



Change and 'New' Politics in Zimbabwe

**Interim Report of a Nationwide Survey of Public Opinion in
Zimbabwe: June-July 2012**

Interim Report by
Susan Booyesen

Fieldwork and data-processing by
Mass Public Opinion Institute, Harare

18 August 2012

CONTENTS

	Acronyms	3
	Listing of Tables and Explanation of Select terms	4
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1	Introduction, methodology and political context, July 2012 FH survey Methodology, Political setting, Structure of the Report	10
2	The 2012 mood in Zimbabwe—hope, optimism, doubt, reconsideration Towards a national consensus? Direction in which Zimbabwe is moving, Idealism anchored in constitution-making, referendum, elections	14
3	Party political change, 2009-12 Provincial breakdown of party support and related vote response categories, Trust in the main parties – reflection of party support, Beliefs about the outcome of the next round of elections, Reasons for party choice, Indigenisation – nuances differentiating the supporters of the main parties, Profiling the main parties’ and undeclareds’ support bases, Party share of responsibility for good-very good performance in Inclusive Government	17
4	Life in the times of Inclusive Government Economic conditions – national and personal, Most serious problems Zimbabweans face, Economic conditions compared – today, yesterday and tomorrow, Lighter load of personal deprivations, Stagnating and declining assessments of the work of IG	26
5	Exploring assessments of the inclusive government Trust in the MDC-T and ZANU-PF and benefits of IG accruing to the main political parties, Trust and cynicism on public institutions	31
6	Elections – expectations and experiences Motivation to vote in a referendum and next election, Voter registration, Growing expectations of free and fair elections, Experiences and expectations of electoral violence, Disproportionate fear in the life of MDC-T supporters, Timing of the next elections	34
7	Political interest, media use and trust in sources Interest in public affairs, Media use, Trust in the sources that are used for information on public affairs	42
	Appendix A: Summary of questionnaire items	47

LIST OF TABLES

	page	
Table 1	Direction in which Zimbabwe is moving, judged by party supporters	16
Table 2	Hope or doubt that unfolding processes will lead to a better future in Zimbabwe	17
Table 3	Trends in party support, 2009-12	18
Table 4	Party support and related categories of vote response across the provinces, 2010 and 2012	19
Table 5	Changing levels of trust in the two main political parties, 2010-12	20
Table 6	Zimbabweans choice of political party: Issues that shape the minds	21
Table 7	Variations on the theme of indigenisation differentiating party supporters	23
Table 8	Changing hierarchies of problems experienced in the country, 2010-12	27
Table 9	Overall assessment of national-level and personal economics and living conditions, 2012	28
Table 10	Deprivation in the past year on living essentials, 2010-12	29
Table 11	Assessment of Inclusive Government performance across sectors, 2010 and 2012	30
Table 12	Party political share of credit for IG successes	31
Table 13	Trust in Inclusive Government and the two main parties, 2012	32
Table 14	Changing levels of trust in public institutions, 2010 and 2012	33
Table 15	Motivation to vote in a next referendum and next election, 2012	34
Table 16	Expectations of 'free and fair' for the next round of Zimbabwean elections	36
Table 17	Reported incidents of politically motivated violence & intimidation in communities of residence, 2008-12	37
Table 18	Experiences of violence and intimidation in Zimbabwe, 2010 and 2012	37
Table 19	Exposure to politically motivated incidents of violence and intimidation since 1980	39
Table 20	Politically motivated incidents of violence and intimidation since 1980 reported by party association, 2012	39
Table 21	Fear of political intimidation in daily lives and election campaigns, 2012	40
Table 22	Desired timing for the next election, 2009, 2010 and 2012 surveys	41
Table 23	Two measures of Interest in public affairs and politics, 2010-12	42
Table 24	Frequency of media use for news about government and politics	43
Table 25	Trust in the media most used, MDC-T and ZANU-PF supporters, 2012	45

ACRONYMS

COPAC	Parliamentary Select Committee on the Constitution
CSO	Central Statistical Office / ZimStats
EAs	Enumeration Areas
FH	Freedom House
GNU	Government of National Unity
GPA	Global Political Agreement
IG	Inclusive Government
MDC-T	Movement for Democratic Change-Tsvangirai
MDC-M/N	Movement for Democratic Change-Mutambara/Ncube (after Welshman Ncube)
MPOI	Mass Public Opinion Institute
POSA	Public Order and Security Act
Q	Question
SADC	Southern African Development Community
ZANU-PF	Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front
ZAPU-Dabengwa	Zimbabwe Africa Patriotic Union-Dabengwa
ZBC	Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation
ZEC	Zimbabwe Electoral Commission

EXPLANATION OF SELECT TERMS

MDC-Ts	Supporters of the MDC-T, as declared on party preference on Q71 in this survey.
ZANU-PFers	Supporters of ZANU-PF, as declared on party preference on Q71 in this survey.
Secreters	Those respondents on Q71 in this survey who declare that their vote is their secret and prefer not to reveal it in this public opinion poll.
Undeclareds	An umbrella category of respondents in this survey, inclusive of the 'Secreters', that do not reveal their party preference in this survey. The category also includes 'Don't know', 'Not sure' and 'Refuse'.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Zimbabweans are showing the evidence of having been torn in all directions in the transitional period. They have been scarred by the party political wars since the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) from late 2000 onwards first posed an electoral challenge to the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF). Zimbabweans, as represented in this stratified-random and nationally representative sample, are not sure it seems on what to believe and how to relate to political and economic circumstances. They veer between praises for economic conditions that have improved and condemnations of the Inclusive Government (IG) when they move to more general-level assessments. They leap from great anticipation that the next election is the one that will bring more definitive change to their lives to concrete assessments that reveal more of their politically tormented sides. They proclaim that free and fair elections are in the offing, yet express similar levels of fear of electoral violence and intimidation than they had in the past. The 2012 survey results illuminate these complex, nuanced and evolving positions that Zimbabweans hold today.

The contemporary mood amongst Zimbabweans

- A substantial and persisting mood of optimism, hope and idealism characterises many of the responses in the FH 2012 survey. Zimbabweans have not given up on hoping that the given moment of turnaround to a democratic and human rights-driven system will be unleashed come the next constitution, the next referendum or the next election. However, many of the orientations emerging from the survey reveal cynicism and doubt about leadership deals, government and public institutions, and specifically about IG.
- Zimbabweans link their hope for further change and a better future to four unfolding phenomena and processes in Zimbabwe: the practice of Inclusive Government in which the main political parties are in a power-sharing arrangements, the process of constitution-making, the expected referendum to test popular support for the draft constitution, and the elections that are generally agreed to be due not later than June 2013.

Party support in flux – trends corroborated through trust measures

- In terms of the declared survey-based support, it appears the MDC-T has been suffering a decline in support, falling from 38% to 20% in the parliamentary vote from 2010 to 2012, in a period of approximately 18 months between the 2010 and 2012 FH surveys.
- In contrast, the survey data point to ZANU-PF having experienced a growth in popular support, moving from 17% to 31% in the same period.
- It is essential to bear in mind that a total of 47% of the respondents did not declare their voting intention in this 2012 survey. The percentage includes those who declared their vote to be their secret. Analyses in the rest of the report show that this undeclared category does not veil a systematic party orientation. Rather, should these persons vote in a next election, their support is likely to be diffused across party categories.

- Similarly, survey results are not direct indicators of election outcomes – they are snap shots in conditions of fluidity, conditions that have been confirmed in Zimbabwe, in the support that is declared for all of the political parties, both major and minor.
- The basic thrust of declared party support is borne out through the assessment of trust in the political parties. 52% of the respondents say that they trust ZANU-PF or trust it a lot; the corresponding percentage for the MDC-T only comes to 39%. The response level is higher than on party support, but the measure confirms the gap between the parties.
- It needs to be taken into account that the current survey of 1,198 people carries a margin of error of 2.8% at a 95% level of confidence. These aspects might moderate the exact level of expressed party support, but are insufficient to subvert the trends.

Profiling supporters of ZANU-PF, the MDC-T and the ‘undeclareds’

- Only a handful of the reasons for party choice in Zimbabwe show up clear differences between the two main parties’ supporters. Land, indigenisation, foreign interference in Zimbabwe, liberation from colonialism (all linked to ZANU-PF), and the need for change (associated with the MDC-T) do differentiate.
- On the bulk of themes the supporters of the arch foes largely speak the same political and economic language. This is the case especially in the experience of economic issues, and often in the assessment of government.
- The demographic side of profiling in this report shows much demographic convergence between the supporters of the two main parties, yet also reveals continuous differences (often just in scope) on ethnicity and national identification, unemployment, rural-urban location, religion and age.
- The 47%-strong grouping of undeclared support, specifically those who say ‘my vote is my secret’, is a demographic hybrid of the characteristics of the MDC-T and ZANU-PF. The undeclareds there do not systematically resemble a specific party.

Motivation to vote

- A substantially higher percentage of Zimbabweans than those that usually vote in elections declare their determination to cast ballots, both in the forthcoming referendum and elections. A total of 80% say that they are ‘sure’ or ‘very sure’ that they will vote in a referendum, and 85% are ‘sure’ or ‘very sure’ that they will be casting their ballots in the next elections.
- The undeclared category and specifically those who say that their votes are their secret are mildly less motivated to vote in a referendum and next election than their MDC-T and ZANU-PF counterparts: 57% of them anticipate voting in the referendum and 67% in a next election.
- There is no significant difference in the intent of the declared supporters of the two main parties to cast their ballots. On reasons for intending to vote a larger proportion of ZANU-PF supporters than of the MDC-T say that they will vote because the political principals instruct them to do so. MDC-T supporters continue to emphasise their hope that voting will bring change.
- A high proportion of Zimbabweans (77%, slightly down from the 83% of 2010) assert that they are registered as voters. Only one-quarter of these registered voters have inspected the voters

roll in 'the last 12 months' to confirm that their registration details remain in order. Three-quarters of those who report their status as currently not registered said they still intend to get registered.

Party share of responsibility for good-very good performance in Inclusive Government

- The comparison of 2010 and 2012 findings on which party gets the most credit for successes of the IG the MDC-T suffers a sharp decline. In 2010 it was 52% of Zimbabweans that reckoned that the MDC-T was the main contributor to IG successes – by 2012 this recognition had fallen to 15%. ZANU-PF picked up a portion of the shifting credit. There was also a greater tendency in 2012 than in 2010 to credit the two parties equally.

Changing experiences of national and local economic conditions

- Life for Zimbabweans has become less survival-oriented. Zimbabweans (49%, with other assessments scattered over a range of response categories) reckon economic conditions have improved in the past year, and they have good hopes (58% do) that things will be better or much better in another year's time. Another 28% consider things to be about the same as a year earlier, meaning that just a small minority feel that things have worsened.
- The most serious problem that Zimbabweans confront on the national level is unemployment. On the local level, this is roughly equalled by poor services. The survey showed that around two-thirds of Zimbabweans are formally unemployed, and the effects are felt strongly on both community and national levels. Despite many improvements in their lives, Zimbabweans consistently still rate food shortages as one of the most pervasive problems.
- Consistent with the respondents' indication of main problems that the country and they themselves face, IG is rated substantially worse in 2012 than in late 2010 on issues such as making consumer goods available and distributing food relief. The IG is doing equally poorly on impressions of attracting foreign investment. It is possible that the deficits remain vast despite good IG performance, or that the popular expectations for continuous improvement continue to rise.
- Zimbabweans' load of deprivations that they suffer has been getting lighter – even if IG remains cynically assessed. On availability of food the reported deprivation level declined from 85-50-31% from 2009 to 2010 to 2012; shortage of clean water for home use declined from 49-43-42%; non-availability of modern medicines decreased from 80-65-37%; lack of access to traditional medicines (only measured in 2010 and 2012) declined from 9-6%; shortage of cooking fuel declined from 55-48-44%; and lack of cash income went down from 94-91-79%.

Stagnating and declining assessments of the work of the IG

- The IG is often still highly positively assessed – such as in the sectors of making consumer goods available and distributing food relief – despite getting substantially less positive assessments than in 2010. On some questions the total positive assessments are below 50%, yet the positive assessments often remain higher than the negatives.

- These assessment trends also prevail in the political domain, where the IG continues to get credit for reducing political violence and preventing arbitrary arrest. Yet, in contrast with 2010 the survey respondents are now far more critical of the IG's ability to increase freedom to speak about political matters openly. A total of 44% now reckon that the IG is doing poorly or very poorly compared with 9% in 2010. This means that even if respondents *presently* report higher levels of freedom from fear, the fear of state violence has not dissipated.
- Assessments of the MDC-T's role in IG were down at the time of the 2012 FH. The credit it received for its role in IG through the lens of this survey fell from 52% at the end of 2010 to 15% in July 2012. It was now on par with ZANU-PF whose contribution was set at 16%.
- Trust in or cynicism of public institutions often converges between the supporters of the two main parties' supporters, and for the undeclareds. The comparative ratings of public institutions reflect the changing 2012 political landscape. Not only is the level of trust for some of the security forces, including the police, very high –aspects of the practice of IG get credit from supporters of both the main parties and the undeclareds, agreeing on most of the attributes that they wish to see in their government. Despite often-high levels of trust, MDC-T supporters are more cynical than their ZANU-PF counterparts of especially the judiciary and office of the Attorney General. The undeclareds are favourably disposed towards the judiciary, but more cynical about the attorney general.

Elections and hope, participation and 'free and fair' expectations

- Zimbabweans retain their love relationship with elections. They overwhelmingly believe that the next election (or the next referendum) will be *the definitive one* that will bring all of the desired changes to politics and society. A probe of reasons why Zimbabweans say they will vote showed that 47% (of those that anticipate participating in the next round of elections) give as motivation that 'this is the election that will make the difference'. This reason for voting was roughly twice as prevalent as its closest competitor in the hierarchy of responses.
- A total of 35% in this survey (compared with 16% in 2010) now believe that the next round of elections will be completely free and fair. This category of responses has largely fed off the grouping that had previously expected major problems. In a direct comparison, 55% and 57%, respectively, now believe that the 2012 elections will be more free and fair than those of March and June 2008.
- Zimbabweans report experiencing substantially less violence in 2012 than they have in the 2009 and 2010 FH surveys. A total of 50% agree or strongly agree that there is higher freedom in 2012 to express their political views. A smaller proportion state that just a threat of violence is sufficient to reinstate fear.
- By far the largest block of respondents, 45%, said that the Zimbabwean people will be ready for elections in the first half of 2013. This makes this a strong endorsement of the 2013 timing of elections. In 2010 57% had recommended that elections should be held immediately or the following year; in 2009 56% wished for elections either immediately or 'within the next year'.

Interest in public affairs, media use and trust in sources

- Zimbabweans are showing a growing interest in public affairs, with respondents mostly moving out of the mid-response category of 'not very interested'. Those who are interested or very interested in politics and public affairs rose from 42% (2010) to 51% (2012). The 2012 figure, however, is still more modest than that of 2009.
- Besides using personal sources of information and opinion on public matters, many Zimbabweans depend on public and private mass media that are electronic, print or based on mobile phone technology. There is much consistency in media uses from 2010 to 2012. Radio use shows a mild decline, and television and newspapers small increases. The internet retains its previously very modest use and cell-based technology establishes a small presence.
- The exploration of trust in the media sources that are most commonly used for news on politics and public affairs shows that radio – and that would be ZBC radio – is very well trusted by ZANU-PF supporters, is trusted by just under 50% of MDC-T supporters and by 41% of those who keep their vote their secret. ZANU-PF supporters are somewhat less trusting of television than of radio. The two parties' supporters and the undeclared are generally rather similar in the trust they have in their sources of information.

