 804 | 33.3\% |
| Not be part of Coalition | 634 | 44.0\% | 116 | 27.7\% | 10 | 19.8\% | 14 | 30.0\% | 6 | 29.6\% | 2 | 20.7\% | 3 | 12.8\% | 6 | 23.5\% | 135 | 36.1\% | 927 | 38.4\% |
| Don't know/Not answered | 6 | 0.4\% | 2 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1.1\% | 2 | 0.4\% | 11 | 0.4\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P17_6 Think of this coalition of parties, will you say: FF+

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Definitely in Coalition | 280 | 19.4\% | 163 | 39.0\% | 21 | 41.4\% | 11 | 22.8\% | 12 | 54.9\% | 11 | 93.7\% | 8 | 35.0\% | 9 | 34.4\% | 87 | 23.2\% | 602 | 24.9\% |
| Would accept in Coalition | 387 | 26.9\% | 136 | 32.5\% | 18 | 35.1\% | 24 | 51.3\% | 5 | 24.5\% | 0 | 2.3\% | 5 | 20.4\% | 7 | 25.9\% | 113 | 30.3\% | 696 | 28.8\% |
| Not be part of Coalition | 767 | 53.3\% | 116 | 27.7\% | 12 | 23.5\% | 12 | 25.8\% | 4 | 20.6\% | 0 | 4.0\% | 11 | 44.6\% | 10 | 38.5\% | 171 | 45.8\% | 1,104 | 45.7\% |
| Dont know/Not answered | 6 | 0.4\% | 4 | 0.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1.1\% | 3 | 0.8\% | 13 | 0.5\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

## P17_7 Think of this coalition of parties, will you say: PAC

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Definitely in Coalition | 448 | 31.1\% | 79 | 18.8\% | 16 | 31.9\% | 10 | 20.4\% | 8 | 39.5\% | 3 | 28.6\% | 9 | 39.4\% | 18 | 69.3\% | 104 | 28.0\% | 697 | 28.9\% |
| Would accept in Coalition | 448 | 31.1\% | 110 | 26.2\% | 21 | 41.5\% | 17 | 35.4\% | 5 | 25.6\% | 2 | 19.1\% | 4 | 18.6\% | 7 | 25.4\% | 117 | 31.2\% | 731 | 30.3\% |
| Not be part of Coalition | 536 | 37.3\% | 227 | 54.2\% | 14 | 26.6\% | 21 | 44.2\% | 7 | 34.9\% | 6 | 52.3\% | 10 | 42.0\% | 1 | 4.1\% | 150 | 40.3\% | 973 | 40.3\% |
| Don't know/Not answered | 7 | 0.5\% | 3 | 0.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1.1\% | 2 | 0.6\% | 13 | 0.5\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P18 Is there any party I have not mentioned that you feel should be included in such a coalition

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| ACDP | 58 | 4.1\% | 30 | 7.2\% |  |  | 6 | 11.7\% | 17 | 78.7\% | 1 | 6.0\% | 1 | 4.2\% |  |  | 20 | 5.4\% | 133 | 5.5\% |
| Azapo | 87 | 6.0\% | 5 | 1.3\% |  |  | 1 | 1.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.4\% | 8 | 2.1\% | 102 | 4.2\% |
| SACP | 57 | 4.0\% | 2 | 0.5\% | 1 | 2.8\% | 2 | 4.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4.6\% | 9 | 2.4\% | 73 | 3.0\% |
| Other | 14 | 1.0\% | 11 | 2.7\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 1 | 1.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 8.0\% | 12 | 3.2\% | 41 | 1.7\% |
| Madeco | 13 | 0.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 7.7\% |  |  | 15 | 0.6\% |
| Christian Party | 6 | 0.4\% | 2 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1.2\% | 13 | 0.5\% |
| Minority Front | 2 | 0.1\% | 4 | 0.9\% | 1 | 2.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.6\% | 2 | 0.5\% | 10 | 0.4\% |
| Refused | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1.6\% | 7 | 0.3\% |
| None | 1,201 | 83.4\% | 364 | 86.9\% | 48 | 93.1\% | 38 | 79.9\% | 5 | 21.3\% | 11 | 94.0\% | 23 | 95.8\% | 20 | 74.7\% | 312 | 83.5\% | 2,022 | 83.7\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P18 Is there any party I have not mentioned that you feel should be included in such a coalition

