

LIMPOPO CITIZENS MUNICIPAL SERVICES SATISFACTION STUDY

RESEARCHED

FOR

**THE DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL & HOUSING
LIMPOPO PROVINCE**

BY THE

COMMUNITY AGENCY FOR SOCIAL ENQUIRY

AND

**GOTSIKI-MAYEVU ENGINEERING AND
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

DECEMBER 2005



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	I
LIST OF TABLES.....	IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	9
1. INTRODUCTION.....	10
KEY INDICATORS	10
2. METHODOLOGY.....	12
START-UP WORKSHOP AND INSTRUMENT DESIGN	12
RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS.....	12
DATA COLLECTION	13
HOUSEHOLD SURVEY	13
FOCUS GROUPS.....	13
DATA CAPTURING AND CLEANING	14
ANALYSIS AND REPORT WRITING	14
WEIGHTING.....	14
ANALYSIS	15
LIMITATIONS	15
3. SURVEY FINDINGS	17
REALISED SAMPLE SIZE	17
AREA DETAILS	18
HOUSEHOLD AND DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS	19
SERVICE DELIVERY.....	22
HOUSING.....	23
WATER.....	26
ELECTRICITY.....	35
SANITATION	41
REFUSE REMOVAL	43
COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES.....	45
DISASTER MANAGEMENT	53
LOCAL GOVERNANCE	56
PRIORITY FOR IMPROVEMENT	63

AREA DETAILS	81
HOUSING	83
SERVICE DELIVERY	89
WATER.....	89
ELECTRICITY.....	104
SANITATION.....	116
REFUSE REMOVAL.....	119
DISASTER MANAGEMENT	124
LOCAL GOVERNANCE	133

TABLE 38: DO YOU RECEIVE THE FREE ELECTRICITY ALLOWANCE?	38
TABLE 39: DISRUPTION OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY IN THE PAST THREE MONTHS.....	38
TABLE 40: MAIN CAUSE OF ELECTRICITY DISRUPTIONS IN THE PAST THREE MONTHS	38
TABLE 41: AMOUNT OF TIME TAKEN TO FIX DISRUPTED ELECTRICITY SUPPLY	39
TABLE 42: AN ACCEPTABLE AMOUNT OF TIME WITHIN WHICH THE MUNICIPALITY IS EXPECTED TO GET AN ELECTRICITY BREAKDOWN FIXED.....	39
TABLE 43: LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE QUALITY OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY	40
TABLE 44: MAIN TYPE OF SANITATION FACILITY USED BY HOUSEHOLDS	41
TABLE 45: PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED WITH SANITATION FACILITIES IN PAST THREE MONTHS?.....	41
TABLE 46: AMOUNT OF TIME TAKEN BY MUNICIPALITIES TO GET SANITATION PROBLEMS ADDRESSED.....	42
TABLE 47: ACCEPTABLE AMOUNT OF TIME MUNICIPALITIES WERE EXPECTED TO FIX SANITATION PROBLEMS	42
TABLE 48: HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH SANITATION IN YOUR AREA?	43
TABLE 49: MAIN METHODS OF HOUSEHOLD'S REFUSE REMOVAL	43
TABLE 50: ARE THERE SPECIFIED DAYS FOR REFUSE REMOVAL?	44
TABLE 51: APPROPRIATENESS OF THE LOCATION OF THE DUMPING SITE	44
TABLE 52: LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH REFUSE REMOVAL.....	45
TABLE 53: SERVICES AND FACILITIES AVAILABLE IN COMMUNITY AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE QUALITY OF THE SERVICE (N = 5158)	46
TABLE 54: SERVICES AND FACILITIES AVAILABLE, BY MUNICIPALITY (1).....	47
TABLE 55: SERVICES AND FACILITIES AVAILABLE, BY MUNICIPALITY (2).....	48
TABLE 56: AVAILABILITY OF INFRASTRUCTURE (N = 5158).....	49
TABLE 57: AVAILABILITY OF INFRASTRUCTURE, BY MUNICIPALITY	50
TABLE 58: PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER THE COMMUNITY HAS CHANGED OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS	51
TABLE 59: PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER THE COMMUNITY HAS CHANGED OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS	52
TABLE 60: LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES PROVIDED BY THE MUNICIPALITY	53
TABLE 61: LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES PROVIDED BY THE MUNICIPALITY, BY PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER THE COMMUNITY HAS CHANGED	53
TABLE 62: IS THERE A DISASTER MANAGEMENT CENTRE IN YOUR AREA?.....	54
TABLE 63: AVAILABILITY OF AMBULANCE SERVICES	54
TABLE 64: QUALITY OF AMBULANCE SERVICES	54
TABLE 65: AVAILABILITY OF FIRE BRIGADE	55
TABLE 66: QUALITY OF FIRE BRIGADE SERVICE	55
TABLE 67: AVAILABILITY OF POLICE STATION SERVICES	55
TABLE 68: QUALITY OF POLICE STATION FACILITY.....	56
TABLE 69: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS KNOWING WHERE TO GO IN CASE OF FIRE AND FLOODS/STORM	56
TABLE 70: DO YOU KNOW WHICH WARD YOU LIVE IN?.....	57
TABLE 71: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED KNOWLEDGE OF THEIR WARD COUNCILLOR	57
TABLE 72: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR WARD COUNCILLOR?	57
TABLE 73: RESPONDENTS/HOUSEHOLDS TAKING PART IN VARIOUS ORGANISED ACTIVITIES WITHIN THEIR WARDS	58

TABLE 110: CROSS TABULATION OF HOW HOUSEHOLD PAY FOR ITS ELECTRICITY BY MUNICIPALITY	108
TABLE 111: CROSS TABULATION OF AWARENESS OF FREE ELECTRICITY BY MUNICIPALITY	109
TABLE 112: CROSS TABULATION OF WHETHER HOUSEHOLD RECEIVE FREE ELECTRICITY ALLOWANCE BY MUNICIPALITY	110
TABLE 113: CROSS TABULATION OF DISRUPTION OF ELECTRICITY IN PAST 3 MONTHS BY MUNICIPALITY	111
TABLE 114: CROSS TABULATION OF MAIN CAUSE OF NO ELECTRICITY AT ALL TIMES BY MUNICIPALITY	112
TABLE 115: CROSS TABULATION OF DURATION OF TIME TO FIX ELECTRICITY PROBLEMS BY MUNICIPALITY	113
TABLE 116: CROSS TABULATION OF ACCEPTABLE TIME EXPECTED FOR MUNICIPALITY TO FIX ELECTRICITY PROBLEMS BY MUNICIPALITY	114
TABLE 117: CROSS TABULATION OF LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH ELECTRICITY BY MUNICIPALITY	115
TABLE 118: SATISFACTION WITH SANITATION FACILITIES BY MUNICIPALITY	116
TABLE 119: MAIN TYPE OF SANITATION FACILITY THE HOUSEHOLD USE, BY MUNICIPALITY	117
TABLE 120: IN THE PAST THREE MONTHS, HAVE YOU EXPERIENCED ANY PROBLEMS WITH YOUR SANITATION FACILITY IN GENERAL?	118
TABLE 121: SERVICES AND FACILITIES AVAILABLE, BY MUNICIPALITY (1)	119
TABLE 122: SERVICES AND FACILITIES AVAILABLE, BY MUNICIPALITY (2)	120
TABLE 123: AVAILABILITY OF INFRASTRUCTURE, BY MUNICIPALITY	121
TABLE 124: PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER THE COMMUNITY HAS CHANGED OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS	122
TABLE 125: LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES PROVIDED BY THE MUNICIPALITY, BY MUNICIPALITY	123
TABLE 126: CROSS TABULATION OF PRESENCE OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT CENTRE IN THE AREA BY MUNICIPALITY	124
TABLE 127: CROSS TABULATION OF AVAILABILITY OF AMBULANCE BY MUNICIPALITY	125
TABLE 128: CROSS TABULATION OF QUALITY OF AMBULANCE BY MUNICIPALITY	126
TABLE 129: CROSS TABULATION OF AVAILABILITY OF FIRE BRIGADE BY MUNICIPALITY	127
TABLE 130: CROSS TABULATION OF QUALITY OF FIRE BRIGADE SERVICE BY MUNICIPALITY	128
TABLE 131: CROSS TABULATION OF AVAILABILITY OF POLICE STATION BY MUNICIPALITY	129
TABLE 132: CROSS TABULATION OF QUALITY OF POLICE STATION FACILITY BY MUNICIPALITY	130
TABLE 133: CROSS TABULATION OF WHETHER RESPONDENT KNOWS WHERE TO GO IN CASE OF FIRE BY MUNICIPALITY	131
TABLE 134: CROSS TABULATION OF WHETHER RESPONDENT KNOWS WHERE TO GO IN CASE OF FLOODS OR STORM BY MUNICIPALITY	132
TABLE 135: PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE REPORTING KNOWLEDGE OF THEIR WARD COUNCILLOR BY MUNICIPALITY	133
TABLE 136: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR WARD COUNCILLOR BY MUNICIPALITY	134
TABLE 137: RESPONDENTS OR HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS REPORTING MEMBERSHIP OF WARD COMMITTEES	135
TABLE 138: DO YOU OR ANYONE IN THIS HOUSEHOLD TAKE PART IN ORGANISED ACTIVITIES WITHIN YOUR WARD: WARD COMMITTEE MEMBER	136
TABLE 139: AWARENESS AND FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS ORGANISED BY COUNCILLOR OR WARD COMMITTEE BY MUNICIPALITY	137
TABLE 140: ATTENDANCE OF MEETINGS ORGANISED BY COUNCILLOR OR WARD BY MUNICIPALITIES	138

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team (C A S E and GOTSIKI) would like to acknowledge and express gratitude for the contribution made by men and women of the Limpopo province who assisted with the collection of data across the province. Their contribution is inestimable, and it is due to their hard work that this study became manageable.

Primarily, the study instruments enquired about the availability of these basic municipal services, citizens' level of awareness regarding their availability, their quality, and levels of satisfaction with the service being provided, where applicable.

The current report provides a comprehensive situational analysis of municipal service delivery in the Limpopo province. In other words, the report documents information gathered on the availability, or unavailability, of services in all 26 municipalities across the province. In addition to reporting on the availability of services, the report further provides information on the citizens' level of awareness of various services as well as their perceptions regarding the quality and quantity of the services as well as their level of satisfaction and reasons thereof.

Six chapters constitute this report. Chapter 1 is the introduction in which a brief background of the study and the structure of the report are clarified. Chapter 2 reports on the methodological approach employed for the study. In this chapter, we explain various data collection techniques used to gather the information analysed in the report. Furthermore, the chapter highlights some of the limitations to be borne in mind when interpreting the results of the study. Key findings of the survey are presented in Chapter 3 and in Chapter 4 we present the focus group findings. Chapter 5 is the summary and conclusions, in which the results of the study are interpreted and analysis of what they could mean for the Limpopo provincial government and individual municipalities is provided. The sixth and final chapter is recommendations. The report ends with Appendix A and Appendix B in which we present the tables of the cross tabulation analyses conducted and the study instruments we used to gather data, respectively.

DATA COLLECTION

Two data collection techniques were used, i.e., household survey and focus groups. The survey data and the focus group data were collected concurrently. Details of each of these techniques are provided below.

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

A sample size of 5 200 interviews with household members across 26 municipalities was agreed upon. A total of 520 Enumerator Areas (EAs) were randomly selected from 26 municipalities and the research team set out to conduct 10 interviews in each to realise the sample size of 5 200.

Sample allocation per municipalities was done in two stages. The first stage was to allocate the number of interviews per municipality in proportion to the size of the municipality. This is to say that the municipality with the highest number of households was allocated the most number of interviews to be conducted in the area. At the second stage, the sample size was adjusted to bring some balance and to avoid a situation where significantly fewer interviews would be conducted in certain smaller municipalities. In the end, no fewer than 150 household interviews were conducted in a municipality, and in the largest municipality, 300 interviews were conducted.

In terms of household selection in an area, a starting point marked by a public place such as a local school, store, or church was identified from which the counting began. An interval of 10 stands in urban areas and 5 in rural areas was used. Upon picking the appropriate stand, the interviewers selected a household with main service connection point (e.g., electricity and/or water meter), where applicable. One interview was then conducted with head of the selected household, caregiver or a member of the household who is responsible for most household decision-making regardless of age or gender.

FOCUS GROUPS

A total of 8 focus groups with caregivers, head of households and/or household decision-makers were conducted. The focus groups were disaggregated by area type and gender. In total, 4 focus groups were conducted with female participants and another 4 with male participants. Two of the focus groups were with White urban dwellers and the rest were conducted with Black rural dwellers.

The focus group discussion guide focused on similar issues to those raised in the survey instrument with the view to gather more qualitative information on the similar issues covered in the household survey. The discussions lasted for between one-and-half and two hours and were audio recorded. These were then transcribed prior to analysis.

ANALYSIS

The survey data was analysed using SPSS, a quantitative data analysis software package for social scientists. Mainly, basic Frequencies, Descriptive statistics, Cross tabulations and Chi-square analyses were conducted to bring about the results of this study. Frequencies were conducted to measure the prevalence rates (e.g., to what extent a particular service is available or what percentage of the respondents reported availability of a particular service), cross tabulations were conducted in order to establish whether there were differences between municipalities in terms of the availability and/quality of a particular service, and finally, a Chi-square test was conducted to establish the significance of differences between municipalities in terms of service delivery.

LIMITATIONS

As with any other study, certain limitations must be borne in mind when reading and interpreting the findings of this study. First, a sample size of 5 158 questionnaires instead of the intended 5 200 was realised, captured and analysed.

Second, the amount of time within which the study had to be completed was significantly tight considering the amount of work that needed to be done. As a result, the study was conducted rapidly in order to meet the deadline set by the Department of Local Government and Housing of the Limpopo province. Owing to this, some of the processes such as training of fieldworkers had to be done with rapid speed.

The third limitation is related to the first and second limitations. During quality assurance, it became clear that some of the fieldworkers, especially those who were first time recruits, did not grasp all the necessary details highlighted during the training. This was made evident by the number of questionnaires we found to be of poor quality hence they could not be used in the analysis. In the end, 42 questionnaires could not be used for analysis, leaving the total number of questionnaires at 5 158 instead of the targeted 5 200.