-----000-----

1: INTRODUCTION, METHODOLOGY AND POLITICAL SETTING

Freedom House (FH) has conducted a series of three surveys of the socio-economic and political situation in Zimbabwe. The series— the current one is the third since 2009 – aims at monitoring and understanding political and economic change in Zimbabwe, and to advance democracy by using the knowledge in support of Zimbabwe’s ongoing political and economic transition.

The 2012 survey was conducted close to four years after the Global Political Agreement (GPA), and three and a half years after the formation of the Inclusive Government (IG). The series of surveys offered Zimbabweans a platform to express opinions and relate experiences on a series of issues that are critically important to the citizenry as Zimbabwe continues its transitional process. The surveys are vital in helping to ensure that the voices of the Zimbabwean people are known, and that they help shape the political decisions that are made.

Zimbabweans are showing the evidence of having been pulled in all directions in the transitional period. They have been scarred in the party political wars since the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) from late 2000 onwards first posed an electoral challenge to the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF). The MDC (later the MDC-Tsvangirai) and its supporters have on several occasions through elections come close to assuming power. ZANU-PF, however, had the total strategy to circumvent its own electoral defeat. When the 2008 electoral stalemates arrived the two rival parties, also for the sake of peace, entered joint or IG in the form of the GPA. The MDC-T had to be satisfied with a subject position.

The years in power took their toll on the MDC-T. It was pressured to prove itself as a capable co-governing party, and often neglected to continuously nurture the political organisation. Leadership fatigue and battles, along with the MDC-T in office often being exposed as comparable-in-corruption to ZANU-PF helped complicate the MDC-T’s early years in joint-but-dominated power. This dented its popular standing, also in measures such as those included in the current survey. There are indications that some MDC-T supporters may be moving away from seeing their party and its leaders as their unquestioned political saviour.¹

Zimbabweans, as represented in this stratified-random and nationally representative sample, are, it seems, not sure any more about what to believe and how to relate to political and economic circumstances. They veer between praises for economic conditions that have improved and condemnations of the IG when they engage in more general-level assessments. They leap from great anticipation that the next election is *the one* that will bring more definitive change to their lives to concrete assessments that reveal more of their politically tormented sides. They proclaim that free and

¹ The vote measure in this survey explores the notion of ‘if elections were held tomorrow ...’ It thus indicates how Zimbabweans presently translate their joys and frustrations into decisions about voting. With politics in flux their vote declarations may very well be different at a future point in time and in changed circumstances.

fair elections are in the offing, yet express similar levels of fear of electoral violence and intimidation as they had in the past.

The 2012 survey results illuminate the complex and in-flux current positions that Zimbabweans hold. Results are not always what might have been expected, but in the context of what Zimbabwe is today the nuanced picture that emerges from the FH 2012 survey makes sense.

Methodology

This section relates essential details of the polling process that generated the data for this report. The process was a cooperative endeavour between Freedom House, Susan Booyesen, and the Mass Public Opinion Institute (MPOI), Harare, Zimbabwe. Ongoing political volatility and potential dangers to both researcher-interviewers in the field, and the survey respondents, were continuous considerations in the drafting of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire dealt with the issues of continuous transition and gradual political change in Zimbabwe, circa 2012. It was constructed after an extensive set of consultative discussions with civil society in Zimbabwe. The questionnaire centred on general socio-political-economic attitudes (experiences and expectations regarding the nature and extent of change in contemporary Zimbabwe); Zimbabweans' assessments of the Inclusive Government (IG) (issues of power-sharing vis-à-vis elections, the performance of the IG); trends in the final phases of the constitutional reform process (the need for constitutional change, experiences of the COPAC process; expectations of the contents and directions of the new constitution, content and process); elections and voting actions (timing, expectations of future elections, the order of elections and constitution-making, violence and elections, voter registration and confidence in electoral authorities including the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC) and the Registrar-General; political interest and media use; and 'the vote' along with the inclination not to reveal party support.

The Mass Public Opinion Institute (MPOI) was responsible for sample design, fieldworker training, implementation of the fieldwork, and data entry. MPOI (see MPOI Fieldwork Report of 20 July 2012) applied a random selection method at every stage of sampling and also a probability proportionate to population size wherever possible. An achieved sample size of 1,198 (allowing a margin of error of plus or minus 2.8% at the 95% level of confidence) enabled population inferences. The sample was stratified first by province and secondly by rural/urban distinctions within provinces. In total 100 Enumeration Areas (EAs) were sampled with the latter subdivided into 63 rural and 37 urban enumeration areas. The allocation of the sample was consistent with Zimbabwe's urban and rural population projections for 2011 in which the rural population is about 63% of the total population. 12 interviews were conducted in each enumeration area. To achieve gender parity interviews were alternated between male and female respondents in each EA, thus at the end of the survey gender representation was equally split with 599 interviews constituted by males and the balance comprising females.

Political setting

The nuanced and sometimes seemingly conflicted political and socio-economic orientations that emerge from the FH 2012 survey need to be positioned in the political context that elicited idealism and optimism, yet that clashed frequently with disappointment and compromises. By current political indications political stalemates and compromises may be continuing. Hope for far-reaching change may yet again have to be moderated, as Zimbabweans perhaps come to terms with the fact that they may very well already 'be living their political future' in the conditions in Zimbabwe in the second half of 2012. The hope that a new constitution, a referendum and another set of elections will bring the relative utopia may be just another landmark rather than a benchmark for a substantially different future.

When the MDC-T entered into the Inclusive Government (IG) members in its higher realms told public audiences that they were now in the river with the crocodiles so they had better be careful. In the months before they finally sealed Global Political Agreement's (GPA) pact – signed in September 2008 and finally initiated in February 2009 – there was much discussion about whether or not the MDC-T should accept the deal, even though the party had signed. Up until mid-January 2009 many foreign observers and supporters expressed surprise that the MDC-T would enter into the GPA formula. But almost inevitably – with or without rumours of extreme pressure from a South Africa dominated SADC – the MDC-T joined the ZANU-PF in the 'inclusive government' on 12 February 2009. One of the first steps was the expansion of the cabinet to cater to ZANU-PF insiders' demands. Cabinet portfolios were split between the parties, and ZANU-PF retained the strategic and security related pickings.

Some believed that if the MDC-T could get Zimbabwe's economy working again, it could take credit and move into a new election – promised by the GPA in at least five years, after a new (publicly debated) constitution had been ratified by referendum and procedures for free and fair elections were guaranteed. ZANU-PF regained opportunity when diamonds were discovered and could easily be controlled by the party-state. In spite of isolating the Reserve Bank and its governor, Gideon Gono, the new Minister of Finance, the MDC-T's Tendai Biti, could not capture diamond revenue for broadly based use in the state. The MDC-T was denied the means to make a state work. In addition, the Kimberley Process did not have a means for making states responsible for 'blood diamonds'. The Ministry of Mines hence became the *de facto* Treasury, managed by ZANU-PF's minister of mines, Obert Mpofu.

Sanctions meant that World Bank proposals to rebuild the sanitation system could not work: no credit, then, to the Finance Minister. 'Humanitarian plus' from the donors mean some elements of creaking infrastructure get mended and a modicum of welfare services such as health continues, but it is a band-aid operation and Zimbabweans are unclear in their own minds as to which party should be credited with the change.

The middle-classes, working the margins in the private sector, can afford private health care and so on. They can also buy goods in the well-stocked shelves of suburban food retailers. The rural poor, however, have little access to American dollars ('foreign' currency that had become the only currency) so resort often to barter. Still, in comparison to recent memory material life is better.

The survey results will show that Zimbabweans are, perhaps ironically, enjoying the benefits of MDC-T's stabilisation of the political situation by having agreed to enter the transitional government in a position that would be subject to ZANU-PF dominance. The MDC-T made some specific contributions to IG. Yet, such credits have not been transferred into the kitty of party political endorsement and declarations to support the party come the next round of elections. Meanwhile, the MDC-T 'in power' – or with a bit of power in reach – has suffered under accusations that local MDC-T councillors are involved in corruption, in effect equalising MDC-T and ZANU-PF.

Although violence has been simmering at a low-level for the past couple of years, it is still there in sufficient quantity to remind people that it can be stepped up in an instant. The ZANU-PF military-political complex has honed low intensity violence to a fine art: when announcements of a pending election in 2011 were made, violence increased – against 'human rights defenders', MDC supporters, and ordinary people.

Repression is less than in mid-2008 during the presidential run-off 'election' but the memory of that is strong. The magnitude of the 2008 electoral violence left Zimbabweans traumatised. National healing did not happen and communities are reminded of both 2008 and subsequent incidents as the perpetrators continue to roam villages. The political re-education campaigns by war veterans leader Jabulani Sibanda from 2010-12 broad harsh reminders of an era that many Zimbabweans now hope has passed. Operating in Gutu, Zaka and Bikita, Sibanda forced villagers to flee, threatening that 2008 was just a 'piece' of what was to come, that 'blood will flow', and that those who sideline ZANU-PF should 'prepare for death'.

The military and other security forces have hardly joined the 'détente' that many Zimbabweans are now imagining. Sources that are informed about security matters relate that at the same time as fieldworkers were rolling out the survey questionnaires, senior military officers were continuing their planning on how to take control of villages should political processes unfold that run counter to their interests. Many villagers report that soldiers, militia or ZANU-PF youth intimidate the communities.

ZANU-PF's control over print and electronic state media ensure that the party dominates in dissemination of propaganda, and part of these media's onslaught is against the MDC-T and civil society. At the same time, some MDC-T rallies in the countryside were banned, signalling that the political space was in fact not opening up. Rather, there had probably been a temporary contraction in scale of political oppression in the period between electoral contests, when it was considered 'safe' to do so.

Some Matabeleland-based activists in early 2010 said that the military in Zimbabwe would wait until the MDC-T had proved itself as pliant towards its accumulation strategies as ZANU-PF, and then accept it as a government in waiting. Such a process could be hastened by rumoured talks between the so-called moderates within ZANU-PF and the military, and some elements of the MDC-T, with a view to some newform of government of national unity. Stephen Chan's cynical words of early 2011:² 'some form of coalition [is likely] for years into the Zimbabwean future' may come to pass. His words were an attempt

² Stephen Chan, 'International Views of Zimbabwe', *Zimbabwe Review*, Solidarity Peace Trust, January 21 2011, <http://www.solidaritypeacetrust.org/928/international-views-of-zimbabwe/>

to interpret European attitudes to Zimbabwe's political future, but this could now be the way to interpret the opinion of a broad mass of Zimbabwe citizens that has grown exasperated with politicians and their promises.

Structure of the report

The rest of this interim report³ first explores the 2012 national mood in Zimbabwe and assesses how this has changed over time. It then turns to an exploration of electoral issues and the changing trends in support for Zimbabwe's main political parties. The section deals with a series of themes that link to voting and party preference. The choices that Zimbabweans make will help shape the future of Zimbabwe, and they would have been influenced by life in the times of Inclusive Government in Zimbabwe – the assessments to which the next section turns. Thereafter follows Zimbabweans' expectations and experiences of elections. The report ends with the consideration of patterns of political interest and media use.

2: THE 2012 MOOD IN ZIMBABWE – HOPE, OPTIMISM, DOUBT, RECONSIDERATION

A substantial and persisting mood of optimism, hope and idealism characterises many of the responses in the FH 2012 survey. Zimbabweans have not given up on hoping that the moment of turnaround will be realized come the next constitution, the next referendum or the next election. However, many of the orientations emerging from the survey reveal cynicism and doubt about leadership deals, government and public institutions, and specifically about Inclusive Government (IG).

Despite that resilient Zimbabwean hope for a new future to be escorted in by a new constitution, referendum and elections, it may very well be that Zimbabweans' future has been unfolding incrementally, and that it has been the practice of IG (section below) and 'forced/enforced' cooperation and mutual accountability (with international backing) that has brought Zimbabweans to the point where they are already *living their political future*. This would then have been the result of incremental change and parties building piecemeal-style the power relations and shared political dispensation.

Optimism, albeit often moderated, showed across a series of questions – about the direction in which Zimbabwe is seen to be moving (Q8A), views on the economy and personal economic conditions (Q9C), the outcome of the unfolding processes of constitution, referendum and elections (Q11), views that the next elections will be more free and fair than the preceding ones (Q50C) and that 'this time around' there will be nothing to fear about elections (Q52C).

³'Change and 'New' Politics in Zimbabwe' is an interim report of the 2012 FH public opinion poll. The full report, exploring a broader diversity of socio-economic and political issues, will be available in September 2012.

Towards a national consensus?

On many of the survey responses there is no clear differentiation between the supporters of the two main parties, the MDC-T and ZANU-PF. They also blend with the categories on undeclareds. This emerged in an analysis of cross-tabulations to explore party choice (Q71A and Q70B) amongst Zimbabweans. There is still a handful of issues – and no more than this – that clearly differentiates the party and other political identities of individuals. On the bulk of issues, themes and phenomena, however, the supporters of the arch foes have the same experiences and largely speak the same political and economic language. This is the case especially in the experience of economic issues, and often in the assessment of government. Some of the themes on reasons for party political support (section below) continue to differentiate party-specific political views. In almost all of these cases, the category of ‘my vote is my secret’ slots in somewhere between the MDC-T and ZANU-PF, even if the differences between these two were already modest. In addition, twice as many respondents endorse the statement that prioritises national Zimbabwean identity over an ethnically-centred identity. This is also true for all of ZANU-PF, MDC-T and ‘my vote is my secret’ categories of respondents.

Direction in which Zimbabwe is moving

Yet Zimbabweans do not have complete consensus that the country is moving in a right direction – mixed feelings prevail. It is largely the improved state of the economy that makes Zimbabweans see the good in the current direction of the country. This is also reflected in their perceptions of their personal economic conditions.

In 2010 Zimbabweans were split down the middle as to the general direction in which the country was moving – 35% thought the direction is right and 31% that it is wrong. By 2012 (Table 1) the proportion that is happy with the country’s direction had remained quite in line with the earlier assessment – 36% approved of the direction. The 2012 difference was the decrease in the category of ‘wrong direction’ – now down to 26%. A total of 27% spotted elements of both right and wrong. Zimbabweans’ motivation for the positive assessment of direction was overwhelmingly in the domain of quality of life and the economy.

The main 2012 reasons cited for the verdict of ‘right direction’ were in descending order that the economy is in a good condition, commodities are available, food has become more available, that there is political stability and more peace. As the most frequently stated reasons, they noted that the economy was in an improved condition (16%) commodities were available (6%) and food was available (4%). Political stability and peace (on 3% each) were the next most frequently cited reasons (the totality of all reasons cited, plus ‘not sure’ and so forth, added up to 100%).