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| ACDP | 58 | 4.1\% | 30 | 7.2\% |  |  | 6 | 11.7\% | 17 | 78.7\% | 1 | 6.0\% | 1 | 4.2\% |  |  | 20 | 5.4\% | 133 | 5.5\% |
| Azapo | 87 | 6.0\% | 5 | 1.3\% |  |  | 1 | 1.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.4\% | 8 | 2.1\% | 102 | 4.2\% |
| SACP | 57 | 4.0\% | 2 | 0.5\% | 1 | 2.8\% | 2 | 4.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4.6\% | 9 | 2.4\% | 73 | 3.0\% |
| Other | 14 | 1.0\% | 11 | 2.7\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 1 | 1.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 8.0\% | 12 | 3.2\% | 41 | 1.7\% |
| Madeco | 13 | 0.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 7.7\% |  |  | 15 | 0.6\% |
| Christian Party | 6 | 0.4\% | 2 | 0.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1.2\% | 13 | 0.5\% |
| Minority Front | 2 | 0.1\% | 4 | 0.9\% | 1 | 2.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.6\% | 2 | 0.5\% | 10 | 0.4\% |
| Refused | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1.6\% | 7 | 0.3\% |
| None | 1,201 | 83.4\% | 364 | 86.9\% | 48 | 93.1\% | 38 | 79.9\% | 5 | 21.3\% | 11 | 94.0\% | 23 | 95.8\% | 20 | 74.7\% | 312 | 83.5\% | 2,022 | 83.7\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P19 In such a coalition should the majority of candidates be people who are not white, should there be broad quotas of people of different groups or should the majority simply be people with the best knowledge and experience without considering their group?

|  | AN | ACP |  | A |  | P |  | , |  | P |  | F |  | , |  | \% |  | ponse |  | , |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | , | \% | n | \% |
| The majority should not be white | 166 | 11.5\% | 9 | 2.2\% | 2 | 3.5\% | 2 | 3.4\% | 1 | 6.7\% |  |  | 1 | 3.2\% | 3 | 11.9\% | 13 | 3.6\% | 198 | 8.2\% |
| There should be broad Quotas of different groups | 464 | 32.2\% | 125 | 29.9\% | 19 | 37.4\% | 10 | 20.9\% | 8 | 39.2\% | 7 | 57.8\% | 11 | 48.1\% | 10 | 39.6\% | 130 | 34.8\% | 785 | 32.5\% |
| The majority should be the people with the best knowledge an | 755 | 52.4\% | 283 | 67.4\% | 30 | 59.1\% | 36 | 75.7\% | 12 | 54.1\% | 5 | 42.2\% | 12 | 48.8\% | 13 | 48.5\% | 214 | 57.1\% | 1,358 | 56.2\% |
| Don't know/Not answered | 51 | 3.5\% | 2 | 0.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 4.1\% | 68 | 2.8\% |
| Quotas in proportion to support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Blacks | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3\% | 2 | 0.1\% |
| People with best knowledge and skills | 3 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P20 How necessary would it be for such a coalition to have a strict code of conduct for candidates to exclude people with any record of corruption, crime, bad management, debt or poor performance or behaviour? Would you:

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Strongly support a strict code | 716 | 49.7\% | 331 | 78.8\% | 25 | 47.6\% | 33 | 69.8\% | 18 | 85.5\% | 10 | 82.5\% | 13 | 54.1\% | 16 | 61.3\% | 210 | 56.3\% | 1,371 | 56.8\% |
| Support the code but very popular candidates should be considered anyway | 203 | 14.1\% | 31 | 7.3\% | 7 | 14.0\% | 6 | 11.8\% | 1 | 5.1\% | 1 | 9.6\% | 8 | 32.0\% | 4 | 14.4\% | 38 | 10.3\% | 298 | 12.3\% |
| Support the code but if necessary some people should be included to get the right balance of groups | 325 | 22.6\% | 52 | 12.4\% | 15 | 29.5\% | 6 | 13.7\% | 2 | 9.4\% | 1 | 7.9\% | 1 | 6.2\% | 5 | 20.5\% | 84 | 22.5\% | 493 | 20.4\% |
| Feel that such a code is not really necessary | 195 | 13.6\% | 6 | 1.5\% | 5 | 8.8\% | 2 | 4.7\% |  |  |  |  | 2 | 7.7\% | 1 | 3.7\% | 40 | 10.7\% | 251 | 10.4\% |
| Not answered | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3\% | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P21 Kind of candidates most likely want to support

