

**Have Labour Market Outcomes Affected Household
Structure in South Africa?
A Descriptive Analysis of Households**

Farah Pirouz

School of Economic and Business Sciences
University of the Witwatersrand
pirouzf@sebs.wits.ac.za

Abstract

This paper seeks to investigate how the demography of households relates to individual labour market outcomes. We comprehensively examine household size and structures in the October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999 and the Labour Force Surveys September 2001 and 2002. Over the 1995-2002 period, the number of households has increased in the face of rising unemployment and the average household size has decreased significantly. A rising proportion of single households mostly drives this result. We further investigate how such changes in the patterns of household composition could be correlated to changes in labour force participation rates, unemployment rates, and employment rates. We find that employment rates in smaller households are substantially higher and unemployment rates lower than in larger households with more than two adult members. The shares of workless households where no member is employed, and fully employed households, where all working age adult members earn income from work, tell about employment polarisation. In particular, the share of households with unemployed members has doubled to 27 per cent in 2002, and the share of workless households, in which no member is employed, has risen to a third of all South African households. The results highlight some of the wider welfare effects of job losses and other economic variables on households in South Africa.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge support through the Ronnie-Bethlehem-fellowship of the School of Economic and Business Sciences. Helpful comments were received from participants at the conference "African Development and Poverty Reduction: The Micro-Macro Linkage" DPRU/TIPS, Cape Town, 13-15 October 2004 and seminar participants at the University of the Witwatersrand.

Development Policy Research Unit
Tel: +27 21 650 5705
Fax: +27 21 650 5711

Information about our Working Papers and other published titles are available on our website at:
<http://www.commerce.uct.ac.za/dpru/>

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Data.....	2
3.	The decline in household size.....	3
4.	Households and labour market states.....	4
5.	Conclusions.....	10
6.	References.....	11
7.	Tables.....	13

1. Introduction

Recent studies using South African household survey data have questioned the exogeneity of household size and composition from income flows and labour market outcomes. (Maitra and Ray, 2001, and Klasen and Woolard, 2000). Research on unemployment in South Africa has occasionally viewed the household as either an important source of labour market information, as providing incentives or disincentives to participate, and its composition at a point in time as outcome of members' labour market possibilities. It has been proposed that household structure and location has a major impact on an individual's decision to participate in the labour market and their success in looking for work. In the absence of long-term unemployment insurance in South Africa, jobless people have been found to live in households where they can share in wage income or other income, i.e. make use of a private safety net (Klasen and Woolard, 2000). The relatively large state old age pension may further have led to larger pensioner-headed households and larger households when a pensioner is present (Case and Deaton, 1998; Edmonds, Mammen and Miller, 2002). The above-mentioned studies employ household survey data collected in 1993 and 1998, and the Census 1996 but neither use more recent datasets nor compare trends across time.

In this paper we comprehensively examine household size and structures in the October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999 and the Labour Force Surveys September 2001 and 2002. Over the 1995-2002 period, the average household size has decreased significantly, by 0.4 household members. A rising share of single households from 12.6 per cent to 21 per cent of all households mostly drives this result. We investigate the question of how such changes in the patterns of household composition could be correlated to changes in labour force participation rates, unemployment rates, and employment rates. We further trace the distribution of unemployment and employment over South African households over time. The shares of workless households where no member is employed, and fully employed households, where all working age adult members earn income from work, tell about employment polarisation. Not surprisingly, the share of households with unemployed members has doubled to 27 per cent in 2002. Of concern is a rise in the share of workless households, in which no member is employed, to a third of all South African households.

The present study offers tentative explanations of how households' demography is influenced by individual labour market outcomes and vice versa. Demographic variables that contribute to household changes are not considered here. Changes in fertility and mortality can be expected to partially explain household trends. To further explore household dynamics in conjunction with labour force dynamics, panel data is required. In

South Africa, panel data is limited to a two-wave survey of African households in KwaZulu-Natal (KIDS). The Labour Force Survey is designed as a rotating panel, and Statistics SA is still in the process of matching household and individual observations across the different surveys.

2. Data

We use household survey data from Statistics South Africa's (Stats SA) October Household Surveys (OHS) in 1995, 1997 and 1999 and the subsequent Labour Force Survey (LFS) in September 2001 and September 2002.

In defining labour force participation and unemployment, this paper uses definitions that follow the procedure set out in Klasen and Woolard (1999) and were provided by the HSRC. The modifications in comparison to the Stats SA definition pay attention to consistency across the different surveys but do not alter labour force participation and unemployment significantly (Altman and Woolard, 2004). Despite the 'official' definition of unemployment adapted by Stats SA being strict unemployment, the questionnaires continue to collect the narrow and broad unemployment rate. Individuals who are categorised as unemployed on the broad definition only, are those who have not been actively searching in the reference period and we refer to them as the 'non searching unemployed'. The searching unemployed are those who are unemployed on the strict definition.

