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Income, Inequality and Poverty Dynamics

Who are the poor and where do they reside?
Stats SA applies and measures various definitions of poverty

Money-metric (lack of income/expenditure)

Subjective poverty (self-perceived)

Inequality (Gini coefficient, share of expenditure, etc.)

Multidimensional poverty (lack of basic services, education, etc.)
Threshold of absolute deprivation

The amount of money required to purchase the minimum required daily energy intake

Food Poverty Line

R585

Threshold of relative deprivation below which people cannot afford the minimum desired lifestyle by most South Africans

Upper-Bound Poverty Line

R1268

Austere threshold below which one has to choose between food and important non-food items

Lower-Bound Poverty Line

R840

Source: National Poverty Lines

National Poverty Lines based on April 2020 prices

Source: National Poverty Lines
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National Poverty Line Series from 2006 to 2020

Source: National Poverty Lines
In 2015, more than a quarter of the population were living below the food poverty line.

Money-metric Poverty headcounts in 2015

Upper-Bound Poverty Line

- Poor: 55.5%
- Non Poor: 45.5%

Lower-Bound Poverty Line

- Poor: 40.0%
- Non Poor: 60.0%

Food Poverty Line

- Poor: 25.2%
- Non Poor: 74.8%

Is the Rand value below which individuals are unable to purchase or consume enough food to supply them with minimum per-capita-per-day energy requirement for good health.

Provides an unambiguous threshold of relative deprivation below which people cannot afford the minimum lifestyle desired by most South Africans.

Provides an austere threshold below which one has to choose between food and important non-food items.

Source: Living Conditions Survey
Approximately **13.8 million** South Africans were living below the FPL in 2015, down from a peak of **16.7 million** in 2009.
The poorest three provinces in the country have consistently been Limpopo, Eastern Cape & KwaZulu-Natal.

Gauteng & Western Cape remain the two provinces with the lowest poverty headcounts at 13.6% & 12.8% respectively.


Source: Poverty Trends Report
Females remain more disadvantaged than males consistently recording a higher headcount, gap and severity measures at each point in time; however, the difference between the sexes is narrowing.

Source: Living Conditions Survey
Money metric poverty in 2006 (LBPL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Money metric poverty by age group

Poverty in 2006

Source: Living Conditions Survey
Elderly saw the greatest reduction in money metric poverty

Change in money metric poverty between 2006 and 2015 (LBPL)

- Elderly: 30.1% reduction (19.3% Points)
- 55-64: 29.9% reduction (10.0% Points)
- 45-54: 27.8% reduction (11.3% Points)
- 35-44: 30.1% reduction (9.4% Points)
- 25-34: 34.7% reduction (5.0% Points)
- 18-24: 43.6% reduction (10.0% Points)
- 0-17: 51.0% reduction (11.8% Points)

Source: Living Conditions Survey
Non-poor households had better access to services compared to poor households

Profile of Poor and Non-poor households (Money Metric)

Poor Households
- Household size: 4.6
- Household income: R46 624
- Ownership of dwelling: 78.2%
- Piped water inside/on site: 59%
- Electricity: 80.5%
- Flush toilet: 39.3%
- Household Expenditure: R31 669

Non-poor Households
- Household size: 2.4
- Household income: R199 267
- Ownership of dwelling: 60.1%
- Piped water inside/on site: 86.7%
- Electricity: 91.4%
- Flush toilet: 80.8%
- Household Expenditure: R151 097

Non-poor households had better access to services compared to poor households.
The South African Multidimensional Poverty Index (SAMPI) provides a more holistic view of poverty.
The four dimensions of the SAMPI

Health
- Child mortality (death of child under 5)

Education
- Years of schooling (completed 5 years of schooling)
- School attendance (school-aged child out of school)

Living standards
- Deprivation cut-offs
  - Lighting (no electricity)
  - Heating (no electricity)
  - Cooking (no electricity)
  - Water (no piped water)
  - Sanitation (no flush toilet)
  - Dwelling (informal/traditional/caravan/tent)
  - Assets (no radio/TV/phone/car)

Economic activity
- Unemployment (adults unemployed)
Headcount poverty decreased from 17.9% in 2001 to 7.0% in 2016

Source: The South African MPI
In 2001 wide dispersion of Poverty with Msinga having a poverty Headcount of around 60%.

