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1. Introduction

The popular protests in Brazil on the eve of the Confederations Cup held by FIFA in 2013 were a milestone in the Brazilian political history, because, as well as in other countries worldwide in the same period (Tunisia, Iceland, Egypt etc.), a significant part of the population (mainly composed by youths) took to the streets to protest against something in their societies.

This fact mobilized the society, especially through social networks and the coverage of more traditional media, and consequently had a strong impact on the Brazilian politicians' credibility. Besides President Dilma Rousseff, the governors of all Brazilian states had their popularity compromised.

In response to this popular manifestation, the Brazilian government presented a series of measures to “calm down” the protesters and try to meet part of the most urgent demands posed by the movement. Among these measures was the implementing of a Political Reform.

The subject of a Political Reform in Brazil has long been discussed, especially because although the 1988 Brazilian Constitution presented a framework for a parliamentary system, the presidential regime was eventually chosen. Furthermore, it was ratified in a plebiscite in 1993. Therefore, some important adjustments would be necessary to the Constitution, and since then the subject is always on the agenda.

A topic related to the Political Reform in Brazilian recent history, which is frequently under discussion, for instance, is party fragmentation. Brazil has had several regulations in this sense, all of them drastic: from 1945 to 1964 we had a multiparty system dominated by three parties (PSD, PTB and UDN). Then, during the authoritarian period, 1964-1982, when we had a façade democracy, only two parties (ARENA and MDB) existed, but none of them had real decision-making power. In 1982, in the first direct elections after the military period, five parties competed: PDS (former Arena), PDT, PT, PTB and PMDB (former MDB). In the 1986 and 1989 elections, the number of parties skyrocketed, and a lax legislation has led to the creation of an even larger number since then. Today the party system still has many parties, but there is a clear distinction of two large blocks (government and opposition) composed of, on one side, PSDB / PFL-DEM and some other more conservative parties, and on the opposite side, PT / historical left-wing parties. PMDB might join one block or the other, depending on who is in power.
A broader Political Reform was first articulated under President Fernando Henrique Cardoso. However, the only substantial change achieved since then was the approval of the reelection amendment to the Constitution, in 1997. Another important matter on the subject, party fidelity, was actually established later, by a decision of the Judiciary, when the Superior Electoral Court (TSE), and then the Supreme Federal Court (STF) ratified that the parliamentarians’ mandates belong to the parties, and not to the politicians.

An evidence that Brazilian politicians deal with topics related to Political Reform in a frivolous way is noncompliance with previously established changes. The best example of this behavior is the Barrier Clause, also established under President Fernando Henrique, which aimed at reducing the number of political parties. Although it was supposed to take effect in 2007, it was eventually declared unconstitutional. Another little change occurred in 2010 that did not take effect until 2012, due to Court analysis - the so-called “Ficha Limpa” (Clean Record) Law. In practice, very little has been “reformed” in the Brazilian political system since the 1988 Constitution.

Our goal in this study is to capture Brazilian public opinion on Political Reform. How much do Brazilians really care about such an important subject? What is their opinion on the main aspects suggested as being likely to change? With that in mind, Ibope Inteligência carried out a survey on the subject at the climax of the popular demonstration in August 2013, and then another one at the beginning of 2015, when once again (after being completely asleep during the campaign for the 2014 elections) the creation of a special Committee on Political Reform inside the House of Representatives, at the beginning of the new legislature.

My hypothesis is that, despite being announced by the media and the Brazilian politicians (the ones who are most interested in the subject), the Political Reform itself is not the population’s major demand, and despite all this social demonstration, it is not the main reason for the popular outcry. It might be a means to an end, but not an end in itself.
2. Context

On June 6, 2013 a group of youths gathered on Paulista Avenue in Sao Paulo to protest against the bus fare increase in the city. The fare had been increased from R$ 3.00 to R$ 3.20. For some people that represented “only” 20 cents, but for others, exactly 6.67% (index lower than the accumulated inflation rate since the last fare increase), but in practice, that initiative of “a few youths” belonging to the MPL (Movimento Passe Livre: Free Pass Mouvement), triggered a series of popular demonstrations all over the country, which entered our recent history.