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Candidates that know most about policies and Governance | 712 | 49.5\% | 287 | 68.3\% | 16 | 30.9\% | 32 | 66.9\% | 12 | 58.5\% | 9 | 73.9\% | 8 | 31.7\% | 8 | 29.4\% | 211 | 56.4\% | 1,293 | 53.6\% |
| Candidates that belong to your Language group | 129 | 9.0\% | 18 | 4.4\% | 2 | 4.4\% | 5 | 10.4\% |  |  | 1 | 9.2\% | 3 | 13.1\% | 7 | 27.1\% | 25 | 6.8\% | 192 | 7.9\% |
| Candidates that can inspire you to support them | 196 | 13.6\% | 77 | 18.3\% | 4 | 8.1\% | 7 | 14.5\% | 2 | 8.6\% | 4 | 30.4\% | 6 | 23.7\% | 2 | 7.2\% | 55 | 14.8\% | 352 | 14.6\% |
| Candidates from your local community | 173 | 12.0\% | 34 | 8.1\% | 8 | 14.7\% | 4 | 8.9\% | 2 | 10.7\% | 1 | 5.7\% | 9 | 38.7\% | 2 | 7.7\% | 27 | 7.3\% | 260 | 10.7\% |
| Candidates that belong to the party you normally support | 277 | 19.2\% | 44 | 10.6\% | 10 | 20.2\% | 7 | 14.8\% | 3 | 13.3\% | 0 | 3.2\% | 3 | 11.6\% | 5 | 20.7\% | 41 | 11.0\% | 392 | 16.2\% |
| Candidates that will work very hard to improve conditions for people like you | 965 | 67.1\% | 285 | 68.0\% | 41 | 79.8\% | 31 | 65.4\% | 17 | 80.4\% | 8 | 70.0\% | 16 | 66.4\% | 15 | 56.1\% | 280 | 75.0\% | 1,659 | 68.7\% |
| Candidates that belong to the most powerful party | 92 | 6.4\% | 24 | 5.8\% | 6 | 10.8\% | 2 | 3.5\% | 1 | 4.9\% |  |  | 1 | 2.6\% | 1 | 3.7\% | 24 | 6.4\% | 150 | 6.2\% |
| Candidates that are of your race group | 29 | 2.0\% | 11 | 2.7\% | 2 | 3.4\% |  |  | 0 | 1.1\% | 0 | 3.8\% | 0 | 1.9\% |  |  | 9 | 2.3\% | 52 | 2.2\% |
| Do not know/Not answered | 306 | 21.3\% | 58 | 13.8\% | 14 | 27.7\% | 7 | 15.5\% | 5 | 22.6\% | 0 | 4.0\% | 2 | 10.4\% | 13 | 47.9\% | 75 | 20.0\% | 480 | 19.9\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P22 How likely are you to vote in the next election in 2009 - will you

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Most definitely vote | 1,156 | 80.3\% | 281 | 67.0\% | 28 | 55.1\% | 25 | 51.8\% | 14 | 66.6\% | 3 | 29.2\% | 18 | 74.0\% | 14 | 53.5\% | 186 | 49.8\% | 1,726 | 71.5\% |
| Probably vote | 187 | 13.0\% | 82 | 19.6\% | 9 | 18.1\% | 17 | 36.9\% | 4 | 19.1\% | 5 | 41.0\% | 2 | 7.0\% | 5 | 20.8\% | 60 | 16.0\% | 372 | 15.4\% |
| See how things are possibly vote | 65 | 4.5\% | 29 | 7.0\% | 8 | 15.9\% | 4 | 9.0\% | 1 | 5.7\% | 1 | 9.0\% | 3 | 14.4\% | 3 | 11.3\% | 31 | 8.4\% | 146 | 6.1\% |
| Probably not vote | 13 | 0.9\% | 9 | 2.2\% |  |  | 0 | 1.0\% | 2 | 8.5\% | 2 | 20.7\% | 1 | 2.9\% | 0 | 1.5\% | 17 | 4.4\% | 44 | 1.8\% |
| Definitely not vote |  |  | 10 | 2.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 9.2\% | 44 | 1.8\% |
| Not sure | 19 | 1.3\% | 8 | 1.8\% | 6 | 10.8\% | 1 | 1.3\% |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1.7\% | 3 | 12.9\% | 46 | 12.2\% | 82 | 3.4\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P24 We have spoke about a coalition of parties for the general election next year if there is a coalition of parties consisting of the Democratic Alliance (DA), the Independent Democrats (ID) and the United Democratic Movement (UDM), will you:

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Definitely vote for such Coalition | 176 | 12.2\% | 176 | 41.9\% | 2 | 3.6\% | 21 | 44.7\% | 6 | 26.5\% | 0 | 1.9\% | 4 | 18.6\% | 6 | 24.0\% | 46 | 12.4\% | 438 | 18.1\% |
| Probably vote for the Coalition | 293 | 20.4\% | 123 | 29.4\% | 7 | 14.5\% | 18 | 37.8\% | 6 | 29.2\% | 4 | 31.0\% | 10 | 42.3\% | 5 | 17.1\% | 75 | 20.0\% | 541 | 22.4\% |
| Seriously consider voting for the Coalition | 197 | 13.7\% | 75 | 17.9\% | 13 | 25.7\% | 7 | 15.7\% | 7 | 33.7\% | 5 | 46.3\% | 7 | 30.3\% | 9 | 35.1\% | 85 | 22.8\% | 407 | 16.9\% |
| Not vote for the Coalition but for some other party | 627 | 43.6\% | 40 | 9.6\% | 27 | 52.2\% | 1 | 1.8\% | 2 | 10.6\% | 2 | 17.0\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 5 | 17.8\% | 75 | 20.0\% | 781 | 32.4\% |
| Will Probably not vote or will not vote in the election at a | 142 | 9.9\% | 4 | 1.1\% | 2 | 4.0\% |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3.8\% |  |  | 2 | 6.0\% | 84 | 22.5\% | 235 | 9.7\% |
| Don't know | 3 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 2.3\% | 12 | 0.5\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P25 If there is a coalition of parties consisting of the DA the ID the UDM and the Inkatha Fredoom Party, will you

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Definitely vote for such Coalition | 112 | 7.8\% | 151 | 36.1\% | 7 | 14.2\% | 11 | 23.2\% | 5 | 21.2\% | 2 | 16.0\% | 2 | 10.3\% | 5 | 19.0\% | 32 | 8.7\% | 328 | 13.6\% |
| Probably vote for the Coalition | 280 | 19.4\% | 111 | 26.4\% | 10 | 18.4\% | 17 | 35.0\% | 5 | 24.2\% | 2 | 15.4\% | 8 | 35.0\% | 7 | 27.7\% | 62 | 16.6\% | 501 | 20.7\% |
| Seriously consider voting for the Coalition | 205 | 14.2\% | 74 | 17.7\% | 15 | 29.0\% | 15 | 32.1\% | 4 | 20.6\% | 5 | 41.9\% | 4 | 16.5\% | 8 | 29.2\% | 71 | 18.9\% | 401 | 16.6\% |
| Not vote for the Coalition but for some other party | 686 | 47.6\% | 72 | 17.2\% | 17 | 32.8\% | 5 | 9.7\% | 7 | 34.0\% | 3 | 26.7\% | 6 | 25.5\% | 5 | 18.0\% | 99 | 26.5\% | 900 | 37.3\% |
| Will Probably not vote or will not vote in the election at a | 155 | 10.7\% | 10 | 2.4\% | 3 | 5.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 12.7\% | 2 | 6.0\% | 102 | 27.4\% | 275 | 11.4\% |
| Don't know | 2 | 0.2\% | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 1.8\% | 10 | 0.4\% |
| Total | ,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 00.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 00.0\% | 26 | 00.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P26 If there is a coalition of parties consisting of the DA,the ID, UDM and the Freedom Front plus will you

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Definitely vote for such Coalition | 114 | 7.9\% | 164 | 39.2\% | 6 | 11.1\% | 17 | 35.8\% | 5 | 24.6\% | 3 | 22.6\% | 2 | 7.3\% | 1 | 4.7\% | 35 | 9.4\% | 347 | 14.4\% |
| Probably vote for the Coalition | 283 | 19.6\% | 115 | 27.5\% | 8 | 14.6\% | 15 | 32.2\% | 6 | 27.6\% | 4 | 31.7\% | 9 | 36.1\% | 8 | 29.9\% | 62 | 16.7\% | 509 | 21.1\% |
| Seriously consider voting for the Coalition | 151 | 10.5\% | 81 | 19.3\% | 8 | 16.5\% | 8 | 17.4\% | 7 | 33.3\% | 4 | 35.6\% | 0 | 1.9\% | 9 | 33.4\% | 60 | 16.0\% | 328 | 13.6\% |
| Not vote for the Coalition but for some other party | 732 | 50.8\% | 51 | 12.2\% | 27 | 52.2\% | 7 | 14.6\% | 3 | 14.5\% | 1 | 10.1\% | 10 | 42.0\% | 5 | 18.9\% | 106 | 28.5\% | 943 | 39.0\% |
| Will Probably not vote or will not vote in the election at a | 157 | 10.9\% | 7 | 1.6\% | 3 | 5.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 12.7\% | 3 | 10.2\% | 104 | 27.9\% | 277 | 11.5\% |
| Don't know | 3 | 0.2\% | 1 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.9\% | 6 | 1.5\% | 11 | 0.4\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P27 Kind of person best for leadership of coalition
A leader with personality who
can inspire people
A leader who can attract people
among the majority of South
A leader with sound experience
in politics, Government or se
An intelligent leader with new
ideas on solving problems in
A leader who has sympathy for
people and who cares about the
Don't support the coalition
Do not know/Not answered
Total

