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Abstract

The adoption and penetration of mobile phones have been on the rise in South Africa with the increased cellular network coverage being a key driver to this growth. This growth in mobile phone usage has also fast tracked the mobile phones usability in a number of areas such as education, health and payments, yet its adoption for m-Government has not experienced the same level of growth. Although m-Government is a prospect for South Africa, current e-Government infrastructure needs to improve in order to realize the possibilities and potential it offers. In this paper the availability of m-Government services and the barriers to adoption were investigated. Surveys were used to ascertain how citizens interact and access government services and information via their mobile phones. The paper concludes with suggestions for easier adoption and insights into citizens’ preferences for accessing m-Government services.
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1. Introduction

The adoption and penetration of mobile phones have been on the rise in South Africa with the increased cellular network coverage being a key driver to this growth. This growth in mobile phone usage has also fast tracked the mobile phones usability in a number of
areas such as education, health and payments, yet its adoption for m-Government has not experienced the same level of growth. Although m-Government is a prospect for South Africa, current e-Government infrastructure needs to improve in order to realize the possibilities and potential it offers.

South Africa along with many developing countries has been part of a growing mobile acceptance (Goodman & Harris, 2010: 24) which has shown an interest – and pressure, to adopt mobile e-Government infrastructure such as m-Government.

Maumbe and Vesper (2008) stated that m-Government is the mobile centric interpretation of e-Government services which includes any method of wireless connection of government services to be broadcasted to a mobile phone (Yu & Kushchu, 2004:3; Song & Cornford, 2006) furthermore it is also by extension an immediate evolutionary step of e-Government infrastructure.

M-Government is very much the way forward for e-Government argues some (Ford, 2008: 2; Maumbe & Owei, 2006) while some say m-Government is still its infancy suggesting its full potential has not been seen yet (Kushchu et al: 2007: 150-151).

Mobile adoption in South Africa marks a unique opportunity to capitalize on mobilizing e-Government projects inevitably making government more accountable in a sense. Provided that openness continues to improve and barriers preventing government websites decreases the chances of corruption (D'Agostino et al, 2011:10) and increase service delivery (Mphidi, 2009:9; Boruchki et al, 2005: 57).

For this paper the focus was set at a community level and specifically at those who use their mobile phones for browsing the Internet and social networking. This allowed us to establishing people's expectations and accessibility preferences when accessing South African Government (SAG) websites through their mobile phones.

2. m-Government: e-Government's next stage in evolution

In this section below, it will discuss how e-Government has been implemented throughout Africa particularly focusing on what m-Government fundamentally means to South Africans.

2.1. m-Government

Developing countries in Africa has seen many of them adopt m-Government in their stride to give in to international trend; or pressure, and while poor infrastructure noted by Goodman and Harris (2010: 28) exists in majority of them. The Kenyan project 'Ushahidi' is an e-Service that provides 'SMS alerts regarding outbreaks of violence' (Goodman & Harris, 2010: 25). It has become a prominent example of e-Service real estate that governments around Africa are adopting. e-Service real estate is potentially an e-Service that adapts in a short time to the context of the situation, this technology essentially gives people access to information seen here as provision to prejudicial violence awareness which in recent months South Africa needed during the xenophobia related attacks.
Furthermore the progression towards m-Services is on the increase in Africa; while progress near home proves to be slow adopters (Barnard, 2012:21). Kenyans seem to be much more energetic in their stride to provide more m-Services, such as m-Pesa, an e-payment service, with more than 14 million users, provides a user with the ability to transfer money to other users; even non registered users (Mas & Radcliffe, 2011:170).

M-Government becomes more evident by a change in dynamic to adopt mobile as a direct way to interact with consumers (Grosskurth, 2010:50). M-Government should therefore make sense to government only after establishing the proper infrastructure of pre-existing e-facilities. This mobile infrastructure is the singular differentiating factor that set its aside from its e-Government counterpart (Kushchu & Borucki, 2004: 4).

Ifinedo (2005: 55) describes e-Readiness as a nation's ability to knit together an economy by means of two categories namely e-Society; which focuses on the nation's ability in adoption of e-Services and secondly, on how society can benefit from the use of ICT. e-Readiness assessments should be seen as a helpful guide to establish a benchmark on how well a nation's ICT is performing (Budhiraja & Sachdeva, n.b: 3) giving evidence to anecdotal assumptions.