It was not surprising in 2010 that ZANU-PF supporters were more likely than MDC-T supporters to believe that the country was heading in a right direction – 51% of ZANU-PF’s compared to 26% of MDC-T supporters felt this way. By 2012, this had changed. ZANU-PF supporters were more of the opinion that

there was a mix of right and wrong direction. MDC-T supporter sentiments remained roughly the same, except that there was quite an increase in the view that there was no movement.

Direction	Political party (%)					
	ZANU-PF		MDC-T		My vote is my secret	
	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Right direction	51	48	26	23	27	35
Wrong direction	26	19	40	38	15	25
Bit of both	15	25	21	24	25	30
Not moving at all	1	6	7	14	15	7
Don't know / Refuse	7	1	6	1	8	4

Note: Q8A (2012), 'How do you feel about the general direction in which Zimbabwe is moving'?

Idealism anchored in constitution-making, referendum, elections

Zimbabweans link their hope for further change and a better future to four unfolding phenomena and processes in Zimbabwe: the practice of Inclusive Government in which the main political parties are in a power-sharing arrangement, the process of constitution-making, the expected pre-election referendum to test popular support for the draft constitution, and the elections that are expected by June 2013.⁴ At the time of the survey, an unofficial preliminary draft of the constitution had already been selectively leaked and infused public discussions.

The IG, the constitution-making process and the referendum (a 2012-specific survey item; Q11) give close to 50% of Zimbabweans hope for a better future. With the addition of the 'neither hope nor doubt' responses, these percentages rise to 57, 60 and 59%, on the three processes respectively.

The same trend, just much stronger, emerged on Zimbabweans' hope associated with elections. A total of 62% believe that the next election will ring in a better future, rising to 74% with the inclusion of the 'neither hope nor doubt' category (Table 2).

It is simultaneously clear nevertheless that a substantial amount of cynicism continues, especially around the IG, but also on the emerging constitution and the role of the referendum. Zimbabweans remain divided (Q11A), specifically on whether IG will lead Zimbabwe to a better future (47% yes; 34% no). Cynicism about the next round of elections is far smaller (also see section below). The 47% that

⁴By August 2012 there were varied opinions in Zimbabwe's political circles as to whether there may be an extension beyond June 2013. Some averred that the president would have three months leeway to implement elections proclaimed by mid-2012; others noted that the President tended to not proclaim virtually at will, as had been the case, for example, in the vacancies in the prevailing parliament. The formal position remained 'not later than June 2013'.

reckon that IG gives them some level of hope contrasts with the substantial chunk of 34% that have doubt or serious doubt about this.

Level of hope or doubt	Four processes (%)			
	Inclusive government	Current constitution-making	Forthcoming referendum	Elections of 2013
Strong hope	14	17	15	30
Some hope	33	33	33	32
Neither hope nor doubt	8	10	11	12
Some doubt	15	12	10	8
Serious doubt	19	8	7	9
Undecided	11	19	23	10

Note: Based on Q11 (2012), 'How much hope or doubt do you have that each of the next four processes will take Zimbabwe to a better future?'

3: PARTY POLITICAL CHANGE 2009-12

Zimbabweans in the FH survey cautioned the Movement for Democratic Change-Tsvangirai (MDC-T) to recapture the popular imagination as agent for change. The survey suggested that the MDC-T has lost the edge that it had enjoyed over the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) (Table 3).

The consistent and substantial block of non-declarers (those who choose not to reveal which party or candidate they will support in a next election) is big enough at 47% to change the relative standings of the main parties. Zimbabweans, in the typical style of Zimbabwean culture, *often refuse* to disclose which party they anticipate supporting, come the event of a next parliamentary or presidential election. As Table 3 shows, however, this percentage has been rising in the course of the three FH surveys from 2009 to 2012 – the joint percentages of undeclared and 'will not vote' rose from 31% to 41% to 47%. In the current poll 41% preferred not to disclose whom they would support in a parliamentary election, and 40% followed suit on declaring for a presidential race. Further chunks of respondents, said they do not know / are not sure.

It is not possible to do a systematic re-allocation of this category, but it *is possible* to further dissect the undeclared category of respondents (that are manifested through responses of 'my vote is my secret', 'don't know', 'not sure' and 'refuse'). This will establish which of the main parties they resemble best. This profiling is done in much of the rest of the report. The analysis also aims to shed light on the reasons for the substantial chunks of the voters refusing to declare.

Party	2009 Presidential election (%)	2010 Parliamentary election (%)	2012 Presidential election (%)	2012 Parliamentary election (%)
MDC-T	55	38	19	20
ZANU-PF	12	17	31	31
Other	3	3	2	2
Undeclared*	25	33	40	41
Will not vote	6	8	7	6
TOTAL**	100	100	100	100
Question: 'If parliamentary / presidential elections were held tomorrow, which party's candidate would you vote for / which party would you vote for?' * For all elections, representing the combination of 'my vote is my secret' (28.3 and 28.4%, respectively for presidential and parliamentary elections in 2012), refuse (8.3 and 8.3%, respectively for presidential and parliamentary elections in 2012), don't know / not sure (3.7 and 4%, respectively for presidential and parliamentary elections in 2012). ** Due to rounding, percentages do not always add up to 100.				

The essential findings on party political support in the July 2012 FH survey are:

- In terms of the declared support, the MDC-T appears to have been suffering a substantial decline in survey-based levels of support in the period since the 2008 Zimbabwean elections falling from 38% to 20% in the parliamentary vote from 2010 to 2012, a period of approximately 18 months.
- The survey data simultaneously indicate that ZANU-PF seems to have experienced a growth in popular support, moving from 17% to 31% in the same period.
- Smaller political parties have virtually become extinct.

It is necessary, possibly even more than in the 2010 phase of the survey, to emphasise the fact of 'declared support'. The 'undeclared' vote is on a very high level, even higher than in 2010.

It is important that these results show tendencies *at the time of the survey and in relation to the question of how people would vote should elections have been held on the day following the survey interview*. The findings may be important pointers to future election results, should conditions and motivations remain as they were at the time of the interviews. We know, simultaneously, that conditions in Zimbabwe are fluid and experiences and impressions change. Voter preferences may very well again change away from the present findings, just as they have changed towards the current set of results.

Election results are also mediated by factors such as voter registration status and motivation to vote come the time of the next elections. The survey shows, at this stage, a large degree of convergence between the main parties' and the undeclareds' registration statuses, as well as their motivation to participate in a next election.

**.Table 4:
Party support and related categories of vote response across the provinces, 2010 and 2012**

Vote declaration	Year	Harare	Bulaw	MidIn	Masvi	MashE	MashW	MashC	MatS	MatN	Manic
MDC-T	2012	17	29	25	22	18	6	6	23	20	31
	2010	50	51	36	37	33	34	20	37	49	40
ZANU-PF	2012	22	15	29	42	42	35	50	22	13	34
	2010	8	4	19	17	15	25	39	13	8	17
ZAPU-Dabengwa	2012	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
	2010	6	6	-	1	-	-	-	4	-	-
MDC-M	2012	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
	2010	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	1
MDC-N	2012	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-
	2010	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2012	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2010	1	1	-	3	4	1	1	-	2	1
My vote my secret	2012	34	22	25	28	27	36	32	25	43	17
	2010	29	13	21	19	27	24	26	14	27	22
Don't know Not sure	2012	4	6	7	1	1	2	4	13	7	4
	2010	3	1	3	4	4	4	2	5	3	5
Not vote Abstain	2012	11	10	6	2	3	8	4	10	10	2
	2010	3	17	13	8	6	6	8	12	8	3
Refuse	2012	13	7	6	3	8	13	2	2	5	11
	2010	4	5	6	12	12	7	5	14	3	11
TOTAL		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Notes: Abbreviations for the provinces: Harare; Bulaw=Bulawayo; MidIn=Midlands; Masvi=Masvingo; MashE=Mashonaland East; MashW=Mashonaland West; MashC=Mashonaland Central; MatS=Matabeleland South; MatH=Matabeleland North; Manic=Manicaland; Due to rounding not all total add up to exactly 100%.											

Provincial breakdown of party support and related vote response categories

Table 4 offers valuable details on the growth of the 'my vote is my secret' category. This means that a certain amount of caution is required in interpreting the responses in declaring party support for the 'tomorrow' election that respondents were asked to imagine in the survey. The proportion of responses in this category rose in eight of the ten provinces, modestly declined in one, and remained stable in

another. The changes in the positions of the two main parties in terms of the declared component of the vote – either down across the provinces in the case of the MDC-T or up across the provinces for ZANU-PF – is nevertheless notable for the consistency of this pattern. The details also show the decline between the two surveys of the small political parties

Trust in the main parties – reflection of party support

The basic thrust of declared party support is generally borne out through measures such as trust in the political parties (Table 5). Whereas 52% of respondents indicate that they trust ZANU-PF or trust it a lot, the corresponding percentage for the MDC-T only reaches 39%. The trust measure indicates that there is substance to the party vote determinations in the survey. The MDC-T in this survey has not only suffered a notable decline in support, its level of popular trust has also spun downward, from 32% to 20% in roughly 18 months.

The drop in declared support for the MDC-T, compared with previous surveys, is a vexing issue. The dips in MDC-T support are illuminated when the analysis delves into perceptions in the ranks of MDC-T supporters themselves – this is reflected in the rest of the report.

Table 5: Changing levels of trust in the two main political parties, 2010-12				
Extent of trust	MDC-T (%)		ZANU-PF (%)	
	2010	2012	2010	2012
A lot	32	20	16	34
Somewhat	34	19	20	18
Just a little	11	23	19	16
Not at all	9	25	34	24
Notes: Q61 (2012), ‘In the current Zimbabwe, how much do you trust ...? In 2012, 6% and 3% of the respondents stated that they do not know whether they trust the MDC-T and ZANU-PF, respectively. See also Table 12.				

It is important that the MDC-T does not have the historically ingrained type of support, or the historically legitimated ‘liberation movement’ standing, that ZANU-PF has. Its popular standing is more reliant on performance than that of ZANU-PF. The latter regularly invokes the (indubitable and severe) historical injustices to veil the scope of its own shortcomings.

Beliefs about the outcome of the next round of elections

Anticipating the prominence of non-declaration, the questionnaire included the item of ‘Use one sentence please to tell me what kind of place you think Zimbabwe will be after the next elections ...’

(Q73). It differentiated well between the supporters of the two main parties. A total of 62% of those who had declared that they would vote ZANU-PF if elections were to be held the day following the interview reckoned that ZANU-PF would improve its electoral standing and win such an election. This was by far the largest single chunk of ZANU-PFers' responses.

MDC-Ts' responses were more divided – the biggest block, 38%, responded that the MDC-T would win and that ZANU-PF would hand over power. 25% of the MDC-T supporters said that ZANU-PF would lose, yet would still not hand over power. The main undeclared category, that of 'my vote is my secret' predominantly remained undeclared, with 40% saying they don't know and a further 20% refusing to answer the question. The third biggest response category, 9%, went along with the predominant ZANU-PF category (ZANU-PF will improve and win the elections) and 6% with one of the main MDC-T categories, viz. ZANU-PF would win but not give up power. This item thus gave a small, yet not decisive indication of the inclinations of the undeclared.

Reasons for party choice

It is only a few of the most popular reasons for party choice in Zimbabwe that show up clear differences between the two main parties' supporters. Land, indigenisation, foreign interference in Zimbabwe and especially liberation from colonialism do differentiate. The survey results clearly show that ZANU-PF has crafted itself a number of effective election and party choice platforms. The MDC-T largely relies on its emphasis on change, and to some extent on civil liberties, to achieve such platforms (Table 6).

These results on Q56A show that local level service delivery and the pursuit of human rights are pivotal issues when Zimbabweans choose political parties. These points also help shed light on the MDC-T's sub-optimal performance. It has been unsuccessful in living up to popular expectations – its clear commitment to human rights and the pursuit of associated programmes in recent years cracked under the pressure of it being in government. Its record in local government was also one that did not elevate it over ZANU-PF; it became seen as fallible in local government.

The item on defending Zimbabwe against 'foreign interference' shows that this ZANU-PF 'battle cry' finds resonance across the party and undeclared boundaries. The same applied to the themes of indigenisation and land reform. On the theme of 'liberation from the British' ZANU-PF is more isolated, with the MDC-T and undeclareds not supporting this platform in great numbers.

The rest of the party political platforms cited show that whereas the level of support may differ between ZANU-PF, the MDC-T and undeclareds, they differentiate less definitively. There is a high level of consensus between the supporters of these two political parties that the way the parties govern is an important reason for the parties to be supported. It follows both from the survey and from common logic that perspectives on the parties' respective performance in government – and in particular in Inclusive Government (IG) – would help shape their minds. Parties whose power is more traditionally entrenched (such as ZANU-PF) would, however, be less affected than the MDC-T, whose support is less

entrenched and that is more likely to be assessed on performance, including its trials and tribulations in the time of IG.

Table 6:
Zimbabweans choice of political party: Issues that shape the minds

<i>Zimbabweans ...</i>	Support by (all row %'s)	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	DK
Choose a party that is not corrupt and spends public money accountably	All	58	31	3	4	1	3
	MDC-T	65	27	3	4	0	0
	ZANU-PF	59	32	2	3	1	3
	Undeclared	56	33	2	4	1	4
Look for a political party that supports land reform to Zimbabwe	All	37	28	9	13	8	5
	MDC-T	23	25	11	27	14	1
	ZANU-PF	56	29	4	5	4	2
	Undeclared	33	30	9	13	9	7
Support any political party that can bring change	All	53	29	9	5	2	4
	MDC-T	73	22	3	3	0	0
	ZANU-PF	47	29	8	8	5	3
	Undeclared	49	34	7	5	1	5
Go with a political party that supports indigenisation in Zimbabwe	All	38	28	10	9	7	8
	MDC-T	25	28	12	18	12	5
	ZANU-PF	55	27	5	4	3	6
	Undeclared	33	29	11	10	7	9
Choose a party that shows it can deliver services, especially on the local level	All	59	33	2	2	1	3
	MDC-T	68	28	0	3	0	0
	ZANU-PF	62	31	1	2	1	2
	Undeclared	54	36	3	2	1	4
Choose a party that is committed to civil and political freedoms (freedom to speak openly, vote freely, protest)	All	59	30	5	2	2	3
	MDC-T	73	22	3	2	1	0
	ZANU-PF	58	29	5	2	2	2
	Undeclared	54	34	5	2	1	4
Support a party that defends Zimbabwe against the interference of foreign countries	All	34	30	12	10	8	6
	MDC-T	21	31	17	17	14	1
	ZANU-PF	50	33	6	4	3	4
	Undeclared	30	20	12	11	9	8
Look at who it is that liberated Zimbabwe from the British	All	27	18	12	14	12	8
	MDC-T	10	11	9	23	45	3
	ZANU-PF	52	22	11	7	5	4
	Undeclared	17	19	14	17	22	11

Note: Based on Q56A (2012), 'When Zimbabweans choose a political party to support, what do you think is the most important issue that lets them make up their minds?'

Indigenisation – nuances differentiating the supporters of the main parties

The survey's exploration of support for variations on the theme of indigenisation showed that it resonates with a large proportion of Zimbabweans. A total of 50% of the survey respondents answered that they had heard of 'Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment'. This group then responded to the rest of the indigenisation questions. There was a fair knowledge of some of the detailed aspects of existing and proposed indigenisation policy, including the Common Share Ownership Trust (39% of the screened respondents knew about it), the Sovereign Wealth Fund (16% of the screened respondents had knowledge of these details) and the National Indigenisation Economic and Empowerment Board (44% of the screened respondents had heard of it).

