Pre-Analysis plan: What messages encourage political participation in young South Africans?

September 18, 2015

Abstract

What messages work best to encourage political participation among un-represented and low-participating groups in developing democracies? This study examines the impact of providing young, urban South Africans who are not registered to vote with different types of motivational messages encouraging them to register and vote. Using a randomized controlled trial (RCT), we test whether providing a carefully piloted, clearly expressed motivation for why citizens should vote, delivered face-to-face, will change voters' intentions to register and vote.

1 Introduction

What messages work best to encourage voter registration and turnout among currently un-represented (and low-participating) groups in developing democracies? Finding ways to grow and sustain broad-based electoral engagement is a pressing concern, as widespread political participation is a foundational component of a vibrant democracy and an important mechanism for voters to exercise oversight over policy development and public spending. This study examines the impact of providing young, urban South Africans who are not registered to vote with different types of motivational messages encouraging them to register and vote. Using a randomized controlled trial (RCT), we test whether providing a carefully piloted, clearly expressed motivation for why citizens should vote, delivered face-to-face, will change voters' intentions to register and vote.

In middle-income democracies such as Botswana, Colombia, India, Ghana, or South Africa, turnout is low, and sometimes declining. Yet governance and accountability challenges remain severe. Conventional approaches to increasing voter participation – often developed in lower-income contexts – are poorly suited to these contexts. Literacy is relatively high, there is credibly free media, citizens have widespread access to information about candidates or parties and there is widespread procedural knowledge about where and how to vote. This participation paralysis may instead reflect higher opportunity costs on voters? time, or more informed disillusionment with politics. We focus on South Africa, where voter turnout overall has declined dramatically since the first democratic election in 1994. In 1994, 86 per cent of the voting-age population voted, but this dropped

1

to 54 per cent in 2014 (Schulz-Herzenberg 2014).

Participation may be lowest among certain segments of the population. In particular, we focus on youth (under age 30) who are not registered to vote, which is novel in studies of election mobilization in the developing world. Youth are often politically and economically marginalized. In South Africa, the 'Born Free' generation – under 30s whose formative years did not involve any experience of apartheid – participate at much lower rates than their older compatriots or youth in other African countries (Scott et al 2011). In 1999, 77 per cent of youth 20-29 were registered to vote, but by 2014 only 56 per cent of this age group were registered (older cohorts register at between 85 and 90 per cent) (Schulz-Herzenberg 2014). Youth are also less likely to vote when registered: only 58 per cent of registered 20-29 year olds voted in 2009 (between 80 and 90 per cent of older registered voters vote) (Scott et al 2011).

Theory in political science differentiates the ability to vote from the motivation to vote (Harder and Krosnick 2008). It suggests that procedural knowledge about when, where, and how to vote is likely to act only on ability and not motivation. Learning why to vote may, however, generate greater motivation to participate. Theory thus suggests that campaigns to get out the vote in middle-income democracies should focus on motivation rather than information. However, the current literature does not examine the effects of different types of motivation, because voter education campaigns have invariably included a broad variety of motivations to vote. We thus test the relative efficacy of various motivational appeals when the same basic procedural information is provided.

South Africans under 30 are an ideal group in which to examine the effect of messages which may activate different motivations to vote. This age group knows more than older cohorts about how to register and vote and trusts the electoral process more (Roberts et al 2014). However, higher proportions of youth than adults think their vote makes no difference, lower proportions think it is their civic duty to vote, and youth are less interested in politics (Roberts et al 2014).

We examine both voter registration and turnout. Most studies consider only how best to generate turnout among registered citizens. In South Africa, where there are costly bureaucratic barriers to registration, establishing how to encourage registration is key. If we find evidence of motivational barriers to registration, this lends support to arguments in favor of reduced barriers to registration (e.g. home registration or day-of registration).

This document summarizes the main tests that we intend to conduct. We do not rule out the possibility of running other tests. We will make clear in the paper which estimations are specified in this pre-analysis plan and which are not (Casey, Glennerster, and Miguel, 2012).

2 Experimental design

In June, August, and September 2015 we conducted a "lab-in-the-field" experiment to assess the effectiveness of seven motivational messages in stimulating the intention to register and the intention to vote.

2.1 Sample

We surveyed 3,190 young people from universities, technical colleges and a street sample in Gauteng, South Africa's most populous province and the country's economic center. In Gauteng, we target young South Africans aged 18 to 29, who are eligible but not registered to vote. Gauteng had the lowest rates of youth voter registration in 2014, with 46 per cent of 18-29-year olds registered compared to 56 per cent nationally (Schulz-Herzenberg 2014).