It is important to highlight that the way the Military Police treated the protesters rather heated the debate and ended up leading more people to join the demonstration. Several excesses were shown by the media, and this scenario, in a pre-World Cup moment (a few days before the start of the Confederations Cup in Brazil), led to the dissemination of these demonstrations across the country, not only for the bus fare increase, but also for several other matters that were stifled in Brazilian society.

Despite the initial association with the MPL in Sao Paulo, the demonstrations that spread throughout the country had no connection with any organized entities or groups. In fact, the people taking part in the demonstrations rejected the association with any political parties or trade unions. Those manifestations were “free” from any institutionalized entities, and always positioned against, above all, the poor quality of public services in general, corruption, the police violent approach to the protesters, and everything else that was wrong in the country.
Due to the impact of these events, short after this first movement, Ibope Inteligencia online pannel, CONECTAí, carried out a poll\(^1\), which can help us better understand the reasons for that ‘spark’:

- 10% of the Brazilian internet users claimed they have taken to the streets to protest.
- For 47% of the respondents, the motivation for the demonstration was divided, partly because of the fare increase and partly due to the population’s dissatisfaction overall.
- It is relevant to highlight that for 32% the actual cause of the protests was mainly the overall popular discontent, rather than the price of transport itself.
- For only 18%, the actual cause of the protests was merely the increase in the bus and subway fare.
- Most internet users (83%) believed that Brazil would go through a critical period in which political changes were most needed.

On June 20, the day set for another mass demonstration throughout Brazil, still a reflection of the spark of June 06, Ibope Inteligencia carried another survey\(^2\) aiming at collecting information on the protesters' profile. 2002 people were polled across eight Brazilian capitals. Some data in this survey show the respondents' motivations and their reasons for not being linked to any institutions: most respondents claimed that they do not feel represented by any political party (89%) or politician (83%). Among the respondents, 96% said they were not affiliated to any political party, and 86% were not affiliated to any union, class entity or student council or association.

---

\(^1\) The data were collected from 1,775 internet users members of the CONECTAí pannel, throughout the country, between June 15\(^{th}\) and 17\(^{th}\).

\(^2\) IBOPE Inteligência polled 2002 protesters, across eight Brazilian capitals (Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Belo Horizonte, Porto Alegre, Recife, Fortaleza, Salvador and Distrito Federal), on June 20\(^{th}\). The error margin is two percentage points and the reliability interval is 95%.
When asked what claims took them to the streets, 38% mentioned the public transport issue as a prime reason for mobilization. Secondly, claims for changes in the political scenario (30%), in health (12%) and in the PEC 37\(^3\) (6%). Considering the sum of all issues mentioned by the respondents, 65% claimed for changes in the current political scenario, 54% claimed for changes in public transport and 37% claimed for changes in health care.

With regard to the political scenario, 49% of the respondents claimed that they fight corruption and embezzlement of public funds, while 11% claimed an urgent need for change and 10% said they were dissatisfied with the government in general. Another significant finding is that there has been a great deal of commitment in social networks: according to data, 75% of the protesters have exhorted other people to join the demonstration through Facebook and Twitter.

In the same period, Ibope Inteligencia carried out another survey (between June 19th and 20th), nationwide, polling the whole population (not only protesters like the previous survey). This time respondents appeared to be more pessimistic about the consequences of these actions: although 75% claimed to be favorable to the popular demonstrations, particularly the younger with a higher education level, almost half of the respondents (46%) believed that the demonstrations would bring about few practical changes in the country. A quarter (26%) were more optimistic, believing that many changes would occur after the demonstrations, while 21%, totally pessimistic, believed there will be no change.

Regarding the various topics that have been raised, most people (59%) spotted the increase in public transport fares as the main reason for the protests. Fighting corruption has also been mentioned by approximately one third of the respondents, as well as demands for more investments in health in education.

There is also a portion of 18% that said they believed the protests were against the politicians in general, percentage equivalent to those who claimed that the demonstrations were against bus companies or against inflation.

\(^3\) Proposed Constitution Amendment (Proposta de Emenda Constitucional ) 37/2011, abbreviation PEC 37, was a Brazilian bill that, once approved, would prohibit investigations by public prosecutors. Public prosecutors called it the "Impunity PEC ", a retaliation to the work of public prosecutors in fighting corruption. For some police chiefs’ associations, on the other hand, it was considered the "Legality PEC ". Besides the police chiefs, the PEC had the support of the Federal Board of the Brazilian Bar Association.
Still, 59% of Brazilians think the demonstrations are the best way to demand improvements in public policies and government and politicians’ performance. 37% believed there are more suitable means to push such changes.