Tiamiyu and Ogunsola (2008: 59) summarized particular African countries e-Readiness back in 2004, while South Africa held a higher ranking back then the Report of 2012 (The Global Information Technology Report 2012: 2012) shows a decline to 72nd position which comprised out of 142 countries. Ifinedo (2005: 55) notes that a country's 'readiness' cannot be fully interpreted by indices for reasons such as ‘…reliability, availability and completeness of data’.

South Africa's notably 'Batho Pele' maintains they help improve in areas such as service delivery and increasing openness and transparency according to Farelo and Morris (2006: 7). The Batho Pele Project is an extensive project boasting much legislation and a white paper all in the name of open transparent e-Government infrastructure (Principles of Batho Pele, n.d.).

2.2. Adoption of mobile

The conscious decision to move towards a mobile environment needs to happen sooner and with much great urgency, as shown by current mobile trends. The overreaching extent of mobile subscriptions worldwide rose to 6 billion whereby developing countries accounted for 80% of its growth in 2011 with an increasing adoption amongst youth in these markets (International Telecommunication Union, 2012:1; The World Bank, 2012: 87; Li, 2012).

The mobile gateway is the current phase that is the most intuitive form of technology. The mobile-only phenomenon that blankets South Africa represents a community out to utilise social networks rather than seeking information (Donner & Gitau, 2009: 8). The trends today scream mobile adoption in nearly every facet of today’s life. Factors such as pricing and infrastructure have become key contributing factors in the continuous growth of mobile phone adoptions worldwide (The World Bank, 2012: 96).
2.3. E-filing: it seems someone is doing it right - finally.

South African Revenue Service (SARS) e-filing process has shown to be a success by the amount of support generated by taxpayers in 2008. E-Filing has shown that e-services rendered by SAG has the ability to provide a service worthwhile but more significantly has potential to adopt the mobile crazed society in South Africa (Vorster, 2012), this is evidence which shows customers are more confidence with the system provided the R 140 million was a worthwhile investment (Engelbrecht, 2008).

Presently SARS is in the process of developing a mobile website whereby taxpayers will have the ability to file their tax returns and receive assessments using their smart device; smart phone and/or tablet (Odendaal, 2012). This strategic move to incorporate smart devices is a step in the right direction, however as the strategy will not supporting devices of lesser capability thereby only incorporating a small segment of the mobile community, the strategy can be viewed as a step forwards to having no influence at all for many people in our communities.

3. Understanding the person’s perspective

Established in a case study involving difficulties in the developing mobile infrastructure for citizens (Kushchu et al, 2007:147), it was essential to include the participation of citizens during the development as well as the implementation phase of the project.

Given that m-Government depend on as much pre-existing e-Government services to just be adapted (Maumbe & Vesper, 2008: 1) and service delivery (Maumbe & Owei, 2006: 10). Adoption levels (Boruchki et al, 2005: 64) highlighted that citizens failed to adopt mobile technologies in the workplace.

M-Government therefore should not be a force-fed action – implementation, which government should be pressured into adopting without the necessary precautions (Kushchu et al: 2007: 139). Once a level of confidence has been established in a service well adopted by the public; i.e. e-filing, a level of trust begins to emerge. Government must therefore manage the level of trust (The World Bank, 2012: 98) by adopting acceptable security standards.

3. Methodology

The approach for distribution of the survey was via Mxit, where its users use the platform for mobile Internet browsing, applications, social networking and communication. Mxit established in South Africa, is a prominent mobile social network platform, which boasts over 50 million users (Davis, 2012) and have been studied by other researchers in understanding this ‘mobile-community’. Previous research included the development of Math Skills (Butgereit, 2007; Davis, 2012) and mobile counselling (Parker & Nitsckie, 2009: 8) via Mxit. The choice to do a survey tool would help uncover a mobile user’s individualisation through their perceived use of mobile phones (Cilliers & Parker, 2008:8; Davis, 1993: 480).

The likert scale was chosen in the construction of the questionnaire. This scale helps define along a continuum someone’s ability to relate to a question (McLeod, 2008). The questionnaire was basing on two scales; ‘Government’ and ‘Mobile Usage’. The number of 200 participants was a rudimentary number set for this study furthermore a five level
agreement factor - the traditional, code (1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - neutral, 4 - agree and 5 - Strongly Agree) was chosen.

The final questionnaire comprised of 13 questions, which has been divided into the mobile usage and government scales respectively; refer to Appendix 1. The slant towards including one additional question towards the government scale over the mobile usage scale was to answer the question on whether people perceived future government mobile websites as having a service to suit their needs.