The fourth limitation is that there was no age specification in this study. This is to say that any person living in the province and had some household decision-making powers was eligible to partake despite age. As a result, the age of the study participants ranged from the mid-teens to over 90 years of age.

3. SURVEY FINDINGS

REALISED SAMPLE SIZE

This section reports on the total number of questionnaires completed, captured and analysed in the current report in relation to the originally intended sample size.

	Intended (N)	Realised (N)	%
Aganang	200	170	85%
Ba-Phalaborwa	200	200	100%
Bela Bela	160	160	100%
Blouberg	200	200	100%
Bushbuckridge	240	240	100%
Fetakgomo	160	155	97%
Great Giyani	210	210	100%
Great Letaba	210	210	100%
Greater Groblersdal	200	200	100%
Greater Marble Hall	180	180	100%
Greater Tubatse	210	205	98%
Greater Tzaneen	230	230	100%
Lepelle-Nkumpi	210	210	100%
Lephalale	170	169	99%
Makhado	240	240	100%
Makhudutamaga	210	210	100%
Maruleng	160	160	100%
Modimolle	160	160	100%
Mogalakwena	220	220	100%
Molemole	200	200	100%
Mookgopong	150	150	100%
Musina	150	150	100%
Mutale	160	160	100%
Polokwane	300	300	100%
Thabazimbi	170	169	99%
Thulamela	300	300	100%
Total	5 200	5 158	99%

Table 1: Number of questionnaires analysed per municipality

	N	%
Village formal settlement	2322	45%
Formal urban township	952	19%
Village informal settlement	525	10%
Farm	501	10%
Village traditional dwelling	409	8%
Informal urban township	260	5%
Suburb	162	3%
Total	5131	100%

Table 3: Area type

A large proportion of areas in the province were found to be formal village settlements (45%), followed by urban formal townships. Areas described as suburbs, usually characterised by an affluent population and established service delivery system, and informal urban townships accounted for only 3% and 5% respectively.

While municipalities such as Ba-Phalaborwa, Modimolle and Polokwane showed a spread of different types of areas, with urban formal townships and village formal settlements dominant, municipalities such as Aganang, Blouberg, Fetakgomo and Molemole were found to be almost completely made of formal village settlements. It was interesting that in the latter municipalities no areas described as suburbs were found, except for Aganang municipalities in which only 1% was described as a suburb.

Majority of the farms are concentrated in the Mookgopong municipality, accounting for almost three-quarters of the area. Over half of the areas in the Greater Giyani municipality, which is more than any other municipality, are described as traditional village settlements.

HOUSEHOLD AND DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS

This section investigated, and reports on the demographic details of the people who took part in the study. The section reports on the gender of the respondents, age, levels of education, the language of the respondents and their employment status.

	N	%
Some high school: Grade 8-11 or Std 6 - Std 9	1335	26%
None	968	19%
Matric or grade 12	859	17%
Some primary: Up to Grade 4 - 6 or Std 2 – Std 4	800	16%
Primary completed: Grade or Std 5	476	9%
Post-matric – diploma or certificate, not degree	409	8%
Some high school plus trade certificate or diploma	111	2%
Degree completed	113	2%
Degree incomplete	69	1%
More than one degree	15	0%
Total	5155	100%

Table 7: Highest educational qualification

The level of education is generally low among the respondents, with the largest proportion of the respondents, about a quarter (26%), having completed some high school only, followed by one-fifth (19%) who have no schooling at all. The respondents who have completed some post-matric qualification such as a diploma, trade certificate or degree accounted for only 12%.

	N	%
Sepedi - North Sotho	2520	49%
Xitsonga - Shangaan	1266	25%
Tshivenda	778	15%
Sesotho - South Sotho	106	2%
Setswana	113	2%
Afrikaans	103	2%
Siswati – Swazi	64	1%
IsiNdebele	57	1%
IsiXhosa	23	0%
IsiZulu	26	1%
English	69	1%
Other language	16	0%
Total	5140	100%

Table 8: Language of the respondents

There are three languages mostly spoken by the respondents. The most spoken language is Sepedi (49%), followed Xitsonga (25%) and Tshivenda (15%). Only 2% and 1% of the respondents reported that they mostly speak Afrikaans and English, respectively.

Findings from this section are further used to assess different municipalities' overall performance on service delivery.

HOUSING

		N	%
Formal	House - formal structure on a separate stand	3466	67%
	Room in house - backroom	444	9%
	Flat in a block of flats	78	2%
Informal	Shack on own stand	392	8%
	Backyard shack	110	2%
	Traditional dwelling or hut	630	12%
	Other	34	1%
	Total	5153	100%

Table 10: Type of dwelling of households

Majority of the households (67%) occupy formal houses on separate stands. This includes both the houses supplied by the government (RDP houses, as commonly known) and houses financed or built by individuals. Generally, close to 8 in 10 of respondents reported that they lived in some form of a formal house, i.e., formal house on a separated stand, flat in a block of flats or room in a house.

Other dwellings visited include hostels, which housed 13 respondents, and mixed dwellings consisting of formal housing and traditional dwellings on the same stand, in which 16 respondents claimed to live.

The municipalities in which the respondents were most likely to report living in formal dwellings are Aganang, Fetakgomo, Greater Letaba, Greater Groblersdal, Greater Marble Hall, Lepel-Nkumpi, Molemole, Musina, and Polokwane.

Informal dwellings were more likely to be found in Bushbuckridge, Lephalale, Modimolle, Mogalakwena, Mookgopong, and Thabazimbi; while traditional dwellings were more likely to be found in Ba-Phalaborwa, Greater Giyani, Greater Tzaneen, Mutale, and Thulamela.

Thabazimbi were less likely to express satisfaction with their dwellings. This, however, should not be misinterpreted to suggest that the respondents in these municipalities do not own their dwellings.

	N	%
Own it	3804	74%
Just live here	1047	20%
Rent it	296	6%
Total	5147	100%

Table 14: Mode of Accommodation

Ownership of the dwellings was widely reported by the respondents. About three-quarters of the respondents (74%) owned their dwelling while one-fifth (20%) reported that they just lived there.

Ownership of the dwellings was mostly reported in Ba-Phalaborwa, Blouberg, Greater Giyani, Greater Tubatse and Thulamela municipalities. On the other hand, respondents in Lephalale, Mookgopong, and Thabazimbi were less likely to own their dwellings. Of those who did not own their dwellings, three quarters (76%) reported that they needed their own housing.

Only those who did not own their dwellings were asked if they needed their own housing, and respondents in Greater Letaba, Modimolle and Thabazimbi were more likely to express a need for their own housing, while respondents in Polokwane, Molemole, Mogalakwena and Greater Groblersdal were less likely to say that they needed their own housing.

	N	%
Yes	3959	78%
No	1153	23%
Total	5111	100

Table 15: Awareness of housing provided by government in the area

The majority of respondents (78%) appeared to be aware of housing provided by the government in their area.

Respondents in Bushbuckridge, Greater Giyani, Greater Marble Hall, Molemole, Mutale and Thulamela were more likely to be aware of housing provided by the government in their

Piped water appears to be the most common source of water in the province. Majority of the respondents (76%) reported street taps, on-site taps or piped water in dwelling as their main sources of water, with street taps being the most commonly reported source (30%).

Polokwane is the only municipality in which more than half of the respondents (55%) reported piped water in dwelling as their main source of water. This was followed by respondents in Ba-Phalaborwa, BelaBela and Thabazimbi where slightly less than half in each reported a similar source.

Over two-thirds of the respondents in each of the Blouberg and Greater Marble Hall municipalities, and slightly less than 6 in 10 respondents in the Makhudutamaga municipality, reported street taps as their main source of water.

It was interesting that piped water (whether in the form of piped water in dwelling, on-site taps or street taps) was the only reported source of water among the respondents in Ba-Phalaborwa.

	N	%
No	3231	66%
Yes, pay for amount of water used	1277	26%
Yes, pay flat rate each month	253	5%
Yes, pre-paid	132	3%
Total	4893	100%

Table 18: Water source metered or paid for

Although the majority of the respondents reported piped water as their main source, about two-thirds (66%) indicated that they do not pay for their water as their water sources are neither metered nor paid for. Of the remaining one-third, the most (26%) reported that they only pay for the amount of water they use and the remainder either pay a flat rate each month or use a pre-paid system.

Polokwane municipality, followed by Musina, has the highest percentage of respondents reporting payment for the amount of water used while BelaBela has the highest percentage of respondents who reported paying a flat rate for their water usage on a monthly basis. The highest percentage of the respondents who reported using the pre-paid system was in the Greater Marble Hall municipality.

It is interesting that none of the respondents in Musina reported travelling more than 500 meters to reach their water sources. On the other hand, the highest percentage of those who reported travelling more than half a kilometre to get to their water sources are residents of Maruleng municipality.

	N	%
No	3533	69%
Yes	1580	31%
Total	5113	100%

Table 21: Awareness of free water allowance

About 7 in 10 respondents were not aware of the free basic water allowance (i.e., free 6000 litres allowance) provided by the municipalities.

While the respondents in Bushbuckridge, Greater Marble Hall, and Makhado municipalities were the most likely to report knowledge of the free basic water allowance, respondents in Blouberg and Greater Letaba municipalities were the least likely to report knowledge of the service.

	N	%
No	2275	54%
Do not know	1363	33%
Yes	561	13%
Total	4198	100%

Table 22: Access to free basic water (6000 litres)

As can be seen from Table 22, majority of the respondents do not have access to the free basic water provided by the municipalities in terms of the legislation. Only 13% reported that they have access and a third was unsure about whether the service is available to them or not.

It was striking that more than 80% of the respondents in Bela Bela and 60% in Modimolle reported having access to the free basic water service while hardly half of the respondents in each of all other municipalities reported having access to such service.

municipalities were more likely to report that they did not know what the main causes of the interruptions were.

	N	%
Within a couple of days (2-3 days)	228	19%
A month or more	229	19%
Within a day	212	18%
Other	161	14%
About a week (4-7 days)	118	10%
About 2 weeks	148	13%
Within hours	85	7%
Total	1179	100%

Table 25: Time taken to repair broken water supply

Looking at Table 25, it is difficult to ascertain any specific time period it takes to repair broken water supply. The findings suggest that restoring water supply can take anything between a few hours and a month or more. It was clear, however, that only under rare circumstances was the restoration of water supply done within just a few hours.

Among those who reported “other”, some indicated that it takes between five and six months to reconnect the water supply while in some cases the water supply was never restored since the breakdown in 1999.

In Bela Bela, followed by Musina, respondents were more likely to report that the water breakdown is reconnected within hours of breaking down, while respondents in Blouberg and Greater Giyani municipalities were more inclined to report that it takes a month or more to reconnect.

	N	%
Municipality	2488	49
Other	1445	28
No-one	1201	23
Total	5133	100

Table 27: Entity responsible for the maintenance of taps and water sources

Less than half of the citizens (49%) reported that their municipalities are responsible for the maintenance of taps and other water sources in their communities. About a quarter reported that the taps and water sources are not maintained by anyone. However, about three in ten reported that the water sources are maintained by "other" entities such as private contractors, farm owners, individuals employed by the community, community members themselves, and community leaders, among others.

Respondents in the Greater Giyani (86%), Ba-Phalaborwa (84%) and Mogalakwena (76%) municipalities were more likely to report that their municipalities are responsible for maintaining the water sources while the respondents in the Greater Tzaneen municipality, followed by Molemole and Greater Groblersdal, were more likely to report that there is no one maintaining the water sources. "Other" entities such as community leaders were mostly reported by the respondents in Aganang and Maruleng municipalities.

	N	%
Don't know	1879	48%
Monthly	638	16%
Other	625	16%
Weekly	460	12%
Once every two weeks	151	4%
Quarterly	152	4%
Total	3904	100%

Table 28: Frequency of maintenance checks performed on taps or water sources

The highest percentage of the respondents (48%) did not know how often the maintenance checks are performed on taps and other water sources. The second highest percentage (16%) reported that maintenance checks are performed on a monthly basis, and a similar percentage reported "other" intervals such as whenever necessary, only when reported, annually, and so forth.

	N	%
Satisfied	1767	35%
Dissatisfied	1472	29%
Very dissatisfied	1201	23%
Very satisfied	611	12%
Don't know / Not Applicable	71	1%
Total	5121	100%

Table 31: Level of satisfaction with the quality of water supply

Generally, slightly more than half of the respondents were not satisfied with the quality of their water supply. Twenty-nine percent and twenty-three percent reported being dissatisfied and very dissatisfied, respectively.

The respondents in the Fetakgomo, Greater Letaba, Greater Tubatse and Makhado municipalities were more likely to report dissatisfaction with the quality of water supply, while the respondents in Bela Bela, Lephalale, Modimolle and Mookgopong municipalities were more likely to report being satisfied with the quality.

ELECTRICITY

	N	%
Wood	2431	47%
Electricity	2117	41%
Paraffin	463	9%
Gas	69	2%
Coal	58	1%
Generator	3	0%
Dung	11	0%
Other	5	0%
Total	5156	100%

Table 32: Household's main energy source for cooking

Wood is still commonly used as the main source of energy for cooking (47%). However, two-fifths (41%) of the households reported that they use electricity for cooking. The municipalities in which most respondents reported that they mainly use wood for cooking are Blouberg, Fetakgomo, Greater Letaba, Greater Marble Hall, Mutale, Mookgopong and Makhado. Electricity is mainly used in Polokwane and Molemole. Furthermore, between 50% and 60% of

	N	%
Never	3624	82%
Every month	772	18%
Once every two months	11	0%
Once every three months	2	0%
After four months and more	3	0%
Total	4412	100%

Table 35: How often do you receive an electricity account?

Over eighty percent (82%) of the households do not receive their electricity accounts while the remainder (18%) receive monthly statements. The municipalities that are mostly likely to send electricity accounts on a monthly basis are Maruleng (51%), Ba-Phalaborwa (44%), Thabazimbi (42%), Polokwane (41%) and Bela Bela (40%).

	N	%
Pre-paid card	3330	75%
Conventional meter	654	15%
Dwelling does not have electricity	362	8%
Other	87	2%
Solar, wind generators, petrol or diesel generators	2	0%
Total	4436	100%

Table 36: How does the household pay for its electricity?