As for effective participation, according to the survey, 94% of the respondents declared they did not take part in any demonstration happening in the country, as opposed to 6% that declared they did. The compliance rate with the protests was higher among the more educated: 16% of the respondents with higher education said they took to the streets. Similarly, the stratum with a higher family income appeared to be more participatory in the protests (15%). Among those who did not take part in the demonstrations, 35% declared they are willing to take to the streets if they have the opportunity.

As a result of this popular turmoil, the performance evaluation of President Dilma and all Brazilian governors fell sharply. During this period, the positive evaluation of the PT government fell 27 points in three weeks according to a Datafolha survey\(^4\), which had a great impact at the time.

\(^4\) On June 27th and 28th 2013, Datafolha polled 4,717 people across 196 cities. The error margin is two percentage points, higher or lower.
After the start of the demonstrations, Dilma made an announcement on TV and proposed a pact to the governors, which included a plebiscite for Political Reform. That was the first pact presented by the president to governors and mayors, and it demanded fiscal responsibility, economic stability and inflation control. Moreover, the president called for a “fierce” fight against corruption and said that, in order to do so, it would be necessary to toughen legislation, so that willful corruption should be classified as equivalent to a heinous crime, subject to “severe penalties”

At a second moment, president Dilma proposes another national pact, consisting of 5 measures:

1. Fiscal responsibility and inflation control
2. A plebiscite to set up a Constituent Assembly to push through a political reform

3. Health

Dilma asked the governors and mayors to "speed up" the investments already started in hospitals, emergency care units and basic health units and expand the compliance of philanthropic hospitals to the Health Ministry’s program that exchanges debt for more care. In addition, the government wants to provide health care in the country's remote and impoverished areas, where doctors are scarce, and, as long as there are no Brazilian doctors available, hire foreign doctors to work exclusively for the Unified Health System (Sistema Único de Saúde - SUS).
4. Education

For the education sector, Dilma pledged support for the bill that aims at investing 100% of Brazil's oil royalties in education, still in Congress. According to her, "no nation is able to develop without a literacy process at a proper age, without day care for the people that need it most, without full-time education, without technical and vocational education, without universities of excellence, without research, science and innovation ". "The essential conditions to achieve these goals are training, valuing and fair salaries for the educators, and they require resources ", she said.

5. Public transport

To tackle the problem of public transport, spotted as one of the factors that determined the outbreak of the wave of demonstrations throughout the country, Dilma talked about making a "qualitative leap". She emphasized the tax relief of the sector promoted by the federal government, which, she said, allowed the reduction of the bus fares in 7.23%, and the train and subway fares in 13.25%.

"Now we are willing to expand the tax relief of PIS-Cofins on diesel used by public buses and trains, and on electricity used by subways and trains. This process may be strengthened by states and municipalities with the relief of their taxes. I am sure that you will be responsive to that", she said, addressing the governors and mayors. She also announced the allocation of over R$ 50 billion on new investments in works of urban mobility.

Another announcement during the opening of the meeting was the creation of a National Council of Public Transport, with the participation of civil society representatives and users, to ensure para "a thorough participation of the society in the political debate on transport" and "more transparency and social control in determining transportation fares".

Out of these proposals in 2013, some have been totally forgotten by the media and the society as a whole in recent months, and only two are still standing:

- The proposal concerning health turns out to be the push that was necessary for the implementation of the "More Doctors" (Mais Médicos) program, that hired thousands of doctors to work in the public health system (SUS) in over 3,700 cities, including about 15 thousand foreign doctors, of which almost 80% from Cuba, fact that has brought about much debate in the country.
The Political Reform, a topic that returned to debate on the day of the new Brazilian Parliament swearing-in ceremony\(^5\), by its leader Eduardo Cunha.

It is noteworthy that the resumption of the Political Reform theme by the House of Representatives, and more specifically by its new leader Eduardo Cunha, is the outcome of a conflict of interest of PT, the president’s party, and a significant portion of PMDB. From PT point of view, the main interest in political reform is to end private funding of election campaigns. Since the beginning of the “Car Wash” Operation, an ongoing Brazilian Federal Police effort to map out millions of dollars in bribery and contract fraud at Petrobras, PT, the main target of the accusations, has adopted a speech against private campaign funding, and has been striving for its banning, precisely to prevent further scandals like the one the party is involved in. It is worth remembering that even the former president of the House of Representatives (and former PT member) André Vargas, as well as PT Treasurer João Vaccari Neto, have been arrested.