The official working age in South Africa is 15 to 64 years. Some studies use a different working age for women who become age-eligible for the state old age pension at the age of 60, men only at 65. Labour force participation of individuals aged 15-17 is below 5 per cent in all survey years with most individuals at this age still being in education and living at home. We therefore chose to count them as children in the household context and calculate statistics for working age adults rather than for working age individuals. This treatment raises household labour force participation rates compared to other studies (see also Table 9 and Tables 11 a & b). In our categorisation of household types we thus consider children up to age 17, adult men between age 18 and 64, adult women between age 18 and 59, male pensioners over 64 and female pensioners over 60 years of age. Unemployment and labour force participation rates are calculated for the working age between 16-64 years of age. The official working age in South Africa is 15 to 64 years. Some studies use a different working age for women who become age-eligible for the state old age pension at the age of 60, men only at 65. Labour force participation of individuals aged 15-17 is below 5 per cent in all survey years with most individuals at this age still

being in education and living at home. We therefore chose to count them as children in the household context and calculate statistics for working age adults rather than for working age individuals. This treatment raises household labour force participation rates compared to other studies (see also Table 9 and Tables 11 a & b). In our categorisation of household types we thus consider children up to age 17, adult men between age 18 and 64, adult women between age 18 and 59, male pensioners over 64 and female pensioners over 60 years of age.¹ Unemployment and labour force participation rates are calculated for the working age between 16-64 years of age.

3. The decline in household size

Table 4 reveals that household size in South Africa has significantly decreased over the 1995-2002 period, the average household size has dropped by almost half a household member. Over the same time the number of households has increased from roughly 8.4 million to 10.8 million. The decrease in size can mainly be attributed to smaller African households, but household sizes for the other population groups have shrunk, too. Urban households decreased more than rural households which remain significantly larger. We further observe in Table 4 that the decline in household size has occurred for households that are headed by employed individuals, headed by females or headed by pensioners. The average household size with an unemployed head has decreased by more than one member to 3.6. Employed individuals on average head smaller households (average size of just under 3.5 members in 2001 and 2002), whereas female- and pensioner-headed households tend to be larger (around 4 members and 4.6 members respectively in 2001 and 2002).

To observe smaller households of employed household heads could be explained as follows. Getting a job often enables people to move out of an existing household and start their own family, in particular younger people. Larger female-headed households are somewhat puzzling, given that women are thought to mostly assume headship if the husband or partner leaves the household. However, over the 1995-2002 period the proportion of female-headed households has increased from 27.7 per cent to 37.9 per cent of all households. There are various interpretations of larger pensioner-headed households. It may indicate that in three-generation households the elderly are respectfully seen as the head of the households.² It has also been suggested that

1 We consider women between 60 and 64 as pensioners only if they are not employed.

2 Three generation households are common in the African tradition, also see Case and Deaton (1998).

unemployed relatives attach themselves to pensioner households, since the South African state old age pension constitutes a significant source of non wage income (Klasen and Woolard, 2000 and Edmonds, Mammen and Miller, 2004) and is large relative to mean or median household incomes. Pensioner households have also been found to contain more children (Case and Deaton, 1998). In Table 5a, the average number of working age adults per household has decreased, as well as the number of children under 18. The average number of pensioners has slightly increased. Looking at trends in average household size and composition for each population group in Table 5b, we see that African households have lost 0.3 working age members over the 1995-2002 period in contrast to small increases in working age members for Indian, Coloured and White households. African and Coloured households remain the biggest, and although the average number of children in African and Coloured households declined by about 0.3 it is still substantially more than the number of children in Indian and White households. White households differ considerably in that they are one person smaller than the average of all households; have fewer working age adults and children, and more elderly members.

Table 6 sheds further light on the decrease in average household size. Single households have increased from 12.6 per cent of South African households to 21 per cent. The LFS 2002 records 2.5 times more single households than the OHS 1995.³ The proportions of households with 5-8 members and more than 8 members have decreased from 33.7 per cent to 27.9 per cent and 7.4 per cent to 5.7 per cent. There are thus relatively more small households with 1-2 individuals and fewer large households in South Africa.

4. Households and labour market states

Over the 1995-2002 period the number of unemployed has considerably increased. On the strict definition, the number of unemployed has increased from approximately 1.8 million to 4.8 million in 2002 and from 4 million broadly unemployed to over 8 million (See Tables 1 & 2). The question arises whether rising unemployment has affected all households or whether some households get burdened more than others.