Between 2001 and 2011 poverty generally declines for all municipalities.

However between 2011 and 2016 poverty trends diverge between municipalities.
High levels of poverty in rural areas of SA

Source: The South African MPI

Location of the ten poorest municipalities (by headcount) in 2016.

1. Intsika Yethu 28%
2. Msinga 25%
3. Umzimvubu 24%
4. Port St Johns 23%
5. Engcobo 23%
6. Ntabankulu 23%
7. Mbizana 23%
8. Umhlabuyalingana 23%
9. Emalahleni 23%
10. Ngquza Hill 22%
District and Municipal View of Poverty 2016

Source: The South African MPI
Data from Census 2011 allows us to zoom into poverty hotspots.
Mapping the poverty headcount by ward - 2011

Source: The South African MPI
Mapping the poverty headcount by Municipality
Eastern Cape – 2011
Mapping the poverty headcount by ward
Port St Johns – 2011

Source: The South African MPI
Multidimensional Poverty Drivers


POVERTY DRIVERS
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52.5% of Female headed households in LP do not have an employed household member

Households without an employed household member by sex of household head, 2018

Source: Marginal Groups Indicator Report 2018
Grants remain a significant source of income for SA households, particularly in rural areas.

**Percentage distribution of sources of household income by province, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Remittances</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Other Sources</th>
<th>Pensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4,31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GHS 2018

**Grants remain a significant source of income for SA households, particularly in rural areas.**
Vulnerability to hunger at an individual and household level has been declining whilst access to grants has been increasing.

Grants and Vulnerability to hunger 2002 - 2018

Source: GHS 2018
Limpopo as a whole (4.2%) had the lowest percentage of households male or female that reported suffering from hunger.
## 3.6 Million Indigent households identified by municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigent households registered with municipalities: 2018</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>Sewerage and sanitation</th>
<th>Solid waste management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>370 639</td>
<td>360 571</td>
<td>365 839</td>
<td>357 619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>797 103</td>
<td>516 972</td>
<td>337 832</td>
<td>274 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>73 831</td>
<td>67 015</td>
<td>69 548</td>
<td>63 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>178 740</td>
<td>147 304</td>
<td>164 215</td>
<td>144 414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>769 258</td>
<td>643 560</td>
<td>296 034</td>
<td>347 792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>162 170</td>
<td>99 492</td>
<td>146 996</td>
<td>74 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>863 221</td>
<td>744 844</td>
<td>407 788</td>
<td>384 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>109 318</td>
<td>103 125</td>
<td>104 447</td>
<td>90 741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>307 163</td>
<td>127 550</td>
<td>131 448</td>
<td>44 603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Africa</strong></td>
<td>3 631 443</td>
<td>2 810 433</td>
<td>2 024 147</td>
<td>1 782 050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poor households as determined by municipalities; The basis on which a municipality determines if a household is indigent varies across municipalities, even within the same province.
A gender disaggregated perspective on poverty and inequality as experienced by **Women, Youth and People with Disabilities**?
SA Disability Prevalence Stood at 7.7%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Disability Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The disability prevalence for the FS was 3.3% points more than the SA average.

Disability prevalence was measured using a computed index based on the general health and functioning question asked in CS 2016.
Average annual personal income of persons with disabilities is lower compared to those with no disabilities.

Average annual personal income by sex and disability status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Both Sexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disability</td>
<td>R35 153</td>
<td>R21 245</td>
<td>R27 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons without disability</td>
<td>R60 421</td>
<td>R39 033</td>
<td>R49 977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Profile of persons with disabilities in South Africa Census 2011
Disability and level of education

Persons with disabilities showed the highest proportion with no formal education (24,6%) and had the lowest proportion that had attained higher education (5,1%)

Persons without disabilities: only 7,4% had no formal education and about 11% had tertiary education

Source: Profile of persons with disabilities in South Africa
In 2018 women’s median monthly earnings were 76% of men's median monthly earnings.
Women with **tertiary education** experienced a narrower pay gap in 2018, earning 92.3% of men’s earnings.