On the other side, the president of the Chamber of Deputies Eduardo Cunha is one of the greatest advocates of private funding for election campaigns, and to prevent PT – despite its political fragility – from banning this type of campaign funding through the implementation of exclusive public campaign funding, he is trying to set up a Political Reform in order to prevent exclusive public campaign funding from being approved. That is why the subject is back on the agenda.

3. Data surveys

As mentioned, we will be presenting here the results of two surveys carried out by Ibope Inteligência, with national samples, one in August 2013 (shortly after the popular demonstrations of the commitment by the federal government to address the Political Reform) and another one in January 2015, when the new parliament took up the theme after the 2014 elections.

It is important to highlight that the samples from both surveys were, methodologically speaking, exactly alike. Also, the questions presented had the same instructions.

The first datum of the surveys is about the level of awareness of the proposal of a Political Reform in Brazil. What we see is a very low awareness from the voting population about this theme.

**AWARENESS OF THE PROPOSAL OF A POLITICAL REFORM (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>aug/13</th>
<th>jan/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent is aware of the reform</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time respondent has heard of the reform</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know / Did not answer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the respondents said they have never heard anything about the subject (even though the theme has been recurrent in the political and social sciences context in Brazil in recent years), or that they do not know anything about it.

Regionally speaking, one can notice a slightly higher level of awareness of the Political Reform among southern voters. The table below shows the results of the January 2015 survey:
AWARENESS OF THE PROPOSAL OF THE POLITICAL REFORM
(Per geographic region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>NORTH/ MIDWEST</th>
<th>NORTHEAST</th>
<th>SOUTHEAST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent is aware</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time respondent has heard of the proposal</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not know/ Did not answer</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second point addressed in the survey is the Brazilians’ amount of information on the Political Reform. Here it can be observed that half of voters are uninformed about the Reform, while a third believe they are under-informed, which shows that less than 10% of citizens are well-informed about the Political Reform.

LEVEL OF INFORMATION ON THE PROPOSAL OF THE POLITICAL REFORM (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Well-informed</th>
<th>Under-informed</th>
<th>Uninformed</th>
<th>Do not know/ Did not answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aug/13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jan/15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, regionally speaking the less oblivious to the subject are the inhabitants of the Southern region in Brazil.

**LEVEL OF INFORMATION ON THE PROPOSAL OF THE POLITICAL REFORM**

(Per geographic region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>NORTH/CENTER WEST</th>
<th>NORTHEAST</th>
<th>SOUTHEAST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well-informed</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-informed</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninformed</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know / Did not answer</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third point addressed by Ibope Inteligencia was the level of agreement on the need for a Political Reform in Brazil. In this aspect, unlike the data shown so far, there are differences in the percentages between the 2013 and 2015 surveys. The level of agreement decreases by 19 percentage points (totally agree + partly agree) from one survey to the next. On the other hand, the level of disagreement (totally disagree + partly disagree) remains the same. The difference occurs among respondents who have no opinion, the oblivious, which increase from 3% in 2013 to 19% in 2015.

**LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON THE NEED FOR A POLITICAL REFORM (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>aug/13</th>
<th>jan/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ Did not answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An indication of how oblivious Brazilian society is to the Political Reform potential projects is that, when those respondents claiming to be well-informed or somewhat informed about the theme were spontaneously asked what measures were under discussion in the Reform, a relative majority (28%) said they did not know any of them.