Over the same period, labour force participation has also increased. Table 3 reveals that participation rates increased for men and women, over all population groups and age

³ In table 7d we investigate to what extent single households are residents in workers hostels, since the coverage of these hostels may have varied. The LFS questionnaires do not allow us to identify whether an individual resides in such a hostel or not. Even a generous approximation of likely hostel dwellers in the LFS suggests that the proportion of single households that are hostel dwellers has halved.

groups (not in table 3). The strict labour force increased by almost 4.4 million people and exceeds population growth over this period. The increase has been particularly large amongst Africans, Indians, and amongst women. Casale and Posel (2002) observe that while more unmarried women enter the labour force, their numbers are increasing, too. Combining trends in numbers and rates of unemployment and labour force participation we conclude that more South Africans say they want to work, more are actively searching, but most of them do not find work. Again the question of concern is in which households and living arrangements the new labour force participants reside.⁴ Employment losses are expected to lead to more workless households, and new unemployed labour force participants are expected to increase the number of households with unemployed members. Apart from the overall levels of employment and unemployment, the distribution of unemployment and employment across households will also depend on family and household demography, and how the labour market states of household members are linked (Gregg and Wadsworth, 1996). Finally, government policy and welfare payments can also be expected to affect household creation.

Table 7a continues the descriptive analysis of households. The category 'pensioner/s, child/ren' deserves explanation. These households contain at least one pensioner and at least one child under 18, and may or may not contain working age individuals. Most of these households comprise several generations and the category also describes the largest households, average household size is 6.6 in 1995 and 6.4 in 2002.

In 1995, we observe around 45 per cent of households with two working age adults with or without children. Of these, 12.5 per cent are single households and 6.5 per cent are single parents with children.⁵ Table 7b reports for African households and table 7c for rural (non-urban) households. We note a higher share of African single households as well as a higher share of larger 'pensioner/s, child/ren' households amongst Africans and non-urban households. Table 8 describes the distribution of the employed, unemployed and non economically active over households. In 1995, no member was employed in 18.5 per cent of households, all adults were employed in 28.9 per cent, and all adults were labour

4 In terms of labour market flows, labour force participation rises with new labour market entrants and re-entrants, who either find employment or remain in unemployment. Unemployment rises due to employment losses and those labour market entrants who cannot find a job. Using a set of cross sectional datasets we compare numbers of labour force participants and unemployed over different years. We do not observe, however, how individuals move from one labour market state into the other.

5 The household typology in these tables does not necessarily reveal the proportion of three-generation and skip households since it uses age of household members rather than their relationship. Many grandparents of younger children are likely to be younger than 65. However, Case and Deaton (1998) found in 1993 14% of African households in which a pensioner is present to be skip-generation households. Children and grandchildren who reside with their parents and/or grandparents may also be over 18 years of age.

force participants in 33.7 per cent of households. 1.8 million unemployed were distributed over 13.4 per cent of all households but only 4.7 per cent of households with unemployed members had no employed member. With rising unemployment rates after 1995 we could expect more households to have unemployed members and more of the unemployed to live without employed persons. Rising labour force participation can be expected to lead to more 'fully participating' households. The effect on living arrangements will depend on two issues. Firstly, who the unemployed are, in particular the shares of labour market entrants (young adults), re-entrants (prime-age adults), and recently retrenched workers within the pool of unemployed individuals. Secondly, to what extent the unemployed make use of private safety nets through household transfers. In 2002, 77 per cent of workless households reported remittances or pensions and grants as their main income source, 8 per cent reported no income. Despite being on average larger households, 76 per cent of workless households also fall into the two bottom expenditure categories (compared to 57 per cent of all households).⁶

After 1995, the share of two-adult households without and with children remained stable at around 30 per cent of all households while the share of single working age adult households rose to 18.5 per cent in 2002. Household with pensioners as well as children under 18 constitute 13.5 per cent of all households (Table 7a). In 2002, these households have on average 6.4 members and 60 per cent of these households are in non-urban areas.

We now turn to the evidence on the distribution of employment and unemployment over households presented in Table 8. The share of workless households has increased considerably from 18.5 per cent of all households in 1995 to 29.5 per cent in 2002. The proportion of households with unemployed members has more than doubled from 13.4 per cent in 1995 to 27 per cent in 2002 but is still below the strict unemployment rate. Amongst these, the proportion of households in which unemployed reside, but no one who is employed (and earns income from work), has increased from 4.7 per cent in 1995 to 11.6 per cent in 2002. Few of the unemployed live in households with two or more employed members. Employment polarisation occurs when there is an increase in workless households and fully employed households (Gregg and Wadsworth, 1996). The share of fully employed households increased slightly to 26.6 per cent of all households; these results indicate some degree of employment polarisation in South Africa over the 1995-2002 period. In Table 9 employment rates and strict unemployment rates are calculated for working age individuals living in a particular household type. We observe

6 R0-R399 and R400-R799. The maximum amount of the state old age pension in 2002 was R620.

that in the categories 'pensioner/children' and 'other', the employment rate is much lower and the unemployment rate much higher than in single or two-adult household types. Employment rates have decreased for individuals in all household types except 'other' and unemployment rates have increased for individuals living in any household type. As could be expected, unemployment is lowest amongst singles, but also significantly lower amongst individuals residing in two-adult-only households without and with children. Unemployment is highest amongst members of the large households that fall into the category 'pensioner/s, child/ren', at almost 51 per cent in 2002.