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 229 | 15.9\% | 124 | 29.6\% | 3 | 6.4\% | 18 | 37.7\% | 6 | 26.6\% | 4 | 36.0\% | 5 | 19.3\% | 6 | 23.9\% | 65 | 17.3\% | 460 | 19.1\% |
| 165 | 11.4\% | 70 | 16.8\% | 11 | 21.7\% | 8 | 16.2\% | 0 | 1.7\% | 1 | 12.2\% |  |  | 5 | 19.3\% | 33 | 8.9\% | 294 | 12.2\% |
| 552 | 38.4\% | 182 | 43.4\% | 15 | 28.6\% | 20 | 43.2\% | 7 | 31.7\% | 4 | 34.5\% | 15 | 61.8\% | 15 | 55.4\% | 142 | 38.0\% | 951 | 39.4\% |
| 626 | 43.5\% | 211 | 50.3\% | 21 | 40.7\% | 16 | 33.4\% | 10 | 48.3\% | 3 | 29.4\% | 7 | 27.5\% | 5 | 20.4\% | 191 | 51.2\% | 1,091 | 45.2\% |
| 572 | 39.7\% | 114 | 27.2\% | 26 | 49.4\% | 18 | 38.9\% | 11 | 53.4\% | 4 | 37.0\% | 7 | 27.5\% | 4 | 16.0\% | 145 | 38.9\% | 901 | 37.3\% |
| 23 | 1.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.6\% | 25 | 1.1\% |
| 6 | 0.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.1\% | 7 | 0.3\% |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P28_1 How much do you admire or dislike the present leaders of parties? Thabo Mbeki of the ANC

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Strongly dislike | 194 | 13.5\% | 174 | 41.4\% | 31 | 59.2\% | 18 | 37.1\% | 6 | 28.3\% | 5 | 40.4\% | 3 | 13.5\% | 4 | 16.5\% | 102 | 27.3\% | 536 | 22.2\% |
| Dislike | 132 | 9.2\% | 113 | 27.0\% | 9 | 17.6\% | 11 | 24.2\% | 5 | 23.7\% | 5 | 39.0\% | 3 | 12.9\% | 6 | 24.3\% | 65 | 17.3\% | 350 | 14.5\% |
|  | 340 | 23.6\% | 92 | 22.0\% | 8 | 15.4\% | 14 | 29.7\% | 6 | 29.3\% | 1 | 12.4\% | 1 | 3.7\% | 7 | 27.2\% | 104 | 27.9\% | 574 | 23.8\% |
| Admire | 319 | 22.2\% | 25 | 6.0\% | 3 | 5.0\% | 4 | 9.0\% | 2 | 10.7\% | 0 | 3.7\% | 11 | 45.0\% | 6 | 22.0\% | 47 | 12.7\% | 418 | 17.3\% |
| Admire strongly | 441 | 30.6\% | 9 | 2.1\% | 1 | 2.8\% |  |  | 2 | 8.0\% | 1 | 4.5\% | 3 | 11.0\% | 2 | 8.4\% | 49 | 13.2\% | 507 | 21.0\% |
| Do not know | 13 | 0.9\% | 6 | 1.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 13.9\% | 0 | 1.6\% | 6 | 1.6\% | 29 | 1.2\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P28_2 How much do you admire or dislike the present leaders of parties? Helen Zille of the DA

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Strongly dislike | 622 | 43.2\% | 14 | 3.4\% | 31 | 59.7\% | 5 | 10.2\% | 1 | 6.4\% |  |  | 7 | 30.7\% | 9 | 33.3\% | 125 | 33.3\% | 814 | 33.7\% |
| Dislike | 314 | 21.8\% | 17 | 4.1\% | 8 | 15.1\% | 4 | 7.9\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 0 | 4.0\% | 9 | 39.0\% | 6 | 21.8\% | 71 | 18.9\% | 430 | 17.8\% |
|  | 216 | 15.0\% | 54 | 12.8\% | 7 | 14.2\% | 18 | 37.9\% | 6 | 26.7\% | 2 | 16.9\% | 5 | 21.2\% | 4 | 13.3\% | 86 | 23.0\% | 398 | 16.5\% |
| Admire | 111 | 7.7\% | 161 | 38.5\% | 4 | 8.3\% | 13 | 28.0\% | 10 | 46.3\% | 6 | 54.2\% | 1 | 5.1\% | 4 | 15.1\% | 46 | 12.2\% | 357 | 14.8\% |
| Admire strongly | 50 | 3.5\% | 168 | 40.1\% | 1 | 2.7\% | 6 | 13.1\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 2 | 19.8\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 4 | 14.2\% | 36 | 9.7\% | 272 | 11.2\% |
| Do not know | 126 | 8.8\% | 5 | 1.2\% |  |  | 1 | 2.9\% | 1 | 3.5\% | 1 | 5.1\% |  |  | 1 | 2.4\% | 11 | 2.9\% | 145 | 6.0\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P28_3 How much do you admire or dislike the present leaders of parties? Mangosutho Buthelezi of the IFP