Table 7: Variations on the theme of indigenisation differentiating party supporters and undeclareds			
STATEMENT A			
1. Foreign-owned companies bring growth and development to Zimbabwe.		2. If all major companies that operate in Zimbabwe are owned by Zimbabweans there will be growth and development.	
Agree very strongly: 15% MDC-T 2% ZANU-PF 20% Undeclared 30%	Agree: 8% MDC-T 20% ZANU-PF 7% Undeclared 15%	Agree: 6% MDC-T 11% ZANU-PF 16% Undeclared 12%	Agree very strongly: 17% MDC-T 15% ZANU-PF 53% Undeclared 31%
STATEMENT B			
1. I agree with both the principle and the current methods of indigenisation in Zimbabwe.		2. I agree with the indigenisation thrust in Zimbabwe ... it is just the current methods that are a problem.	
Agree very strongly: 8% MDC-T 2% ZANU-PF 32% Undeclared 16%	Agree: 5% MDC-T 20% ZANU-PF 2% Undeclared 8%	Agree: 8% MDC-T 17% ZANU-PF 14% Undeclared 20%	Agree very strongly: 23% MDC-T 69% ZANU-PF 29% Undeclared 40%
STATEMENT C			
1. Indigenisation will ensure economic benefits for ALL Zimbabweans.		2. Indigenisation is only for elites who can buy or claim shares in foreign-owned companies in Zimbabwe.	
Agree very strongly: 10% MDC-T 6% ZANU-PF 35% Undeclared 16%	Agree: 7% MDC-T 7% ZANU-PF 22% Undeclared 14%	Agree: 7% MDC-T 14% ZANU-PF 11% Undeclared 20%	Agree very strongly: 23% MDC-T 71% ZANU-PF 24% Undeclared 45%
Notes: Q58(2012), 'Which of the following statements do you agree with most? Choose statement 1 or 2 ...' The percentages in this table exclude responses of 'Agree with neither' and 'Don't know / not sure'. The party percentages are derived by taking the declared supporters of each party and noting what proportion of them supported each of the response options on a particular party. Undeclared in this table refers to those who declare their vote to be their secret.			

Indigenisation issues have substantial potential to cut across party political boundaries. The details in Table 7 show that wherever one party gathers strong chunks of support for certain response options, the other party's supporters will mostly still be in there with some of its supporters also rallying around the option. Beyond this, as illustrated on Statement A, MDC-Ts' support spread out across the options.

The same goes for ZANU-PF with regard to statement B, and to some extent statement C. ZANU-PF supporters on statement B cluster around *both* unambiguous endorsement and approval with recognition of problems with the indigenisation thrust in Zimbabwe.

Statement B responses illustrated how MDC-T supporters strongly cluster around the idea of indigenisation whilst emphasising that there are serious problems with the current methods that are used to execute the process. The MDC-Ts also differentiate themselves through their strong association (on statement C) with the belief that indigenisation as it is currently implemented in Zimbabwe benefits the elite.

Profiling the main parties' and undeclareds' support bases

It is often a case of so much-so little difference in the orientations of the supporters of Zimbabwe's two main political parties. Their socio-political DNA largely converges, yet also remains different on a few crucial dimensions. It is largely the conventional issues of liberation of Zimbabwe from colonial rule, the role of the military, the land and indigenisation, and trust in some of the public institutions that differentiate the supporters of the two main parties. MDC-T supporters are characterised by their strong endorsement of 'change'. The large grouping of undeclared support – and even the more specific category of 'my vote is my secret' – by all demographic indications are hybrids of the characteristics of the two main parties. They do not clearly and systematically resemble a specific party.

Survey indicators are not indicators of election outcomes – especially not if the question states that if you had to vote or decide today whom or which party to support. Politics and economic conditions in Zimbabwe are in flux. Zimbabweans have not disowned the MDC-T, just as they have not unambiguously endorsed ZANU-PF. Whilst Zimbabwean politics is undergoing change many of the old divisions remain. Zimbabweans are expressing disappointment and anger with the failures of the MDC-T, and are showing appreciation for ZANU-PF seemingly having moderated violence and intimidation, and appearing (at least at the time of the fieldwork for the survey) to have come to terms with a consensus constitution. Simultaneously, they are more trusting of ZANU-PF.

The FH 2012 survey trends are useful in indicating the demographic lines along which the support for the two main parties has been changing since late 2010:

- **Gender:** The MDC-T's gender profile is shown to be closer to a gender balance than it was before (2012: 54-46% male-female; 2010: 60-40% male-female). ZANU-PF remains closely balanced between the two genders. Those who regard their vote to be their secret (2012) emerge as 51% male and 49% female.
- **Rural-urban:** In 2010 63% of the MDC-T support base was in the rural areas (and 37% urban). In 2012 it had become 59% rural and 41% urban. The gap has also been closing for ZANU-PF, which emerged as 77% rural in 2012 (down proportionately from the 89% of 2010). This change could be related to former and largely urban MDC supporters now declaring backing for ZANU-PF. The 2012 secret-vote component of the undeclareds is more rural (58%) than urban (42%).

- **Ethnic group:** The survey results suggest that the MDC-T's support base had become more Shona-centred than it had been in 2010 when the Ndebele constituted a slightly higher proportion of those that declared they would vote MDC-T than the Shona. The MDC-T also continues to have substantial support in the Karanga, Ndau, Zezeru and Manyika groups. ZANU-PF's support base also appears to have been in flux. The single biggest ethnic chunk of its support now seems to come from the Korekore group, followed by Shona, Zezeru, Karanga, Ndebele and Ndau. The 2012 ethnic profile of the 'vote is my secret' category is not clearly differentiated from those of the two main parties. This grouping is predominantly Shona, followed by Zezeru, Karanga, Ndebele and Manyika.
- **Nationalism:** The supporters of both these main parties see themselves by far as more 'Zimbabwean' than as a member of the ethnic group which they claimed. Twice as many respondents endorse the statement that prioritises national identity as the number that felt more ethnic than national. The respective percentage of MDC-T and ZANU-PF declared supporters that see themselves as Zimbabwean were 69% and 74%. The undeclareds follow closely, on 67% that see themselves as Zimbabweans in the first place.
- **Religion:** The MDC-T has a more religiously diverse support base than ZANU-PF. Christian, Pentecostal and Independent are the most popular religions amongst MDC-T supporters (in 2010 results Roman Catholic, Independent and Methodist dominated). The 'Independent churches' overpower the other religious denominations in ZANU-PF ranks (this is in line with 2010). Like the ZANU-PF grouping, the 'vote is my secret' cluster (2012) has Independent churches as the most eminent religious affiliation, followed by Pentecostal, Roman Catholic and Christian.
- **Age:** In terms of the 2012 results, the 18-25 year olds constitute 51% of the MDC-T's declared support base in the survey – highly similar to ZANU-PF's 48% in this age category. The similarities continue in the 36-55 year old category, where a further 35% of the MDC-T's and 34% of ZANU-PF's declared base can be found. For both parties, these trends only modestly vary compared with 2010. The 'vote is my secret' category age-wise is dominated by the two lowest age categories, jointly covering the ages 18-35 years. Each of these two categories is 24% 'my vote is my secret'.
- **Education:** The educational background profile of the declared supporters of the MDC-T and ZANU-PF remained similar across the two surveys. Both parties, as for the 'vote is my secret' category, have the bulk of their 2012 support base in the two categories of some secondary/high school completed, or in 'high school completed'. Simultaneously, the ZANU-PF support base now has a far smaller proportion of its supporters in the categories of 'no education' and more with 'some primary school'. The MDC-T retains its 2010 post-secondary education edge over ZANU-PF. The 'vote is my secret' category also has a stronger post-secondary base than ZANU-PF (although for all three party groupings the proportions are low in the overall picture).
- **Employment:** Vast majorities of the supporters of both the main parties and the undeclared voters remain unemployed. The MDC-T has 68% of its declared supporters unemployed, as it had in 2010. The 'vote is my secret' category has the best employment profile of the three groupings, namely 37% – or 63% unemployed. In the case of ZANU-PF there is a substantial

improvement in its supporters' employment status. In 2010 a total of 87% were unemployed – in 2012 this had dropped to 70%, which is effectively equal to the MDC-T's figure. A difference remains in that the MDC-T's employed supporters are more likely than those of ZANU-PF to be in full-time employment. A larger proportion of ZANU-PF's unemployed supporters than those of the MDC-T also report *never* to have been employed.

- **Province:** Table 4 details the provincial breakdown of the main parties' and undeclareds' support. On one level there appears to be a substantial shift of support from the MDC-T to ZANU-PF. On another level, however, the 'my vote is my secret' category has grown in most of the provinces, a trend that makes the MDC-T declines more ambiguous. Overall and in terms of the vote pronouncements of early July 2012 the MDC-T's 2012 survey proportions as compared with those of 2010 were down in all provinces and those of ZANU-PF rose in all provinces.

Party share of responsibility for good-very good performance in Inclusive Government

The comparison of 2010 and 2012 findings on which party is to get the most credit for good or very good aspects of IG, the MDC-T suffers a sharp decline in the level of credit its receives for its contribution. In 2010 of total of 52% of Zimbabweans reckoned that the MDC-T was the main contributor to successes – by 2012 this recognition had fallen to 15%. ZANU-PF picked up a portion of the shifting credit. There was, however, a far greater tendency in 2012 than in 2010 (up by 9 percentage points from 30 to 39%) that these two parties deserve equal credit (Q19). Amongst MDC-T supporters in 2010 a total of 87% had reckoned that the good work was mainly attributable to the MDC-T. By 2012 this was the opinion of only 44% of the MDC-T supporters (and 3% of ZANU-PF supporters). This indicates that these people's belief in their own party had been badly dented in the time of IG. This lowered percentage was nevertheless aligned with the 35% of ZANU-PF supporters that reckoned that their party deserved the main credit.

The overall trends from this question on Zimbabwe's direction support the idea – evident in several of the findings of this survey – of higher levels of national consensus than had existed before.

4: LIFE IN THE TIMES OF INCLUSIVE GOVERNMENT

Zimbabweans' experiences of life have been changed in the course of their experience of the time of Inclusive Government (IG). Expecting that IG and power-sharing have been impacting experiences, perceptions and attitudes, the survey crafted measures to assess Zimbabweans' orientations towards life in the time of IG. The measures ranged from the personal and mostly socio-economic experiences of Zimbabweans, to views on the performance of IG across different sectors, generalised assessments of the performance of IG, checking which party is more responsible for the sectoral performance ratings, and following through with assessing expectations about IG continuing post-next-election, or not.

Economic conditions – national and personal

Life for Zimbabweans has become easier and less survival-oriented in the time since the catastrophic 2008 elections, and since the introduction of IG in 2009. Zimbabweans (49%, with other assessments scattered over a range of response categories) reckon economic conditions have improved in the past year, and they have good hopes (58%) that things will be better / much better in another year's time. Another 28% consider things to be about the same as a year earlier, meaning that just a small minority feel that things have become worse.

Most serious problems Zimbabweans face

The most serious problem that Zimbabweans confront on the national level is unemployment (Table 8). On the local level, this is roughly equalled by poor services. Around two-thirds of Zimbabweans are formally unemployed, and those effects are felt strongly on the community level as well. Despite many improvements in their lives, Zimbabweans consistently still rate food shortages as one of the most pervasive problems.

Table 8: Changing hierarchies of problems experienced in the country (2010-12) and in the community of residence (2012)						
Hierarchy of most important problems	Country 2012	%	Community 2012	%	Country 2010	%
1 st problem	Unemployment	36	Poor services	24	Unemployment	23
2 nd problem	Foreign currency	15	Unemployment	21	Foreign currency	12
3 rd problem	Food shortages	12	Food shortages	18	Food shortages	9
4 th problem	Poverty	8	Poverty	7	Poor services	8
5 th problem	Bad governance	5	Bad governance	3	Bad governance	7
6 th problem	Political instability	4	Education	2	Poverty	5
7 th problem	Poor services	3	Health	2	Education	4
A wide range of other issues less frequently mentioned are not listed in this table						
Total		100		100		100
Notes: Based on Q12A (2012) and Q5A (2010): 'What is the most serious problem that Zimbabwe faces today?' And, 'What is the most serious problem that has to be addressed specifically in the community where you live?' the 2010 survey did not explore the community angle, only the country-national dimension.						

Economic conditions compared – today, yesterday and tomorrow

In a further exploration of the conditions of Zimbabweans on the ground, respondents were asked how they experience economic conditions in Zimbabwe today, how their current conditions compare with those of 12 months before, and how they reckon conditions will be 12 months ahead. All three questions were asked in relation to conditions in Zimbabwe in general, and the respondent's own living

conditions. The details in Table 9 show remarkable consistency of evaluation on the first dimension, namely of conditions as experienced 'today' from 2010 to 2012 ('A' in Table 9).

The same goes for respondents' own comparisons in how they assess conditions today as compared with 12 months before ('B' in Table 8) and their generalisations as to how well they believe things might be going 12 months down the line. This consistency of evaluation over time contrasts with the assessments that are delivered, for example, in exploration of specific sectoral areas of IG performance, also in relation to specifics of economic conditions. Illustrations of the latter are IG performance in 'making consumer goods available' and 'ensuring access to cash income' and 'distributing food relief'.

Table 9: Overall assessment of national-level and personal economic and living conditions, 2010 and 2012													
Present, past and future national and personal	Scale	Very good		Good		Neither good nor bad		Bad		Very bad		DK NS (%)	
	Year	'12	'10	'12	'10	'12	'10	'12	'10	'12	'10	'12	'10
A: Conditions as experienced today													
Economic conditions in the country today	6	1	47	51	12	19	21	18	13	9	1	2	
Own present living conditions	6	2	46	48	13	17	22	23	13	9	0	0	
		Much better (%)		Better (%)		Same (%)		Worse (%)		Much worse (%)		DK NS (%)	
B: Conditions today compared with 12 months earlier													
Economic conditions in the country	10	5	39	58	28	21	16	13	5	2	2	2	
Own present living conditions	10	6	38	54	30	25	16	13	6	2	1	1	
C: Expectations for 12 months ahead													
Economic conditions in the country	26	14	33	35	12	12	9	11	8	5	13	23	
Own present living conditions	27	14	34	34	13	15	8	11	7	4	11	22	
Notes: DK and NS refer to 'Don't know' and 'Not sure'. Based on 2012 Q9A-C and 2010 Q2A, Q3A and Q4A, 'Thinking about the economy generally and your own life in Zimbabwe ...' All 2012 figures are in bold.													

The details in the assessment of specific actions of the IG (Table 10, below) indicate that either a widespread cynicism with IG has set in, or that IG is busy stagnating now after important changes had been effected in the earlier years. Consistent with the respondents' indication of main problems that the country and they themselves face, IG is rated substantially worse now than in late 2010 on issues such as making consumer goods available and distributing food relief. The IG is doing equally poorly on impressions of attracting foreign investment. This does not necessarily mean that government is faring worse. It is possible that the deficits remain vast despite good IG performance, or that popular expectations for continuous improvement continue to rise.