Tables 11 a & b show labour market states of working age members of different household types. The distribution of non-economically active, employed and searching and non searching unemployed members in two-adult or nuclear households is fairly similar in 1995. On average, more than one of the adults is employed (over 60 per cent), in half of these households one of the adults is not economically active (25 per cent), and unemployment is relatively low. The employment rate is highest amongst single households, 86.3 per cent of working age living alone are employed.

By 2002, the employment rate has dropped in all household types, but relatively more in nuclear households with children under 18. Notably, the share of adult household members not participating in the labour market dropped significantly in all household types, except for single households, and also declined in households with children. The share of strictly unemployed members has almost tripled in the two-adult and nuclear households with children, and more than doubled in the categories 'single adult, child/ren', 'pensioner/s, child/ren' and 'other'. Of single households, 17.5 per cent are now either searching or non-searching unemployed. Tables 11 a & b lead to two suggestions. As employment rates decrease, fewer households could afford to have not economically active household members and therefore more adults look for or want work. More single households without wage income can sustain themselves or are being newly set up.

The October Household Surveys recorded the relationship of each household member to the head of the household and it is thus possible to examine the relation between the household position and labour market state of an individual. It is for example of interest whether unemployed who do not head their own household predominantly live with a spouse/partner, their parents or other relatives. Table 12 illustrates living arrangements of working age individuals in 1995 and 1999 by labour market status. Of all strictly unemployed aged 16-64 in 1999, 40.2 per cent lived with their parent(s), and a further 21 per cent with sibling(s), grandparent(s) or other relative(s). The figures shed further light on the decline in household size. Working age children, irrespective of their labour market status, have become less likely by 1999 to live with their parents and more working age

individuals, irrespective of their labour market status, head their own household or are the household head's spouse/partner. So despite rising unemployment rates among the youth, fewer children live with their parents in 1999. The proportion of non-economically active grandchildren living with grandparents has increased to 7 per cent and for non-searching unemployed to 4 per cent in 1999. Household positions have in particular changed for the non searching unemployed. Being the head or spouse has increased by 13 percentage points to 56.7 per cent whereas living with the parent(s) has decreased. Of all non-searching unemployed in 1995, 19.3 per cent were children under 24 living with a parent as household head and 30.8 per cent were children over the age of 24. These percentages decreased to 14.8 per cent and 12.9 per cent respectively in 1999. Of course these figures do not necessarily indicate that non searching unemployed have moved between households. They can be interpreted as telling something about who the non searching unemployed are. The number of broadly unemployed has increased from just over 4 million in 1995 to 8.1 million in 2002. Of these, 2.2 million and 3.3 million respectively are non searching unemployed. A large number of the additional non searching unemployed are women (724 000). It is plausible that an increasing number of spouses/partners want work after the partner lost his job. The Labour Force Survey questionnaire does not record the information on household position anymore. Instead, we are only able to deduct whether a person is head of household or married to the head or someone else residing in the household or not residing in the household (LFS 2000: 2, 2001: 2, 2002: 2: Flap, Question 1.1 b-c).

A person level analysis mirrors the above household descriptions. As evident in Table 10, the increase in unemployment has resulted in more unemployed individuals heading a household in 2002 than in 1995. In 1995, only 14.9 per cent of unemployed headed their own household, compared to 21.2. per cent in 2002. Headship rates for older unemployed are quite high and comparable to those employed, but have in particular increased in the 25-34 and 35-44 age groups. Employed individuals are most likely to head their own household, 57.4 per cent of the employed in the LFS 2002 were household head. Household headship has remained relatively stable at around 18 per cent of non-economically active individuals since 1997. The result that 75 per cent of those employed head their own household or are spouse of the head is in line with the idea that own income enables people to set up their own households. On the other hand, employment losses explain why a higher proportion of the unemployed are household heads. As mentioned earlier, loss of income in a household can bring on the added worker effect where other household members become willing to work or start seeking work to compensate for the income loss.