The sample was a convenience sample rather than a representative sample, but should capture a reasonable range of people who are currently greatly under-represented in politics in South Africa. 1,905 (59.72 per cent) of our participants were drawn from tertiary education institutions. 1,285 (40.28 per cent) were sampled off the street in Soweto, the largest township in Gauteng. Townships in South Africa are residential areas (mixed formal and informal), typically relatively far from cities. They were historically restricted to black African residents under Apartheid, and remain almost entirely black African at present. The full set of venues from which participants were recruited is provided in Annex B.

2.1.1 Student Recruiting

Campus recruiting took place on campuses of major universities, and Further Education and Training institutions (FETs) which offer vocational training in a specific field. Recruiting from both types of institutions allowed us to recruit a more diverse set of students, in terms of socio-economic status and educational achievement

Two of the largest universities in the province were selected for the study: University of Johannesburg (UJ) and University of the Witwatersrand (Wits), which are first and third largest in the province respectively. UJ has 4 campuses and Wits has 5 campuses in and around Johannesburg. From these we selected 6 campus sites based on enrolment and student demographics: University of Johannesburg Auckland Park Kingsway campus, University of Johannesburg Auckland Park Bunting Road campus, University of Johannesburg Doornfontein campus, University of Johannesburg Soweto campus, University of Witwatersrand Braamfontein East campus and University of Witwatersrand Education campus.

FET colleges were selected based on enrolment and student demographics, across a range in vocational training courses (i.e. business, engineering, hospitality, tourism, art and design, marketing,

clothing production, information technology, construction, hair styling etc.). Two major FET institutions were identified: Central Johannesburg College (CJC) and South West Gauteng College (SWGC). After consultation with staff at these institutions, 3 campus sites were selected: Central Johannesburg College Parktown campus, South West Gauteng College George Tabor (Soweto) campus and South West Gauteng College Roodepoort campus.

At the campuses, we set up one or two central locations – "labs" – in a small marquee where fieldworkers conducted surveys and delivered motivational messages to participants. Other fieldworkers walked around the campus recruiting participants and bringing them back to these central areas.

2.1.2   Street Recruiting

The remainder of our sample was drawn from residents of low-turnout districts in Gauteng, in order to capture the effects of our motivational messages on young South Africans who have not pursued higher education. We selected sites by determining the electoral wards in Soweto where population voter registration was below 70 per cent in the last municipal election in 2011 (voter turnout data by age is not available from the Electoral Commission).

As in the student recruiting process, we then selected a central "lab" location in each of these polling districts, typically at community centres or halls. These venues were selected based on their proximity to housing and community gathering points (e.g. public spaces, municipal service points, community vendors, schools etc.) and general level of foot-traffic. The venues often also served as sites for community development and skills training programs, community meeting points, municipal service centres (e.g. South Africa Social Security Agency (SASSA) disbursements), recreational workshops and work spaces for civil society organisations (e.g. City of Johannesburg Youth Development Program) or schools. The venues used are given in Annex B.

Fieldworkers walked around the streets of the ward recruiting young people who met the eligibility requirements, directing them back to the central location. Respondents did not have to reside within the area. To determine the boundaries of the ward, we provided fieldworkers with maps of the wards from the Electoral Commission, which demarcate the roads that serve as ward limits.

2.1.3   Eligibility

We restricted our sample to unregistered, black South African citizens between the ages of 18 and 29. We enforced these criteria in two ways. First, we asked people for their South African Identity Number and verified this from their South African Identity Document. Only citizens have an Identity Document. The Identity Number gives date of birth as the first six digits, which we checked to ensure participants were in the correct age range.

Second, we verified participants' registration status using a publicly available mobile application published by the Electoral Commission which allows the user to check the registration status of anyone with their ID number.[1]. We also include in the sample a small number of participants who believed they were unregistered (i.e., they answer "no" to a survey question on registration status) but were in fact registered, because motivational messages might still encourage them to participate more in the future.

We instructed our recruiters to only seek out black participants, although we did not refuse participation in the survey to anyone based on their race. This was only an issue in major universities, as in the street sampling and technical colleges, eligible young people were exclusively black. We chose this screening criterion because political participation and voting rates differ between black South Africans and others, and because black South Africans have been systematically economically and politically disadvantaged for generations.