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Strongly dislike | 616 | 42.8\% | 94 | 22.3\% |  |  | 24 | 50.1\% | 6 | 29.2\% | 4 | 30.2\% | 9 | 36.8\% | 7 | 26.5\% | 139 | 37.3\% | 898 | 37.2\% |
| Dislike | 371 | 25.8\% | 125 | 29.7\% | 2 | 3.3\% | 11 | 23.3\% | 3 | 16.0\% | 3 | 26.6\% | 9 | 39.2\% | 3 | 11.1\% | 77 | 20.5\% | 604 | 25.0\% |
|  | 227 | 15.8\% | 118 | 28.2\% | 3 | 6.2\% | 6 | 12.8\% | 9 | 41.7\% | 4 | 30.5\% | 3 | 14.1\% | 12 | 44.1\% | 79 | 21.2\% | 462 | 19.1\% |
| Admire | 101 | 7.0\% | 48 | 11.5\% | 16 | 30.5\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 0 | 1.8\% | 0 | 3.7\% | 1 | 4.8\% | 1 | 3.7\% | 39 | 10.4\% | 207 | 8.6\% |
| Admire strongly | 45 | 3.1\% | 11 | 2.5\% | 31 | 60.0\% | 3 | 5.5\% | 2 | 7.8\% | 1 | 9.0\% | 1 | 3.3\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 27 | 7.3\% | 123 | 5.1\% |
| Do not know | 80 | 5.5\% | 24 | 5.8\% |  |  | 3 | 6.0\% | 1 | 3.5\% |  |  | 0 | 1.8\% | 0 | 1.6\% | 13 | 3.3\% | 121 | 5.0\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P28_4 How much do you admire or dislike the present leaders of parties? Jacob Zuma of the ANC

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Strongly dislike | 167 | 11.6\% | 242 | 57.7\% | 8 | 15.8\% | 23 | 47.8\% | 7 | 32.4\% | 9 | 74.1\% | 3 | 12.3\% | 2 | 6.2\% | 122 | 32.5\% | 582 | 24.1\% |
| Dislike | 151 | 10.5\% | 72 | 17.1\% | 9 | 16.5\% | 13 | 27.0\% | 6 | 25.7\% | 2 | 19.0\% | 6 | 27.0\% | 0 | 1.1\% | 39 | 10.4\% | 297 | 12.3\% |
|  | 238 | 16.5\% | 45 | 10.7\% | 9 | 17.7\% | 5 | 11.3\% | 5 | 25.2\% | 0 | 3.2\% | 10 | 41.5\% | 4 | 14.1\% | 63 | 16.9\% | 379 | 15.7\% |
| Admire | 305 | 21.2\% | 18 | 4.3\% | 8 | 15.0\% | 5 | 9.7\% | 0 | 1.1\% | 0 | 3.7\% | 1 | 5.9\% | 10 | 39.5\% | 55 | 14.7\% | 403 | 16.7\% |
| Admire strongly | 563 | 39.1\% | 24 | 5.7\% | 18 | 34.9\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 3 | 12.3\% |  |  | 3 | 13.4\% | 10 | 37.6\% | 85 | 22.8\% | 707 | 29.3\% |
| Do not know | 15 | 1.1\% | 18 | 4.4\% |  |  | 1 | 3.0\% | 1 | 3.3\% |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1.6\% | 10 | 2.6\% | 46 | 1.9\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P28_5 How much do you admire or dislike the present leaders of parties? Patricia De Lille of the ID


P28_6 How much do you admire or dislike the present leaders of parties? Pieter Mulder of the Freedom Front Plus