The above examination demonstrates that household positions differ substantially with labour market status. Different labour market states yield different economic motives for individuals to either remain in a household, move to another or set up a new household. Labour market success or failure of fellow household members generates further economic motives. The measurement of such decision-making is likely to be flawed when based on household and labour market information in a single year.⁷

The descriptive statistics in Tables 10 and 12 point to more spouses or partners of household heads becoming active in the labour market, as well as more head of households who are unemployed. Tables 11a & b also showed that different household types attract or produce individuals in different labour market states.

These results elicit the image that labour force participants in South Africa have become more independent and mobile in pursuing favourable outcomes in the labour market. Are they the younger workforce? The headship rate for unemployed individuals aged 25-34 has increased from 10 per cent to 16.5 per cent over 1995-2002. For employed in the same age group, headship has increased from 22.4 per cent to 48.4 per cent. The suggestion that smaller households become younger is not borne out in a comparison of the average age of working age members by household type. The average age of singles living on their own has slightly increased and has remained stable for two-adult households.⁸ This is not unsurprising given that the mean age of individuals in each labour market state has almost not changed, except for the mean age of the employed; they are one year older in 2002 than in 1995.⁹ Moreover, working age single and two-person households are on average significantly older (37.2 and 38.6 years) than larger households (around 35 years), working age in households with more than 8 members are on average around 33 years old. While there appears to be some movement toward more independence in smaller households of labour force participants, younger working age people are still exposed to the dynamics of large households.

To move households from informal settlements to formal dwellings and to facilitate the set up of new households has also been the goal of the government's housing policy and its Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP). Between 1.2 and 1.8 so-called RDP houses have been built across the country since 1993, and it has been implied that

7 Wittenberg (2001) develops a model in which conflictual intra-household allocations lead to more productive members leaving larger households.

8 The increase in the age of single working age households is not statistically significant.

9 Employed are approximately 7 years older on average (37.5 in 2002) than unemployed and non participating individuals of working age.

the layout of these houses favour nuclear and thus smaller households. Wittenberg and Collinson (2005) find for an RDP village in the Agincourt sub-district a higher proportion of single households but not a higher proportion of nuclear households. Again, the LFS questionnaire does not allow for a dwelling to be characterised as such an RDP house but does ask a question “whether any member of the household received a government housing subsidy” (Q7.6), 4.7 per cent of all households reported such a grant.

5. Conclusions

The descriptive analysis has discussed two main findings. Firstly, the declining household size in South Africa is driven by an increasing share of single households, especially among African households, over the 1995-2002 period. More individuals live on their own or with a partner, and work or seek to work instead of having children. In these smaller households, employment rates are substantially higher and unemployment rates lower than in larger households with more than two adult members. Secondly, as the number of households has increased in the face of rising unemployment rates and labour force participation rates a larger proportion of individuals in any labour market state head their own household. While we observe more of the working age to live in smaller households, more than 60 per cent of the non-employed in 2002 still live in households with more than two adults. The unemployment rate among members of smaller household is still about half the unemployment rate of those residing in households with more than two adult members. Descriptive statistics are obviously limited in that they cannot provide any answers to causalities and more complex correlations between household structures and labour market outcomes. Changes in household structure are due to changes in demographic variables, economic circumstances and preferences. As far as economic explanations are driving household change, these cannot be interpreted as a behavioural change of labour market participants only. Changes of household composition may reflect changes in the proportion of individuals with certain characteristics in each labour market state. Moreover, a further disaggregation of households by location, population group, education and age of the head is expected to highlight substantial differences between households. Of heightened interest are also the mechanisms behind the drastic increase in single households captured in the Labour Force Surveys.

Studying the living arrangements of individuals in different labour market states only roughly captures economic motivations of remaining in a household or leaving a household. Theoretical literature has modelled the decision to leave the parental home and marriage decisions, and the impact of housing prices. The substantial changes in household size

and composition have consequences for policy-making when considering the effects of employment generation on household welfare.

6. References

- Altman, Miriam and Woolard, Ingrid (2004), "Employment & Unemployment Trends in South Africa, 1995-2002, Employment and Economic Policy Research Programme (EPR), Human Sciences Research Council, April 2004.
- Bertrand, Marianne, Mullainathan, Sendhil and Miller, Douglas (2003), "Public Policy and Extended Families: Evidence from Pensions in South Africa," *World Bank Economic Review* 17(1): 27-50.
- Case, Anne and Deaton, Angus (1998), "Large Cash Transfers to the Elderly in South Africa," *Economic Journal* 108: 1330-1363.
- Edmonds, Eric, Mammen, Kristin, Miller, Douglas, 2004, Rearranging the Family? Income Support and Elderly Living Arrangements in a Low Income Country, *Journal of Human Resources*, Winter 2005, 40(1)
- Gregg, Paul and Wadsworth, Jonathan (1996), "It takes two: Employment Polarization in the OECD," Centre for Economic Performance Discussion Paper No. 304, London School of Economics.
- Klasen, Stephan and Woolard, Ingrid (2000), "Surviving Unemployment without State Support: Unemployment and Household Formation in South Africa", IZA Discussion Paper No. 237.
- Klasen, Stephan and Woolard, Ingrid (1999), "Levels, trends and consistency of employment and unemployment figures in South Africa", *Development Southern Africa*, 16:1, 3-35.
- Maitra, Pushkar and Ray, Ranjan (2001), "Resource Inflows and Household Composition Evidence from South African Panel Data"
- Posel, Dorit and Casale, Daniela (2002), "The continued feminisation of the labour force in South Africa: An analysis of recent data and trends", *South African Journal of Economics*, Vol. 71:1, 156-184

