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On behalf of the Board of the Foundation for Human Rights, it is with great pleasure that I am able to present the findings of this Baseline Survey on awareness of, attitude and access to Constitutional Rights.

Previous studies found that South African citizens had a relatively poor understanding of the Bill of Rights, but we felt it necessary to carry out a study that focused on the specific understanding by vulnerable and marginalised members of society of their justiciable socio-economic rights.

The team surveyed 20 sites and interviewed 4,200 respondents from farming communities, from poor communities in rural and urban areas, from members of LGBTI communities, and from migrant communities.

The result of the study tells us that there is much work to be done. Those most in need have a poorer understanding of their rights and face more challenges to access the mechanisms of redress that are available to them.

As a result of these findings, the Foundation has initiated a second survey to build on this work, by expanding the sample size to ensure that it is representative of the nation as a whole.

This research will guide the work of the Foundation to assist vulnerable and marginalised citizens with a better understanding of their rights and give them the tools they need to assert their rightful claims to socio-economic justice.

I would like to give special thanks to Dr Zaid Kimmie for the execution of the survey and the analysis of the results, and to the team at the FHR for producing this report.

Ms Thoko Mpumlwana
Chairperson
In January 2009 the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development (DOJ&CD) implemented the Access to Justice and Promotion of Constitutional Rights Programme in partnership with the Foundation for Human Rights (FHR).

Included in this programme was a baseline survey, completed in March 2011, which measured the extent to which human rights awareness and knowledge of institutions and processes had shifted since the 1990s, particularly in vulnerable and marginalised communities.

The survey was a site-based survey, designed to obtain detailed information from specifically targeted vulnerable and marginalised groups to guide programme planning and policy formulation.

At the heart of the survey were two questions: “Have you heard about the Constitution of South Africa?” and “Have you heard about the Bill of Rights?”

Only 46% of respondents had heard of them and less than 10% had read these documents, or had them read to them.

This figure is lower than has previously been reported in other surveys preceding this one. This is particularly concerning as it shows that vulnerable and marginalised communities – those most in need of asserting their rights – are least aware of the legislation that they have at their disposal to enforce these rights.

In general, the survey found that low levels of awareness of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, human rights legislation and Chapter 9 institutions were strongly linked to education levels, low socio-economic status and lack of access to information. The survey also found that, although uneven, actual levels of knowledge and understanding of concrete rights and the impact of legislation and human rights institutions on respondents’ lives, was higher than their awareness of legislation and institutions itself.

Members of vulnerable and marginalised communities showed that, despite low levels of awareness of formal constitutional rights, they were aware of those rights that affected their daily lived experiences.

The DOJ&CD is mandated to put in place legislation and programmes aimed to promote constitutional development and awareness. Government cannot play this role in isolation and civil-society organisations in South Africa may achieve greater success in promoting human rights awareness than government alone is able to achieve. Partnership in this regard is vital.

If people are not aware of the Constitution or of their basic human rights, the Constitution really becomes a piece of paper with unattainable promises.

It is only when people are made aware that they are able to claim their rights that they can actively influence decisions made about their community and country.

John Jeffery MP
Deputy Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development
Since its inception in 1996, the Foundation for Human Rights (FHR) has been promoting and entrenching a human rights culture using the Constitution as a tool. It supports civil society organisations and public institutions that promote, protect and realise human rights by empowering vulnerable groups to understand and access their rights, and by promoting participatory democracy.

This focus on constitutional rights provides a framework for developing policies and programmes, and gives the marginalised and those living in poverty the tools they need to demand accountability in a society characterised by inequality and hugely imbalanced power relations.

Since the elections of 1994, basic citizenship and political rights have been extended to the entire population. The South African Constitution specifies that all human beings are entitled to their rights without discrimination, including on the grounds of race, colour, sex, ethnicity, age, language, religion, politics, national or social origin and disability.

A series of media, advocacy and educational campaigns about constitutional rights were launched by various governmental and non-governmental organisations post 1994, including the FHR. Despite this, levels of awareness and knowledge about the meaning and content of the Bill of Rights have remained worryingly low.

As a consequence, the extent to which these rights are being promoted, protected and implemented by the state, as well as the extent to which people have access to them is highly uneven.

Despite South Africa’s range of anti-poverty legislation and policies, and efforts by both government and civil society to implement them, citizens are faced with widespread poverty, deep inequality and recurrent human rights violations. Our country remains structurally divided, with the majority of the population residing at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder. In particular, vulnerable and marginalised groups such as black women, rural dwellers, the disabled and refugees/migrants are hit hardest.