The results in Table 36 clarify the results in Table 35 which suggested that less than a fifth of the electricity consumers received electricity accounts. As shown here, three-quarters (75%) of the households use pre-paid card system to pay for their electricity. Only 15% use the conventional meter system. The respondents in Maruleng municipality (54%) are the most likely to report using the conventional meter to pay for their electricity.

	N	%
No	3487	79%
Yes	938	21%
Total	4425	100%

Table 37: Awareness of free electricity allowance

The levels of awareness are generally low with regard to free basic electricity allowance. Close on four-fifths (79%) of the respondents are not aware of the free electricity allowance.

Majority of the disruptions of electricity supply are due to general electricity failure (70%) while only 8% of the electricity disruptions are attributable to monetary problems such as inability to pay for pre-paid electricity or paying the account.

The general electricity failure was reportedly less prevalent in Blouberg (9%) while the disruptions related to money-related problems are more prevalent in Modimolle (56%), Maruleng (35%) and Mookgopong (35%) municipalities.

	N	%
Within a day	694	42%
Within hours	664	40%
Within a couple of days (2-3 days)	185	11%
About a week – 4-7 days	33	2%
Other	34	2%
About 2 weeks	19	1%
A month or more	20	1%
Total	1650	100%

Table 41: Amount of time taken to fix disrupted electricity supply

Among those who reported experiencing some disruptions to electricity supply, overwhelming majority (82%) indicated that it took less than day for the electricity to be reconnected. Respondents in Bela Bela (76%) and Bushbuckridge (64%) were most likely to report that the electricity was reconnected within hours while in Maruleng (48%) the respondents were more likely to report that it takes a couple of days.

	N	%
Within hours	2774	63%
Within a day	1025	23%
Other	413	9%
Within a couple of days - 2-3 days	121	3%
About a week - 4-7 days	32	1%
About 2 weeks	10	0%
A month or more	11	0%
Total	4386	100%

Table 42: An acceptable amount of time within which the municipality is expected to get an electricity breakdown fixed

SANITATION

	N	%
Basic latrine	2060	40%
Full waterborne flush toilet	1243	24%
Ventilated or improved pit latrine	934	18%
None	502	10%
Septic tank	233	5%
Other	135	3%
Chemical toilet	20	0%
"Bucket system"	20	0%
Total	5146	100%

Table 44: Main type of sanitation facility used by households

Majority of the respondents (87%) have some form of sanitation facility as opposed to only 10% who have none. The largest proportion (40%) reported that they use basic latrine as their main type of sanitation facility, followed by about a quarter (24%) who use a full waterborne flush toilet. Respondents in Bela Bela, Mogalakwena, Mookgopong, Musina, Polokwane and Thabazimbi are mostly using full waterborne flush toilets, while septic tanks are common in Ba-Phalaborwa, Greater Giyani and Modimolle. Respondents in Aganang, Bushbuckridge, Greater Marble Hall, Makhado, Makhudutamaga and Mutale tend to use ventilated or improved pit latrines. Basic latrines are mostly reported in Fetakgomo, Greater Groblersdal, Greater Tubatse, Lepelle-Nkumpi, Molemole and Thulamela, and chemical and bucket systems are mostly reported in Lephalale and Maruleng, respectively.

Lack of sanitation facilities is prevalent among respondents in Blouberg and Greater Letaba municipalities who reported "other" facilities, particularly bushes.

	N	%
No	3461	91%
Yes	348	9%
Total	3809	100%

Table 45: Problems experienced with sanitation facilities in past three months?

Majority of the respondents (91%) said that they have not experienced any problems with their sanitation facilities in the 3 months prior to the current study. Respondents in Bushbuckridge,

Almost a third (32%) of the respondents expect their municipalities to get sanitation problems fixed within hours of reporting, while close to a fifth (19%) said their sanitation problems should be fixed within a day.

	N	%
Satisfied	1450	30%
Dissatisfied	1412	29%
Very dissatisfied	1115	23%
Very satisfied	613	13%
Don't know or No opinion	233	5%
Total	4823	100%

Table 48: How satisfied are you with sanitation in your area?

More than half of the respondents (52%) reported that they are dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the state of sanitation in their area.

Respondents in Aganang (52%), Ba-Phalaborwa (37%), Greater Letaba (42%), Mogalakwena (49%) and Mutale (37%) are the most likely to report satisfaction with their sanitation facilities, while respondents in Bushbuckridge (54%), Greater Marble Hall (78%) and Greater Tubatse (56%) are the most likely to report dissatisfaction.

REFUSE REMOVAL

	N	%
Burn it	2306	45%
Collected by municipality	1043	20%
Bury it	644	13%
No refuse removal	531	10%
Throw it onto empty site	440	9%
Thrown in the communal dump	97	2%
Collected by a private company	78	2%
Total	5139	100%

Table 49: Main methods of household's refuse removal

The responses in the table indicate that close to half (45%) of the respondents dispose of their refuse by burning it. A fifth (20%) reported that household refuse is collected by the municipality, while a few said it is collected by a private company.

	N	%
Dissatisfied	1795	38
Satisfied	1178	25
Very dissatisfied	1087	23
Very satisfied	438	9
Don't Know or No opinion	180	4
Total	4678	100

Table 52: Level of satisfaction with refuse removal

Majority of the respondents (61%) are dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with refuse removal in their area. Respondents in Bushbuckridge, Greater Letaba, Greater Marble Hall, Greater Tubatse and Thulamela are most likely to report being dissatisfied. In these areas, the majority reported that they dispose of their refuse by burying it or burning it as opposed to having it collected by the municipality or private companies.

COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES

The main aim of this section was to investigate availability, accessibility and the quality (where they exist) of various community services and facilities in the province and in individual municipalities. In particular, the section focused on establishing whether services such as the police, postal and municipal bus services, among others, and facilities such as community halls, parks, sports grounds, and so forth, are available in various communities. Levels of satisfaction with these services and facilities were also investigated.

	Community Halls	Grass cutting	Housing support services	Municipal bus service	Municipal cemeteries	Municipal health services	Parks	Police services	Postal services	N
Aganang	2%	0%	96%	31%	4%	30%	-	27%	40%	170
Ba-Phalaborwa	45%	12%	63%	48%	63%	95%	16%	60%	87%	200
Bela Bela	65%	23%	63%	3%	65%	79%	35%	75%	71%	160
Blouberg	38%	1%	71%	1%	2%	48%	1%	8%	12%	200
Bushbuckridge	20%	-	83%	7%	50%	64%	1%	32%	36%	240
Fetakgomo	8%	-	83%	1%	-	42%	-	19%	36%	153
Great Giyani	40%	-	88%	19%	46%	67%	19%	34%	33%	210
Great Letaba	18%	7%	66%	22%	14%	40%	0%	21%	30%	210
Greater Groblersdal	37%	2%	75%	38%	51%	63%	-	61%	85%	200
Greater Marble Hall	30%	4%	72%	9%	12%	52%	-	6%	55%	180
Greater Tubatse	25%	-	43%	3%	18%	44%	-	29%	19%	207
Greater Tzaneen	9%	6%	58%	6%	11%	28%	4%	12%	19%	230
Lepelle-Nkumpi	36%	0%	86%	79%	23%	79%	1%	74%	68%	210
Lephalale	21%	22%	34%	-	19%	35%	20%	45%	35%	169
Makhado	30%	13%	73%	41%	26%	70%	12%	72%	65%	240
Makhudutamaga	23%	-	49%	4%	1%	60%	3%	42%	54%	210
Maruleng	58%	28%	78%	11%	16%	44%	-	49%	47%	160
Modimolle	53%	49%	44%	4%	52%	66%	36%	87%	56%	160
Mogalakwena	34%	14%	68%	13%	34%	54%	7%	42%	51%	220
Molemole	18%	-	97%	1%	4%	56%	0%	53%	67%	200
Mookgopong	30%	20%	32%	2%	29%	41%	13%	48%	39%	150
Musina	70%	14%	61%	8%	59%	68%	20%	71%	61%	150
Mutale	42%	-	85%	3%	37%	69%	2%	67%	75%	160
Polokwane	32%	23%	63%	35%	45%	70%	48%	71%	67%	300
Thabazimbi	45%	32%	29%	1%	45%	67%	24%	39%	49%	169
Thulamela	22%	6%	94%	11%	72%	69%	9%	62%	60%	300

Table 54: Services and facilities available, by municipality (1)

Table 54 provides an indication of some of the services and facilities available in each of the municipalities. The table is continued below.

Besides for schooling, housing support services and municipal health facilities are the mostly reported facilities available in most of municipalities.

	Count	%
Accessing health services	2999	58%
Accessing welfare services	2324	45%
Road maintenance	1309	25%
Accessing community halls	1238	24%
Roads are tarred	1002	19%
There are street lights	836	16%
Walkways are paved	308	6%

Table 56: Availability of infrastructure (N = 5158)

The availability, and accessibility thereof, of infrastructure in these areas appears to be limited. Health services are the most commonly accessible services. However, less than half of the respondents (45%) are able to access welfare services, and only a quarter indicated that road maintenance or community halls are available. Less than 1 in 5 (19%) respondents indicated that roads are tarred in their area.

	Count	%
Stayed the same	2709	53%
Improved	2104	41%
Deteriorated	323	6%
Total	5137	100%

Table 58: Perceptions of whether the community has changed over the past five years

Slightly more than half (53%) of the respondents felt that their communities have not changed over the past five years in terms of the services and facilities available. However, a large proportion (41%) felt that their communities have improved – only 6% reported that their communities have deteriorated.

	Count	%
Dissatisfied	1967	39%
Very dissatisfied	1215	24%
Satisfied	1491	29%
Very satisfied	223	4%
Don't Know or No opinion	218	4%
Total	5113	100%

Table 60: Level of satisfaction with the community services and facilities provided by the municipality

Levels of satisfaction with the community services and facilities are generally low. When asked about their level of satisfaction with the services and facilities provided by the municipality in their communities, only a third of respondents (33%) reported that services and facilities are satisfactory. More than 60% reported being dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the services and facilities.

	Satisfied	Disatisfied	No opinion	Total	
Improved	64%	32%	3%	100%	2101
Stayed the same	12%	83%	5%	100%	2689
Deteriorated	15%	82%	3%	100%	322
Total	34%	62%	4%	100%	5112

Table 61: Level of satisfaction with the community services and facilities provided by the municipality, by perceptions of whether the community has changed

Respondents who reported that their communities have stayed the same or deteriorated are most likely to be dissatisfied with the services and facilities provided by the municipality.

Reported satisfaction is highest in Ba-Phalaborwa (49%), Mookgopong (48%), Polokwane (48%), Maruleng (47%), Modimolle (47%) and Mogalakwena (46%). Levels of dissatisfaction are high in Greater Groblersdal (90%), Molemole (85%), Greater Tubatse (83%) and Fetakgomo (79%).

DISASTER MANAGEMENT

This section reports on the availability and questions of awareness around disaster management facilities in various municipalities. Respondents were asked to report on whether they know of the existence of such facilities in their areas as well as reporting on their accessibility and the quality of service delivered by these facilities.

Tubatse and Thulamela municipalities are the most likely to report dissatisfaction with the ambulance services.

	N	%
No	4168	82%
Yes	923	18%
Total	5091	100%

Table 65: Availability of fire brigade

Overwhelming majority of the respondents (82%) indicated that there is no fire brigade in their areas. However, in each of Musina and Maruleng municipalities, respondents are most likely to indicate that there is fire brigade in their areas.

	N	%
Good	451	46%
Average	403	41%
Bad	138	14%
Total	991	100%

Table 66: Quality of Fire brigade service

The quality of the fire brigade services is generally viewed to be acceptable considering that only 14% of the respondents reported that the service is bad.

	N	%
No	2672	53%
Yes	2407	47%
Total	5079	100%

Table 67: Availability of Police station services

Slightly more than half of the respondents indicated that there are no police stations in their areas. The municipalities in which the highest percentages indicated that there are no police stations are Greater Marble Hall (93%), Blouberg (92%), Fetakgomo (85%), Greater Letaba (82%), Greater Groblersdal (76%), Greater Tubatse (74%), and Greater Tzaneen (71%) while in municipalities such as Modimolle, over 90% of the respondents reported that there are police services.

	N	%
No	3447	67%
Yes	1711	33%
Total	5158	100%

Table 70: Do you know which ward you live in?

Table 70 indicates that two-thirds of the respondents (67%) do not know which ward they live in. The municipalities in which respondents are most likely to report knowing which ward they live in are Mutale (69%), Greater Giyani (61%), Thulamela (58%) and Bela Bela (57%).

	N	%
Yes	2881	56%
No	2246	44%
Total	5126	100%

Table 71: Percentage of respondents who reported knowledge of their ward councillor

When asked whether they know who their ward councillor is, more than half of the respondents (56%) reported that they do. It was however striking that more than eight in ten of the respondents in each of Mookgopong and Musina, and about three-quarters in Lephalale and Modimolle municipalities reported that they did not know their ward councillors.

	N	%
Don't know	1623	32%
Inefficient	1269	25%
Very inefficient	1076	21%
Efficient	927	18%
Very efficient	232	5%
Total	5126	100%

Table 72: How would you rate your ward councillor?

When asked to rate their ward councillors, the highest percentage of the respondents (46%) were of the view that they are inefficient, or very inefficient. The second highest percentage, about a third (32%), indicated that they do not have any opinion.

The municipalities in which the respondents were most likely to report that the councillors are inefficient are Greater Tubatse (77%), Fetakgomo (67%), Greater Groblersdal (65%), Greater Marble Hall (65%) and Lepelle-Nkumpi (62%), with Greater Tubatse having the highest percentage of the respondents who feel that the councillors are inefficient. In contrast, Greater

(86%), Musina (85%), Blouberg (84%) and Mookgopong (82%). On the other hand, the municipalities in which the respondents were more likely to report awareness are Greater Groblersdal (64%), Greater Marble Hall (63%) and Bushbuckridge (62%).

	N	%
No	3432	67%
Yes	1676	33%
Total	5108	100%

Table 75: Attendance of meetings organised by councillor or ward

Noting that only less than half of the respondents reported awareness of the meetings organised by councillors or the ward committee, it is not surprising that the attendance of such meetings is reported by only a third of the respondents (33%). The municipalities in which the respondents were most likely to report attendance of the meetings are Ba-Phalaborwa and Greater Groblersdal, 56% in each case. Lephalale and Mookgopong are the two municipalities in which the respondents are most likely to report non-attendance of ward committee meetings. In each of the two municipalities, 89% reported that they never attend the meetings organised by the councillor or the ward committee.