Wittenberg, Martin and Collinson, Mark (2005), "Restructuring of households in rural South Africa: Reflections on average household size in the Agincourt sub-district 1992-2003", University of Cape Town and University of the Witwatersrand.

Wittenberg, Martin (2001), "Conflictual intra-household allocations", Econometric Research Southern Africa Working Paper No. 26, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

7. Tables

Table 1: Unemployment rates [in %] and number of unemployed on the official (strict) definition

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002
Strict Definition					
Unemployment rate	15.9	20.7	23.6	29.9	30.5
N (in '000)	(1817)	(2374)	(3206)	(4595)	(4823)
by gender					
Men	12.7	17.0	19.8	26.4	26.8
Women	20.3	25.9	28.4	33.8	34.7
by population group					
African	19.7	26.5	29.4	36.3	36.9
Coloured	14.4	14.7	15.8	22.1	21.3
Indian	9.6	10.3	16.8	18.5	21.3
White	3.3	4.1	5.0	5.9	6.2

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999, Labour Force Surveys 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations.

Table 2: Unemployment rates [in %] on the broad definition of unemployment

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002
Broad definition					
Unemployment rate	29.4	37.8	39.8	41.8	42.5
N (in '000)	(4011)	(5524)	(6846)	(7736)	(8124)
by gender					
Men	23.0	30.7	32.8	35.4	36.5
Women	37.4	46.4	47.3	48.2	48.7
by population group					
African	36.4	46.6	47.5	49.2	49.9
Coloured	21.2	23.6	26.6	31.2	28.7
Indian	12.7	13.7	24.1	23.1	26.2
White	4.6	6.5	9.3	9.0	10.4

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999, Labour Force Surveys 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations.

Table 3: Labour Force Participation Rates (in %) and numbers with the strict definition of unemployment

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002
[%]					
Total	47.8	45.3	52.1	56.7	57
Number (in '000)	(11453)	(11456)	(13570)	(15389)	(15827)
by gender					
Men	58.5	54.9	59.8	65.5	63.6
Number (in '000)	(6691)	(6663)	(7481)	(8438)	(8424)
Women	38.0	36.4	45.0	50.6	51.0
Number (in '000)	(4762)	(4794)	(6084)	(7207)	(7404)
by population group					
African	42.9	40.6	47.7	53.6	54.2
Coloured	60.4	57.2	63.6	64.3	64.1
Indian	57.4	55.0	62.1	64.2	65.0
White	65.1	62.7	68.8	69.5	68.1

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999, Labour Force Surveys 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations.

Table 4: Average household size: All households, employed head of household, female head of household and pensioner head of household

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002
Mean household size					
All	4.32	4.56	4.02	3.83	3.84
Employed head of hh	4.00	4.22	3.62	3.45	3.46
Unemployed head of hh	4.70	4.43	3.90	3.64	3.63
Female head of hh	4.54	4.49	4.24	4.02	4.06
Pensioner head of hh	4.74	5.07	4.85	4.77	4.62
N households (in '000)	8443	9257	10810	10886	10818

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999, Labour Force Surveys 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations using household weights.

Table 5a: Average household size and average number of working age, adult, employed, unemployed household members

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002
Mean household size	4.32	4.56	4.02	3.83	3.84
No. of working age adults	2.32	2.33	2.14	2.09	2.15
No. of pensioners	0.28	0.33	0.27	0.25	0.27
No. of children<18	1.72	1.90	1.61	1.45	1.48
No. of employed	1.10	0.91	0.96	0.95	0.95
No. of unemployed	0.19	0.24	0.28	0.39	0.41
N households (in '000)	8443	9257	10810	10886	10840

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999, Labour Force Surveys 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations using Stats SA household weights.