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Strongly dislike | 833 | 57.9\% | 120 | 28.5\% | 32 | 61.7\% | 15 | 30.9\% | 2 | 10.1\% |  |  | 9 | 37.0\% | 7 | 26.9\% | 197 | 52.7\% | 1,215 | 50.3\% |
| Dislike | 228 | 15.8\% | 88 | 21.0\% | 11 | 21.2\% | 13 | 28.1\% | 6 | 26.8\% | 0 | 4.1\% | 8 | 33.5\% | 10 | 37.7\% | 65 | 17.4\% | 429 | 17.8\% |
|  | 105 | 7.3\% | 84 | 20.1\% | 5 | 8.8\% | 10 | 20.4\% | 7 | 34.1\% | 1 | 7.1\% | 2 | 8.9\% | 4 | 15.5\% | 53 | 14.2\% | 271 | 11.2\% |
| Admire | 45 | 3.1\% | 59 | 14.0\% | 3 | 5.3\% | 4 | 8.1\% | 5 | 22.6\% | 4 | 34.9\% | 0 | 1.7\% |  |  | 20 | 5.4\% | 140 | 5.8\% |
| Admire strongly | 5 | 0.4\% | 27 | 6.4\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 3 | 5.8\% | 0 | 1.7\% | 6 | 49.9\% | 0 | 1.4\% |  |  | 11 | 2.9\% | 53 | 2.2\% |
| Do not know | 222 | 15.4\% | 42 | 10.0\% | 1 | 1.8\% | 3 | 6.6\% | 1 | 4.7\% | 0 | 4.1\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 5 | 19.9\% | 28 | 7.4\% | 307 | 12.7\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P28_7 How much do you admire or dislike the present leaders of parties? Bantu Holomisa of the UDM

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Strongly dislike | 545 | 37.8\% | 150 | 35.7\% | 22 | 42.0\% | 16 | 34.8\% | 3 | 14.5\% | 4 | 32.4\% | 2 | 9.4\% | 3 | 12.9\% | 141 | 37.6\% | 886 | 36.7\% |
| Dislike | 328 | 22.8\% | 101 | 24.1\% | 11 | 21.0\% | 16 | 34.8\% | 4 | 17.0\% | 4 | 38.7\% | 2 | 6.3\% | 6 | 24.4\% | 89 | 23.8\% | 562 | 23.3\% |
|  | 297 | 20.6\% | 91 | 21.8\% | 12 | 24.1\% | 6 | 13.7\% | 9 | 41.6\% | 2 | 19.7\% | 3 | 13.4\% | 6 | 21.9\% | 75 | 20.2\% | 502 | 20.8\% |
| Admire | 149 | 10.3\% | 32 | 7.6\% | 5 | 10.0\% | 3 | 6.7\% | 5 | 21.8\% |  |  | 12 | 51.1\% | 5 | 17.6\% | 27 | 7.1\% | 237 | 9.8\% |
| Admire strongly | 62 | 4.3\% | 7 | 1.6\% |  |  | 1 | 2.2\% | 0 | 1.7\% |  |  | 5 | 19.7\% | 4 | 16.2\% | 16 | 4.4\% | 95 | 3.9\% |
| Do not know | 59 | 4.1\% | 39 | 9.2\% | 2 | 3.0\% | 4 | 7.8\% | 1 | 3.3\% | 1 | 9.2\% |  |  | 2 | 6.9\% | 26 | 6.9\% | 132 | 5.5\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P28_8 How much do you admire or dislike the present leaders of parties? Blade Nzimande of the SACP

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Strongly dislike | 483 | 33.5\% | 210 | 50.2\% | 25 | 49.2\% | 26 | 55.7\% | 5 | 24.1\% | 7 | 61.3\% | 5 | 21.5\% | 4 | 14.8\% | 145 | 38.7\% | 911 | 37.7\% |
| Dislike | 297 | 20.6\% | 69 | 16.4\% | 11 | 22.1\% | 10 | 21.5\% | 5 | 22.4\% | 3 | 25.8\% | 9 | 36.2\% | 1 | 5.3\% | 72 | 19.3\% | 477 | 19.8\% |
|  | 248 | 17.3\% | 46 | 11.0\% | 5 | 10.3\% | 2 | 3.2\% | 7 | 31.4\% | 1 | 5.6\% | 4 | 15.2\% | 10 | 39.3\% | 55 | 14.7\% | 377 | 15.6\% |
| Admire | 180 | 12.5\% | 15 | 3.5\% | 6 | 12.4\% | 3 | 6.1\% | 2 | 7.6\% |  |  | 1 | 5.9\% | 3 | 12.2\% | 39 | 10.5\% | 250 | 10.4\% |
| Admire strongly | 119 | 8.2\% | 5 | 1.3\% | 2 | 4.3\% | 1 | 1.5\% | 1 | 2.8\% |  |  | 1 | 4.2\% | 1 | 4.6\% | 30 | 8.1\% | 160 | 6.6\% |
| Do not know | 112 | 7.8\% | 74 | 17.7\% | 1 | 1.8\% | 6 | 12.1\% | 3 | 11.8\% | 1 | 7.4\% | 4 | 17.1\% | 6 | 23.8\% | 32 | 8.6\% | 239 | 9.9\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P28_9 How much do you admire or dislike the present leaders of parties? Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka of the ANC