	N	%
Sometimes	1006	61%
Always	526	32%
Rarely	110	7%
Total	1642	100%

Table 76: Frequency of attending meetings organised by the councillor or the ward committee

Among those who reported attendance of the meetings organised by the councillors and/or the ward committees, the majority (61%) reported that they only attend them occasionally. Only about a third (32%) attends the meetings regularly.

The municipalities in which the respondents were most likely to report attending the meetings regularly are Ba-Phalaborwa (62%) and Thabazimbi municipalities (60%). On the other hand, Blouberg, Lepelle-Nkumpi and Lephalale are the three municipalities in which the respondents are most likely to report attending the meetings only rarely. There are no major differences between the municipalities in regards to the percentage of respondents who reported attending the meetings rarely.

The largest proportion of the respondents (50%) reported that they were dissatisfied with the impact of their participation in the municipal activities. This was followed by 28% who were indifferent.

The respondents in Ba-Phalaborwa (53%) followed by Modimolle (44%) and Maruleng (43%) were most likely to report satisfaction with the impact of their participation in the municipal activities while the respondents in the Greater Tubatse (81%) and Greater Marble Hall (80%) were more likely to report being dissatisfied. The municipalities in which the respondents were mostly like to report being indifferent are Bela Bela (62%) followed by Makhudutamaga (48%).

	N	%
Bad	2011	39%
Average	1851	36%
Good	701	14%
Don't know	451	9%
Excellent	106	2%
Total	5119	100%

Table 80: Municipality's performance with regard to service delivery

The largest proportion of the respondents, constituting about two-fifths (39%), reported that their municipalities' performance is bad. The second largest percentage, constituting slightly more than a third (36%), reported that their municipality's performance is average.

The municipalities in which the respondents were most likely to report that the performance is below standard are Greater Groblersdal (73%), Greater Tubatse (71%) and Aganang (57%).

programmes while those in Greater Tubatse (62%) and Thabazimbi (61%) were most likely to report that the poverty alleviation programmes are generally inaccessible in their areas.

PRIORITY FOR IMPROVEMENT

The last section of the questionnaire enquired about whether there were areas and services which the municipalities need to prioritise for improvement. The respondents were asked to rate their municipalities in so far as service delivery is concerned. They were also asked to suggest what the municipalities could do to ensure that they delivered the service with which the residents could be happy.

	N	%
Yes	4734	93%
No	374	7%
Total	5108	100%

Table 82: Proportion of respondents reporting that their municipalities' services need improvement

At least 9 in 10 respondents (93%) indicated that there is a need for the municipalities' services to be improved. Respondents in Modimolle (78%) and Aganang (79%) municipalities were the least likely to report that the municipal services require some improvement.

Among other suggestions, respondents indicated that the municipalities need to consult more with the communities, need to build schools in areas where children travel long distances to get to the nearest school, and the government needs to closely monitor service delivery, among others.

participants, the government's performance is judged on the basis of the quality of the services provided. Most of the participants complained about the number of times they experienced electricity cut-offs and duration thereof, as well as the taste and suspected impurity of water.

Among the participants in rural areas, the government's performance was questionable with regards to monitoring the public works programmes and services in general. Most of the participants in this category felt that the government is not doing enough to ensure that individuals and companies awarded the contracts to deliver service such as water and building low-cost houses are delivering up to the required standard. On the other hand, participants in urban areas felt that the government is inefficient in terms of handling accounts for the basic services such as refuse removal, water and rates and taxes.

MUNICIPAL SERVICES DELIVERY

This section was focused on understanding the participants' perceptions on the performance of their municipalities regarding service delivery. The participants were prompted to raise their views on the availability, quality and quantity of basic services provided by their municipalities. They were also asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the municipal services, where applicable. The particular services focused on are water, sanitation, electricity, refuse removal, housing delivery and disaster management facilities.

WATER

Urban participants were more concerned about the management of water accounts by the municipalities, the cleanliness of the water and the water pressure. The participants reported that they often receive statements suggesting that they have used excessive amount of water which according to them does not reflect a true situation. About the quality of the water, some complained that the water pressure was low such that they were unable to use showers when bathing. In addition, some highlighted that they have been advised to boil the water before drinking it as it contained a disease-causing bacteria. One of the participants had the following to say:

"I want to talk about the quality of the water. I can't take bottled water to work everyday. I drink 2 litres of water a day and I must boil the water first and cool it off"
(Urban, females).

The rural participants on the other hand raised concerns about a range of issues, from total unavailability of water to the quality. It was highlighted that in some villages only certain sections do get water while some do not. This shortage of water also affected essential services such as clinics and hospital. Participants reported that as a result, they are forced to buy water

The participants in the rural areas further raised concerns about the efficiency and accessibility of points of sale of recharge cards. They reported that the current pre-paid card vending system requires improvement in the form of better management and maintenance as the ones that they currently depend on are almost always not in a working order. As a result, they find themselves having to spend more money on transport to get to places where they could find vending machines which are in a working order.

REFUSE REMOVAL

Refuse removal services are non-existent in rural areas. Participants in the rural areas complained that absence of such a service makes their areas look untidy and it becomes dangerous to their livestock. One of the participants reported the following:

"On the issue of refuse, the municipality is doing nothing. You will find that there are lot of plastics in the streets and if animals eat that they will have to be killed because they won't survive. The sad part is we are making a living out of these animals" (Rural, males).

To curb the problem, most of them reported that they bury or burn their household refuse to try and keep their areas tidy. They, however, highlighted that it would be very beneficial if the municipality could provide a communal refuse bins in each village.

In the urban settings on the other hand, a key concern was raised with regard to the collection of household refuse. The participants highlighted that sometimes household refuse stays uncollected for several weeks yet they are expected to pay for the service. It was highlighted that the municipalities need to award contracts to companies which would carry out the service reliably.

HOUSING DELIVERY

Participants in the urban setting are not aware of any houses provided by the municipalities. Two main concerns were however raised by the participants in the rural settings concerning the government's housing delivery. First, participants are unhappy that they have been promised houses for a long time but the houses are still not built. They argue that the builders appointed by the government have come and built a few houses and took off without completing building all the houses they were supposed to build. One of the participants reported the following:

"People who have been awarded the contracts do not finish their work. They have built some houses which are not finished and they have left" (Rural, males).

Second, there are concerns about the quality of the houses. There is a general feeling that the quality of the houses provided by the municipality was of a substandard. Respondents report that:

participants however reported that they only came in contact with them during the local government elections. One participant reported the following:

"We only met them when they were campaigning and the community agreed to let him be elected to give him a chance to see what he can do for the community. After he was elected, you never see him again until the next elections" (Rural, females)

The councillors are generally rated negatively. Some reported that their councillors are good at making promises but never delivering on them. However, the councillor was applauded in one of the areas for arranging for burial of some two old ladies who fell victims to criminals.

In terms of improving the systems of local governance, participants across the board understood that as citizens they need to play a role. They however added that the municipalities need to be accessible and increase their interaction with the communities. It was further added that the municipalities need not only grant contracts to companies to deliver services. It was felt that the contracted companies need to be closely monitored in order to ensure that quality service is delivered.

areas. This low level of development in the latter municipalities is likely to influence the communities' perception with regard to the government's performance on service delivery in general. As indicated in our findings section, people who report satisfaction with their dwelling structures are most likely to report satisfaction with the government's performance. It might therefore prove useful for the government to prioritise improvement of people's living conditions (e.g., by providing housing) in the specified municipalities in order to change the communities' perception regarding the government performances.

SERVICE DELIVERY

HOUSING DELIVERY

As reported earlier, although there are municipalities in which the dominant type of dwelling is informal and traditional, majority of the households in the province live in formal dwellings. This suggests that the problem of housing delivery is on a relatively low scale in the province. The situation however warrants some urgent intervention in municipalities such as Bushbuckridge, Lephalale, Maruleng, Greater Giyani, and Modimolle among others. These municipalities have a slightly higher percentage of households occupying informal dwellings, and the majority are dissatisfied with the government's performance on housing delivery.

In terms of ownership, majority of the households own their dwellings in the province. However, municipalities such as Polokwane, Molemole, Mogalakwena and Greater Groblersdal are dominated by households which do not own their dwellings, and among those who do not own their dwellings, over three-quarters said they need their own dwellings. This situation may be explained by a high influx of people into these municipalities as they are the main economic centres in the province. As a result, majority of the people in these municipalities may be migrant workers who own dwellings elsewhere. However, it is worth noting that even though these people might own dwellings elsewhere, majority of them indicated that they need to own dwellings in these municipalities as well. It may therefore be useful for the government to ascertain the number of those who own dwellings elsewhere before embarking on a programme to provide people with houses where as failure to determine this may lead to duplicates, i.e., providing people with extra houses when they have in fact been allocated houses in other municipalities.

get the water cut-offs fixed is difficult to ascertain as the responses varied. However, for most people, a day is a reasonable amount of time within which cut-offs are expected to be fixed.

By and large, municipalities in the province seem to be doing well with regard to the issuing and management of water consumption accounts as most of those who receive water accounts from their municipalities do not have problems with incorrect water accounts. This may be one of the reasons why more than half of the respondents are happy with the quality of water supply in their areas. As shown in Table 149 (see appendix A), on a scale of 0 – 1, with 1 representing good performance, Mookgopong (0.76) and Musina (0.76) are among the best performing municipalities. Fetakgomo (0.27), Greater Goblersdale (0.25), Greater Tubatse (0.24) and Molemole (0.22) are on the other hand among the worst performing municipality with regards to water supply. Municipalities such as Bela Bela (0.69), Modimolle (0.67) and Polokwane (0.63) are rated well above average.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Although a notable percentage of households in the province use electricity for cooking, the largest proportion uses wood. There is however no question about energy source for lighting as close to 8 in 10 households reported that they use electricity. This could be interpreted to suggest that close to 80% of the households in province are electrified, a performance which can be regarded as satisfactory for the province.

Eskom is the main electricity supplier in the province, and most of the households use a pre-paid card system as opposed to conventional meters. Noting that the pre-paid card system is dominant, it is not surprising that awareness of free electricity allowance is very low. The pre-paid card system does not clearly indicate the amount of electricity received as free electricity allowance. If the government wishes to make the communities aware of this service, it may take a dedicated awareness campaign on the matter, and the easiest could be a reflection of the amount of electricity received as free allowance on the coupon. Although it may not seem a priority to make the communities aware of this service, the consequence of failing to do so may be dissatisfaction which may lead to apathy, especially among those who believe that they deserve free electricity allowance.

Disruptions in during the three months preceding the study were reported by two-fifths of the respondents and these were generally due to a general power failure. These were however fixed

are among the poor performing municipalities. In total, 20 of the 26 municipalities' performance is below average.

COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Schools, housing support services, and to some degree, municipal health services, are the most commonly available community services and facilities in various municipalities across the province. However, community services such as grass cutting, storm water drainage, and recreation facilities such as parks and public sports facilities, multi-purpose centres and public libraries have only been provided on a very small scale. Quality of the services is also unsatisfactory in areas where they are available. The only services that are highly commended by the public for good quality are public libraries, schools, postal services and grass cutting services, where these exist. The rest are rated mostly as average, which suggests that the municipalities need to pay more attention with the view to improve the quality of the services in question.

Accessibility of the services is another issue that requires an urgent attention as it would appear that it is highly limited. Municipal health service is the most accessible service in comparison with other services such as welfare services, road maintenance, community halls, and street lights, among others. For majority of the citizens, their communities have stayed the same in the past five years. This suggests that most of the communities feel that a lot still needs to be done in terms of improving delivery on community services and facilities. Almost all the municipalities are seen as underperforming with regards to the delivery of community services and facilities (see Table 156 in Appendix A).

DISASTER MANAGEMENT

Similar to the community services and facilities, availability of disaster management services and facilities is limited. Facilities and services such as disaster management centres, ambulances, fire brigade and police stations are unavailable in most of the communities. It should, however, be understood that according to the Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000, local municipalities are not obliged to establish disaster management centres, and this may be one of the key reasons why most of the local municipalities in the province do not have such centres. However, in areas where these services and facilities are available, their quality is to some extent satisfactory. What this suggests therefore is that the municipalities need to make

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations outlined here are informed by the findings of the citizens satisfaction study conducted among the residents of the Limpopo province across all 26 municipalities. Various subjects under which the recommendations are made are outlined.

EDUCATION LEVEL

Despite various programmes such as Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET) and the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) (which has an element of skills development) put in place by the national government in conjunction with provincial governments, the level of education and skills attainment in the province is still low. A recommendation we would like to make here is that these government programmes need to be targeted, especially at those individuals to whom they would make a significant difference. The government, especially at the local level, needs to ensure that the programmes are accessed exclusively by those individuals who fit the criteria and have demonstrated commitment to such programmes.

EMPLOYMENT CREATION

Although the level of unemployment in the province was found to be on par with the national rates at 40%, proper targeting of employment programmes such as the EPWP would ensure that only those people who are indigent and need to earn income are employed rather than having a *laissez-faire* situation where any individual could get employment on the programme even if they do not meet the criteria to be employed on such programmes. Furthermore, proper management and monitoring of the projects falling under the EPWP by the municipalities is essential for the realisation of the employment creation object of the programme.

HOUSING DELIVERY

A clear backlog has been identified with regard to the provision of houses by the government. In some municipalities, the dominant type of housing remains informal and traditional housing structures. There is therefore an urgent need for the government to intervene in the affected municipalities of Greater Giyani, Mogalakwena, Bushbuckridge, Greater Tzaneen, Mutale, and Thulamela, among others identified.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Capable transformers should be installed in areas where electricity supply is via overhead electricity cables to minimize electricity disruptions due to minor weather effects and overloading. Communities should also be advised of electricity cut-offs well in advance so that they could make alternative arrangements. Furthermore, pay points should be more accessible, well-maintained and user friendly.

Generally, more areas still need to be electrified in consultation with the Department of Minerals and Energy (DME) and Eskom.

SANITATION

Each household must be assisted with a basic sanitation facility by the municipalities as per Centre for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) and the South African Bureau of Standards (SABS) guidelines, to eliminate disease-causing pathogens and ground water pollution. Programmes to assist the community in emptying of the latrines should be put in place in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Environmental affairs, with the possibility of job creation at community level.