The work of the FHR is focused on strengthening civil society and supporting those who reside on the margins. Educating citizens about their rights is an essential starting point for change, at the personal, collective and structural levels, so, guided by a commitment for its work to be informed by the empirical realities of vulnerable and marginalised groups, the FHR commissioned a study called the ‘AJPCR Baseline Survey on Awareness of, Attitude and Access to Constitutional Rights’.

What follows is a report about the findings of the survey and its implications for Human Rights awareness programmes.
The first nationwide assessment of the extent to which the new democratic government was fulfilling its constitutional obligations was carried out by the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) during 1997–1998.

Based on information obtained from institutions of the state, the SAHRC Economic and Social Rights Report provided a useful, if limited, view of how various government departments understood their human rights obligations and the actions they reportedly undertook to meet them.

Simultaneously, the SAHRC oversaw a nationwide survey conducted by the Community Agency for Social Enquiry (CASE) on public perceptions of the realisation of economic and social rights.

These reports captured aspects of human rights awareness from two sides: the understanding of human rights obligations within the state, and the perception and knowledge of constitutional rights amongst the public. But the limited methodological scope of the reports presaged the need for a more comprehensive survey specifically targeted at marginalised and vulnerable groups that would include knowledge and awareness of human rights, attitudes, access to institutions and sources of information.
The Foundation for Human Rights’ CASE survey

The Foundation for Human Rights (FHR) filled this gap when it commissioned CASE in 1998 to conduct a nationwide survey entitled ‘Assessing Knowledge of Human Rights among the General Population and Selected Target Groups’ that was targeted at women, children, prisoners, refugees and migrants, disabled people, people with HIV/AIDS, and dispossessed people.

In addition to gathering information on the levels of human rights knowledge, the survey also assessed knowledge of the mechanisms needed to secure these rights as well as the media through which such knowledge was obtained. It aimed to determine attitudes towards specified target groups and their rights.

The survey assessed the following:
- General knowledge and education about the Bill of Rights;
- Attitudes towards the rights of minorities and communities;
- Sources of assistance and access to information; and
- Opinions on key human rights issues.

Amongst its many other findings, the core finding of the survey was that knowledge about the Bill of Rights was worryingly low, with just over half the population (55%) saying that they had heard about it.

National Institute for Public Interest Law and Research study

Subsequently, in 2000, the National Institute for Public Interest Law and Research (NIPILAR) commissioned a study titled ‘National Survey Report on Human Rights Awareness’. This study assessed:
- Basic knowledge of the Bill of Rights;
- Knowledge of Chapter 9 institutions;
- Sources of information on human rights issues and institutions;
- Context and/or circumstances in which human rights had been violated; and
- Attitudes towards key human rights issues.

Like the FHR’s study, its findings were also cause for concern. Two thirds of respondents could not explain the main purpose of the Bill of Rights.
Human Sciences Research Council 2001 public opinion survey

As part of its 2001 Public Opinion Survey, the Human Sciences research Council (HSRC) included questions specifically related to human rights\(^1\), covering:

- Knowledge of the major instruments and institutions designed to protect and enforce human rights;
- Access to Chapter 9 institutions; and
- Attitudes to human rights in their broadest sense, including socio-economic rights.

This study found that the majority of respondents were either unfamiliar with the instruments designed to protect and enforce their rights, or were unaware of their purpose. Despite this, respondents felt that human rights in the broadest sense, including socio-economic rights, were an essential component of a democratic society.

Survey on protection of human rights: perceptions and awareness

The results from this small-scale academic survey\(^2\) carried out in 2004 confirmed most of the key findings of previous surveys as summarised above. The study included assessments of:

- Perceptions about the causes of human rights violations;
- Legitimacy of election processes; and
- Freedom to speak and express opinions.

It found that many South Africans are unaware of the existence of the Bill of Rights and that public knowledge of the existence of human rights institutions and the work they do is severely limited. It found that the majority of South Africans blamed the government for most human rights violations and that people were not happy with the level of protection of their rights, particularly socio-economic rights.


Background

In March 2009, the DOJ&CD implemented the Access to Justice and Promotion of Constitutional Rights (AJPCR) Programme in partnership with the FHR to work with civil society organisations (CSOs) to address the highly uneven levels of awareness and knowledge of constitutional rights in our society and to promote access to justice for vulnerable and marginalised communities.