2.2   Survey and treatment

Once recruited and consented into the study, participants completed a brief electronic pre-survey with an enumerator to gather demographics and a baseline for their intention to register and vote in the forthcoming 2016 election. Subjects were then randomly assigned to one of eight conditions (the seven messages or a control, which received no message). We randomly assigned participants in each location-day to treatment arms, so we stratify by location-day.

Respondents received the message read out face-to-face by enumerators. They then answered a short electronic post-survey about registration, voting intention, prospective vote choice, and interactions with government. All subjects received a small compensation, R10/R20 (college/street), for their participation.

All messages were delivered in English and the consent and survey process were conducted in English. Given that our sample is from urban Gauteng, levels of English proficiency are high. It was difficult to accurately translate the meaning and emotional effect of the motivational messages into vernacular languages and to ensure exact consistency in translations into the different languages spoken in urban Gauteng. Vernacular (Zulu and Sotho) translations of questions and answer choices were available to surveyors, but were used in very few cases, where the respondent did not understand an English word or phrase. Vernacular languages were used during the process of recruiting participants.

The seven treatment messages are given in Annex A. These messages were crafted from theories of political participation. In addition, we conducted eight focus groups in May 2015 in the study area with both registered and unregistered voters aged 18-30. We discussed whether participants think voting is important, their reasons for (not) registering and voting, where they get information from,

---

[1] For the web-based version, see https://www.elections.org.za/content/For-voters/My-voter-registration-details/

and who or what influences their decisions. Many of the phrases in the messages, such as politics being 'an old person's game', every vote 'being counted', the youth 'jobs crisis', or non-voters 'letting their community down', were drawn from these focus groups. We also asked focus group participants to recommend adaptations to messages to make them more appealing to young people.

The different messages are:

1. one has an obligation to vote as a responsible citizen;

2. one has a special obligation to vote as a young person, because young South Africans are less likely to vote;

3. one has an obligation to vote stemming from history, specifically that the majority of South Africans only recently obtained the right to vote, and only after a lengthy struggle;

4. one should vote because every vote counts (drawing on theory on political efficacy);

5. one should vote because most MPs are over 50 and young people are underrepresented in parliament (an appeal to people's desire to be descriptively represented);

6. one should vote because young people voting may force politicians to pay more attention to issues which affect young people, like youth unemployment (an appeal to people's desire to be represented on substantive issues); and

7. one should vote because not voting lets others (friends, neighbours) down and they will know if one doesn't vote (using social pressure to encourage political participation).

We use the following notation:

1. Individual level treatment arms t are denoted by 1 to 7 for each message from 1 to 7 above.

2. Messages which focus on one's duty to vote, messages 1, 2 and 3, are alternatively pooled as the D message group.

3. Messages which focus on improving the extent to which voters are represented, messages 5 and 6, are sometimes pooled as the R message group.

4. To refer to all messages, we use a dummy $M = 1$ if $t \in 1...7$.

3   Experimental integrity

To establish experimental integrity will compare each of the treatment groups to the control group on key baseline and outcome variables. In expectation, the mean and variance of these variables in each treatment group and the control group should not be distinguishable. Some comparisons will be statistically significant simply by chance, so we will correct balance tests for multiple testing using Benjamini, Krieger and Yekutieli (2006) sharpened q values. For the balance tests, variables will be specified as below:

1. Age (baseline question 1);

2. Gender (baseline question 2);

3. Level of education (baseline question 21, grouped into categories depending on the distribution of respondents across categories);

4. Whether the respondent is from an ethnolinguistic minority, captured by whether they speak Afrikaans, English or a minority African language at home (baseline question 3, where isiXhosa and isiZulu are the only languages which are not minority languages);

5. The respondents' income quintile, where income is an average of their total income in the preceding two months (baseline question 19 and 20);

6. The proportion of household members who have jobs (from baseline question 17 and 16);

7. The proportion of household members who receive a government grant (from baseline question 18 and 16);

8. The respondent's current employment status (formally employed, casually employed or unemployed, from baseline question 23 and 25);

9. If the respondent is currently enrolled in a training course, certificate or diploma (answers yes to either baseline question 22);

10. How often the respondent attends religious services (categories as in baseline question 25);

11. If the respondent migrated to the area where they are currently living in the last five years (baseline question 14);