REFUSE REMOVAL

Every household must be provided with rubbish bins, which will have to be collected regularly. Communities should be trained on environmental issues to understand the benefits of a clean environment. More dumping sites should be built in accordance with environmental specifications.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

All community services must be looked into as per individual municipality's requirements. Infrastructure level has to be improved. There is a need for Multipurpose Community Centres (MPCC) to ensure easy access to government and municipal services. Communities need to be improved through implementation of various projects, which will help with poverty alleviation

APPENDIX A

AREA DETAILS

	Formal %	Informal %	Traditional %	N	Total %
AGANANG	74%	1%	25%	169	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	47%	22%	31%	199	100%
BELA BELA	76%	21%	3%	159	100%
BLOUBERG	88%	12%	1%	200	100%
BRRIDGE	11%	88%	1%	240	100%
FETAKGOMO	88%	12%	0%	152	100%
GREATER GIYANI	33%	2%	65%	209	100%
GREATER LETABA	56%	39%	5%	210	100%
G. GROBLERSDAL	86%	13%	2%	200	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	77%	23%	0%	180	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	51%	49%	1%	206	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	49%	11%	40%	229	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	99%	1%	1%	210	100%
LEPHALALE	54%	42%	4%	168	100%
MAKHADO	80%	7%	13%	238	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	81%	9%	10%	210	100%
MARULENG	5%	79%	16%	154	100%
MODIMOLLE	46%	49%	4%	160	100%
MOGALAKWENA	82%	18%	1%	212	100%
MOLEMOLE	99%	1%	0%	198	100%
MOOKGOPONG	84%	16%	1%	148	100%
MUSINA	77%	23%	0%	150	100%
MUTALE	62%	11%	28%	160	100%
POLOKWANE	98%	1%	1%	298	100%
THABAZIMBI	46%	52%	2%	170	100%
THULAMELA	53%	26%	21%	291	100%
TOTAL	66%	24%	11%	5120	100%

Table 83: Dominant type of housing by municipality

HOUSING

	Formal dwellings	Informal dwellings	Traditional dwellings	N
AGANANG	95%	4%	2%	170
BA-PHALABORWA	59%	15%	27%	200
BELA BELA	85%	13%	3%	160
BLOUBERG	86%	9%	5%	195
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	75%	20%	6%	236
FETAKGOMO	91%	5%	4%	152
GREAT GIYANI	50%	13%	37%	210
GREAT LETABA	92%	2%	6%	209
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	94%	5%	2%	199
GREATER MARBLE HALL	93%	7%	1%	180
GREATER TUBATSE	78%	17%	5%	206
GREATER TZANEEN	54%	8%	39%	230
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	99%	1%	0%	210
LEPHALALE	57%	32%	11%	169
MAKHADO	82%	3%	15%	241
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	85%	3%	12%	209
MARULENG	79%	6%	15%	159
MODIMOLLE	45%	42%	13%	161
MOGALAKWENA	78%	20%	2%	220
MOLEMOLE	100%	0%	0%	199
MOOKGOPONG	75%	19%	6%	141
MUSINA	93%	1%	6%	115
MUTALE	75%	3%	22%	158
POLOKWANE	93%	6%	1%	300
THABAZIMBI	46%	53%	2%	169
THULAMELA	76%	1%	23%	296
Total	78%	11%	11%	5094

Table 85: Municipality by type of dwelling

	Own it	Rent it	Just live here	N
AGANANG	59%	2%	40%	169
BA-PHALABORWA	84%	1%	16%	200
BELA BELA	60%	15%	25%	159
BLOUBERG	87%	0%	14%	200
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	72%	1%	27%	239
FETAKGOMO	94%	0%	6%	152
GREAT GIYANI	98%	0%	2%	210
GREAT LETABA	65%	29%	6%	210
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	76%	2%	22%	201
GREATER MARBLE HALL	54%	0%	46%	180
GREATER TUBATSE	97%	0%	3%	207
GREATER TZANEEN	60%	2%	39%	230
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	77%	0%	23%	210
LEPHALALE	36%	24%	39%	168
MAKHADO	83%	4%	13%	239
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	66%	0%	34%	210
MARULENG	54%	36%	11%	160
MODIMOLLE	60%	12%	29%	161
MOGALAKWENA	74%	4%	22%	218
MOLEMOLE	82%	3%	16%	200
MOOKGOPONG	22%	9%	69%	148
MUSINA	48%	41%	11%	150
MUTALE	84%	0%	16%	160
POLOKWANE	69%	10%	22%	300
THABAZIMBI	49%	20%	32%	168
THULAMELA	92%	0%	8%	299
Total	71%	7%	22%	5148

Table 87: Municipality by Mode of Accommodation

	Yes	No	N
AGANANG	86%	14%	170
BA-PHALABORWA	73%	27%	195
BELA BELA	56%	44%	158
BLOUBERG	65%	35%	196
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	92%	8%	237
FETAKGOMO	83%	17%	152
GREAT GIYANI	88%	12%	209
GREAT LETABA	69%	31%	208
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	78%	23%	200
GREATER MARBLE HALL	89%	11%	180
GREATER TUBATSE	70%	30%	206
GREATER TZANEEN	64%	36%	229
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	78%	22%	210
LEPHALLE	84%	16%	168
MAKHADO	73%	27%	238
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	64%	36%	210
MARULENG	61%	39%	160
MODIMOLLE	54%	46%	160
MOGALAKWENA	82%	18%	214
MOLEMOLE	96%	5%	198
MOOKGOPONG	86%	14%	146
MUSINA	59%	41%	147
MUTALE	91%	9%	160
POLOKWANE	71%	29%	300
THABAZIMBI	79%	21%	169
THULAMELA	94%	6%	293
Total	77%	23%	5113

Table 89: Municipality by Awareness Government Housing

SERVICE DELIVERY

WATER

	Piped water in dwelling %	On-site taps or taps in the yard only %	Street taps or standpipes %	Borehole or rainwater tank or well %	Dam/river / stream / spring %	Other %	Total %
AGANANG	-	32%	45%	14%	5%	4%	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	47%	27%	27%	-	-	-	100%
BELA BELA	49%	33%	1%	14%	4%	2%	100%
BLOUBERG	-	15%	69%	11%	2%	2%	100%
BBRIDGE	8%	36%	42%	8%	14%	4%	100%
FETAKGOMO	35%	3%	46%	27%	3%	10%	100%
GREATER GIYANI	14%	23%	35%	4%	11%	-	100%
GREAT LETABA	11%	2%	23%	26%	16%	2%	100%
G. GROBLERS	-	25%	67%	7%	-	1%	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	8%	18%	49%	4%	15%	7%	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	15%	21%	17%	46%	1%	-	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	17%	37%	11%	22%	2%	11%	100%
LEPHALALE	24%	22%	33%	18%	3%	-	100%
MAKHADO	11%	47%	33%	7%	0%	1%	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	7%	4%	58%	17%	22%	2%	100%
MARULENG	16%	20%	41%	33%	14%	-	100%
MODIMOLLE	31%	8%	19%	42%	3%	5%	100%
MOGALAKWENA	3%	28%	29%	27%	1%	-	100%
MOLEMOLE	13%	22%	23%	47%	-	-	100%
MOOKGOPONG	18%	56%	25%	-	-	3%	100%
MUSINA	1%	39%	49%	1%	1%	9%	100%
MUTALE	55%	20%	12%	13%	1%	-	100%
POLOKWANE	48%	5%	24%	14%	1%	8%	100%
THABAZIMBI	30%	34%	26%	3%	3%	4%	100%
THULAMELA	19%	24%	31%	20%	5%	3%	100%
Total							

Table 91: Households' main source of water by municipality

	Every month		Once every two months		Once every three months		After four months and more		Never		Not applicable		Total	
	%		%		%		%		%		%		N	%
AGANANG	2%		2%		2%				91%		2%		45	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	98%										2%		95	100%
BELA BELA	98%						2%						103	100%
BLOUBERG	26%						2%		36%		36%		47	100%
BBRIDGE	82%								5%		14%		22	100%
FETAKGOMO	40%								46%		11%		35	100%
GREATER GIYANI	86%				2%		3%		8%		2%		65	100%
GREATER LETABA	75%		1%				3%		23%		1%		84	100%
G. GROBLERSDAL	1%		3%						54%		43%		80	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	32%		2%		1%				48%		18%		146	100%
GREATER TUBATSE							100%						48	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	78%								22%				23	100%
LEPELE-NKUMPI	56%		8%		2%		3%		30%		2%		106	100%
LEPHALALE	64%						2%		30%		5%		61	100%
MAKHADO	66%						9%		9%		17%		47	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	4%								33%		63%		24	100%
MARULENG	81%										19%		21	100%
MODIMOLLE	90%		5%						3%		2%		62	100%
MOGALAKWENA	66%		7%						16%		11%		114	100%
MOLEMOLE	24%						3%		18%		55%		38	100%
MOOKGOPONG	67%								25%		8%		61	100%
MUSINA	69%				1%				2%		29%		111	100%
MUTALE	37%								46%		17%		35	100%
POLOKWANE	88%				1%				5%		7%		214	100%
THABAZIMBI	82%						3%		5%		10%		74	100%
THULAMELA	23%		24%		17%		13%		21%		2%		132	100%
TOTAL	59%		3%		2%		2%		23%		12%		1893	100%

Table 93: Frequency of receiving water account by municipality

	Yes	No	Total	
	%	%	N	%
AGANANG				
BA-PHALABORWA	37%	63%	170	100%
BELA BELA	9%	91%	198	100%
BLOUBERG	33%	68%	160	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	5%	95%	200	100%
FETAKGOMO	55%	45%	240	100%
GREATER GIYANI	35%	65%	148	100%
GREATER LETABA	37%	63%	209	100%
G. GROBLERSDAL	5%	95%	209	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	10%	90%	198	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	53%	48%	179	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	14%	86%	188	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	15%	85%	228	100%
LEPHALALE	23%	77%	210	100%
MAKHADO	15%	85%	168	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	54%	46%	240	100%
MARULENG	24%	76%	205	100%
MODIMOLLE	43%	57%	160	100%
MOGALAKWENA	26%	74%	159	100%
MOLEMOLE	42%	58%	216	100%
MOOKGOPONG	35%	65%	199	100%
MUSINA	36%	64%	150	100%
MUTALE	23%	77%	150	100%
POLOKWANE	37%	63%	160	100%
THABAZIMBI	21%	79%	300	100%
THULAMELA	22%	78%	167	100%
TOTAL	40%	60%	297	100%
	29%	71%	5108	100%

Table 95: Awareness of free water allowance by municipality

	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	N
AGANANG	69%	31%	170
BA-PHALABORWA	64%	37%	200
BELA BELA	90%	10%	157
BLOUBERG	61%	39%	200
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	33%	67%	239
FETAKGOMO	45%	55%	152
GREATER GIYANI	63%	37%	210
GREATER LETABA	47%	53%	210
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	75%	25%	199
GREATER MARBLE HALL	76%	24%	179
GREATER TUBATSE	56%	44%	192
GREATER TZANEEN	24%	76%	222
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	52%	48%	209
LEPHALLE	83%	17%	169
MAKHADO	26%	74%	238
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	68%	32%	209
MARULENG	73%	28%	160
MODIMOLLE	90%	11%	153
MOGALAKWENA	74%	26%	220
MOLEMOLE	41%	59%	199
MOOKGOPONG	95%	5%	150
MUSINA	79%	21%	150
MUTALE	9%	91%	160
POLOKWANE	80%	20%	300
THABAZIMBI	63%	37%	169
THULAMELA	14%	86%	300
TOTAL	58%	42%	5116
			100%

Table 97: Water available at all times in the last 3 months by municipality

	Within hours	Within a day	Within a couple of days (2-3 days)	About a week (4-7 days)	About 2 weeks	A month or more	Other	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
AGANANG	10%	10%							
BA-PHALABORWA		22%	26%	2%	8%	13%	60%	40	100%
BELA BELA	82%	18%			28%	18%	6%	51	100%
BLOUBERG		3%	32%	8%	5%	41%		17	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	7%	4%	13%	9%	20%	37%	11%	37	100%
FETAKGOMO		9%	13%	6%	10%	24%	11%	46	100%
GREATER GIYANI	3%	15%	27%	3%	9%	44%	38%	68	100%
GREATER LETABA	8%	15%	25%	20%	13%	18%	3%	34	100%
GREATER								40	100%
GROBLERSDAL		8%	11%	3%	3%	3%	72%	36	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	3%	22%	24%	14%	22%		16%	37	100%
GREATER TUBATSE		8%	8%	9%	18%	33%	25%	89	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	4%	51%	14%	10%	10%	11%	1%	74	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	11%	13%	7%	16%	11%	20%	22%	45	100%
LEPHALALE	9%	44%	13%	4%	9%	22%		23	100%
MAKHADO	5%	11%	23%	13%	28%	17%	3%	64	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA								43	100%
MARULENG		9%	16%	14%	9%	12%	40%	16	100%
MODIMOLLE			13%	19%	6%	19%	44%	7	100%
MOGALAKWENA	14%	14%	43%	29%				35	100%
MOLEMOLE	26%	6%		9%	20%	17%	23%	36	100%
MOOKGOPONG	11%	17%	28%	8%	6%	25%	6%	6	100%
MUSINA	33%		33%	17%			17%	14	100%
MUTALE	57%	29%	7%		7%			69	100%
POLOKWANE	3%	13%	16%	23%	13%	26%	6%	33	100%
THABAZIMBI	15%	15%	27%	12%	3%	7%	21%	45	100%
THULAMELA	22%	20%	20%	2%	7%	17%	5%	115	100%
TOTAL	6%	24%	32%	10%	6%	19%	17%	1120	100%