### AWARENESS OF THE MEASURES PROPOSED BY THE POLITICAL REFORM (%)  
(Among respondents claiming to be well- or somewhat informed about the Political Reform  
Spontaneous – Several options)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Aug/13</th>
<th>Jan/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of compulsory voting / voting becomes optional</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Senate alternates/substitutes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of secret ballot in Congress / Allow everyone to know the vote of Congressmen and Senators</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of alliances / coalitions between parties</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in the number of political parties</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in the form of election campaign funding / Ban on cash donations for election campaigns</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization of a Plebiscite/ Popular consultation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed lists for deputy elections / Voting for a party and no longer for a single candidate deputy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in the rules applied to the use of internet during election campaigns</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization of a new Constituent Assembly for Political Reform</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District vote / Electing deputies by state region</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of reelection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring foreign doctors/ More Doctors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Record Operation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others under 1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know / Did not answer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2013 to 2015, the answer presenting a significant decrease is precisely the one associated with the government proposal shortly after the demonstrations, namely, the realization of plebiscites / popular consultations, with a reduction of 8 percentual points within two years.
Since then, in the questionnaire, respondents were presented the main proposals under discussion in Congress to be modified in the Political Reform. In 2013 as much as in 2015, the most popular measures are the end of secret ballots among congress members, and the change in the form of election campaign funding (precisely the point of greatest conflict between a portion of PMDB and PT in parliament).

**AWARENESS OF PROPOSALS OF THE POLITICAL REFORM (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change the form of election campaign funding.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct vote for the election of councilors and deputies.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a closed list system for the election of councilors and deputies,</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End party alliances for the election of councilors and deputies.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the Senate alternates / substitutes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of secret voting, i.e., allow everyone to know whom deputies vote for.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow candidates who are not affiliated to any party to compete in elections.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the respondents have already heard about the subject, the actual knowledge of the proposals is still very poor. Again, the two proposals (end of secret ballot among deputies and change in the form of election campaign funding) are the most commonly known among respondents.
LEVEL OF INFORMATION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE POLITICAL REFORM (%)

Among the well-informed and under-informed respondents, 42% currently have some knowledge on the proposal of change in the campaign funding (in comparison to 24% in 2013). On the other hand, the end of secret voting has kept the same rate (42%) of respondents claiming to have some knowledge on the topic.

After the survey on the level of awareness, we have deepened the understanding of the respondents' level of agreement regarding the proposals of the Political Reform mentioned above. Here, in a more direct and didactic way, we notice that, in general, the Brazilians are quite favorable to most of them, which is consistent with the motivation of the recent demonstrations.
The proposals showing the highest level of agreement are precisely the elimination of the alternates at the Senate and the elimination of the secret voting at the National Congress. These proposals currently have the agreement – either total or partial – of 3 out of 4 voters (72%).

Even the proposal to reduce the power of the political parties in the electoral system, allowing the candidacy of people without any party affiliation, has a majority agreement (57%).

The core issue in the dispute between PT and PMDB in the Political Reform, campaign funding, still splits voters’ opinions. At a first superficial reading of the chart below, the proposal of exclusively public funding holds a relative majority of opinions, with approximately one third of the references. However, if we add the combined options of funding sources (government + natural person + companies, natural persons + companies), opinions become more polarized.
It is also worth mentioning the large number of Brazilians who have no opinion on this subject - about 1 in 5 - and the fact that the opinions remained unchanged over the period of the two surveys.

Regionally, it can be noted that the highest incidence of sustaining the existing form of campaign funding, with the participation of all sectors, occurs among Northern/Midwestern voters. On the other hand, Southeastern voters crave for an exclusively public source of campaign funding.
OPINION ON WHO SHOULD FUND POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS
(Per region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>NORTH/ MIDWEST</th>
<th>NORTHEAST</th>
<th>SOUTHEAST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political campaigns should get funding from any sources: government, companies and natural persons, as it happens nowadays.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political campaigns should get funding from the government only.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political campaigns should get funding from companies and natural persons only.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political campaigns should get funding from companies only.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political campaigns should get funding from natural persons only.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know / Did not answer</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southern voters, the most well-informed about the topics on the Political Reform in general, as it could be noted in the previous questions, here are the most undecided: 1 out of 4 have no opinion regarding the best form of campaign funding.

Another topic polled in the survey is district vote, which has the support of a relative majority:

BEST WAY OF CHOOSING PARLIAMENTARIANS IN THE FEDERAL UNITS (%)

- Keep the existing model, i.e., each state chooses several federal deputies, regardless of the region they represent. 23%
- There should be a change, and each state should be divided into smaller regions, each one being responsible for choosing its own federal deputy. 40%
- There should be a combination of the two models, i.e., part of the deputies should be elected as they are today and part should be elected in the state smaller regions, which would then be divided just for election purposes. 17%
- Do not know / Did not answer 21%
When analyzing the results per region, we can note significant differences, the main one being that Southern and Southeastern voters want the parliamentarians to be elected on the basis of electoral districts, through district voting, while Northeastern voters want the existing system to be preserved (in the South only 12% want it to be preserved).