Worsened assessments also emerge on political matters, such as reducing political violence. The positive thrust, however, still prevails. A total of 67% believe that the IG is doing well or very well on this front, even if it is down from around 80% in the 2010 survey. The same goes for arbitrary arrest, now a 54% positive assessment, albeit down from 66%.

Lighter load of personal deprivations

In a final set of questions to delve into Zimbabweans' conditions on the ground, the survey asked (Q13) about personal deprivations in terms of life essentials in the past year. The measure represented in Table 10 shows that life for Zimbabweans had indeed improved over several fronts on which basic quality of life is indicated. In all six areas and across the three consecutive survey measurements of 2009, 2010 and 2012 Zimbabweans report that they had experienced systematic improvements.

Type of deprivation	Several times (S) Many times (M) Always (A)	September 2009 (%)		December 2010 (%)		July 2012 (%)	
			Combined		Combined		Combined
Not enough food to eat	S	17	85	27	50	15	31
	M	43		20		12	
	A	25		3		4	
Not enough clean water for home use	S	17	49	20	43	18	42
	M	20		18		14	
	A	12		5		10	
Lack of modern medicines / - medical treatment	S	20	80	31	65	19	37
	M	32		27		13	
	A	28		7		5	
Lack of traditional medicines / - medical treatment	S	-	-	6	9	3	6
	M	-		3		2	
	A	-		0.3		1	
Not enough fuel to cook food	S	18	55	19	48	19	44
	M	22		22		14	
	A	15		7		10	
Lack of a cash income	S	10	94	19	91	26	79
	M	33		39		26	
	A	51		33		17	

Notes: Q13 (2012): 'Over the past year, how often, if ever, have you or anyone in your family, gone without ...?' (Q6) Note: The percentages represent those the levels of deprivation (the percentages of 'never' and 'once or twice' are not listed (but are implied in the percentage remainders)

On availability of food the reported deprivation level declines from 85-50-31% from 2009 to 2010 to 2012; shortage of clean water for home use declined from 49-43-42%; non-availability of modern medicines decreased from 80-65-37%; lack of access to traditional medicines (only measured in 2010 and 2012) declined from 9-6%; shortage of cooking fuel declined from 55-48-44%; and lack of cash income went down from 94-91-79%. These details show clearly that the load of deprivations suffered has been getting lighter – even if IG remains very cynically assessed in many respects.

Stagnating and declining assessments of the work of IG

IG is often still highly positively assessed – such as in the sectors of making consumer goods available and distributing food relief – despite getting substantially less positive assessments than in 2010. Also in cases where the total positive assessments (Table 11) are below 50% the positive assessments often remain higher than the negative evaluations.

Actions	Scale	Very good	Good	Same	Poor	Very poor	DK NS
	Year						
Making consumer goods available	2012	45	46	2	4	1	2
	2010	38	59	2	1	0	0
Ensuring access to cash income	2012	9	31	7	27	23	4
	2010	28	58	8	5	0	1
Distributing food relief	2012	11	31	8	21	20	10
	2010	21	47	17	7	2	6
Attracting international investment	2012	7	29	8	18	13	24
	2010	16	45	15	4	1	19
Stopping land invasions	2012	12	34	13	12	7	22
	2010	10	51	18	3	0	18
Reforming the constitution	2012	8	37	7	16	10	22
	2010	14	56	14	1	1	14
Observing the rule of law	2012	11	38	12	15	10	15
	2010	11	51	25	4	1	9
Reducing political violence	2012	23	44	7	12	7	7
	2010	20	60	13	2	0	5
Preventing arbitrary arrest	2012	14	40	9	16	7	14
	2010	13	53	18	3	0	13
Increasing freedom to speak about political matters openly	2012	11	27	9	18	26	9
	2010	9	43	34	8	1	5
Healing a broken nation	2012	17	39	10	14	10	10
	2012	12	49	24	4	1	10

Notes: DK and NS refer to 'Don't know' and 'Not sure'. Based on 2012 Q18 and 2010 Q12, 'Turning to the specifics of government performance ... how do you rate the performance of the IG with regard to the following matters? Or haven't you heard enough to know ...?' All 2012 figures are in bold; the 2010 figures are not in bold.

These assessment trends also prevail in the political domain, where the IG continues to get credit for reducing political violence and preventing arbitrary arrest. In contrast with 2010, the survey respondents are now far more critical of IG’s ability to increase freedom to speak about political matters openly. A total of 44% now reckon that the IG is doing poorly or very poorly compared with 9% in 2010. This means that even if respondents *presently* report higher levels of freedom this may be ephemeral bravado, given that the fear of state violence has not dissipated.

The range of results in this section confirms that conditions on the ground have been improving for Zimbabweans. Deprivations, however, are far from over and severe problems continue. Foremost is unemployment. The survey result indicates that two-thirds of Zimbabweans are unemployed. Of the one-third that is employed, 41% state that this is on a full-time basis (Q2). Approximately one-third of those that are unemployed also report that they have never been employed.

5: EXPLORING ASSESSMENTS OF THE INCLUSIVE GOVERNMENT

The results so far show that Zimbabweans are less enamoured with the achievement of the Inclusive Government (IG) in 2012 than they were in 2010. In some instances this is despite continuous and some substantial reported improvements in personal conditions. This section further illuminates the assessment fate of IG through measures that look at the party political share of credit for improvement in government performance, and the levels of trust in public institutions.

Relative party political contribution	Year	% rating
Equally the contribution of the MDC-T and ZANU-PF	'10	24
	'12	36
More the contribution of ZANU-PF	'10	13
	'12	16
More the contribution of the MDC-T	'10	52
	'12	15
More the contribution of other political parties	'10	2
	'12	2
Contribution of all parties equally	'10	0.4
	'12	15

Notes: Q19 (2012) and Q 13 (2010), ‘Do you believe the main political parties, ZANU-PF and MDC-T, were equally responsible for the good or very good performance/s that you just noted, was it more the contribution of one of the parties, or are other parties also to be credited?’ A fairly large number of respondents, not included in this table, felt that they did not have enough knowledge to respond to the question, hence the totals not adding up to 100.

Trust in the MDC-T and ZANU-PF and benefits of IG accruing to the main political parties

Despite many criticisms there is an overall recognition that IG has brought positive changes to Zimbabwe. The question arises of which of the two main political parties, the MDC-T or ZANU-PF receives more of the credit. This is especially given the hope that the MDC-T would grow by proving itself in government. The results show that the MDC-T has not necessarily succeeded on this score. The 2010 results showed that Zimbabweans unambiguously believe that ZANU-PF had benefitted far more from its involvement in IG than the MDC-T had.

At the time of the 2012 FH survey the MDC-T was receiving less favourable assessments than it had obtained in the earlier polls. The credit it got for its role in IG through the lens of this survey fell from 52% at the end of 2010 to 15% in July 2012 (Table 12). It was now on par with ZANU-PF whose contribution was set at 16%.

The special 2012 follow-up, measuring comparative trust in IG, ZANU-PF and the MDC-T showed IG as a great equaliser. Not only do the two main parties now balance out in the popular trust they receive, but their levels of trust also level with that of IG in general (Table 13).

Table 13: Trust in Inclusive Government and the two main parties, 2012					
<i>How much do you trust ...?</i>	A lot	Somewhat	DK / HHE	Just a little	Not at all
Inclusive government	22	31	6	25	15
MDC-T	16	35	2	32	14
ZANU-PF	24	27	2	27	19

Notes: Q61 (2012), 'In the current Zimbabwe, how much do you trust each of the following institutions ...?' The political parties were listed amongst as series of public institutions. DK denotes 'Don't know' and HHE to 'have not heard enough'. See also Table 4.

A total of 51% of respondents thus trust both the MDC-T and ZANU-PF 'a lot' or 'somewhat' – and 46% trust both these parties 'just a little' or 'not at all'. In addition, when respondents were asked where power lies in the IG, in a forced choice between the president and prime minister, Robert Mugabe's rating as main power-holder declined from 47% to 32%, whereas the estimation of Morgan Tsvangirai's power in the IG in relation to the president dropped from 4% to 3% (Q10 and Q16, respectively for 2010 and 2012).

A detailed analysis of the sentiments of the supporters of the two parties showed that ZANU-PF supporters believe a touch more than MDC-T supporters do that IG has been a success (50% compared with 46%). A total of 56% of those that keep their vote a secret reckon that that they trust the IG (only 35% of them distrust the IG). In contrast with this modest difference, 36% of MDC-T supporters (and only 25% of ZANU-PF's supporters) reckon that the IG arrangement has failed. The 'Secreters' also show a touch of their political colours in their assessments of the Office of the President (associated with ZANU-

PF) and the Office of the Prime Minister (linked to the MDC-T). A total of 54% of them trust the Office of the President somewhat or a lot (43% do not trust it); and 46% trust the Office of the Prime Minister somewhat or a lot (36% do not trust it).

Trust and cynicism on public institutions

Trust in or cynicism of public institutions often converges between the supporters of the two main parties. The comparative ratings of public institutions reflect the changing 2012 political landscape. Not only is the level of trust for some of the security forces, including the police, very high – it is also notable that many aspects of the practice of IG get credit from supporters of both the main parties. These respondents also agree on most of the attributes that they wish to see in their government. However, despite often-high levels of trust, MDC-T supporters are more cynical than their ZANU-PF counterparts of, for example, the judiciary.

All categories except ‘a lot of trust’ except for the Office of the Prime Minister see substantial rises in the proportion of Zimbabweans that trust these institutions ‘a lot’ (Table 14). This measure gives one of the clearest indicators in this survey of the problems of the MDC-T in Inclusive Government, and the likelihood that leadership problems of the party had rubbed off on the party’s project to earn party political credit for its governance efforts for the people. All of the established institutions of government gain substantially improved trust, including the military and the police. Besides the office of the Prime Minister, it is only the judiciary and the office of the Attorney General that had public trust lower than 50%.

Table 14: Changing levels of trust in public institutions, 2010 and 2012										
Public institution	A Lot		Somewhat		DK / HHE		Just a little		Not at all	
	'10	'12	'10	'12	'10	'12	'10	'12	'10	'12
Parliament	16	29	31	20	10	8	23	24	14	15
Office of the President	19	42	24	16	4	5	21	17	26	17
Office of the Prime Minister	30	26	37	22	11	9	9	23	8	15
Local government	11	28	37	25	10	4	22	22	14	18
Traditional leaders	26	35	34	23	7	7	16	15	14	16
Judiciary	-	27	-	21	-	10	-	21	-	15
Attorney general's office	-	21	-	17	-	21	-	17	-	16
Police	16	40	27	20	2	1	25	18	27	19
Military	16	41	30	20	6	3	22	14	24	20

Notes: Notes: Q61 (2012), ‘In the current Zimbabwe, how much do you trust each of the following institutions ...?’ The political parties were listed amongst as series of public institutions. DK denotes ‘Don’t know’ and HHE to ‘have not heard enough’.

Zimbabweans approval ratings of IG have remained quite stable in the 2010-12 period (Q67 and Q64, respectively). A slight decline in ‘approving’ or ‘strongly approving’ of the IG agreement brought this total to a 52% overall approval in 2012 (58% in 2010). When respondents were asked for their success-failure assessments of the period of IG in Zimbabwe, the biggest change was that those who deem it a failure, rose from 20% in 2010 to 27% in 2012 (Q8 and Q15A, respectively).

6: ELECTIONS – EXPECTATIONS AND EXPERIENCES

The FH 2012 survey delivered a range of valuable characterisations of Zimbabweans experiences and attitudes towards elections. Zimbabweans retain their love relationship with elections; elections retain their expected magical wand status. Zimbabweans overwhelmingly believe that the next election (or the next referendum) will be the definitive one that will bring all of the hoped-for changes to politics and society (see also Section 1). A probe of reasons why Zimbabweans say they will vote showed that 47% (of those that anticipate participating in the next round of elections) give as motivation that ‘this is the election that will make the difference’ (Q47B). This reason for voting was roughly twice as prevalent as its closest competitor in the hierarchy of responses.

Motivation to vote in a referendum and next election

Turnout is an essential part of any party winning an election or referendum. A substantially higher percentage of Zimbabweans than those that usually vote in elections in this survey declared their determination to cast ballots, both in the forthcoming referendum and elections. A total of 80% declared that they are ‘sure’ or ‘very sure’ that they will vote in a referendum, and 85% are ‘sure’ or ‘very sure’ that they will be casting their ballots in the next elections.

Certainty about voting or not	MDC-T		ZANU-PF		Vote is my secret	
	Referendum	Election	Referendum	Election	Referendum	Election
Very sure will vote	66	75	67	81	57	67
Note sure will vote	22	18	23	14	24	20
Neither sure nor unsure	5	4	2	2	7	7
Sure will not vote	3	2	2	1	2	2
Very sure will not vote	3	2	2	1	6	3
Don't know, refuse	1	0	3	1	4	1

Notes: Based on Q32, ‘Will you vote in a referendum? And how sure are you that you will vote, or not?’ and Q 47A, ‘If you had to decide today whether you will vote come the next round of elections, what will you decide, and how sure are you that you will vote, or not?’

The results showed only modest differences in the levels of intent to vote in a next election between the two main parties and the undeclared vote. The 'my vote is my secret' category was situated roughly halfway between the two main parties (Table 15). In all three vote groups respondents are more motivated to vote in next elections than in a referendum.

In terms of the *reasons for intending to vote* a larger proportion of ZANU-PF supporters than of the MDC-T reported that they will be voting because they have no choice, because the political principals instruct them to vote. An analysis of 'who' it is that express this sentiment reveals that it is overwhelmingly either ZANU-PF supporters or those that say their vote is their secret that report being instructed to vote. Row percentages show that 43% of these respondents are 'Secreters' and 41% ZANU-PFers. Only 8% of MDC-T supporters noted that they vote because they are told to do it. MDC-T supporters largely held the sentiment that they vote out of hope that this act will help bring change.

Voter registration

A relatively high proportion of Zimbabweans continue to claim that they are registered as voters. In 2012 a total of 77% said they are registered as voters (Q55). This compared with the 83% in the 2010 FH survey. In addition:

- Only one-quarter of these registered voters have inspected the voters roll in 'the last 12 months' to confirm that their registration details are still in order.
- Three-quarters of those who say they are currently not registered but eligible expressed intent still to go and vote in order to participate in a next election.
- The foremost reasons for currently not being registered are not being in possession of a national identity document (by far the biggest reasons, claimed by about 33% of those who are not registered), simply not being interested to register (21% of those who are not registered) and inability to get to the required place to do the registration (10% of those who are not registered).

An age disaggregation of status as registered voter reveals that there are disproportionately low levels of voter registration in the two age categories of 18-25 years and 26-35 years old – with less than half of the 18-15 year olds registered at the time of the survey. The specifics for the age categories are:

- 18-25 year olds: 44% registered
- 26-35 year olds: 77% registered
- 36-45 year olds: 91% registered
- 46-55 year olds: 93% registered
- 56-65 year olds: 97% registered
- 66 years and older: 93% registered

A dissection of the age categories *and party vote* shows that of the 18-25 year olds, only 17% at the time of the survey declared their intent to support the MDC-T in elections that would have taken place on the

day following the survey. The comparative figure for ZANU-PF was 31% and 36% in the category of the 'Secreters'. A similar trend was manifested for the 26-35 year olds. Here the MDC-T got 24% and ZANU-PF 29%, while 35% in this age category declared that their vote was their secret.