Table 5b: Average household size etc. by population group, 1995 and 2002

	All		African		Coloured		Indian		White	
	1995	2002	1995	2002	1995	2002	1995	2002	1995	2002
Mean household size	4.32	3.84	4.68	3.98	4.52	4.24	4.22	3.85	2.86	2.77
No. of working age adults	2.32	2.15	2.45	2.15	2.49	2.51	2.58	2.64	1.72	1.82
No. of pensioners	0.28	0.27	0.28	0.25	0.23	0.26	0.21	0.21	0.33	0.38
No. of children<18	1.72	1.48	1.95	1.63	1.80	1.53	1.42	1.06	0.81	0.63
No. of employed	1.20	0.95	1.01	0.83	1.47	1.39	1.50	1.43	1.21	1.21
No. of unemployed	0.18	0.41	0.23	0.48	0.23	0.36	0.16	0.38	0.04	0.08
N households (in '000)	8443	10852	5925	8163	735	948	238	273	1545	1456

Source: October Household Survey 1995, Labour Force Surveys 2002:2. Own Calculations using Stats SA household weights

Table 6: Household types by size

	1995	1997	1998	1999	2001	2002
[%]						
Single hh	12.6	10.0	13.5	17.8	21.4	21.0
2 person hh	14.3	14.3	15.4	16.3	16.0	16.3
3-4 person hh	31.9	31.6	31.2	29.9	29.3	29.1
5-8 person hh	33.7	35.6	32.7	29.7	27.5	27.9
> 8 hh members	7.4	8.5	7.2	6.4	5.8	5.7

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997-99, Labour Force Surveys 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations using StatsSA household weights, Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table 7a: Household types by composition, all households

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002
[%]					
2 work.age adults, no child	8.9	8.4	10.5	10.1	10.0
2 work. age adults, child/ren aged 5-18	13.0	10.9	10.5	10.3	10.4
2 work. age adults, child/ren < 5yrs	14.1	12.5	11.1	10.1	9.7
Single work.age adult	10.3	7.9	15.4	18.8	18.5
Single pensioner	2.0	1.8	2.0	2.1	2.3
Single adult, child/ren	5.5	7.0	7.3	7.3	7.1
Pensioner/s, child/ren	13.5	17.3	13.8	13.0	13.5
Other	32.7	34.1	29.5	28.2	28.6
	100	100	100	100	100

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999, Labour Force Surveys 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations using StatsSA household weights, percentages in columns may not add up to 100% due to rounding. The category 'other' includes child headed households.

Table 7b: Household types by composition, African households

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002
[%]					
2 work.age adults, no child	6.5	6.9	9.3	9.1	8.6
2 work. age adults, child/ren aged 5-18	10.9	9.1	8.8	8.7	9.0
2 work. age adults, child/ren < 5yrs	13.7	12.5	10.6	9.7	9.4
Single work.age adult	11.6	8.7	17.7	21.7	21.5
Single pensioner	0.8	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.6
Single adult, child/ren	6.6	8.8	8.8	8.3	8.3
Pensioner/s, child/ren	16.9	20.9	16.4	14.8	15.6
Other	32.9	32.3	27.2	26.3	26.1
	100	100	100	100	100

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999, Labour Force Surveys 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations using StatsSA household weights, percentages in columns may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table 7c: Household size and household types by composition, Rural households

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002
[%]					
2 work.age adults, no child	5.1	4.7	6.5	6.6	6.6
2 work. age adults, child/ren aged 5-18	8.6	8.4	9.1	8.6	8.1
2 work. age adults, child/ren < 5yrs	11.9	12.7	10.9	10.0	9.8
Single work.age adult	8.0	6.4	13.7	16.4	16.9
Single pensioner	4.1	1.1	1.5	1.8	2.1
Single adult, child/ren	6.3	11.7	10.5	10.6	10.5
Pensioner/s, child/ren	23.2	26.1	22.0	20.1	21.1
Other	32.8	28.8	25.9	25.0	25.0
	100	100	100	100	100
Mean household size	4.72	5.23	4.67	4.42	4.37

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999, Labour Force Surveys 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations using StatsSA household weights, percentages in columns may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table 7d: Single households or hostel dwellers?

	1995	2002
No of single households (Proportion of all hh)	865947 (.103)	2,009,549 (.185)
No. of hostel dwellers (Proportion of single hh that are hostel dwellers)	348890 (.403)	424392 (.212)

Source: October Household Survey 1995, Labour Force Survey 2002:2. Own calculations using StatsSA household weights.

Note: We consider working age individuals who reside on their own as single households here. The OHS 1995, Q1.1 on type of dwelling contains the option "Room in hostel/compound for workers provided by employer or municipality. In the LFS questionnaire, the same definition would fit somebody who lives in a room (Q7.1) and the dwelling is "occupied rent-free as part of employment contract" (Q 7.4). However, only ~150,000 single households fit this description. In the above table, we take a single household to be the resident of a workers hostel if the dwelling is "occupied rent-free as part of employment contract" (Q 7.4).