4. Results and discussion

The survey ran for 5 days whereby 224 people participated and 205 people completed the full questionnaire.

The majority of the respondents were female with a total of 154 (70%), while the male contribution was a total of 70 participants. The results also supported the literature that adoption of mobile phones amongst youth is high as the majority (81%) of the respondents were aged between 13 and 25 years.

4.1 The mobile scale

Nokia (56.2%) with 126 participants were the most popular handset, followed by Samsung with 62 participants. This highlights the concern in the literature that only incorporating m-Government strategies for smart devices may not be the ideal, but a step in the right direction.

The study also showed that only 13% of the respondents spend less than an hour on their mobile phones for instant messaging, browsing the Internet and social networks as argued by Donner and Gitau (2009:8) indicating that this mobile community is out to utilise social networks rather than just seeking information (See Figure 1).

Figure 1 - “In a typical day, how often would you use Mxit?”

![Figure 1: In a typical day, how often would you use Mxit?](image)
The applications most popular by the respondents other than Mxit were Social Applications and SMS messaging, see Figure 2.

**Figure 2 - “Which one of the following would you mostly use other than Mxit?”**

![Pie chart showing the popularity of different applications](chart.png)

4.2 The government scale

Although the adoption of mobile phones are on the rise and the active use to access information was evident in the results, most of the respondents still access government services by either visiting their municipalities (41%) or calling the helplines (35%). The alarming finding was that only 20 respondents visited the local municipality website.

**Figure 3 - “How would you contact your local municipality?”**

![Pie chart showing the methods of contacting the local municipality](chart2.png)

Only 34% of the respondents indicated that they believed government are doing their best in making e-services more accessible. The results shown in Figure 4, hints for the desire
of transparency to government activity in that more than 80% of the respondents suggested that they should have ways to monitor government spending. This is a clear indication that openness to government information is desired although many believe that the e-services are not easily accessible.

An alarming 55% of respondents never knew government had a mobile website or visited the current mobile website. Seventy-five (34%) respondents accessed government information via their mobile phones and this is through local news channels whereas 27% do not access government information via their mobile phones.

Figure 4 - “Do you think we should have ways to monitor government’s spending?”

The majority (66%) of the respondents believed that government can provide a mobile website that can meet their needs. Refer to appendix 2 for detailed data

5. Conclusion

Arthur Goldstruck said “A good example is the Nokia 6310. It’s a reliable old phone. It has GPRS internet access and I can check emails on it, but with tremendous difficulty. So people assume, because the phone has got these capabilities, people would use it to access the web, they do not” (Grosskurt, 2010: 48). It was with this motivation that mobile phone users who use browse the mobile Internet and access social networks were targeted for this survey, as they are more likely to use any mobile services if they were available.

With the rise in mobile phone usage South Africans are equipped with multifaceted communication devices. While the cost of data is on the decrease and instant messaging is relevantly cheap, the main method of contacting local municipalities is still undertaken by getting people to walk to the municipality offices or by phone calls. The study also had an overwhelming number of respondents being youth; it showed the interest of young people in monitoring government spending and desire for improved m-Government services. By giving South Africans the ability to monitor government spending will also help promote transparency.

Although many of the respondents spend their time on social networks and the mobile Internet, majority were not familiar with the government mobile websites. Government
could leverage the social networks where most of the mobile users are actively engaging, as a medium to educate and direct to their current m-Government offerings.

These results are grounding our understanding of people’s issues around the provision of m-Services and enabled us to ascertain what the mobile community are ready for a decent m-Government provision.
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Appendix

Appendix 1 - Questionnaire

Code Reference:
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree,
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

Age Bracket:
- 13 – 20,
- 21 – 25,
- 26 – 30,
- > 30

Gender:
- Male
- Female

Questions

Scale 1: Mobile Usage
1. In a typical day, how often would you use Mxit?
   - Less than a hour.
   - 1 - 3 hours
   - 3 - 6 hours
   - Majority of the day - More than 6 hours
   - Can't say

2. Which one of the following would you mostly use other than Mxit?
   - SMS (Short Messaging Service)
   - MMS (Multimedia Messaging Service)
   - Email (Electronic Mail)
   - Social Apps - i.e., Facebook, Twitter, Google+
   - Games

3. What type of phone are you currently using?
   - Samsung
   - Nokia
   - BlackBerry
   - Apple
   - Sony Ericsson
4. How often would you use social media on your phone?
   - I don't see the appeal
   - Sometimes, 2 hours max
   - Often, More than 2 hours
   - More often then I like. More than 3 hours.
   - I don't keep track.