**BEST WAY OF CHOOSING PARLIAMENTARIANS IN THE FEDERAL UNITS**  
(Per region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keep the existing model, i.e., each state chooses several federal deputies, regardless of the region they represent.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>NORTH/ MIDWEST</th>
<th>NORTHEAST</th>
<th>SOUTHEAST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a change, and each state should be divided into smaller regions, each one being responsible for choosing its own federal deputy.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a combination of the two models, i.e., part of the deputies should be elected as they are today and part should be elected in the state smaller regions, which would then be divided just for election purposes.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know / Did not answer</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, Southern voters, this time sided by Northern/Midwestern voters, are the most undecided on the subject.

Another aspect that should be analyzed in the Political Reform in Brazil is the prerogative in ordering the candidates to be chosen during the plea: the party, or each candidate’s performance in the election. That is the ‘open list or closed list’ issue.

This issue also causes a political dispute among Brazilian main parties, since PT, President Dilma Rousseff’s party, strives for the parties’ previous definition of a list, while the other parties tend to choose the candidates for their performance in the elections.

In this case, a clear majority of voters chooses the maintaining of the existing system, in which each candidate’s performance in the plea defines the order of the elect.
It is worth emphasizing that 1 out of 5 voters does not have a fixed opinion on the subject. Regionally, Northeastern voters stand out due to the high rate of approval of the existing format (2 out of 3 voters want to keep the system as it is in that region).
4. Final thoughts

A broader analysis of the data shown herein indicates a great deal of unawareness of the Brazilian citizens regarding political matters. And these figures leave no doubt about the level of alienation of the population on the topic:

- 59% had never heard about Political Reform or did not give their opinion on the subject;
- 92% claim to be under-informed or uninformed on the Reform, or did not give their opinion about it;
- 19% do not know whether they agree with it, they are totally oblivious;
- 39% among those who claim to be well-informed, or at least somewhat informed about the Political Reform, cannot name spontaneously any of its proposals;
- Among the proposals probed, about the one with a higher level of awareness (open voting by the lawmakers), 61% claim it is the first time they have heard about the change;
- Over 90% of voters claim to be under-informed or uninformed about all the proposals presented.

This is the scenario in which Brazilian voters claim to be, in principle, favorable to a range of proposals for changes in our political representation structure; however, it is also clear that these voters are neither acquainted with, nor interested in this type of issue. The changes appear to be necessary and welcome, although, as Brazilian say, “we are still a long way from the bottom of the issue”.

The results presented herein, viewed within the current social scenario in Brazil, with demonstrations of expressive popular participation, indicate the possibility that, more than a Political Reform, in a legal a social-science meaning, Brazilians crave for structural changes in society as a whole, due to their lack of interest and unawareness on the theme, and especially because of the statements of other, more pragmatic motivations, in the 2013 survey about the demonstrations themselves.
Political Reform appears to be a way for some of these changes to happen; however, in practice Brazilians show their desire for a fairer society to all citizens, and not only a change in the way of electing representatives. Political Reform is a means, not an end.

The 2013 demonstrations, on the eve of the Confederations Cup – when several new, modern soccer stadiums were inaugurated (some of them have already been closed, or have hardly been used, nearly a year after the World Cup), mostly financed by public funds, while part of the population do not have access to simple health care, and the quality of education leaves a lot to be desired – was a response to the country’s contradictions.

There is hope that new rules in the choice of political representatives, by improving the representation system, might help reduce the sense of injustice that has dominated Brazilian society in recent years, but it is clear that it is not the only reason Brazilians take to the streets to protest. Besides the provisioning of essential services, such as health care, education, transport, basic sanitation etc., Brazilians also cry out for justice and an end to corruption – the results of the surveys carried out by Ibope Inteligencia shortly after the demonstrations in 2013 make it very clear. The feeling will persist.