Table 99: Time taken to repair water breakdown by municipality

	Municipality		No-one		Other		Total	
	%		%		%		N	%
AGANANG	14%		17%		70%		169	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	84%		9%		7%		200	100%
BELA BELA	59%		25%		16%		159	100%
BLOUBERG	65%		23%		12%		199	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	33%		33%		34%		240	100%
FETAKGOMO	41%		30%		29%		153	100%
GREATER GIYANI	86%		12%		2%		211	100%
GREATER LETABA	45%		40%		15%		210	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	14%		47%		39%		193	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	34%		21%		46%		180	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	29%		17%		54%		196	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	21%		55%		25%		227	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	41%		36%		23%		207	100%
LEPHALALE	31%		3%		66%		169	100%
MAKHADO	65%		20%		15%		240	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	25%		33%		42%		210	100%
MARULENG	16%		18%		67%		160	100%
MODIMOLLE	49%		13%		38%		159	100%
MOGALAKWENA	76%		7%		17%		220	100%
MOLEMOLE	10%		47%		44%		198	100%
MOOKGOPONG	26%		26%		47%		148	100%
MUSINA	55%		8%		37%		149	100%
MUTALE	68%				32%		160	100%
POLOKWANE	55%		17%		28%		300	100%
THABAZIMBI	53%		13%		34%		168	100%
THULAMELA	67%		13%		20%		301	100%
TOTAL	46%		23%		32%		5126	100%

Table 101: Entity responsible for the maintenance of taps and water sources by municipality

	Yes		No		Total	
	%		%		N	%
AGANANG						
BA-PHALABORWA	47%		100%		170	100%
BELA BELA	66%		53%		200	100%
BLOUBERG	3%		34%		160	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	7%		98%		200	100%
FETAKGOMO	3%		93%		237	100%
GREATER GIYANI	30%		97%		151	100%
GREATER LETABA	12%		70%		210	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	1%		88%		209	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	3%		99%		200	100%
GREATER TUBATSE			97%		180	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	8%		100%		193	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	31%		92%		229	100%
LEPHALLE	16%		69%		206	100%
MAKHADO	16%		84%		169	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	1%		84%		238	100%
MARULENG	3%		100%		210	100%
MODIMOLLE	34%		97%		149	100%
MOGALAKWENA	30%		67%		158	100%
MOLEMOLE	5%		70%		220	100%
MOOKGOPONG	21%		96%		198	100%
MUSINA	51%		79%		150	100%
MUTALE	8%		49%		150	100%
POLOKWANE	61%		93%		159	100%
THABAZIMBI	24%		39%		299	100%
THULAMELA	35%		76%		169	100%
TOTAL	21%		79%		5114	100%

Table 103: Do you receive water account from the local municipality by municipality

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know / Not Applicable	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	N
AGANANG	12%	36%	37%	14%	1%	169
BA-PHALABORWA	12%	49%	24%	15%		199
BELA BELA	31%	39%	12%	19%		160
BLOUBERG	6%	28%	24%	28%	15%	200
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	5%	42%	33%	20%		240
FETAKGOMO	12%	16%	30%	41%	1%	153
GREATER GIYANI	7%	41%	26%	25%	1%	211
GREATER LETABA	5%	19%	55%	19%	1%	211
G. GROBLERSDAL	14%	21%	33%	31%	2%	200
GREATER MARBLE HALL	2%	62%	29%	7%		179
GREATER TUBATSE	1%	20%	40%	39%	1%	204
GREATER TZANEEN	13%	19%	29%	34%	5%	223
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	23%	16%	34%	25%	1%	208
LEPHALALE	22%	53%	17%	8%		169
MAKHADO	3%	34%	20%	43%		235
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	3%	49%	28%	20%		209
MARULENG	28%	26%	27%	17%	2%	159
MODIMOLLE	25%	40%	18%	16%	1%	159
MOGALAKWENA	6%	55%	31%	5%	3%	220
MOLEMOLE	6%	10%	23%	60%	1%	197
MOOKGOPONG	18%	58%	13%	9%	2%	151
MUSINA	12%	56%	16%	11%	5%	149
MUTALE	5%	36%	41%	18%		160
POLOKWANE	30%	37%	23%	9%	0%	299
THABAZIMBI	14%	33%	25%	29%		169
THULAMELA	11%	34%	31%	24%	1%	300
TOTAL	12%	35%	28%	23%	2%	5133
						100%

Table 105: Level of satisfaction with the quality of water supply by municipalities

Municipality	Electricity	Gas	Paraffin	Solar Energy	Generator	Candles	Other	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
AGANANG	72%		1%			27%		170	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	74%		5%			22%		200	100%
BELA BELA	69%		1%			29%	1%	159	100%
BLOUBERG	45%		4%			51%		200	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	84%	1%	8%			7%		240	100%
FETAKGOMO	75%		4%			21%		153	100%
GREAT GIYANI	81%	1%	2%			16%		210	100%
GREAT LETABA	86%					14%		210	100%
G. GROBLERSDALE	93%		4%			3%		200	100%
G. MARBLE HALL	89%		3%			8%		180	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	72%		2%			27%		207	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	56%		0%	1%	0%	43%		230	100%
LEPELE-NKUMPI	85%		1%		1%	13%		210	100%
LEPHALALE	67%		1%			33%		164	100%
MAKHADO	91%		2%			7%		240	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	79%					21%		210	100%
MARULENG	50%		13%	1%		36%		160	100%
MODIMOLLE	40%		3%		6%	51%		160	100%
MOGALAKWENA	91%		2%			6%	1%	220	100%
MOLEMOLE	95%			1%		5%		199	100%
MOOKGOPONG	54%		3%	1%		42%		149	100%
MUSINA	73%		13%			14%		150	100%
MUTALE	89%		3%	1%		7%		159	100%
POLOKWANE	89%	0%	1%			10%		299	100%
THABAZIMBI	52%		9%		1%	39%	1%	169	100%
THULAMELA	79%	0%	5%	1%		15%		300	100%
TOTAL	76%	0%	3%	0%	0%	21%	0%	5148	100%

Table 107: Cross tabulation of municipality by household's main energy for lighting

MUNICIPALITY	Every month	Once every two months	Once every three months	After four months and more	Never	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
AGANANG	1%				99%	170	100%
BAPHALABORWA	44%				56%	145	100%
BELABELA	40%				60%	111	100%
BLOUBERG					100%	198	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	5%				96%	202	100%
FETAKGOMO	6%				94%	117	100%
GREAT GIYANI	17%				83%	210	100%
GREAT LETABA	27%	1%			72%	198	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	1%				99%	193	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	1%	1%		1%	98%	161	100%
GREATER TUBATSE					100%	149	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	21%	3%	1%	1%	75%	130	100%
LEPELE-NKUMPI	15%	1%			85%	181	100%
LEPHALALE	19%				81%	124	100%
MAKHADO	19%				81%	239	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA					100%	178	100%
MARULENG	51%	5%			44%	81	100%
MODIMOLLE	21%				79%	66	100%
MOGALAKWENA	17%				83%	202	100%
MOLEMOLE	1%				99%	188	100%
MOOKGOPONG	15%				85%	93	100%
MUSINA	8%				92%	149	100%
MUTALE	5%				95%	160	100%
POLOKWANE	41%				59%	269	100%
THABAZIMBI	42%				58%	89	100%
THULAMELA	18%			0%	82%	300	100%
TOTAL	16%	0%	0%	0%	84%	4303	100%

Table 109: Cross tabulation of how often household receives electricity account by municipality

MUNICIPALITY	Yes		No		Total	
	%		%		N	%
AGANANG	37%		64%		170	100%
BAPHALABORWA	9%		91%		149	100%
BELA-BELA	78%		22%		110	100%
BLOUBERG	4%		97%		199	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	43%		57%		204	100%
FETAKGOMO	30%		70%		116	100%
GREATER GIYANI	22%		78%		210	100%
GREATER LETABA	8%		92%		199	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	20%		80%		192	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	32%		68%		161	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	12%		88%		154	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	9%		91%		130	100%
LEPELE-NKUMPI	17%		83%		180	100%
LEPHALALE	23%		77%		125	100%
MAKHADO	25%		75%		237	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	17%		83%		179	100%
MARULENG	4%		96%		79	100%
MODIMOLLE	96%		5%		66	100%
MOGALAKWENA	10%		90%		204	100%
MOLEMOLE	6%		94%		189	100%
MOOKGOPONG	41%		59%		93	100%
MUSINA	34%		66%		149	100%
MUTALE	42%		58%		160	100%
POLOKWANE	12%		88%		270	100%
THABAZIMBI	23%		77%		87	100%
THULAMELA	22%		78%		300	100%
TOTAL	23%		77%		4312	100%

Table 111: Cross tabulation of awareness of free electricity by municipality

MUNICIPALITY	Yes	No	Total	
	%	%	N	%
AGANANG	21%	79%	169	100%
BAPHALABORWA	32%	68%	148	100%
BELABELA	24%	76%	111	100%
BLOUBERG	10%	90%	198	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	42%	58%	203	100%
FETAKGOMO	60%	40%	117	100%
GREAT GIYANI	24%	76%	209	100%
GREAT LETABA	34%	66%	197	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	43%	57%	192	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	31%	69%	161	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	22%	78%	153	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	27%	73%	129	100%
LEPELE-NKUMPI	27%	73%	179	100%
LEPHALLE	10%	90%	123	100%
MAKHADO	37%	63%	236	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	49%	51%	178	100%
MARULENG	28%	72%	81	100%
MODIMOLLE	24%	76%	66	100%
MOGALAKWENA	24%	77%	204	100%
MOLEMOLE	66%	34%	187	100%
MOOKGOPONG	21%	79%	94	100%
MUSINA	29%	71%	147	100%
MUTALE	58%	42%	160	100%
POLOKWANE	34%	66%	270	100%
THABAZIMBI	11%	89%	89	100%
THULAMELA	69%	31%	298	100%
TOTAL	35%	65%	4299	100%

Table 113: Cross tabulation of disruption of electricity in past 3 months by municipality

MUNICIPALITY	Within hours	Within a day	Within a couple of days (2-3 days)	About a week (4-7 days)	About 2 weeks	A month or more	Other	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
AGANANG	20%	26%	43%			3%		35	100%
BAPHALABORWA	27%	61%	8%	4%			9%	49	100%
BELABELA	76%	20%			4%			25	100%
BLOUBERG	8%	52%	20%					25	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	64%	22%	8%	2%	2%	1%	20%	87	100%
FETAKGOMO	51%	47%	3%					71	100%
GREAT GIYANI	37%	51%	8%	2%	2%			51	100%
GREAT LETABA	23%	59%	10%	6%			1%	69	100%
GREAT GROBLERSDAL	31%	49%	15%	2%	2%			83	100%
GREAT MARBLE HALL	2%	94%	4%					48	100%
GREAT TUBATSE	59%	27%	9%			3%	3%	34	100%
GREAT TZANEEN	17%	56%	17%	8%			3%	36	100%
LEPELE-NKUMPI	49%	26%	8%	6%			12%	51	100%
LEPHALALE	58%	17%		8%	8%	8%		12	100%
MAKHADO	38%	46%	8%			2%	4%	90	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	20%	62%	8%	6%	1%	1%	2%	87	100%
MARULENG	4%	26%	48%	9%	4%	9%		23	100%
MODIMOLLE	25%	63%	13%					16	100%
MOGALAKWENA	43%	26%	22%	4%			6%	51	100%
MOLEMOLE	42%	42%	10%	1%	3%	2%		125	100%
MOOKGOPONG	26%	32%	16%	5%		5%	16%	19	100%
MUSINA	36%	36%	7%			2%	19%	42	100%
MUTALE	27%	52%	21%					92	100%
POLOKWANE	58%	19%	19%	1%	2%	2%		92	100%
THABAZIMBI	55%	9%	9%		18%		9%	11	100%
THULAMELA	38%	52%	8%	1%		1%		207	100%
TOTAL	37%	44%	12%	2%	1%	1%	3%	1531	100%

Table 115: Cross tabulation of duration of time to fix electricity problems by municipality

MUNICIPALITY	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't Know / No opinion	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
AGANANG	19%	40%					
BAPHALABORWA	13%	66%	15%	9%	17%	170	100%
BELABELA	29%	50%	19%	1%		149	100%
BLOUBERG	6%	33%	14%	7%		111	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	9%	66%	8%	44%	10%	197	100%
FETAKGOMO	17%	30%	24%	1%		202	100%
GREAT GIYANI	15%	62%	30%	21%	2%	150	100%
GREAT LETABA	15%	44%	6%	13%	5%	208	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	13%	50%	24%	12%	5%	204	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	2%	50%	26%	11%		199	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	10%	50%	36%	12%		180	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	42%	43%	14%	21%	6%	206	100%
LEPELE-NKUMPI	36%	31%	12%	2%	2%	129	100%
LEPHALALE	35%	42%	32%	1%		180	100%
MAKHADO	17%	55%	3%	7%	12%	125	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	6%	55%	17%	9%	3%	237	100%
MARULENG	1%	49%	23%	13%	4%	209	100%
MODIMOLLE	48%	41%	47%	1%	1%	81	100%
MOGALAKWENA	8%	65%	3%	9%		71	100%
MOLEMOLE	11%	40%	23%	4%		202	100%
MOOKGOPONG	9%	69%	36%	12%	2%	188	100%
MUSINA	12%	35%	8%	14%	1%	93	100%
MUTALE	30%	52%	24%	4%	25%	150	100%
POLOKWANE	35%	36%	7%	11%		160	100%
THABAZIMBI	35%	55%	24%	5%	1%	270	100%
THULAMELA	14%	44%	8%	1%	1%	89	100%
TOTAL	17%	48%	18%	14%	11%	296	100%
			20%	11%	4%	4456	100%

Table 117: Cross tabulation of level of satisfaction with electricity by municipality