Rationale

The surveys described above played a valuable role in informing the work of the DOJ&CD and the FHR, but their results highlighted a need for a more updated, expansive and integrated survey in order to measure the extent to which human rights awareness and knowledge of institutions and processes had shifted since the 1990s, particularly in vulnerable and marginalised communities.

As a result, the FHR developed a questionnaire and executed a baseline study as part of the AJPCR programme, which was completed in March 2011.
The objectives were to:

- Update measures of awareness of, and access and attitudes to, human rights;
- Target marginalised and vulnerable communities that are particularly in need;
- Understand the factors that drive awareness; and
- Guide and inform the programmes of DOJ&CD and FHR to improve citizens’ understanding of their rights.

**Methodology**

The survey was a site-based survey, as opposed to being a national, randomised sample-based survey. It was designed to obtain detailed information from specifically targeted vulnerable and marginalised groups to guide programme planning and policy formulation.

Responses from 4,200 people from 20 sites were collected and analysed. The sites surveyed were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming communities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Malmesbury (WC), Belabela (LP), Ermelo (MP), Mquma (EC), Lejweleputswa (FS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Magusheni (EC), Ilangakazi (KZN), Riemvasmaak (NC), Taung (NW), Dihlophaneng (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Orange Farm (GT), Soshanguve (GT), Manenberg (WC), Khayelitsha (WC), Mzamomhle, East London (EC), Ntuzuma (KZN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI communities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Johannesburg (GT), Durban (KZN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Berea (GT), Musina (LP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the questionnaire, focus groups were convened to obtain more nuanced information on particular issues, and desktop studies were undertaken on the status of rights among particular groups of vulnerable people.

The sample was site-specific and deliberately aimed at some of the most marginalised communities in order to inform the work of the DOJ&CD and the FHR, so the trends that emerged reflect the concrete realities of those specific communities. A second baseline survey will be commissioned in 2014/2015, in collaboration with Statistics South Africa, to align these results with a nationally representative sample.
The questionnaire

The questionnaire that the field workers used was designed to measure basic knowledge of constitutional rights by assessing respondents' awareness of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, Chapter 9 Institutions, and key pieces of human rights legislation. Detailed knowledge of constitutional rights was measured by awareness of the implications of each of these.

It was translated into five of the official languages and then tested in the field as well as in observed settings. This was followed by training sessions for field workers in Johannesburg, Cape Town, Kimberley, Upington, Polokwane, East London and Durban.

The questionnaire asked respondents about the following:

1. Demographic details about the respondent (gender, age, population group, home language, economic status, source of income, employment status, education);
2. Household data (size, tenure status, household quality, source of energy);
3. Awareness of human rights (legislation, institutions, information sources);
4. Attitudes to basic human rights;
5. Access to basic human rights;
6. Participation in political processes and organisations; and
7. General political attitudes.

The results were tabulated and captured on a database for statistical analysis.

Demographics of the respondents

The field workers collected responses from 4,200 people at the selected sites. The gender divide was almost exactly 50/50 because fieldworkers were given quotas for gender representivity. Most of the respondents were young adults aged between 18–24 years (25%) and 25–34 years (20%).

The survey was targeted at vulnerable and marginalised communities, and the split by race of the sample confirms that black South Africans still comprise the overwhelming majority of these groups:

Racial demographics of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Asian</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some socio-economic characteristics of the sample:

- Almost 50% were unemployed;
- In almost 50% of respondent households, there was one person receiving a government pension;
- In almost 60% of respondent households, there were one or more persons receiving a child support grant;
- A total of 82% of respondent households had piped water in the yards or inside their dwelling while 72% had access to flushing toilets.
Basic Awareness of Rights

At the heart of the survey were two questions: ‘Have you heard about the Constitution of South Africa?’ and ‘Have you heard about the Bill of Rights?’ The responses indicated that only 46% of respondents were able to answer ‘yes’ to either of these two questions.

This figure is lower than was reported in any of the surveys referenced above, showing that members of vulnerable and marginalised communities are particularly lacking in awareness of their basic rights. Those most in need of asserting their rights are those who are least aware of the legislation that they have at their disposal.