**Median Female Earnings as a percentage of Median Male Earnings 2018, QLFS by education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Female Median Earnings</th>
<th>Earnings at Parity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>Female Median Earnings Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary completed</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>Female Median Earnings more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary not completed</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary completed</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than primary completed</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** QLFS 2018
Limpopo has the highest gender pay gap - Females earned 66.2% of men’s median monthly earnings in 2018.
**Black African** women are the most vulnerable with an unemployment rate above 28.0%.

*OFFICIAL* unemployment rate by population group and sex

**Unemployment Rate by Population Group**

- **Both sexes**: 30.1% (Q1:2020), 23.3% (Q2:2020)
- **Black African**: 33.8% (Q1:2020), 26.3% (Q2:2020)
- **Coloured**: 24.0% (Q1:2020), 19.0% (Q2:2020)
- **Indian/Asian**: 13.0% (Q1:2020), 14.4% (Q2:2020)
- **White**: 8.1% (Q1:2020), 6.1% (Q2:2020)

**Male Unemployment Rate by Population Group**

- **All**: 28.3% (Q1:2020), 22.1% (Q2:2020)
- **Black African**: 31.6% (Q1:2020), 24.8% (Q2:2020)
- **Coloured**: 24.7% (Q1:2020), 20.5% (Q2:2020)
- **Indian/Asian**: 11.7% (Q1:2020), 11.3% (Q2:2020)
- **White**: 8.0% (Q1:2020), 6.5% (Q2:2020)

**Female Unemployment Rate by Population Group**

- **All**: 32.4% (Q1:2020), 24.8% (Q2:2020)
- **Black African**: 36.5% (Q1:2020), 28.2% (Q2:2020)
- **Coloured**: 23.2% (Q1:2020), 17.4% (Q2:2020)
- **Indian/Asian**: 15.3% (Q1:2020), 20.3% (Q2:2020)
- **White**: 8.2% (Q1:2020), 5.6% (Q2:2020)
Irrespective of gender, the **black African and coloured population groups remain vulnerable** in the labour market.

**EXPANDED unemployment rate by population group and sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expended unemployment rate by population group</th>
<th>Male expanded unemployment rate</th>
<th>Female expanded unemployment rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both sexes</td>
<td>Q2:2020 38,9% Q1:2020 36,5%</td>
<td>Q2:2020 45,7% Q1:2020 43,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>Q2:2020 42,9% Q1:2020 40,4%</td>
<td>Q2:2020 50,2% Q1:2020 48,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Q2:2020 33,3% Q1:2020 31,8%</td>
<td>Q2:2020 33,0% Q1:2020 30,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>Q2:2020 19,7% Q1:2020 15,3%</td>
<td>Q2:2020 36,6% Q1:2020 24,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Q2:2020 14,0% Q1:2020 9,8%</td>
<td>Q2:2020 14,6% Q1:2020 10,5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those young people (15-34 years) who are categorised as NEET are considered to be disengaged from both work and education.

Youth NEET rate is calculated as the total number of youth who are NEET as a proportion of the total youth-specific working-age population.
Over 9.2 million (44.7%) out of 20.5 million young people aged 15-34 years were not in employment, education or training (NEET). The overall NEET rate increased by 4.4 percentage points y/y.

**NEET (15-34 years) by gender**

**15-34 YEARS**

- **FEMALE NEET**
  - Q2: 2019: 43.9%
  - Q2: 2020: 47.9%
  - Up by 4.0 percentage points

- **MALE NEET**
  - Q2: 2019: 36.8%
  - Q2: 2020: 41.7%
  - Up by 4.9 percentage points

Source: QLFS Q2 2020
There is an undeniable relationship between poverty and education.
There is noticeable representation of learners who are older than the ideal graduation age in primary and secondary schools.

Percentage of those aged 5 – 24 years who attend educational institution, 2018

Source: GHS 2018
Over a fifth of learners cited a lack of money as the main reason for not attending an educational institution. Some reasons for not attending an educational institution are particularly affected by gender.

Main reasons given by persons aged 7 to 18 years for not attending an educational institution, 2018

- No money for fees: 24.2%
- Poor academic performance: 22.9%
- Other: 13.3%
- Illness and disability: 10.8%
- Completed education: 9.8%
- Family commitments: 7.9% (M) 7.5% (F)
- Education is useless: 3.9% (M) 11.8% (F)
- Working at home: 3.5%

Vast gender disparities in “family commitment” and “education is useless”

Source: GHS 2018
Ndzi hela kwala!