12. Pre-treatment political affiliation – ANC, DA, EFF or other party supporter or not a supporter of any party, measured only using baseline question 7;

13. Pre-treatment political affiliation – using baseline question 7 and 7b to distinguish strong, moderate, and leaning supporters for all parties;

14. Pre-treatment political interest (baseline question 8);

15. Pre-treatment index of accessing political news (the raw sum of baseline questions 9, 10 and 11);

16. Pre-treatment index of political participation (the raw sum of baseline questions 6a, b and c, where yes is 1 and no is 0); and

17. Pre-treatment political knowledge (number correct of baseline questions 12 and 13).

4 Determinants of participation, partisanship and attitudes and identification of control variables

We will examine the relationship between the variables listed above and our outcome variables among the control group. This is of independent interest in understanding the relationship between key demographic and economic characteristics and political participation, partisanship and attitudes. In addition, we will aim to identify individual characteristics measured at baseline that may help explain variation in a particular outcome. For example, education and religiosity are likely to be positively correlated with political participation. Variables which explain substantial variation will be included as control variables in our main estimations to improve precision.

5 Econometric specification for estimation of treatment effects

We are interested in the average treatment effect of each treatment arm compared to the control, as well as the relative effect of each treatment arm compared to other treatments. Analysis will utilize the following specification:

$$y_{itl} \quad = \beta_0 \delta_t T_i + \mathbf{X'_{itl}} \pi + \eta_e + \phi_l + \gamma_v + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{1}$$

The outcome $y_{iM\phi}$ is measured for individual i assigned to treatment arm t sampled from location ϕ_l. T is a dummy variable indicating assignment to treatment arm t, one of messages one to seven. X is a set of additional control variables that will be determined from analysis of the control group data and will vary by hypothesis. We will also include any variables where there is a significant imbalance between treatment and control groups at baseline. η_e are surveyor fixed effects, ϕ_l are location-day fixed effects, and γ_v is a dummy variable for whether the language assistance in the vernacular was provided.

ε_{it} is an idiosyncratic error term. We will report our main results without clustering at the location level because we randomise at individual level. However, there may be some correlation in the error terms due to location-specific unobservables, so we will examine the robustness of our main results to clustering standard errors at location level. We will also show results for the sparser specification that includes only location and enumerator fixed effects and γ_v as a robustness check.

For each treatment arm, the coefficient of interest is δ_t, the average treatment effect for treatment t compared to the control group. We also conduct some tests pooling all of the treatment arms together, for example $\delta_{t \in 1 \ldots 7} \geq 0$. Tests will be one-sided in the direction stated in the hypothesis, unless specified as two-sided.

We will report treatment effects of all individual outcomes of interest as well as mean effects indices by hypothesis and sub-hypothesis as organized below.

6 Hypotheses and outcomes

6.1 Hypothesis 1: Intention to participate politically

1. We hypothesize that receiving any message will improve the following measures of intention to participate politically relative to the control group, namely $\delta_{t \in 1...7} \geq 0$.

2. We also test each message compared to the control group, namely $\delta_t \geq 0$, where $t \in 1...7$.

3. Finally, we test the obligation messages pooled, compared to the representation messages pooled, compared to the social pressure message, namely $\delta_D \neq \delta_R \neq \delta_7$, where $D \in 1...3$ and $R \in 5, 6$.

The measures of intention to participate politically we use are:

1. Intention to register to vote measured immediately after receiving the message (endline question 1);

2. Intention to vote immediately measured after receiving the message (endline question 2);

3. Intention to obtain information about registering and voting (we dichotomise endline question 4 and question 5 such that 'definitely yes', 'very likely' and 'somewhat likely' are equal to 1 and 'unsure', 'somewhat unlikely', 'very unlikely' and 'definitely not' are equal to 0. If either question is equal to 1, we code the person as intending to obtain information);

4. Partisanship (endline question 3, where 1 is voting for any political party and 0 is answering 'I won't be voting');

5. Intention to register and vote among others like you (endline question 6);

6. Intention to register to vote measured at the end of the questionnaire (endline question 14); and

7. Intention to vote measured at the end of the questionnaire (endline question 15).

8. Objective registration status checked using the online voter registration tool and participants' ID numbers (only available after the next registration period).