Further demographic breakdowns show that of those who are registered 51% are women and 49% men; and 35% of the registered voters are in urban areas (with the balance of 65% in the rural areas).

Growing expectations of free and fair elections

Zimbabweans have had many traumatic experiences with elections ... yet optimism rules. The 2012 wave of optimism is at least partially rooted in that Zimbabweans have experienced somewhat lessened levels of political oppression and politically-related personal violence in recent times.

A total of 35% in this survey (compared with 16% in 2010; Table 13) now believe that the next round of elections will be completely free and fair. This category of responses has largely fed off the grouping that had previously expected major problems in an election that would hardly amount to free and fair. In a direct comparison (middle section of Table 16) 55% and 57% now believe that the 2012 elections will be more free and fair than those of March and June 2008, respectively.

Table 16:							
Expectations of 'free and fair' for the next round of Zimbabwean elections							
How free and fair do you expect the next general elections to be? (%)							
Not free & fair at all		Hardly free & fair, major problems		Free & fair with minor problems		Completely free & fair	
2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
10	16	25	12	30	32	16	35
Compared with March 2008, the next round of elections will be ... (%)							
More free & fair		Less free & fair		No difference			
2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012		
43	55	15	13	24	13		
Compared with June 2008, the next round of elections will be ... (%)							
More free & fair		Less free & fair		No difference			
2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012		
46	57	17	13	19	10		
Note: Table does not report on 'don't know' or 'refuse' responses. Based on Q50A-C, 2012.							

Row percentage analysis shows comparable trends on beliefs in the free and fairness of the next elections between the 'Secreters' and supporters of ZANU-PF. Of those who believe that the next elections will be completely free and fair, 45% are ZANU-PF supporters and 32% 'Secreters'. Only 16% of the MDC-T supporters share this belief. The single biggest block for the MDC-T is its 39% that reckon

that the next elections will not be free and fair at all (compared with the 23% for ZANU-PF and 18% of 'Secreters').

Experiences and expectations of electoral violence

Expectations of free and fair elections already suggest that Zimbabweans have high hopes that the next round of elections will allow the free expression of political preferences, and even free campaigning.

The survey findings bear out observations that Zimbabwe has been a relatively peaceful place in the past two years. Respondents' reports on violence and intimidation in the communities where they live decreased from 58% reporting 'yes, there have been cases ...' in the 2010 survey to 22% in 2012 (Table 17).

Response	Incidents from 2008-2010 in my community (%)	Incidents from 2010-2012 in my community (%)
Yes	58	22
No	39	76
Don't know, Not sure, Refuse	2	2

Notes: Q43 in 2012 and Q50 in 2010, 'In the years ___ to ___, have there been cases of politically motivated violence and intimidation in your community?'

Statements	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
	Strongly agree (%)		Agree (%)		Disagree (%)		Strongly disagree (%)	
Violence & intimidation were bad in the past, but nowadays we feel free to express political views	10	22	21	28	30	20	24	17
Our experiences of violence & intimidation mean that perpetrators nowadays need only threaten violence to bring fear back to life again	28	22	36	34	12	18	5	7
The youth militia & war veterans look after the good interests of the people of Zimbabwe	4	14	12	18	27	17	36	33
Each time Zimbabwe comes to important political decisions, violence & intimidation surface	37	39	39	33	7	9	3	3
Fear of violence & intimidation makes people vote for parties/candidates other than those they prefer	49	42	25	24	10	9	3	11

Question: 'People are saying different things about intimidation in the current era in Zimbabwe. Which of the following statements do you agree or disagree with?' Q41 in 2011 and Q47 in 2010.

Table 18 further illustrates that Zimbabweans report experiencing substantially less violence in 2012 than they have in the 2009 and 2010 FH surveys. A total of 50% agree (or strongly agree) that there is higher freedom in 2012 to express their political views. A smaller proportion reckons that just a threat is sufficient to bring back fear. Yet, other violence-and-intimidation characteristics remain in full force. There is consistency in the level of belief that violence and intimidation surface when Zimbabwe comes to important political decisions to be made, and that violence and intimidation impact electoral choice.

In a further elaboration of who in terms of party association continue to fear most for political reasons, the party split in the responses to items in Table 18 show that:

- A total of 49% of MDC-Ts and 43% of those that keep their intended vote a secret (compared with 22% of ZANU-PFers) disagree or disagree strongly that 'violence and intimidation were bad in the past but nowadays we feel free to express our political views'.
- Similarly, 85% of MDC-Ts and 76% of 'Secreters' agree or agree strongly that violence and intimidation surface in Zimbabwe each time that the country approaches important political decisions (compared with 55% of the ZANU-PFers).
- Stronger differentiation between MDC-Ts and 'Secreters' set in when they are asked about violence and intimidation making people vote for parties or candidates 'other than those they prefer'. A total of 81% of MDC-Ts agree or agree strongly, while 69% of 'Secreters' and 52% of ZANU-PFers do. Differentiation is most evident when it comes to opinion on youth militia and war veterans (associated with ZANU-PF) and the statement that they 'look after the good interests of the people of Zimbabwe'. Here 83% of MDC-Ts disagreed or disagreed strongly. The corresponding percentages for ZANU-PFers are 26% and for 'Secreters' a mid-way 50%.
- Furthermore and similarly for all three party categories, 58% of MDC-Ts, 56% of 'Secreters' and 56% of 'Secreters' all recognise that just a threat nowadays is indeed enough to bring fear back to life again.

Recollections of experiences of political violence will vary over time, especially if a longer period of recollection time is at stake. This is evident in Table 19. The broad trends remain indefatigable and valuable, especially when the personal experiences of the previous rounds of assessment are compared with the 2012 survey results. This presents a wall of evidence of the range and levels of political violence that have affected Zimbabweans.

Despite the prevailing optimism 73% of the 2012 respondents agreed with the statement that 'each time Zimbabwe comes to important decisions to be made, violence and intimidation surface' (Q47D). In addition, 65% agreed or strongly agreed that 'fear of violence and intimidation makes people vote for parties or candidates other than the ones they prefer'. Only 19% disagreed or disagreed strongly.

Zimbabweans have no illusions as to the reasons for political violence. In an open-ended question (and a series of inter-related responses) in 2012, 48% identified political clashes / party political conflict as the primary reason; 18% noted intolerance of political differences as the main reason, along with 11% that identified greed for political power and 8% the parties' misuse of supporters as the main reason.

Table 19:**Exposure to politically motivated incidents of violence and intimidation since 1980**

Acts of politically motivated violence, force, intimidation	Personal exposure (%)		Exposure of family members (%)				Merged (%)			
	2009		2010		2009		2010		2012	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Intimidation, threat, harassment	35	37	35	65	39	33	44	51	40	60
Theft, damage to personal property	12	60	13	87	18	54	25	69	19	80
Denial of food or starvation	17	55	15	85	18	53	21	73	19	80
Forced removal from home, land	9	63	7	93	16	55	17	78	14	86
Closure of business	7	65	4	96	10	62	9	85	12	88
Loss of a job	7	65	5	95	14	86	11	82	13	87
Arrest, kidnap or 'abduction'	6	66	6	94	13	59	29	64	20	80
Personal injury, incl. rape, torture	12	60	10	90	22	50	38	54	28	72
Witnessed someone killed, injured	27	45	35	65	24	46	7	29	42	58

Notes: Based on Q39 (2012), 'Thinking about the period since independence in 1980, please tell me whether you personally / members of your family were ever affected in any of the following ways – refer only to events that were politically motivated', Q44 in 2009 and Q45 in 2010.

A dissection (Table 20) of which of the political party-undeclared categories suffered most under the measures explored in Table 19 shows clearly that it is those of the MDC-T that disproportionate experiences of the range of forms of violence that have been used on citizens of Zimbabwe. The details demonstrate that the experiences-of-violence profile of the undeclared (and specifically those who say that their vote is their secret) are much closer to the levels reported by ZANU-PF supporters than by the MDC-Ts. Fear of violence is thus not indicated as *the* reason for refusing to disclose party support.

Table 20:**Politically motivated incidents of violence and intimidation since 1980 reported by party association, 2012**

<i>Respondent personally or members of family have suffered ...</i>	MDC-T supporters (%)	ZANU-PF supporters (%)	Undeclared – Vote is my secret (%)
Intimidation, threat or Harassment	60	32	35
Personal injury incl. physical/sexual assault, torture	45	23	25
Witnessed someone else being injured or killed	66	36	35

Notes: Based on three of the most drastic items in Q39 (2012), 'Thinking about the period since independence in 1980, please tell me whether you personally / members of your family were ever affected in any of the following ways – refer only to events that were politically motivated'.

Disproportionate fear in the life of MDC-T supporters

The current political environment – Zimbabweans’ perceptions of it – appears somewhat less fear-inducing than in the past (point subject to a specific 2010-12 comparison). The results show that MDC-T supporters, more than their ZANU-PF counterparts, report the continuation of fearfulness in making known their political positions. This factor thus does remain continuously important.

The three measures in Q37 clearly differentiate MDC-T supporters from those of ZANU-PF. The Undeclareds whose votes are their secret (Table 21) have higher fear levels than the ZANU-PF category, but are less fearful than their MDC-T counterparts. Whereas fear of violence and intimidation for political reasons (whether in daily lives or in election campaigns) are certainly also present amongst the rank-and-file of ZANU-PF, there are quite consistently close to double the percentage of MDC-T supporters than of ZANU-PF that report that one ‘always’ had to be careful about what one says about politics, about fearing intimidation in election campaigns, and fearing intimidation in daily lives.

The data show that the undeclared category of voters, and in particular those who say their vote is their secret, are less fearful of intimidation than their MDC-T counterparts (Table 20). For example, 60% of MDC-T supporters say they or members of their family have experienced intimidation, threat or harassment (compared with 32% from ZANU-PF and 35% ‘Secreters’). On having suffered personal injury for political reasons, 45% of the MDC-Ts say they have suffered this (compared with 23% from ZANU-PF and 25% ‘Secreters’). This suggests that fear is not a sufficient reason to explain non-declaration of party support intentions.

Table 21: Fear of political intimidation in daily lives and election campaigns, 2012				
Acts of political intimidation	Frequency	MDC-T (%)	ZANU-PF (%)	Undeclared (%)
<i>People have to ...</i>				
Be careful about what they say about politics	Often	34	28	33
	Always	45	30	44
Fear political intimidation during election campaigns	Often	22	23	16
	Always	63	45	61
Fear political intimidation as they go about their daily lives	Often	28	18	19
	Always	26	13	30
Notes: Table contents single out two of the five response categories on Q37, ‘In this country, how often do people ...’ The three block of vertical percentages thus do not, respectively, add up to 100%. The bulk of the responses were in these two categories. Undeclared in this table refers to the respondents who elect to keep their vote a secret.				

The comparison over time nevertheless shows declines in levels of fear and intimidation:

- In 2012 a total of 63% of MDC-T supporters and 45% of those of ZANU-P declared that people always have to fear political intimidation in election campaigns. In 2010 81% of the MDC-T supporters and 51% of those from ZANU-PF reported this, then higher, level of fear associated with election campaigns. It shows that the MDC-T supporters far more than those of ZANU-PF see an easing up in levels of fear due to intimidation.
- In 2012 45% of the MDC-T supporters and 30% ZANU-PF noted that people one always have to be careful about what they say about politics. The respective 2010 percentages were 56% and 33% -- again indicating that MDC-T supporters at the time of the 2012 survey felt a change in fear climate far more than their ZANU-PF counterparts.
- This broad trend also extends to the measure of 'always fear political intimidation in daily lives'. The MDC-Ts' percentage declined from 40% to 26% and ZANU-PFers from 20% to 13% and 26% (13% ZANU-PF) that one always has to fear intimidation as one goes about one's daily life.

Timing of the next elections

Zimbabweans show that their preferences for when the next elections should be held move with the times and the associated political debates. By 2012 there was quite a spread of opinions, yet the bulk went with the protocol that elections need to be preceded by the finalisation of the constitution-making process, its subjugation to a referendum, and with the next election then to follow towards the middle of 2013 (Table 22).⁵ In comparison, in 2010 respondents felt that elections the following year, 2011, would be appropriate. In 2009, closer to the upheavals of the 2008 elections, respondents favoured 'immediate' next elections, or elections at least within one year.

Table 22:					
Desired timing for the next election, 2009, 2010 and 2012 surveys					
Desired timing in the 2012 survey (%)					
Immediately	Sept-Dec '12	Jan-March' 13	April-June '13	Other	DK, NS, R
12	12	17	34	11	14
Desired timing in the 2010 survey (%)					
Immediately	2011	2012	2013	Other	DK, NS, R
11	46	8	8	13	15
Desired timing in the 2009 survey (%)					
Immediately	Within 1 year	Within 2 years	Within 3 years	Within 5 years	DK, NS, R
31	25	17	5	15	7
Question: 'In your opinion, when should the next presidential and parliamentary elections be held?' Q45 in 2012 and Q14A in 2010.					

⁵ By August 2012 there were varied opinions in Zimbabwe's political circles as to whether there may be an extension beyond June 2013. Some averred that the president would have three months leeway to implement elections proclaimed by mid-2012; others noted that the President tended to not proclaim virtually at will, as had been the case, for example, in the vacancies in the prevailing parliament. The formal position remained 'not later than June 2013'.

Opinions were mixed on Zimbabwean’s readiness for elections (Q46A-B), especially on the questions whether they were ready at the time of the survey – 38% thought they were ready, 21% that they were not quite ready, and 29% that they were not ready at all. In contrast by far the largest block of respondents, 45% said that the Zimbabwean people will be ready for elections in the first half of 2013. This response was in a probe of the respondents who felt Zimbabwe was not ready yet for elections in 2012. A further 30% were thus excluded from the question, which makes this a strong endorsement of the 2013 timing of elections.

7: POLITICAL INTEREST AND MEDIA USE

The political and socio-economic attitudes reported all have their base in information and experiences, and the opinions and interpretations by the other sources. The extent to which any individual or group expose themselves to information, including others’ opinions, depend on factors such as interest in public affairs, the availability of information, and ability to access sources of information. The current section thus explores multiple dimensions of political interest and media use. It includes details and trends on interest in public affairs, expressions of political interest such as direct communication with other people, the use of a range of media, and trust in the sources that are used for information on public affairs.

Interest in public affairs

Zimbabweans are showing a growing interest in public affairs, with respondents mostly moving out of the mid-response category of ‘not very interested’. Those who are interested or very interested rose from 42% (2010) to 51% (2012) (Table 19). The 2012 figure, however, is still more modest than the very high levels of interest that had prevailed in 2009.

‘How interested are you in public affairs?’				How often do you discuss politics when you get together with friends, family or neighbours?			
Reported level of interest	2009 (%)	2010 (%)	2012 (%)	Frequency of discussions	2009 (%)	2010 (%)	2012 (%)
Not interested at all	15	20	22	Never	19	25	29
Not very interested	27	39	27	Sometimes	62	58	47
Somewhat interested	38	28	26	Often	19	16	23
Very interested	21	14	25				

Note: ‘Don’t know’, ‘not sure’ and refuse are not reported in this table, Based on Q69A (2012), ‘How interested are you in public affairs?’ and Q69B (2012; Q 76 in 2010), ‘When you get together with close people such as friends, family or neighbours, how often do you discuss political matters?’