5. How would you contact your local municipality?
   - Phone call
   - SMS
   - Email
   - website
   - Personally go to local municipality

Scale 2: Government
1. Do you think government is making electronic services; such as taxes, more accessible?
   - Yes I believe government is doing their best (5)
   - Yes but they not doing their best (4)
   - I don't have an opinion (3)
   - No, they are not trying hard enough (2)
   - Absolutely not (1)

2. Do you think we should have ways to monitor government’s spending?
   - Yes, absolutely. It will make them more accountable (5)
   - Yes but only share certain information. (4)
   - No opinion (3)
   - No, i don't care about our government’s spending. (2)
   - No, we better off not knowing. (1)

3. What do you think about our government’s mobile websites?
   - The website had everything i needed (5)
   - it was ordinary, nothing special (4)
   - I haven't visited any using my phone (3)
   - terrible I hated the experience (2)
   - i didn't know our government had mobile websites (1)

4. How do you keep up with government activities via your phone?
   - I don't care about our government (5)
   - I don't really use my phone to keep track of government (4)
   - I have no opinion (3)
   - I read a few local news channels (2)
   - I follow government's news by any means (1)
5. Which category do you think government is lacking in?
   - education
   - healthcare
   - social
   - home affairs
   - all the above

6. Do you believe government can provide mobile websites that can suite your needs
   - yes, absolutely (5)
   - yes, perhaps it’s possible (4)
   - I have no opinion (3)
   - no, but i’ll believe it when I see it (2)
   - I don’t believe it’s ever possible (1)

Appendix 2 - Questionnaire results

1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. Participates 224

2. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 - 20</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. Participates 224

Mobile Scale

1. In a typical day, how often would you use Mxit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than a hour</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 hours</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 6 hours</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of the day</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t say</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. Participates 224

2. Which one of the following would you mostly use other than Mxit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMS (Short Messaging Service)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS (Multimedia Messaging Service)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email (Electronic Mail)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perc (%) 30.36% 1.34% 2.68%
Social Apps - i.e., Facebook, Twitter, Google+ 108 48.21%
Games 32 14.29%
blank 7 3.13%
No. Participates 224

3. What type of phone are you currently using?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samsung</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nokia</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlackBerry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony Ericsson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorola</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siemens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Participates</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How often would you use social media on your phone?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't see the appeal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes, 2 hours max</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, More than 2 hours</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More often then I like. More than 3 hours</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't keep track</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Participates</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How would you contact your local municipality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone call</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send a SMS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send an email</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting their website</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally go to local municipality</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Participates</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government Scale
1. Do you think government is making electronic services; such as taxes, more accessible?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes I believe government is doing their best</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes but they not doing their best</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't have an opinion</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, they are not trying hard enough</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely not</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Do you think we should have ways to monitor government's spending?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely. It will make them more accountable</td>
<td>117 52.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes but only share certain information</td>
<td>66 29.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>12 5.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don't care about our government's spending</td>
<td>3 1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, we better off not knowing</td>
<td>14 6.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. Participates: 224

3. What do you think about our government's mobile websites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The website had everything i needed</td>
<td>56 25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was ordinary, nothing special</td>
<td>21 9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I haven't visited any using my phone</td>
<td>56 25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrible, I hated the experience</td>
<td>10 4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn't know our government had mobile websites</td>
<td>67 29.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>14 6.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. Participates: 224

4. How do you keep up with government activities via your phone?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't care about our government</td>
<td>12 5.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't really use my phone to keep track of government</td>
<td>61 28.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no opinion</td>
<td>18 8.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read a few local news channels</td>
<td>75 35.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I follow government's news by any means</td>
<td>41 19.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>17 8.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. Participates: 212

5. Which category do you think government is lacking in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>46 25.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>33 18.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>21 11.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Affairs</td>
<td>19 10.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all the above</td>
<td>87 49.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>17 9.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. Participates: 177

6. Do you believe government can provide mobile websites that can suite your needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Perc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely</td>
<td>76 34.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, perhaps it's possible</td>
<td>71 31.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no opinion</td>
<td>5 2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but I'll believe it when I see it</td>
<td>40 18.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't believe it's ever possible</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Participates</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>