We first run independent regressions on each of these variables on a seven point scale, analysed using a linear regression as specified above. We then create four indices. In all cases, we dichotomise all variables such that 'definitely yes', 'very likely' and 'somewhat likely' are equal to 1 and 'unsure', 'somewhat unlikely', 'very unlikely' and 'definitely not' are equal to 0. The indices are as follows:

1. the main factor or factors from a factor analysis of questions 1, 2, 3, 6, 14 and 15;

2. the main factor or factors from a factor analysis of questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14 and 15 i.e. including the two questions on intention to gather information;

3. an additive scale summing up dichotomized questions 1, 2, 3, 6, 14 and 15; and

4. an additive scale summing up dichotomized questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14 and 15.

6.2   Hypothesis 2: Partisanship

1. We hypothesize that receiving any message may alter measures of partisanship relative to the control group, namely $\delta_{t \in 1...7} \neq 0$.

2. We also test each message compared to the control group, namely $\delta_t \neq 0$, where $t \in 1...7$.

3. Finally, we test the obligation messages pooled compared to the representation messages pooled, namely $\delta_D \neq \delta_R$, where $D \in 1...3$ and $R \in 5, 6$.

We examine the following measures of partisanship:

1. Whether the respondent would vote for the ANC, compared to voting for an opposition party or not voting (endline question 3); and

2. Whether the respondent believes 'Opposition parties should regularly examine and criticize government policies and actions'.

6.3   Hypothesis 3: Satisfaction with democracy and government performance

1. We hypothesize that receiving any message may alter satisfaction with democracy relative to the control group, namely $\delta_{t \in 1...7} \neq 0$.

2. We also test each message compared to the control group, namely $\delta_t \neq 0$, where $t \in 1...7$.

3. Finally, we test the obligation messages pooled compared to the representation messages pooled, namely $\delta_D \neq \delta_R$, where $D \in 1...3$ and $R \in 5, 6$.

We examine the following measures of democracy and government performance:

1. Preference for democracy over other forms of government (answers 'Democracy is preferable to any other kind of government' to endline question 12);

2. Overall satisfaction with democracy (endline question 7); and

3. Index of satisfaction with municipal performance (the sum of answers to endline questions 9a, 9b, 9c and 9d).

6.4   Mechanisms behind any changes in the intention to participate politically

Finally, we examine potential mechanisms behind any changes in the intention to participate politically. We examine the following measures of beliefs or attitudes:

1. Political efficacy index (the sum of scores on endline questions 11e, 11f, 11i and 11j);

2. Importance of accountability index (the sum of scores on endline questions 11g, 11h and 9a);

3. Belief that voting matters index (the sum of scores on endline questions 11a, 11b and 11d);

4. Agreement that voting is a duty (extent of agreement with endline question 11c); and

5. Strength of identification with being a young person (extent of agreement with endline question 8).

7   Heterogeneous treatment effects

We will only analyse heterogeneous treatment effects for our main outcome variables, namely the variables and indices capturing intention to register and intention to vote. The questions used are the same as in the tables testing for balance but they are in some cases specified differently. All the tests considered here are two-sided.

1. Whether the respondent is above or below the median age;

2. Gender;

3. Whether the respondent is above or below the median level of education;

4. Whether the respondent is from an ethnolinguistic minority, captured by whether they speak Afrikaans, English or a minority African language at home;

5. Whether the respondent is above or below the median level of income, where income is an average of their total income in the preceding two months;

6. Whether any household member has a job;

7. Whether any household member receives a government grant;

8. The respondent's current employment status (formally or casually employed versus unemployed;

9. If the respondent is currently enrolled in a training course, certificate or diploma;

10. How often the respondent attends religious services regularly;

11. If the respondent migrated to the area where they are currently living in the last five years (baseline question 14);

12. If the respondent is an ANC supporter at baseline, measured using baseline question 7 and 7b to get some sense of political affiliation from those who do not identify as party supporters;

13. If the respondent has a strong political affiliation at baseline, versus not supporting any party or not being a strong supporter of any party;

14. If the respondent is somewhat or very interested in politics at baseline;

15. If the respondent accesses any form of political news daily or a few times a week;

16. If the respondent answered yes to any of the three baseline measures of political participation in baseline question 6; and

17. If the respondent got both measures of pre-treatment political knowledge correct.

8 Annex A: Treatment texts

After completing the baseline survey, participants were randomly assigned to one of seven treatment conditions. Each participant was read the paragraph below followed by the text associated with the treatment to which they were assigned. Participants in the control condition were read no text.