Another indicator of interest in public affairs is discussions with friends, family or neighbours that are close to the respondent. The responses show modest polarisation (Table 239), with increases in the categories of both ‘never’ and ‘always’, along with the depletion of the ‘sometimes’ mid-option. The increase in interest exceeds the decrease on the other end of the continuum.

Media use

Besides using personal sources of information and opinion on public matters, many Zimbabweans depend on public and private mass media that are electronic, print or based on mobile phone technology (Table 24). Overall levels of consistency in media uses from 2010-12 are very high. Radio use shows a mild decline, and television and newspapers small increases in usage. The internet retains its previously very modest use and cell-based technology establishes a small presence.

Table 24: Frequency of media use for news about government and politics, 2010-12										
News source	Frequency in percentage (%)									
	Every day		Few times a week		Few times a month		Few times a year		Never	
	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Radio	28	26	24	26	11	14	2	4	35	30
Television	18	20	16	17	8	11	4	5	54	46
Newspapers	9	8	14	18	13	17	4	7	60	51
Internet*	2	2	4	3	3	2	1	1	91	92
Internet-cell	-	4	-	4	-	2	-	1	-	89
Text messages	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	95

Notes: Question: ‘How often do you get news about matters of government and politics from radio / television / newspapers / the internet?’ * In 2012 was converted to ‘Internet-computer’.

Radio: A total of 70% (65% in 2010) of Zimbabweans report that they use radio (even if infrequently) for news about politics and public affairs. The three most commonly used 2012 radio sources were, in descending order, for the total of radio use for public affairs-political news:⁶

- ZBC’s Radio Zimbabwe – 45%
- ZBC’s Power FM – 12%
- VOA Studio 7 – 7%

⁶ Respondents were asked: ‘Which radio station do you most commonly listen to for news on politics and public affairs?’ (or, ‘which television station do you most commonly watch ...’, ‘which newspaper do you most commonly use ...’, and ‘which internet news sites do you most commonly use ...?’) (Q70A-D).

The top three radio stations for 2010 were ZBC Radio Zimbabwe – 35%, VOA Studio 7 – 14% and ZBC Power FM – 9%. A total of 41% of the MDC-T’s declared 2012 supporters rely on ZBC’s Radio Zimbabwe for their news; as do 58% of ZANU-PF’s declared supporters. A further 15% of the MDC-T also use ZBC’s Power FM. 15% of the MDC-T’s supporters are exposed to public affairs on VOA Studio 7. The undeclareds use radio slightly less frequently for news on public matters than their declared counterparts.

Television: As in 2010, 54% of respondents said that they never access television for news on politics and public affairs. The most commonly used television stations-channels in 2012 for public affairs-political news were:

- ZBC TV – 35%
- SABC TV – 12%
- France 24 – 2%

The top three television sources for 2010 were ZBC TV – 24%, SABC TV– 18% and eTV – 0.9%. As in the case of radio, MDC-T supporters in 2012 use predominantly the same television news sources as their ZANU-PF counterparts. 32% of the MDC-T’s declared supporters now use ZBC TV for their information, as do 39% of ZANU-P’s supporters. In contrast with radio, the undeclareds are more inclined than the declared supporters of ZANU-PF to use television for news on public matters, but are still less exposed than the declared MDC-T supporters.

Newspapers: Newspapers also constitute an important source of news on politics-public affairs, albeit only for 50% of the population. Dire economic conditions, and specifically the scarcity of ‘foreign’ currency (by now *the* Zimbabwe currency), probably continued to contribute. The most widely used newspapers in 2012 for public affairs news were:

- *The Herald* – 23%
- *Daily News* – 7%
- *The NewsDay* – 5%
- *The Chronicle* – 5%
- *The Sunday Mail* – 4%

The top public affairs newspaper sources for 2010 were *The Herald* – 17%, *The NewsDay* – 7%, and *The Chronicle* – 6%, *Zimbabwe Independent* – 3% and *The Sunday Mail* – 2%. There is not much more differentiation in newspaper use of the supporters of the two main parties. MDC-T supporters in 2012 again converge with their counterparts in that 19% of them use *The Herald* as a source (27% ZANU-PF), along with 12% for the *Daily News* (2% ZANU-PF), 9% *NewsDay* (2% ZANU-PF) and 7% *The Chronicle* (3% ZANU-PF). On the newspaper usage front as well, the undeclareds have a higher frequency of use than ZANU-PF supporters; they come close to but do not exceed the usage level of the MDC-T supporters.

Internet sites: Internet news sites have established a consistent yet very small base for information on politics and public affairs in Zimbabwe. A total of 13% of respondents reported their use of this source. In contrast with 2010, when the survey showed that it was predominantly a news information source for

supporters of the MDC-T, the 2012 results showed that the number of ZANU-PF supporters using this source now exceeded the number for the MDC-T. It was possible that some of the internet-using MDC-T supporters had switched party allegiance, besides ZANU-PFers perhaps converting to it. The trend is associated with the ascendance of the ZANU-PF associated *The Herald's* online news site into the prime slot. The most commonly used sites in 2012 were:

- The Herald Online –3%
- NewZimbabwe. Com – 1%
- The NewsDay online – 1%
- Zimbabwe Situation.com – 1%
- Daily News online – 1%

This compares with 2010's top three in Newzimbabwe.com – 2%, Zimdaily.com – 2%, Zimbabwe.com – 2% and Zimonline – 2%.

Cell and computer news usages: Only 17% of Zimbabweans in this survey reported that they never use a cell phone, giving 83% of use (compared with the 67% in 2010, pointing to the rapid diffusion of cell phones in Zimbabwe since late 2010). Besides phone calls, the most common usage is to text (64%), access news sites (9%) and to check emails (8%).

With regard to computers, only 13% of Zimbabweans report that they have access to a computer. 10% write documents on their computers, 8% use computers for email, 5% do public affairs searches and 4% use computers for social media.

Source	Party	Strongly trust (%)		Trust (%)		Neither (%)		Distrust (%)		Strongly distrust (%)	
		Party	Total	Party	Total	Party	Total	Party	Total	Party	Total
Radio	MDC-T	18	22	30	26	14	13	12	7	5	3
	ZANU-P	33		27		11		2		1	
	UD (S)	17		25		15		8		3	
TV	MDC-T	12	14	28	22	11	10	7	4	4	2
	ZANU-P	18		19		8		2		1	
	UD (S)	12		21		13		5		2	
News-papers	MDC-T	12	12	28	21	13	10	6	4	2	2
	ZANU-P	17		17		6		2		1	
	UD (S)	10		20		13		5		2	
Inter-net	MDC-T	6	3	8	5	3	3	2	1	1	1
	ZANU-P	2		4		3		1		0	
	UD (S)	3		5		3		2		1	

Notes: Q6, 2012, 'About these news sources that you most commonly use for your news on politics and current affairs, do you trust the news that you receive ...?' In order to keep the perspective on the proportions of the population that do not use some of the categories of media, the percentage in this tables were not rebased. The penetration level of the four media in this table is 70% for radio, 53% for television, 50% for newspapers and 14% for internet sources. UD (S)= Undeclared (my vote is my secret).

Trust in the sources that are used for information on public affairs

The exploration of trust in the media sources that are mostly commonly used for news on politics and public affairs shows that radio – and that would largely be ZBC radio – is very well trusted by ZANU-PF supporters. They are less trusting of TV, but then emerge on approximately the same level of trust of the newspaper sources as their MDC-T counterparts do. MDC-Ts are substantially less trusting of their radio news sources than those from ZANU-PF, yet still show a reasonably high level of trust, namely 48%. The undeclareds patterns of trust in the media that they use run closer to the MDC-T levels than those of ZANU-PF (Table 25).

These trends indicate that supporters of a particular party, or the undeclareds, sometimes obviously for lack of options, use information sources that are linked to the opposing political party. The sometimes low levels of trust indicate that information will be filtered. Yet, it simultaneously means that there is harder work involved to sift through the information received.

Table 21 illustrates the extent to which sources of news that are used by Zimbabweans are differentially trusted by the supporters of ZANU-PF and the MDC-T and by the undeclareds. The widening range of media sources that are available to Zimbabweans also mean that they are enabled to be more selective in the coverage to which they expose themselves. A continuous lack of accessible alternative or independent broadcasting stations nevertheless meant that ZANU-PF continued to dominate the airways in disseminating its take on political developments.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

NATIONWIDE SURVEY OF PUBLIC OPINION IN ZIMBABWE FHSA / MPOI SURVEY – JUNE 2012

Note: The following is a summary of the questionnaire used in the survey. This appendix excludes, for example, response options and instructions to interviewers, including so-called 'skip- instructions.

Section 1: Demographic Information and Media Use

What is your age?

Q1: [Record gender.]

Q2A: Are you employed? Q2B: Are you employed part-time or full-time? Q2C: Are you employed in the formal sector, or informally? Q2D: For how long have you been unemployed now?

Q3: What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Q4: How often do you get news about matters of government and politics from the following media sources?

Q5: Which of these media do you most commonly use for news on politics and current affairs? Q5A: Specifically, which radio station do you most commonly listen to for news on politics and current affairs? Q5B: Which television station do you most commonly watch for news on politics and current affairs? Q5C: Which newspaper do you most commonly use for news on politics and current affairs? Q5D: Which internet news site do you most commonly use for news on politics and current affairs?

Q6: About these news sources that you most commonly use for your news on politics and current affairs, do you trust the news that you receive from this source?

Q7A: How often do you use a cell phone? Please estimate. Q7B: Which of the following do you use your cell phone for? Q7C: How often do you use a computer? Q7D: Which of the following do you use the computer for?

Section 2: General Socio-political-economic Directions in Zimbabwe

Q8A: How do you feel about the general direction in which Zimbabwe is moving? Is Zimbabwe moving in a right or a wrong direction? Q8B: What is the one most important thing that makes you feel Zimbabwe is moving in a right direction? Q8C: What is the one most important thing that makes you feel Zimbabwe is moving in a wrong direction? Q8D: What is the one most important thing that makes you feel Zimbabwe is moving in both directions? Q8E: What is the one most important thing that makes you feel Zimbabwe is not moving at all?

Q9A: Thinking of the economy generally and your own life at present in Zimbabwe, how do you describe ...? Q9A (i): The present economic condition of this country? Q9A (ii): Your own present living conditions? Q9B(i): Economic conditions in this country today, compared to twelve months ago? Q9B: Looking back, how do you rate ...?

Q9B(ii): And how would you rate your own living conditions today, compared to twelve months ago? **Q9C:** Looking ahead, do you expect ...? **Q9C(i):** The country's economic conditions to be better or worse in twelve months time? **Q9C(ii):** Your own living conditions to be better or worse in twelve months time?

Q10: Talking specifically about the future and how things are unfolding in Zimbabwe. Do you ... ?

Q11: How much hope or doubt do you have that each of the next four processes will take Zimbabwe to a better future? **Q11A:** Inclusive Government (IG); **Q11B:** Constitution-making process; **Q11C:** Referendum; **Q11D:** Next set of national elections.

Q12A: Let's talk about the problems that Zimbabwe faces today ... Which would *you say* is the most serious problem that Zimbabwe faces today? **Q12B:** Which would *you say* is the most serious problem that has to be addressed specifically in the community where you live?

13: Over the last twelve months, how often, if ever, have you or anyone in your family gone without: **Q13A:** Enough food to eat? **Q13B:** Enough clean water for home use? **Q13C:** Modern medicines or modern medical treatment? **Q13D:** Traditional medicines or traditional medical treatment? **Q13E:** Enough fuel to cook your food? **Q13F:** A cash income?

Section 3: Inclusive Government (IG)

Q14: Thinking about how you are feeling today, do you approve or disapprove of the agreement among Zimbabwe's political leaders to share power and form the Inclusive Government (IG)?

Q15A: Has the approximately 3 years of the Inclusive Government (IG) been a success or a failure? How much of a success or failure? **Q15B:** How much do you agree or disagree with the next two statements? **Q15B(i):** Power-sharing in government between the main parties has brought stability to Zimbabwe. **Q15B(ii):** Power-sharing in government between the main parties has failed to bring peace to Zimbabwe.

Q16: In your opinion, and considering where things stand at this time in 2012, where does political power reside in Zimbabwe's Inclusive Government (IG)?

Q17: When the President exercises power, how often does he depend on the help of the security forces?

Q18: Turning to specifics of government performance on some of the issues we have raised, how do you rate the performance of the Inclusive Government with regard to the following matters? Or haven't you heard enough [HHE] to know, or don't you know [DK]? **Q18A:** Making consumer goods available; **Q18B:** Ensuring access to cash income; **Q18C:** Reducing political violence; **Q18D:** Preventing arbitrary arrest; **Q18E:** Stopping land invasions; **Q18F:** Reforming the Constitution; **Q18G:** Distributing food relief; **Q18H:** Attracting international investment; **Q18I:** Observing the rule of law; **Q18J:** Healing a broken nation.

Q19: Do you believe the main political parties, ZANU-PF and MDC-T, were equally responsible for the good or very good performance/s that you noted, was it more the contribution of one of the parties, or were other parties also involved?

Q20: How do you feel about the order in which elections and constitution-making happen? Choose between the statements.

Q21: Let us further explore how the two main political parties have changed in the time of IG. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? **Q21A:** ZANU-PF demonstrated willingness to cede some power. **Q21B:** The MDC-T showed that it can perform well in government. **Q21C:** ZANU-PF recovered to ready itself for an electoral

comeback. **Q21D:** The MDC-T got too close to ZANU-PF. **Q21E:** The MDC-T failed to take power from ZANU-PF. **Q21F:** The MDC-T and ZANU-PF were exposed as equally corrupt.

Section 4: Constitutional Reform

Q22: Have you ever heard of ... **Q22A:** The current Constitution of Zimbabwe (the Lancaster House Constitution)? **Q22B:** The process that has been taking place to make a new Constitution? **Q22C:** The preliminary draft Constitution that has come out of the COPAC process?

Q23: Do you believe or do you doubt that the current constitution-making process will be delivering a constitution that will take Zimbabwe forward to democracy?

Q24: In which forums, and with which types of people, *if any*, have you discussed Zimbabwe's unfolding constitution-making process? Please name all of the places or people ...

Q25: How likely do you think it is that citizens' views collected during the outreach will be reflected in the new Constitution?

Q26: Let us talk further about the current constitution-making process in Zimbabwe. Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. **Q26A:** It is time just to get the new Constitution adopted and let a new government get on with the job. **Q26B:** Zimbabweans are tired of being consulted on constitutional matters when the politicians decide as they like anyway. **Q26C:** The current COPAC is producing a Constitution that will be good for democracy and human rights in Zimbabwe. **Q26D:** Even the smartest Constitution cannot in itself bring Zimbabweans a good-willed government. **Q26E:** The new Constitution will only bring change if it ends the alliance between the President and the security forces.