More worrying is that less than 10% of respondents had read these documents, or had either of the documents read to them.
Awareness of Human Rights legislation

Respondents were asked about their awareness of specific pieces of human rights-related legislation in order to test whether they had a detailed understanding of their rights or not. They were asked if they had heard about three specific pieces of legislation:

- the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act (PAJA);
- the Promotion of Access to Information Act (PAIA);
- the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act (PEPUDA).

Overall, respondents showed an extremely low level of awareness for each piece of legislation and only a very small minority (10%) of respondents were able to identify any one of these Acts.

Awareness of legislation and some specific rights

![Figure 4: Awareness of specific pieces of legislation and some specific rights]

In addition to the specific pieces of legislation, respondents were asked about four specific rights in order to assess whether or not they were aware of the substantive content of the Constitution and Bill of Rights, irrespective of their awareness of the actual documents or legislation.

Respondents were asked whether the following statements were true or false:  

a) anyone has the right to join a trade union;  
b) everyone has the right to basic health care, food, water and social security;  
c) everyone has the right to a basic education, including adult basic education;  
d) no one may be evicted from their home, or have their home demolished without an order of court.

Almost three-quarters (75%) of respondents answered all four statements correctly, pointing to a fairly high level of knowledge of some of the substantive content of the documents despite the low levels of general awareness.

Awareness of Chapter 9 Institutions

One of the key features of our post-apartheid constitution is the establishment of institutions that support democracy, called the ‘Chapter 9 Institutions’ after the chapter in the Constitution that gives them their mandate.
Respondents were asked to name any Chapter 9 institution without prompting. Then they were prompted with the names of specific Chapter 9 institutions. Only a very small minority were able to name any one institution without prompting.

Awareness of Chapter 9 Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Unprompted</th>
<th>Prompted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Electoral Commission (IEC)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Commission (SAHRC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Gender Equality (CGE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Protector</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Communities (CRL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Knowledge about the Chapter 9 institutions

When prompted though, many more respondents indicated that they had heard about one or more of the organisations, as follows:
- Independent Electoral Commission (IEC): 43%;
- Human Rights Commission (SAHRC): 40%;
- Commission on Gender Equality (CGE): 30%;
- Public Protector: 28%; and
- Commission for the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Communities (CRL): 20%.

Access to Rights

Legislation for the implementation of constitutional rights is meaningless if citizens do not have access to the relevant institutions and mechanisms for redress, so the survey measured respondents’ travel time to state institutions of justice such as magistrates courts and police stations.

Approximately three quarters of respondents indicated that they needed to travel for less than an hour to access their nearest police station or magistrate’s court. Most respondents in urban settlements reported relatively easy access to the state’s justice infrastructure, whereas travel times for citizens in rural and farming areas were more varied.

When respondents were asked where they would go for assistance if they believed that their rights had been violated, or that someone had acted in a discriminatory manner, most said that they would approach the state for assistance and in almost all cases, this meant the South African Police Services.
Sources of assistance

A significant proportion of respondents (21%) indicated that they would approach a community organisation such as a Community-based Advice Office if they experienced discrimination, particularly respondents in rural areas (33%).

When asked what they actually did the last time they felt that someone or some organisation acted in a discriminatory manner, it emerged that few respondents actually sought assistance:

What did you do last time you experience discrimination

Attitudes to Human Rights

Respondents were asked six relatively straight-forward questions to determine their attitudes towards a number of human rights issues. The questions (with percentage of positive responses) were:

- I think that affirmative action to assist disadvantaged people is still necessary in South Africa (77%);
- I think it was a mistake to take away the death penalty in South Africa (43%);
- If the government represents the majority of the people of South Africa it should be able to decide what information newspapers print (55%);
- Homosexuals should not have the same rights as heterosexual people (63%);
- A political party or organisation should be able to operate freely in my area even if I strongly disagree with their viewpoints (65%);
- A married woman cannot refuse to have sex with her husband if he demands it (73%).

A very large percentage of respondents had negative attitudes to some basic human rights that are protected in the Constitution.

### Attitudes to some specific human rights

- Support affirmative action: 77%
- Support death penalty: 43%
- Government can decide what information newspapers print: 55%
- Homosexuals should not have the same rights: 63%
- Political party or organisation should be able to operate freely: 65%
- Married woman cannot refuse to have sex: 73%

*Figure 8: Attitudes to some specific human rights*
FACTORS AFFECTING AWARENESS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Explanatory factors

One of the main reasons for carrying out the survey was to identify what factors affected the respondents’ awareness of, access to, and attitudes to, their constitutional rights so that programmes to improve the situation are optimally targeted.