That is also evidenced by the fact that over the 17 months separating the two surveys, practically no data changed. When something changed, it was simply because the theme was absolutely overcome by political discussions. Opinions have not changed and the feeling of dissatisfaction persists, which is evidenced by other recent popular demonstrations (which took place after our last survey), this time against corruption involving Petrobras and against President Dilma. Despite the different motivations, something has remained within this period: the indignation against the current political and social scenario in Brazil and the eagerness to somehow change it.
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6. Appendix I

Technical specifications on the research used as a basis for the study:

Survey of August 2013:
OBJECTIVE: The main objective of this study was to measure the level of awareness, as well as the positioning of the Brazilian people with regard to the issues discussed for the implementation of the Political Reform.
LOCATION: Brazil.
PERIOD OF SURVEY: August 15 to 19, 2013.
UNIVERSE: The survey is conducted among a population of 16 year-olds and over in the area surveyed. The universe of residents is stratified. Except for the states of Acre, Amapa and Roraima, which together comprise one stratum, each of the other strata comprises only one Brazilian state. If this state has a metropolitan region, its universe is stratified in metropolitan area and countryside.
SAMPLE: The sampling model used is the 3 stage conglomerates. At the first stage the towns are selected probabilistically through the PPS method (Probability Proportional to Size), based on the population of 16 year-olds and over of each town. At the second stage the conglomerates are selected: census sectors, with systematic PPS (Probability Proportional to Size). The size measure corresponds to the population of 16 year-olds and over residing in the sectors. Finally, at the third stage a fixed number of residents is selected in each conglomerate according to quotas of variables described below.

VARIÁBLES FOR SAMPLE QUOTAS
GENDER: Male and Female.
AGE GROUPS: 16-17, 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64 and 65 and over.
EDUCATION: Up to 4th grade of elementary school; 5th to 8th grade; High School; College education.
OCCUPATION: Dependence sector - agriculture, manufacturing industry, construction industry, other industries, commerce, services, transport and communication, social activity, public administration, other activities, students and retirees.
NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS: 2002 interviews in 142 towns.
ERROR MARGIN: The estimate error margin is 2 percentage points, higher or lower, on the results for the total sample
RELIABILITY LEVEL: The reliability level used is 95%.
DATA COLLECTION: Personal interviews using a questionnaire created according to the research objectives. The interviews are conducted by a team of IBOPE interviewers, duly trained to approach this type of respondent.
QUALITY CONTROL: There was a screening of all the questionnaires after the interviews. Supervision in approximately 20% of the questionnaires.
Survey of January 2015:

OBJECTIVE: The main objective of this study was to measure the level of awareness, as well as the positioning of the Brazilian people with regard to the issues discussed for the implementation of the Political Reform.

LOCATION: Brazil.

PERIOD OF SURVEY: January 15 to 19, 2015.

UNIVERSE: The survey is conducted among a population of 16 year-olds and over in the area surveyed. The universe of residents is stratified. Except for the states of Acre, Amapa and Roraima, which together comprise one stratum, each of the other strata comprises only one Brazilian state. If this state has a metropolitan region, its universe is stratified in metropolitan area and countryside.

SAMPLE: The sampling model used is the 3 stage conglomerates. At the first stage the towns are selected probabilistically through the PPS method (Probability Proportional to Size), based on the population of 16 year-olds and over of each town. At the second stage the conglomerates are selected: census sectors, with systematic PPS ((Probability Proportional to Size). The size measure corresponds to the population of 16 year-olds and over residing in the sectors. Finally, at the third stage a fixed number of residents is selected in each conglomerate according to quotas of variables described below.

VARIÁBLES FOR SAMPLE QUOTAS

GENDER: Male and Female.

AGE GROUPS: 16-17, 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64 and 65 and over.

EDUCATION: Up to 4th grade of elementary school.; 5th to 8th grade.; High School; College education.

OCCUPATION: Dependence sector - agriculture, manufacturing industry, construction industry, other industries, commerce, services, transport and communication, social activity, public administration, other activities, students and retirees.


NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS: 2002 interviews in 142 towns.

ERROR MARGIN: The estimate error margin is 2 percentage points, higher or lower, on the results for the total sample

RELIABILITY LEVEL: The reliability level used is 95%.

DATA COLLECTION: Personal interviews using a questionnaire created according to the research objectives. The interviews are conducted by a team of IBOPE interviewers, duly trained to approach this type of respondent.

QUALITY CONTROL: There was a screening of all the questionnaires after the interviews. Supervision in approximately 20% of the questionnaires.