Now I'd like to talk to you about the importance of voting in our democracy. As you may know, the next elections are just around the corner. In 2016, South Africa will vote in local government elections, to decide which party and politicians will run your municipality. It matters a lot for our lives which party or politician controls local government, so it is very important that you vote in the election.

8.1 MESSAGE 1: obligation as a citizen

Voting is a crucial part of being a responsible citizen of South Africa. As a citizen, you have an obligation to everyone to make your voice heard in the elections. The more people who vote, the stronger our democracy is, and a stronger democracy means a stronger South Africa. But to vote, you have to get registered, so don't forget to register to vote. Can we count on you to register and vote?

8.2   MESSAGE 2: obligation as youth

Voting is a crucial part of being a responsible citizen of South Africa. Unfortunately, most young people in South Africa usually don't vote. Even though more than half of South Africans are under 25 years old, most voters are much older! As a young person, you have an obligation to everyone to make your voice heard in the elections. The more young people who vote, the stronger our democracy will become, and a stronger democracy means a stronger South Africa. But to vote, you have to get registered, so don't forget to register to vote. Can we count on you to register and vote?

8.3   MESSAGE 3: obligation from history

Just 21 years ago, the majority of South Africans gained the right to vote. Before that, most of them – including many people just like you in communities just like this – didn't have the right to choose the people who would represent them in government. In 1994, after decades of struggle and sacrifice, we became a democracy, and everyone gained the right to vote. Voting is a crucial part of being a responsible citizen of the new South Africa. But to vote, you have to get registered, so don't forget to register to vote. Can we count on you to register and vote?

8.4   MESSAGE 4: external efficacy

Remember, every vote counts! Even a single vote from a person like you can make a big difference in deciding who gets to run the country. That's because whoever you vote for, your vote will be counted, and it will never be ignored. You can make the difference. So make sure your voice is heard, and be part of decision making in South Africa. But to vote, you have to get registered, so don't forget to register to vote. Can we count on you to register and vote?

8.5   MESSAGE 5: descriptive representation

Did you know that most politicians in national parliament are over 50 years old, while most South Africans are under 25 years old? Although things are slowly starting to change, national politics still seems to be an old person's game. Even in local councils, politicians are usually older than the people they represent. Though the youth are the majority, very few young people are part of government at all. You can change that by voting! But to vote, you have to get registered, so don't forget to register to vote. Can we count on you to register and vote?

8.6   MESSAGE 6: substantive representation (youth employment)

Young people in South Africa face an unemployment crisis. Almost half of all young people, people just like you, can't find work, even though they want to. The jobs shortage means people can't provide for themselves or their families. In a democracy like South Africa, the best way for you to fix this problem is by voting and making your voice heard. That's because the only way to get politicians to deal with the issues young people care about, like the jobs crisis, is to make politicians hear what you have to say. But to vote, you have to get registered, so don't forget to register to vote. Can we count on you to register and vote?

8.7   MESSAGE 7: direct social pressure

It looks like a lot of South Africans are going to do their duty and vote in 2016. But some people still won't participate, and let everyone down. Did you know that anyone can check whether you are registered? And if you don't vote, your friends, neighbours, and family will know because they can check for the mark on your thumb. So make sure you don't let them down, and get out there and vote. But to vote, you have to get registered, so don't forget to register to vote. Can we count on you to register and vote?

9   Annex B: Sample

9.1   University sampling venues

University of Johannesburg - Auckland Park Kingsway campus (APK)
University of Johannesburg - Doornfontein campus (DFC)
University of Johannesburg - Auckland Park Bunting Road campus (APB)
University of Johannesburg - Soweto campus
University of Witwatersrand - Braamfontein campus
University of Witwatersrand - Parktown Education campus

9.2   Further Education and Training institution (FET) sampling venues

Soweto West Gauteng College - Roodepoort campus
South West Gauteng College - George Tabor campus (Soweto)
Central Johannesburg College - Parktown campus

9.3   Street sampling venues

Bapedi Hall, Meadowlands
Diepkloof Community Hall, Diepkloof
Diepkloof Comprehensive Welfare Centre, Diepkloof
Ipelegeng Community Centre, Jabavu
Jabavu Library
Kopanong Hall, Dobsonville
Mapetla High School, Phiri
Maponya Mall, Klipspruit
Mavis Hall, White City
Orlando/Sofasonke Skills Centre, Orlando East
Protea South Multipurpose Centre
Tladi Hall
Uncle Tom's Community, Orlando West
YMCA Soweto, Orlando East