The survey data was analysed by considering a number of characteristics of the respondents and, of these, the factors that had the most influence were education, location, access to information, and socio-economic status.

Gender was not an important predictor of awareness when controlling for the factors listed above.
Socio-economic status

The first key factor affecting respondents’ level of awareness of their basic rights was found to be socio-economic status, measured by the responses to a number of questions about living conditions. Respondents falling into the ‘Low’ socio-economic group were less likely to have this basic awareness compared to their counterparts in the ‘Medium’ and ‘High’ groups, although there was no significant difference in awareness between the ‘Medium’ and ‘High’ groups.

Education levels

The education levels of respondents made a large difference to their awareness of their rights as well as the likelihood that they would take action if they had been discriminated against. Almost all post-graduates had heard of either the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, compared to only 25% of people with no education.

Location

In general, respondents in rural and farming communities were somewhat less likely to have a basic level of knowledge compared to their urban counterparts.

Location and awareness

Figure 9: Education and awareness of basic rights

Figure 10: Level of awareness of basic rights by location
Information sources

The survey identified three groups with significantly differing levels of awareness of basic rights:

- Those who have no regular source of information,
- Those who rely solely on radio or community members, and
- Those who watch television, read newspapers or consume multiple sources of information.

Members of the group with no regular source of information were the least likely to have a basic level of awareness of their rights.

Source of Information

The most common sources of information about the constitution were television, radio and newspapers, with radio significantly more important in rural and farming areas.

SURVEY OBSERVATIONS

In general, the survey found that the low levels of awareness of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, Human Rights legislation and the Chapter 9 institutions were strongly linked to education levels, low socio-economic status and lack of access to information.

Although uneven, actual levels of knowledge and understanding of concrete rights, and the impact of legislation and human rights institutions on respondents’ lives was higher than their awareness of legislation and institutions, so interventions should be focused on improving citizens’ awareness of those rights that make a practical difference to their lives.

The choice of communication medium and method is important and must take into account the location of the target audience. TV, or some combination of TV and radio, is a key source of information about human rights for 55% of respondents.
One-third of respondents obtained information only from radio, which is a particularly important source of information among poorer respondents. Print media is not particularly important: less than 5% received their information about the constitution from mainly printed sources.

Community-based organisations (CBOs) and other community structures are an important information delivery mechanism in rural areas and poorer communities.

Access to state institutions is reasonably good and should not be under-estimated. People see state institutions, particularly the police services, as an important resource for addressing rights violations.

Two-thirds of people who perceived rights violations did not attempt to address the problem, but increased awareness of constitutional rights significantly reduces inaction.

Respondents had a generally positive view of some specific rights, but attitudes towards the death penalty, press freedom, women’s rights and LGBTI issues are particular areas of concern. Basic awareness does not equal positive attitudes to some specific human rights.

There is very low awareness of the Chapter 9 institutions, with only 10% of respondents saying they knew of any one of these institutions and less than 1% being able to correctly identify any of the institutions, but despite the low awareness about human rights institutions, respondents showed a fairly high level of knowledge of some of the substantive content of the legislation regarding basic constitutional rights.

Awareness of equality courts is extremely low: only 3% of respondents were aware of the existence and function of equality courts despite the central role they play to promote equality, and to prevent and prohibit unfair discrimination, hate speech and harassment.

Physical proximity to state institutions is a key predictor of which institutions respondents would approach for assistance if they felt their rights had been violated or if someone had acted in a discriminatory manner towards them.
### APPENDIX A: ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJPCR</td>
<td>Access to Justice and Promotion of Constitutional Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>CAO Community Advice Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Community Agency for Social Enquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community-based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGE</td>
<td>Commission for Gender Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRL</td>
<td>Commission for the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ&amp;CD</td>
<td>Department of Justice and Constitutional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHR</td>
<td>Foundation for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Free State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT</td>
<td>Gauteng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSRC</td>
<td>Human Sciences Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC</td>
<td>Independent Electoral Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>Kwa-Zulu Natal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Limpopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPILAR</td>
<td>National Institute for Public Interest Law and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIA</td>
<td>Promotion of Access to Information Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAJA</td>
<td>Promotion of Administrative Justice Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPUDA</td>
<td>Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHRC</td>
<td>South African Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StatsSA</td>
<td>Statistics South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Western Cape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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