Table 8: Household types by number of employed and unemployed members

	1995	2002
[%]		
Workless households	26.9	33.3
Fully employed households	25.1	26.6
'Fully participating' households	33.9	43.4
Households with strictly unemployed members	13.4	27.0
Households with unemployed members, no one employed	4.7	11.6
Households with broadly unemployed members	28.2	42.9

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999, Labour Force Surveys 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations using Stats SA household weights.

Note: Workless households are households in which no member is employed; fully employed households are households in which every working age adult is employed, and fully participating households are households in which every working age adult is a labour force participants.

Table 9: Employment and unemployment rates across household types

	Employment rate		Strict unemployment rate	
	1995	2002	1995	2002
[%]				
2 work. age adults, no child	64.0	60.7	7.2	19.4
2 work. age adults, child/ren aged 5-18	53.7	47.2	7.3	20.2
2 work. age adults, child/ren < 5yrs	56.5	49.2	8.7	22.6
Single work. age adult	86.4	72.1	2.9	14.3
Single adult, child/ren	36.6	32.8	12.7	36.7
Pensioners / child/ren	22.1	20.0	31.8	50.8
Other	33.8	34.3	20.5	37.0

Source: October Household Survey 1995, Labour Force Survey 2002:2. Own calculations using StatsSA individual weights. Employment rates are calculated as percentage of employed out of the working age population.

Table 10: Headship and employment status: Proportion of individuals in a particular labour market state who are head of household

	1995	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
[%]							
not economically active	13.2	18	18.2	18	16.2	17.9	18.6
Employed	54.3	53.9	54.3	57.2	56.9	58.0	57.4
Unemployed (strict def.)	14.9	20.4	22.8	20.9	19.7	20.7	21.2

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1997, 1999, Labour Force Surveys 2000:2, 2001:2 and 2002:2. Own calculations using Stats SA individual weights.

**Table 11a: Household types and their members' labour market status
(for adults aged 18-59/64), 1995**

	Not economically active	Employed	Strictly unemployed	Non searching unemployed	
[%]					
2 work.age adults, no child	25.4	63.8	5.0	5.8	100
2 work. Age adults, child/ren aged 5-18	25.3	64.5	4.9	5.3	100
2 work. Age adults, child/ren < 5yrs	25.4	61.4	5.8	7.5	100
Single work.age adult	8.5	86.3	2.6	2.7	100
Single adult, child/ren	28.3	51.1	7.1	13.2	100
Pensioner/s, child/ren	43.1	27.9	12.9	16.1	100
Other	41.7	37.5	9.6	11.2	100

Source: October Household Survey 1995. Own calculations using StatsSA weights, percentages may not add up due to rounding.

**Table 11b: Household types and their members' labour market status
(for adults aged 18-59/64), 2002**

	Not economically active	Employed	Strictly unemployed	Non searching unemployed	
[%]					
2 work.age adults, no child	17.2	60.6	14.6	7.7	100
2 work. Age adults, child/ren aged 5-18	19.6	56.5	14.3	9.7	100
2 work. Age adults, child/ren < 5yrs	18.2	54.1	15.7	12.0	100
Single work.age adult	9.6	72.9	12.3	5.2	100
Single adult, child/ren	22.5	44.6	16.0	16.8	100
Pensioner/s, child/ren	29.4	24.7	25.9	20.0	100
Other	26.7	37.5	22.2	13.5	100

Source: Labour Force Surveys 2002:2. Own calculations using StatsSA individual weights, percentages may not add up due to rounding.

Table 12: Household position of individuals by labour market status, 1995 and 1999

Relationship to household head	Non economically active		Employed		Strictly unemployed		Non searching (broadly) unempl.	
	1995	1999	1995	1999	1995	1999	1995	1999
Head/Spouse	41.7	45.7	74.1	75.5	29.0	37.3	32.7	56.7
Child<24	32.0	26.5	6.2	5.6	21.8	16.7	19.3	14.8
Child>24	11.2	8.1	12.2	9.9	30.8	23.5	30.8	12.9
Sibling	4.1	4.9	2.5	2.5	7.1	7.7	7.2	4.5
Grandchild	4.8	7.0	0.7	1.0	4.4	4.6	3.3	4.0
Other relative	5.7	6.9	2.5	3.5	6.2	8.7	6.2	5.8
Non relative	5.4	1.0	1.8	1.9	0.8	1.4	0.7	1.5

Source: October Household Surveys 1995, 1999. Own calculations using Stats SA weights.

Note: Figures are per cent of individuals in each labour market state who are in a particular household position.