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Strongly dislike | 328 | 22.8\% | 174 | 41.5\% | 21 | 41.0\% | 20 | 43.0\% | 6 | 29.5\% | 8 | 67.2\% | 2 | 7.4\% | 5 | 20.8\% | 143 | 38.4\% | 708 | 29.3\% |
| Dislike | 220 | 15.3\% | 80 | 19.1\% | 12 | 23.6\% | 12 | 25.4\% | 5 | 23.1\% | 3 | 23.7\% | 6 | 26.2\% | 2 | 6.3\% | 53 | 14.3\% | 394 | 16.3\% |
|  | 314 | 21.8\% | 57 | 13.6\% | 5 | 10.6\% | 10 | 21.4\% | 4 | 17.1\% |  |  | 11 | 47.6\% | 4 | 14.0\% | 80 | 21.5\% | 486 | 20.1\% |
| Admire | 310 | 21.5\% | 39 | 9.2\% | 7 | 13.1\% | 3 | 5.8\% | 0 | 1.7\% | 0 | 3.7\% | 0 | 1.7\% | 4 | 16.7\% | 56 | 15.1\% | 420 | 17.4\% |
| Admire strongly | 194 | 13.5\% | 20 | 4.7\% | 6 | 11.7\% |  |  | 5 | 25.2\% |  |  |  |  | 9 | 32.5\% | 24 | 6.3\% | 258 | 10.7\% |
| Do not know | 74 | 5.1\% | 49 | 11.7\% |  |  | 2 | 4.4\% | 1 | 3.3\% | 1 | 5.4\% | 4 | 17.1\% | 3 | 9.8\% | 17 | 4.4\% | 149 | 6.2\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

P23 If you vote which political party would you vote for in 2009

|  | ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| ANC (African National Congress) | 1,437 | 99.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,437 | 59.5\% |
| DA (Democratic Alliance) |  |  | 419 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 419 | 17.4\% |
| IFP (Inkatha Freedom Party) |  |  |  |  | 52 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 | 2.1\% |
| The ID (Independent Democrats) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47 | 2.0\% |
| The UDM (United Democratic Movement) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  | 24 | 1.0\% |
| ACDP (African Christian Democratic Party) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 | 0.9\% |
| PAC (Pan African Congress) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 58.6\% |  |  | 15 | 0.6\% |
| Freedom Front Plus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 0.5\% |
| NADECO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 24.4\% |  |  | 6 | 0.3\% |
| AZAPO (Azanian Peoples Organisation) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 10.5\% |  |  | 3 | 0.1\% |
| SACP (South African Communist Party) | 2 | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Minority Front |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 6.6\% |  |  | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Would not vote |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26 | 7.0\% | 26 | 1.1\% |
| Uncertain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 | 18.8\% | 70 | 2.9\% |
| Don't know/not answered |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 136 | 36.4\% | 136 | 5.6\% |
| Refuse |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 141 | 37.9\% | 141 | 5.9\% |
| Total | 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

## Q1 Race

Black
Coloured
Asian
White
Total

| ANC/SACP |  | DA |  | IFP |  | ID |  | ACDP |  | FF |  | UDM |  | Other |  | No response |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| 1,344 | 93.4\% | 89 | 21.2\% | 45 | 87.6\% | 13 | 28.5\% | 7 | 34.3\% |  |  | 21 | 86.4\% | 24 | 89.8\% | 263 | 70.3\% | 1,806 | 74.8\% |
| 72 | 5.0\% | 73 | 17.3\% | 1 | 1.4\% | 24 | 51.2\% | 7 | 31.6\% | 1 | 10.6\% | 1 | 3.7\% | 0 | 1.3\% | 40 | 10.6\% | 219 | 9.1\% |
| 18 | 1.3\% | 33 | 8.0\% | 3 | 5.1\% | 1 | 1.3\% |  |  | 1 | 4.5\% |  |  | 2 | 6.6\% | 12 | 3.2\% | 69 | 2.9\% |
| 5 | 0.4\% | 224 | 53.5\% | 3 | 5.9\% | 9 | 19.1\% | 7 | 34.2\% | 10 | 84.9\% | 2 | 9.9\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 60 | 15.9\% | 321 | 13.3\% |
| 1,440 | 100.0\% | 419 | 100.0\% | 52 | 100.0\% | 47 | 100.0\% | 21 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 24 | 100.0\% | 26 | 100.0\% | 374 | 100.0\% | 2,415 | 100.0\% |