	Full waterborne flush toilet	Septic tank	Ventilated or improved pit latrine	Basic latrine	Chemical toilet	"Bucket system"	None	Other	Total
AGANANG	0%	6%	57%	35%	0%	0%	2%	1%	100% (N=170)
BA-PHALABORWA	46%	22%	14%	1%	0%	0%	1%	17%	100% (N=200)
BELA BELA	72%	6%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	2%	100% (N=158)
BLOUBERG	4%	0%	0%	51%	1%	0%	44%	0%	100% (N=198)
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	9%	0%	53%	30%	0%	0%	8%	0%	100% (N=240)
FETAKGOMO	0%	1%	5%	83%	0%	0%	10%	2%	100% (N=154)
GREAT GIYANI	30%	37%	3%	19%	2%	5%	3%	0%	100% (N=209)
GREAT LETABA	12%	1%	24%	34%	0%	0%	18%	11%	100% (N=209)
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	4%	0%	17%	77%	0%	0%	2%	0%	100% (N=200)
GREATER MARBLE HALL	0%	1%	45%	46%	0%	0%	8%	0%	100% (N=179)
GREATER TUBATSE	4%	0%	3%	85%	0%	0%	7%	1%	100% (N=208)
GREATER TZANEEN	11%	9%	5%	40%	0%	0%	36%	0%	100% (N=230)
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	31%	0%	2%	65%	0%	0%	3%	0%	100% (N=209)
LEPHALALE	26%	0%	24%	20%	10%	0%	0%	0%	100% (N=169)
MAKHADO	16%	3%	26%	47%	0%	0%	18%	3%	100% (N=240)
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	0%	1%	31%	45%	0%	0%	8%	0%	100% (N=208)
MARULENG	38%	0%	4%	44%	1%	4%	10%	0%	100% (N=161)
MODIMOLLE	44%	24%	0%	23%	0%	0%	5%	0%	100% (N=161)
MOGALAKWENA	42%	0%	27%	30%	0%	0%	1%	0%	100% (N=219)
MOLEMOLE	1%	3%	4%	88%	0%	0%	1%	0%	100% (N=198)
MOOKGOPONG	39%	8%	5%	23%	0%	3%	0%	0%	100% (N=147)
MUSINA	59%	4%	12%	15%	0%	1%	20%	5%	100% (N=147)
MUTALE	1%	0%	48%	35%	0%	0%	11%	0%	100% (N=147)
POLOKWANE	62%	5%	12%	21%	0%	0%	10%	6%	100% (N=160)
THABAZIMBI	64%	0%	1%	3%	0%	0%	1%	0%	100% (N=298)
THULAMELA	22%	0%	10%	57%	0%	0%	17%	16%	100% (N=168)
TOTAL	24%	5%	17%	40%	1%	1%	10%	3%	100% (N=5140)

Table 119: Main type of sanitation facility the household use, by Municipality

	Community Halls	Grass cutting	Housing support services	Municipal bus service	Municipal cemeteries	Municipal health services	Parks	Police services	Postal services	N
AGANANG	2%	0%	96%	31%	4%	30%	-	27%	40%	170
BA-PHALABORWA	45%	12%	63%	48%	63%	95%	16%	60%	87%	200
BELA BELA	65%	23%	63%	3%	65%	79%	35%	75%	71%	160
BLOUBERG	38%	1%	71%	1%	2%	48%	1%	8%	12%	200
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	20%	-	83%	7%	50%	64%	1%	32%	36%	240
FETAKGOMO	8%	-	83%	1%	-	42%	-	19%	36%	153
GREAT GIYANI	40%	-	88%	19%	46%	67%	19%	34%	33%	210
GREAT LETABA	18%	7%	66%	22%	14%	40%	0%	21%	30%	210
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	37%	2%	75%	38%	51%	63%	-	61%	85%	200
GREATER MARBLE HALL	30%	4%	72%	9%	12%	52%	-	6%	55%	180
GREATER TUBATSE	25%	-	43%	3%	18%	44%	-	29%	19%	207
GREATER TZANEEN	9%	6%	58%	6%	11%	28%	4%	12%	19%	230
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	36%	0%	86%	79%	23%	79%	1%	74%	68%	210
LEPHALALE	21%	22%	34%	-	19%	35%	20%	45%	35%	169
MAKHADO	30%	13%	73%	41%	26%	70%	12%	72%	65%	240
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	23%	-	49%	4%	1%	60%	3%	42%	54%	210
MARULENG	58%	28%	78%	11%	16%	44%	-	49%	47%	160
MODIMOLLE	53%	49%	44%	4%	52%	66%	36%	87%	56%	160
MOGALAKWENA	34%	14%	68%	13%	34%	54%	7%	42%	51%	220
MOLEMOLE	18%	-	97%	1%	4%	56%	0%	53%	67%	200
MOOKGOPONG	30%	20%	32%	2%	29%	41%	13%	48%	39%	150
MUSINA	70%	14%	61%	8%	59%	68%	20%	71%	61%	150
MUTALE	42%	-	85%	3%	37%	69%	2%	67%	75%	160
POLOKWANE	32%	23%	63%	35%	45%	70%	48%	71%	67%	300
THABAZIMBI	45%	32%	29%	1%	45%	67%	24%	39%	49%	169
THULAMELA	22%	6%	94%	11%	72%	69%	9%	62%	60%	300

Table 121: Services and facilities available, by municipality (1)

	Accessing health services	Accessing welfare services	Road maintenance	Accessing community halls	Roads are tarred	There are street lights	Walkways are paved	N
AGANANG	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	170
BA-PHALABORWA	6%	4%	7%	6%	11%	10%	12%	200
BELA BELA	4%	5%	2%	6%	4%	11%	1%	157
BLOUBERG	2%	1%	0%	3%	2%	0%	0%	200
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	6%	10%	8%	3%	6%	2%	3%	231
FETAKGOMO	2%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	152
GREAT GIYANI	5%	4%	10%	6%	9%	7%	4%	210
GREAT LETABA	4%	2%	1%	3%	0%	0%	0%	210
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	5%	5%	2%	2%	3%	2%	4%	200
GREATER MARBLE HALL	3%	1%	2%	4%	0%	2%	0%	179
GREATER TUBATSE	1%	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	207
GREATER TZANEEN	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%	5%	230
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	6%	6%	4%	5%	2%	4%	1%	210
LEPHALALE	2%	3%	4%	3%	5%	6%	6%	168
MAKHADO	5%	3%	6%	5%	6%	2%	0%	240
MAKHUDDUTAMAGA	4%	4%	1%	2%	6%	0%	2%	209
MARULENG	3%	3%	7%	7%	8%	3%	5%	160
MODIMOLLE	4%	5%	5%	7%	2%	6%	10%	160
MOGALAKWENA	4%	4%	2%	3%	3%	2%	6%	220
MOLEMOLE	4%	5%	2%	3%	0%	0%	0%	197
MOOKGOPONG	2%	2%	4%	3%	5%	4%	8%	150
MUSINA	3%	4%	6%	6%	6%	10%	0%	150
MUTALE	4%	4%	1%	2%	4%	0%	0%	160
POLOKWANE	7%	7%	9%	8%	11%	18%	21%	297
THABAZIMBI	3%	2%	5%	5%	4%	8%	13%	169
THULAMELA	8%	10%	8%	5%	2%	3%	0%	300

Table 123: Availability of infrastructure, by municipality

	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	No opinion	Total
AGANANG	21%	77%	2%	170
BA-PHALABORWA	49%	46%	5%	201
BELA BELA	41%	52%	8%	159
BLOUBERG	26%	58%	16%	199
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	35%	62%	2%	234
FETAKGOMO	21%	79%	-	152
GREAT GIYANI	50%	47%	3%	210
GREAT LETABA	37%	63%	1%	210
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	9%	90%	1%	200
GREATER MARBLE HALL	29%	71%	-	180
GREATER TUBATSE	17%	83%	-	208
GREATER TZANEEN	18%	72%	10%	229
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	30%	70%	1%	210
LEPHALALE	24%	42%	34%	169
MAKHADO	32%	67%	1%	240
MAKHUDDUTAMAGA	27%	71%	2%	210
MARULENG	47%	46%	7%	160
MODIMOLLE	47%	40%	13%	159
MOGALAKWENA	46%	51%	3%	221
MOLEMOLE	14%	85%	2%	197
MOOKGOPONG	48%	44%	8%	150
MUSINA	39%	39%	22%	149
MUTALE	38%	63%	-	159
POLOKWANE	48%	50%	2%	299
THABAZIMBI	21%	68%	11%	169
THULAMELA	34%	65%	1%	299
TOTAL	33%	62%	5%	5143

Table 125: Level of satisfaction with the community services and facilities provided by the municipality, by municipality

		Yes	No	Total
AGANANG	Count	70	99	169
	Row %	41%	59%	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	Count	135	65	200
	Row %	68%	33%	100%
BELA BELA	Count	119	40	159
	Row %	75%	25%	100%
BLOUBERG	Count	58	142	200
	Row %	29%	71%	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	Count	50	183	233
	Row %	22%	79%	100%
FETAKGOMO	Count	7	146	153
	Row %	5%	95%	100%
GREAT GIYANI	Count	65	145	210
	Row %	31%	69%	100%
GREAT LETABA	Count	31	179	210
	Row %	15%	85%	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	Count	73	127	200
	Row %	37%	64%	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	Count	20	160	180
	Row %	11%	89%	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	Count	2	200	202
	Row %	1%	99%	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	Count	74	155	229
	Row %	32%	68%	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	Count	147	63	210
	Row %	70%	30%	100%
LEPHALALE	Count	83	86	169
	Row %	49%	51%	100%
MAKHADO	Count	119	120	239
	Row %	50%	50%	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	Count	34	174	208
	Row %	16%	84%	100%
MARULENG	Count	147	13	160
	Row %	92%	8%	100%
MODIMOLLE	Count	133	27	160
	Row %	83%	17%	100%
MOGALAKWENA	Count	91	122	213
	Row %	43%	57%	100%
MOLEMOLE	Count	116	81	197
	Row %	59%	41%	100%
MOOKGOPONG	Count	80	70	150
	Row %	53%	47%	100%
MUSINA	Count	93	57	150
	Row %	62%	38%	100%
MUTALE	Count	13	146	159
	Row %	8%	92%	100%
POLOKWANE	Count	216	82	298
	Row %	72%	28%	100%
THABAZIMBI	Count	78	91	169
	Row %	46%	54%	100%
THULAMELA	Count	184	116	300
	Row %	61%	39%	100%
TOTAL	Count	2238	2889	5127
	Row %	44%	56%	100%

Table 127: Cross tabulation of availability of Ambulance by municipality

		Yes	No	Total
AGANANG	Count		169	169
	Row %		100%	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	Count	51	149	200
	Row %	26%	75%	100%
BELA BELA	Count	59	98	157
	Row %	38%	62%	100%
BLOUBERG	Count		200	200
	Row %		100%	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	Count	11	222	233
	Row %	5%	95%	100%
FETAKGOMO	Count	1	151	152
	Row %	1%	99%	100%
GREAT GIYANI	Count	64	146	210
	Row %	30%	70%	100%
GREAT LETABA	Count	8	200	208
	Row %	4%	96%	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	Count		200	200
	Row %		100%	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	Count		180	180
	Row %		100%	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	Count	1	200	201
	Row %	1%	99%	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	Count	22	206	228
	Row %	10%	90%	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	Count	45	165	210
	Row %	21%	79%	100%
LEPHALALE	Count	39	130	169
	Row %	23%	77%	100%
MAKHADO	Count	42	195	237
	Row %	18%	82%	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	Count	1	207	208
	Row %	1%	99%	100%
MARULENG	Count	82	77	159
	Row %	52%	48%	100%
MODIMOLLE	Count	34	120	154
	Row %	22%	78%	100%
MOGALAKWENA	Count	66	147	213
	Row %	31%	69%	100%
MOLEMOLE	Count		197	197
	Row %		100%	100%
MOOKGOPONG	Count	9	137	146
	Row %	6%	94%	100%
MUSINA	Count	94	56	150
	Row %	63%	37%	100%
MUTALE	Count	24	134	158
	Row %	15%	85%	100%
POLOKWANE	Count	66	225	291
	Row %	23%	77%	100%
THABAZIMBI	Count	51	118	169
	Row %	30%	610%	100%
THULAMELA	Count	120	179	299
	Row %	40%	60%	100%
TOTAL	Count	890	4208	5098
	Row %	17%	83%	100%

Table 129: Cross tabulation of availability of fire brigade by municipality

		Yes	No	Total
AGANANG	Count	58	112	170
	Row %	34%	66%	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	Count	98	102	200
	Row %	49%	51%	100%
BELA BELA	Count	118	41	159
	Row %	74%	26%	100%
BLOUBERG	Count	16	183	199
	Row %	8%	92%	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	Count	64	170	234
	Row %	27%	73%	100%
FETAKGOMO	Count	23	129	152
	Row %	15%	85%	100%
GREAT GIYANI	Count	72	137	209
	Row %	34%	66%	100%
GREAT LETABA	Count	36	168	204
	Row %	18%	82%	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	Count	48	152	200
	Row %	24%	76%	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	Count	12	168	180
	Row %	7%	93%	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	Count	53	148	201
	Row %	26%	74%	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	Count	67	163	230
	Row %	29%	71%	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	Count	185	25	210
	Row %	88%	12%	100%
LEPHALALE	Count	74	95	169
	Row %	44%	56%	100%
MAKHADO	Count	163	66	229
	Row %	71%	29%	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	Count	94	116	210
	Row %	45%	55%	100%
MARULENG	Count	112	47	159
	Row %	70%	30%	100%
MODIMOLLE	Count	158	2	160
	Row %	99%	1%	100%
MOGALAKWENA	Count	85	127	212
	Row %	40%	510%	100%
MOLEMOLE	Count	96	101	197
	Row %	49%	51%	100%
MOOKGOPONG	Count	80	70	150
	Row %	53%	47%	100%
MUSINA	Count	112	38	150
	Row %	75%	25%	100%
MUTALE	Count	90	68	158
	Row %	57%	43%	100%
POLOKWANE	Count	207	84	291
	Row %	71%	29%	100%
THABAZIMBI	Count	69	100	169
	Row %	41%	59%	100%
THULAMELA	Count	160	139	299
	Row %	54%	47%	100%
TOTAL	Count	2350	2751	5101
	Row %	46%	54%	100%

Table 131: Cross tabulation of availability of police station by municipality

MUNICIPALITY		Yes	No	Total
AGANANG	Count	3	167	170
	Row %	2%	98%	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	Count	58	142	200
	Row %	29%	71%	100%
BELA BELA	Count	37	123	160
	Row %	23%	77%	100%
BLOUBERG	Count		200	200
	Row %		100%	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	Count	12	221	233
	Row %	5%	95%	100%
FETAKGOMO	Count		152	152
	Row %		100%	100%
GREAT GIYANI	Count	65	144	209
	Row %	31%	69%	100%
GREAT LETABA	Count	8	202	210
	Row %	4%	96%	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	Count		200	200
	Row %		100%	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	Count		180	180
	Row %		100%	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	Count	4	198	202
	Row %	2%	98%	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	Count	27	202	229
	Row %	12%	88%	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	Count	20	190	210
	Row %	10%	90%	100%
LEPHALALE	Count	34	135	169
	Row %	20%	80%	100%
MAKHADO	Count	33	206	239
	Row %	14%	86%	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	Count	2	208	210
	Row %	1%	99%	100%
MARULENG	Count	42	118	160
	Row %	26%	74%	100%
MODIMOLLE	Count	57	103	160
	Row %	36%	64%	100%
MOGALAKWENA	Count	63	150	213
	Row %	30%	70%	100%
MOLEMOLE	Count	1	195	196
	Row %	1%	99%	100%
MOOKGOPONG	Count	18	132	150
	Row %	12%	88%	100%
MUSINA	Count	84	65	149
	Row %	56%	44%	100%
MUTALE	Count	27	133	160
	Row %	17%	83%	100%
POLOKWANE	Count	83	215	298
	Row %	28%	72%	100%
THABAZIMBI	Count	67	102	169
	Row %	40%	60%	100%
THULAMELA	Count	101	198	299
	Row %	34%	66%	100%
TOTAL	Count	846	4281	5127
	Row %	17%	84%	100%