Q27: When you think about the ongoing constitution-making process, how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? **Q27A:** A handful of political leaders are making deals about the constitution, forgetting about the people's inputs that were gathered. **Q27B:** What we say about the contents of the new Constitution will not affect our economic livelihoods.

Q28: Which of the following statements is closest to your view? In each case choose Statement 1 or Statement 2. Or haven't you heard enough about this issue to form an opinion? Do you agree or agree very strongly? 1. Zimbabweans that have lived outside of the country for a considerable time but still want to vote must have the right to vote. 2. Zimbabweans that have been living outside the country for a considerable time forfeit their right to participate in elections. **Q29A:** 1. If the parents of people born in Zimbabwe were not also born in the country, their children must be disqualified from being Zimbabwean citizens. 2. The Constitution should award all people citizenship by birth, irrespective of where their parents were born. **Q29B:** 1. If the parents of people born in Zimbabwe were not also born in the country, their children must be disqualified from being Zimbabwean citizens. . The Constitution should award all people citizenship by birth, irrespective of where their parents were born. **Q30:** 1. National government must have the final say on all government matters, and must not hand important powers over to the provinces. 2. The central government must grant powers to provinces so that they can take decisions that are in the interests of the people of the province. **Q31:** 1. People can be good Zimbabwean citizens even if they also are citizens of another country. 2. People must show undivided loyalty to Zimbabwe by renouncing other citizenships they hold.

Q32: Will you vote in the referendum? And how sure are you that you will vote, or not?

Q33: You said you are sure / very sure that you WILL VOTE in the referendum. Please share with me why you are sure of this. What is the main reason why you believe you would participate?

Q34: You said you are sure / very sure that you will NOT vote come the referendum. Please help me understand why you feel this way. What is the main reason why you do not wish to participate?

Section 5: Violence and Intimidation

Q35: Which of the following statements is closest to your view? Choose Statement 1 or Statement 2.

Do you agree or agree very strongly? 1. Whenever politics is involved, violence is inevitable. 2. Politics need not be dangerous ... people can learn how to work together in peaceful ways.

Q36: Which of the following statements is closest to your view? Choose Statement 1 or 2. *Do you agree or agree very strongly?* 1. In Zimbabwe it is sometimes necessary to use violence in support of a just cause. 2. The use of violence is never justified in Zimbabwean politics.

Q37: In this country, how often do people ... **Q37A:** Have to be careful about what they say about politics? **Q37B:** Have to fear political intimidation during election campaigns? **Q37C:** Have to fear political intimidation as they go about their daily lives?

Q38: What would you do if you were violently and physically attacked by a supporter of another political party?

Q39: Thinking about the period since independence in 1980, please tell me if YOU PERSONALLY OR MEMBERS OF YOUR IMMEDIATE FAMILY were ever affected in any of the following ways. Refer only to events that were POLITICALLY MOTIVATED: **Q39A:** Intimidation, threat or harassment; **Q39B:** Theft of (or damage to) your personal property; **Q39C:** Denial of food or starvation [*Remind respondent: For POLITICAL reasons*]; **Q39D:** Forced removal from your home or confiscation of land; **Q39E:** The closure of a business; **Q39F:** The loss of a job [*Remind respondent: For POLITICAL reasons*]; **Q39G:** Arrest, kidnap or abduction; **Q39H:** Personal injury (including, physical assault, sexual assault or torture); **Q39I:** Witnessed someone else being injured or killed.

Q40: Looking at the situation in Zimbabwe today, please tell me how safe or unsafe you feel in the following situations: **Q40A:** Going about day-to-day daytime activities; **Q40B:** Sleeping at night; **Q40C:** Walking around at night; **Q40D:** Meeting strangers; **Q40E:** Meeting policemen; **Q40F:** Meeting security personnel, other than the police.

Q41: People are saying different things about intimidation in the current era in Zimbabwe. Which of the following statements do you disagree or agree with? **Q41A:** Violence and intimidation were bad in the past, but nowadays we feel free to express our political views. **Q41B:** Our experiences of violence and intimidation mean that perpetrators nowadays need only *threaten* violence to bring fear back to life again. **Q41C:** The youth militia and war veterans look after the good interests of the people of Zimbabwe. **Q41D:** Each time Zimbabwe comes to important political decisions to be made, violence and intimidation surface. **Q41E:** Fear of violence and intimidation makes people vote for parties or candidates other than the ones they prefer.

Q42: What do YOU see as the *most important reason* for the violence and intimidation, where this occurs in the communities?

Q43: In the years 2010 to June 2012, have there been cases of politically motivated violence and intimidation in your community?

Q44A: In your experience, who has been most likely to be involved, as perpetrators, in political violence in your community in the period from 2010 to 2012, the present? **Q44B:** In your experience in general, who in your community or with influence over your community, has the power to stop the violence that has affected Zimbabwe since 2000? *Name as many as you think have this power.*

Section 6: Elections, Voting, Registration and Public Institutions

Q45: In your opinion, when should the next presidential and parliamentary elections be held?

Q46A: In your opinion, are the Zimbabwean people ready for elections right now? Please tell me how ready or not ready you believe they are right now. **Q46A:** In your opinion, are the Zimbabwean people ready for elections right now? Please tell me how ready or not ready you believe they are right now. **Q46B:** In your opinion, will the Zimbabwean people be ready for elections in the first half of 2013? Please tell me how ready or not ready you believe they will be then.

Q47A: If you *had to decide today* whether you will vote come the next round of elections, what will you decide? And how sure are you that you will vote, or not? **Q47B:** You said you are sure / very sure that you WILL VOTE come the next round of elections. Please share with me why you are sure of this. What is the main reason why you believe you will go and vote? **Q47C:** You said you are sure / very sure that you will NOT VOTE come the next round of elections. Please help me understand why you feel this way. What is the main reason why you do not wish to go and vote? **Q47D:** Is there anything that could make you change your mind and decide *not to vote*? Please tell me what it is that could make you change your mind in this way. **Q47E:** Is there anything that could make you change your mind and decide *to vote*? Please tell me what it is that could make you change your mind in this way.

Q48: In your opinion, what is the *most important thing* that needs to change BEFORE Zimbabwe embarks on a next round of national elections?

Q49: Did you vote in the 2008 elections? **Q49A:** In the March 2008 presidential / parliamentary elections? **Q49B:** In the June 2008 presidential run-off election?

Q50A: How free and fair do you expect the next national elections to be? Will they be ... **Q50B:** Do you think the next elections will be more free and fair, or less free and fair than the parliamentary and presidential elections of March 2008? **Q50C:** Do you think the next elections will be more free and fair, or less free and fair than the presidential run-off elections of June 2008?

Q51: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements? *“Elections by not later than mid-2013 will ...”* **Q51A:** Offer all Zimbabweans the opportunity to participate without fear. **Q51B:** Reopen old wounds of violence and fear. **Q51C:** Be free of security force interventions. **Q51D:** Have transparent counting processes.

Q52: If we compare the 2008 elections and the elections that will be held by not later than mid-2013, based on what you know and feel today ... **Q52A:** Would you feel ‘more safe’ or ‘less safe’ voting in the next elections than you did in the March 2008 presidential and parliamentary elections? **Q52B:** Would you feel ‘more safe’ or ‘less safe’ voting in the next elections than you did in the June 2008 presidential run-off election?

And how much do you agree or disagree with the following three statements?

Q52C: This time around, elections will be different ... there will be nothing to fear. **Q52D:** Political parties in Zimbabwe use violence to ensure victory in elections and nothing is going to change this. **Q52E:** In Zimbabwe we should rather not have elections, because elections just bring violence.

Q53: When we talk about the next round of elections, from your side, what would have to happen to *make you feel safe* during elections? **Q53A:** International observers are present at your polling station. *It would make me feel safe.* **Q53B:** Domestic election monitors are present at your polling station. *It would make me feel safe.* **Q53C:** There is no police inside your polling station. *It would make me feel safe.* **Q53D:** A new Constitution that guarantees our rights to freedom of belief, expression and association. *It would make me feel safe.* **Q53E:** Political parties have signed a binding code of conduct that includes ‘no violence’ in campaign: *It would make me feel safe.*

Q54: What in your opinion should SADC (the Southern Africa Development Community) do when any political party that practices serious violence and/or intimidation in elections? Which is the one action that you believe will have the biggest impact?

Q55A: Are you a registered voter of Zimbabwe? **Q55B:** Have you in the last 12 months inspected the voters roll to confirm that all your registration details are in order, or still in order? **Q55C:** If you are *not currently registered*, but are eligible to be registered, do you think that you will go and register in order to vote in the next round of elections? **Q55D:** If you are not registered, what is the one most important reason for this?

Q56A: When Zimbabweans choose a political party to support, what do you think is the most important issue that lets them make up their minds? **Q56A(i):** ... choose a party that is not corrupt and spends public money accountably. **Q56A(ii):** ... look for a political party that supports land reform to Zimbabwe. **Q56A(iii):** ... support any political party that can bring change. **Q56A (iv):** ... go with a political party that supports indigenisation in Zimbabwe. **Q56A(v):** ... choose a party that shows it can deliver services, especially on the local level. **Q56A(vi):** ... choose a party that is committed to civil and political freedoms (freedom to speak openly, vote freely, protest). **Q56A(vii):** ... support a party that defends Zimbabwe against the interference of foreign countries. **Q56A(viii):** ... look at who it is that liberated Zimbabwe from the British. **Q56B:** Would you say that this is roughly how it works for you too when you decide on support for a political party)? **Q56C:** Which of the following statements is closest to your view? 1. People vote for the same party all the time, regardless of what it does. 2. People use elections to punish a party that disappoints them.

Q57: Have you heard of ...? **Q57A:** Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment; **Q57B:** The Community Share Ownership Trust Scheme; **Q57C:** The proposed Sovereign Wealth Fund; **Q57D:** The National Indigenisation Economic and Empowerment Board.

Q58: Which of the following statements do you agree with most? Choose Statement 1 or Statement 2. **Q58A:** 1. Foreign-owned companies bring growth and development to Zimbabwe. 2. If all major companies that operate in Zimbabwe are owned by Zimbabweans there will be growth and development. **Q58B:** 1. I agree with both the principle and the current methods of indigenisation in Zimbabwe. 2. I agree with the indigenisation thrust in Zimbabwe ... it is just the current methods that are a problem. **Q58C:** 1. Indigenisation will ensure economic benefits for ALL Zimbabweans. 2. Indigenisation is only for elites who can buy or claim shares in foreign-owned companies in Zimbabwe.

Q59: Let us further explore how the indigenisation policy in Zimbabwe ... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? **Q59A:** ... Will bring inclusive economic development to Zimbabwe; **Q59B:** ... Will create the opportunity for locals to enjoy the proceeds of the mining operations in their areas; **Q59C:** ... Will benefit me personally. [See follow-up Q3H, only ask after Q3G]; **Q59D:** ... Is about predatorial Zimbabwean business claiming shares in foreign-owned companies; **Q59E:** ... Will finally liberate thousands of our men and women from economic bondage; **Q59F:** ... Will scare away investors **Q59G:** ... Will bring jobs for the youth. **Q59H:** In the question above [Q59C] you said that you *personally* expect benefits through indigenisation ... please tell me, what is it specifically that you hope to get, or see changing in your life as a result of indigenisation?

Q60: Have you heard about ...? **Q60A:** The Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC); **Q60B:** The Registrar-General of elections in Zimbabwe. **Q60C:** Is the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC) ready for elections in 2012 or will it be ready for elections in the first half of 2013? **Q60D:** Do you have confidence that ZEC has the administrative capacity to run the next election effectively? **Q60E:** What is the most important reason for your answer? **Q60F:** Do you have confidence that ZEC will treat all political parties equally in the next election? **Q60G:** What is the most important reason for your answer? **Q60H:** Is the office of the Registrar-General (the RG) ready for elections in 2012 or will the RG be ready for elections in the first half of 2012? **Q60I:** Do you have confidence that the office of the Registrar-General has the administrative capacity to register voters and compile an accurate voters' roll?

Q60J: What is the most important reason for your answer [in Q60I]? **Q60K:** Do you have confidence that the office of the Registrar-General will compile a voter roll that is a true reflection of who Zimbabwe's eligible voters are? **Q60L:** What is the most important reason for your answer?

Q61: In the current Zimbabwe, how much do you trust each of the following institutions? Or perhaps you haven't heard enough about them to say. **Q61A:** Parliament; **Q61B:** The Office of the President; **Q61C:** The Office of the Prime Minister; **Q61D:** ZANU-PF; **Q61E:** The police; **Q61F:** The churches (in general); **Q61G:** Political parties (in general); **Q61H:** Civil society; **Q61I:** The military; **Q61J:** International donor organisations; **Q61K:** The MDC-T; **Q61L:** Local government where I live; **Q61M:** Traditional leaders; **Q61N:** The judiciary; **Q61O:** Attorney general's office; **Q61P:** The Inclusive Government (IG). **Q61Q:** Which organisation, or *which type of organisation*, which you have just rated [in Q61A-P], do you feel can be trusted most to stand up for you and defend your interests? Only give your first choice

Q62: Have you seen any campaign activities, which focus on 2012/13 elections, by the political parties in the last two to three months?

Q63: Which of the following two statements is closest to your view? Choose Statement 1 or Statement 2. /Do you agree or agree very strongly? 1. On the day of elections Zimbabweans bury fear of violence and intimidation and go and vote. 2. Fear of violence and intimidation makes Zimbabweans stay away from the polls.

Q64: What do you think should be the role of the military in Zimbabwe? Please tell me how strongly you believe or do not believe the military should do each of the following. **Q64A:** Exclusively defend the country from external enemies; **Q64B:** Also help police in maintaining law and order internally; **Q64C:** Rule the country; **Q64D:** Defend the party that liberated the country; **Q64E:** Buttress the rule of the president.

Q65: How would you feel if you woke up tomorrow morning and there was military rule in Zimbabwe?

Section 7: Select Aspects of Association and Action

Q66: I am going to read out a short list of groups that people join. For each one, could you tell me whether you are an official leader, an active member, an inactive member, or not a member? **Q66A:** A religious group; **Q66B:** A political party; **Q66C:** Any voluntary or community group.

Q67: How often do you attend meetings or gatherings of these organizations? **Q67A:** Religious group; **Q67B:** Political party; **Q67C:** Voluntary / community group.

Q68: What is your religion, if any?

Q69A: How interested are you in public affairs ... *in politics and government*? **Q69B:** When you get together with close people such as friends, family or neighbours, how often do you discuss political matters?

Q70B: Which of the following two statements is closest to how you feel? Choose Statement 1 or Statement 2. 1. I feel more [Read out ethnic group identified in Q69A] than Zimbabwean; 2. I feel more Zimbabwean than [Read out ethnic group identified in Q69A].

Section 8: Voting and Party Support

Q71A: If parliamentary elections were held tomorrow, which party would you vote for? **Q71B:** If presidential elections were held tomorrow, which candidate would you vote for?

Q72: Accepting that it is your right not to answer a question like the party or candidate you would vote for ... Can you tell me what is your most important reason for choosing not to reveal your vote preference?

Q73: Use one sentence please to tell me what kind of a place you think Zimbabwe will be after the next elections, thinking about winners, losers and who will be in power.

Q74: Finally, and speaking about the whole interview, do you think interviews about these and other issues are important?