Table 133: Cross tabulation of whether respondent knows where to go in case of fire by municipality

LOCAL GOVERNANCE

	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	N
AGANANG	69%	31%	170
BA-PHALABORWA	65%	36%	197
BELA BELA	53%	48%	160
BLOUBERG	49%	52%	200
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	66%	34%	233
FETAKGOMO	66%	34%	152
GREATER GIYANI	68%	32%	209
GREATER LETABA	58%	42%	210
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	67%	33%	200
GREATER MARBLE HALL	78%	22%	180
GREATER TUBATSE	72%	28%	203
GREATER TZANEEN	43%	57%	230
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	61%	39%	209
LEPHALE	25%	75%	169
MAKHADO	60%	40%	239
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	63%	37%	208
MARULENG	60%	40%	160
MODIMOLLE	28%	72%	159
MOGALAKWENA	50%	51%	220
MOLEMOLE	67%	33%	197
MOOKGOPONG	11%	89%	150
MUSINA	17%	83%	149
MUTALE	72%	28%	160
POLOKWANE	43%	57%	299
THABAZIMBI	54%	46%	169
THULAMELA	63%	38%	299
TOTAL	56%	45%	5131
			100%

Table 135: Percentage of people reporting knowledge of their ward councillor by municipality

	Yes		No		Total	
	%		%		N	%
AGANANG	8%		92%		170	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	9%		91%		200	100%
BELA BELA			100%		157	100%
BLOUBERG	4%		97%		200	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	2%		98%		232	100%
FETAKGOMO	2%		98%		151	100%
GREATER GIYANI	7%		93%		209	100%
GREATER LETABA	1%		99%		209	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	5%		95%		200	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL			100%		179	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	4%		96%		203	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	13%		87%		217	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	22%		78%		210	100%
LEPHALALE	2%		98%		169	100%
MAKHADO	4%		96%		238	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	8%		92%		207	100%
MARULENG	25%		75%		160	100%
MODIMOLLE	4%		96%		159	100%
MOGALAKWENA	24%		76%		218	100%
MOLEMOLE	2%		98%		197	100%
MOOKGOPONG	3%		97%		148	100%
MUSINA	5%		95%		150	100%
MUTALE	7%		93%		160	100%
POLOKWANE	9%		91%		298	100%
THABAZIMBI	9%		91%		165	100%
THULAMELA	8%		92%		299	100%
TOTAL	7%		93%		5105	100%

Table 137: Respondents or household members reporting membership of ward committees

	Once a Month	Once every couple of months		Once every six months		Once a year	No.		Total	
	%	%	months	%	months	%	%	N	%	%
AGANANG	25%									
BA-PHALABORWA	49%	9%		3%		2%	61%	170	100%	100%
BELA BELA	31%	10%				3%	40%	200	100%	100%
BLOUBERG	11%	5%		13%		1%	45%	160	100%	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	28%	21%					84%	199	100%	100%
FETAKGOMO	17%	15%		7%		6%	38%	234	100%	100%
GREATER GIYANI	26%	25%		4%		9%	55%	152	100%	100%
GREATER LETABA	24%	10%		1%		1%	47%	210	100%	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	13%	44%		2%		1%	62%	210	100%	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	20%	32%		3%		5%	36%	200	100%	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	26%	23%		7%		4%	37%	180	100%	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	29%			5%		2%	45%	203	100%	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	13%	9%		1%		1%	61%	222	100%	100%
LEPHALALE	11%	32%		4%		1%	49%	209	100%	100%
MAKHADO	14%	1%		1%		1%	86%	169	100%	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	24%	16%		11%		2%	57%	238	100%	100%
MARULENG	16%	16%		2%		6%	52%	209	100%	100%
MODIMOLLE	18%	24%		2%			59%	160	100%	100%
MOGALAKWENA	13%	17%		2%		1%	63%	160	100%	100%
MOLEMOLE	7%	14%		10%		2%	62%	216	100%	100%
MOOKGOPONG	13%	4%				1%	88%	196	100%	100%
MUSINA	2%	5%				1%	82%	150	100%	100%
MUTALE	13%	6%		5%		2%	85%	150	100%	100%
POLOKWANE	5%	10%		4%		4%	70%	159	100%	100%
THABAZIMBI	18%	12%		5%		5%	73%	298	100%	100%
THULAMELA	36%	13%		7%		4%	58%	168	100%	100%
TOTAL	20%	11%		1%		1%	51%	299	100%	100%
		15%		4%		3%	59%	5121	100%	100%

Table 139: Awareness and frequency of meetings organised by councillor or ward committee by municipality

	Always		Sometimes		Rarely		Total	
	%		%		%		N	%
AGANANG	43%							
BA-PHALABORWA	62%		46%		11%		44	100%
BELA BELA	18%		28%		11%		102	100%
BLOUBERG	6%		82%				55	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	25%		94%				32	100%
FETAKGOMO	22%		70%		5%		104	100%
GREATER GIYANI	33%		73%		5%		41	100%
GREATER LETABA	33%		58%		9%		93	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	34%		60%		7%		57	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	37%		58%		8%		112	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	44%		58%		5%		62	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	31%		54%		2%		89	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	9%		64%		5%		64	100%
LEPHALALE	6%		91%				76	100%
MAKHADO	38%		94%				18	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	34%		58%		5%		87	100%
MARULENG	36%		59%		7%		71	100%
MODIMOLLE	24%		62%		3%		78	100%
MOGALAKWENA	14%		48%		28%		46	100%
MOLEMOLE	3%		84%		3%		79	100%
MOOKGOPONG	25%		83%		13%		30	100%
MUSINA	27%		50%		25%		16	100%
MUTALE	33%		73%				11	100%
POLOKWANE	44%		60%		6%		48	100%
THABAZIMBI	60%		44%		12%		73	100%
THULAMELA	27%		40%				57	100%
TOTAL	32%		61%		7%		1615	100%

Table 141: Frequency of attending meetings organised by the councillor or the ward committee by municipality

	Yes		No		Total	
	%		%		N	%
AGANANG						
BA-PHALABORWA	7%		93%		169	100%
BELA BELA	6%		94%		200	100%
BLOUBERG			100%		160	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	5%		95%		200	100%
FETAKGOMO	9%		91%		233	100%
GREATER GIYANI	2%		98%		152	100%
GREATER LETABA	3%		97%		208	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	3%		97%		210	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	29%		72%		200	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	3%		97%		180	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	1%		99%		206	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	10%		90%		229	100%
LEPHALALE	19%		81%		210	100%
MAKHADO	1%		99%		166	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	4%		96%		237	100%
MARULENG	3%		97%		210	100%
MODIMOLLE	6%		94%		154	100%
MOGALAKWENA	4%		96%		160	100%
MOLEMOLE	6%		95%		220	100%
MOOKGOPONG	2%		99%		197	100%
MUSINA	1%		99%		150	100%
MUTALE	1%		99%		147	100%
POLOKWANE	3%		97%		158	100%
THABAZIMBI	4%		96%		297	100%
THULAMELA	4%		96%		168	100%
TOTAL	12%		88%		299	100%
	6%		94%		5120	100%

Table 143: Households participating in any other activities organised by the municipalities: cross tabulation by municipality

	Excellent		Good		Average		Bad		Don't know		Total	
	%		%		%		%		%		N	%
AGANANG	2%		4%		30%		57%		7%		169	100%
BA-PHALABORWA	1%		25%		43%		32%				199	100%
BELA BELA	6%		27%		19%		35%		17%		156	100%
BLOUBERG	1%		10%		9%		23%		52%		196	100%
BUSHBUCKRIDGE			18%		40%		40%		2%		233	100%
FETAKGOMO	3%		27%		32%		36%		3%		206	100%
GREATER GIYANI	1%		14%		40%		45%		1%		208	100%
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	1%		12%		16%		73%		6%		200	100%
GREATER MARBLE HALL	1%		7%		21%		71%				180	100%
GREATER TUBATSE	7%		3%		20%		37%		33%		228	100%
GREATER TZANEEN	3%		19%		28%		47%		3%		211	100%
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	2%		14%		22%		35%		27%		168	100%
LEPHALALE			17%		33%		45%		5%		239	100%
MAKHADO	1%		5%		63%		29%		2%		210	100%
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	11%		24%		39%		24%		17%		160	100%
MARULENG			16%		22%		26%		17%		159	100%
MODIMOLLE	3%		24%		51%		28%		5%		221	100%
MOGALAKWENA	1%		14%		26%		62%		8%		197	100%
MOLEMOLE	5%		16%		32%		35%		13%		151	100%
MOOKGOPONG	3%		15%		31%		47%		27%		149	100%
MUSINA			14%		50%		27%		1%		159	100%
MUTALE	3%		14%		15%		49%		6%		298	100%
POLOKWANE	1%		11%		45%		40%		22%		169	100%
THABAZIMBI	2%		14%		34%		40%		2%		300	100%
THULAMELA												
TOTAL												

Table 145: Municipality's performance with regard to service delivery: cross tabulation by municipality

THULAMELA	1%	9%	47%	12%	31%	297	100%
TOTAL	3%	24%	45%	13%	15%	5108	100%

Table 146: Accessibility of employment programmes: Cross tabulation by municipality

	Mean
MOLEMOLE	0.76
MOOKGOPONG	0.71
THABAZIMBI	0.67
BA-PHALABORWA	0.64
GREAT LETABA	0.62
MOGALAKWENA	0.62
BLOUBERG	0.60
LEPHALALE	0.56
AGANANG	0.55
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	0.53
GREAT GIYANI	0.53
MODIMOLLE	0.52
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	0.51
POLOKWANE	0.48
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	0.43
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	0.42
MUTALE	0.41
GREATER MARBLE HALL	0.40
THULAMELA	0.40
GREATER TZANEEN	0.39
MARULENG	0.39
FETAKGOMO	0.38
MUSINA	0.37
MAKHADO	0.33
BELA BELA	0.28
GREATER TUBATSE	0.27

Table 148: Municipalities' performance with regard to government's housing delivery

	Mean
THABAZIMBI	0.91
MODIMOLLE	0.90
LEPHALALE	0.88
GREATER TZANEEN	0.82
BA-PHALABORWA	0.80
GREAT GIYANI	0.79
MOOKGOPONG	0.78
BELA BELA	0.78
GREAT LETABA	0.78
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	0.77
MUTALE	0.74
MAKHADO	0.72
MOGALAKWENA	0.72
POLOKWANE	0.71
MUSINA	0.70
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	0.69
AGANANG	0.67
THULAMELA	0.63
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	0.63
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	0.62
MARULENG	0.59
GREATER TUBATSE	0.59
MOLEMOLE	0.55
BLOUBERG	0.52
GREATER MARBLE HALL	0.49
FETAKGOMO	0.44

Table 150: Rate of municipalities' performance with regard to electricity supply

	Mean
MODIMOLLE	0.72
BELA BELA	0.67
MUSINA	0.62
MOOKGOPONG	0.62
GREAT GIYANI	0.57
AGANANG	0.56
POLOKWANE	0.49
THABAZIMBI	0.48
LEPHALALE	0.44
MOGALAKWENA	0.42
GREAT LETABA	0.39
BA-PHALABORWA	0.36
MUTALE	0.36
THULAMELA	0.35
MAKHADO	0.34
MARULENG	0.27
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	0.27
MOLEMOLE	0.27
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	0.26
GREAT TZYANEEN	0.24
GREAT GROBLERSDAL	0.22
BLOUBERG	0.13
GREAT TUBATSE	0.10
MAKHUTAMAGA	0.10
GREAT MARBLE HALL	0.09
FETAKGOMO	0.07

Table 152: Municipalities' rate of performance with provision of refuse removal services

	Mean
MODIMOLLE	0.72
BA-PHALABORWA	0.61
MARULENG	0.50
GREAT LETABA	0.45
GREAT GIYANI	0.45
LEPHALALE	0.44
MUSINA	0.41
MOOKGOPONG	0.38
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	0.35
MAKHADO	0.34
POLOKWANE	0.34
BELA BELA	0.34
MOGALAKWENA	0.34
MUTALE	0.33
MAKHUDDUTAMAGA	0.32
THULAMELA	0.30
BLOUBERG	0.30
AGANANG	0.28
GREATER TZANEEN	0.26
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	0.25
THABAZIMBI	0.23
GREATER GROBLERSDAL	0.21
FETAKGOMO	0.16
MOLEMOLE	0.15
GREATER TUBATSE	0.09
GREATER MARBLE HALL	0.07

Table 154: Satisfaction with the impact of level of participation

	Mean
MODIMOLLE	0.58
MUSINA	0.53
MOOKGOPONG	0.51
BA-PHALABORWA	0.49
POLOKWANE	0.48
GREAT LETABA	0.46
MARULENG	0.46
GREAT GIYANI	0.43
LEPHALE	0.43
MOGALAKWENA	0.42
BELA BELA	0.41
BUSHBUCKRIDGE	0.35
BLOUBERG	0.33
LEPELLE-NKUMPI	0.31
MAKHADO	0.31
MUTALE	0.29
THULAMELA	0.28
GREAT T ZANEEN	0.25
AGANANG	0.25
THABAZIMBI	0.23
MAKHUDUTAMAGA	0.23
GREAT MARBLE HALL	0.22
GREAT TUBATSE	0.18
FETAKGOMO	0.18
GREAT GROBLERSDAL	0.17
MOLEMOLE	0.16

Table 156: Municipalities' rate of performance with the provision of community services and facilities

