



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

Farah Pirouz

African Development and Poverty Reduction: The Macro-Micro Linkage

Forum Paper 2004

13 - 15 October 2004
Lord Charles Hotel, Somerset West, South Africa

 Development Policy Research Unit  Trade and Industrial Policy Strategies
 Cornell University

Sponsors



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

Farah Pirouz
School of Economic and Business Sciences
University of the Witwatersrand

First Draft October 2004

Paper submitted to the Conference “African Development and Poverty Reduction: The
Micro-Macro Linkage” hosted by the DPRU and TIPS in association with Cornell
University,
Cape Town, 13-15 October 2004.

The author gratefully acknowledges support through the Ronnie-Bethlehem-fellowship of the School of Economics and Business Sciences. The present work extends a study on labour force participation and unemployment trends prepared for the HSRC.

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 a household's location in South Africa 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 them.

In this paper we comprehensively examine household size and structures in the October Household Survey 1995, 1997, 1999 and the Labour Force Survey 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% to 21% 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 full employment 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% in 2002. Findings may also provide explanations for why rising household inequality and household poverty are observed. Given the absence of a comprehensive social security net, a rising number of workless households in which no

member earns work income may explain an increase in inequality measures over the same period.

The paper aims to be a starting point for further econometric investigation on how households' demography is influenced by individual labour market outcomes and vice versa. Therefore the explorations are general and the argumentation follows several avenues. 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.

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 at 65. Labour force participation of individuals aged 15-17 is below 5% 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 0working age adults rather than for working age individuals. This treatment raises household labour force participation rates compared to other studies. In our categorisation of household types we thus consider children up to age 17, adults aged 18 to 64, and pensioners or elderly above age 64.¹ Unemployment and labour force participation is calculated within the usual working age of 16-64 years of age.

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 0.4 household members. Over the same time the number of households has increased from roughly 7.2million to 10.8million. The decrease in size can mainly be attributed to smaller African households, but household sizes for the other population groups have shrunk, too, in particular white households. Over the same time, the number of households has increased from 7.2 million to almost 11 million households. 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% to 37.9% 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 unemployed relatives attach themselves to pensioner households, since the South African state old age pension constitutes a significant source of non

¹ A revised version of this draft will re-calculate the statistics using the different pension ages for men and women.

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

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 7b, we see that African households have lost 0.4 working age members over the 1995-2002 period compared to small decreases in working age members for Indian, Coloured and White households. African and Coloured households remain the biggest, 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 1 person smaller than the average of all households; have fewer working age adults and children, and more elderly members. The latter is due to the large number of White pensioners who live on their own.

Table 8 sheds further light on the decrease in average household size. Single households have increased from just 12.6 percent of South African households to 21 percent. The LFS 2002 records 2.5 times more single households than the OHS 1995. The proportions of households with 5-8 members and more than 8 members have decreased from 33.7% to 27.9% and 7.4% to 5.7%. There are thus relatively more small households with 1-2 individuals and fewer large households in South Africa.

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 1.8million to 4.8million in 2002 and from 4million broadly unemployed to over 8million (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 5 reveals that participation rates increased for men and women, over all population groups and age groups (not in table 5). 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 African 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.³ 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 status of household members correlates (Gregg and Wadsworth, 1996).

Table 7a continues the descriptive analysis of households. In 1995, we observe around 45% of households with two working age adults with or without children. 12.5% are single households and 6.5% are single parents with children.⁴ Table 7b reports for African households. Table 8 describes the distribution of the employed, unemployed and non economically active over households. In 1995, in 18.5% of households no member was employed, in 28.9% all adults were employed, in 33.7% all adults were labour force participants, and in 22.1% of households no member participated in the labour market. 1.8 million unemployed were distributed over 13.4% of all households but only 4.7% 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 in the pool of unemployed individuals. Secondly, to what extent the unemployed make use of private safety nets through household transfers.

³ 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. 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.

⁴ 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. This incongruity with table 7b could be due to some extent to women aged 60-64 living with grandchildren as well as grandchildren over 18 living with a grandparent.

After 1995, the share of two-adult households without and with children remained stable around 35% of all households while the share of single working age adult households rose to 18.4% in 2002, and the share of single working age adults with children rose to around 10%. Pensioner households with adults above 64 and children under 18 now constitute 1% of all households (table 7a).

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% of all households in 1995 to 29.5% in 2002. The proportion of households with unemployed members has more than doubled from 13.4% in 1995 to 27% 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% in 1995 to 11.6% 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 remained fairly stable at around 28% of all households, as did the share of non participating households at around 22%.⁵ We could thus interpret the results to 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 amongst working age individuals living in a particular household type. To begin with, we note that in the category 'other', which has households with more than two adult members, 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 households without and with children. Employment rates of single parents are comparable to employment rates of individuals in 'other'

⁵ The household shares in the 1997 dataset appear out of line with the overall trend and need further investigation. The dataset shows close to 55% of all individuals to live in households with no one employed although the number of employed individuals between 1995 and 1999 is relatively stable. Strict labour force participation in 1997 is 3 percentage points lower than in 1995.

households, yet their unemployment rate in 2002 is lower at 31% compared to 41% in the category 'other'.

Tables 11a&b show in which types of household working age adults reside according to their labour market status in 1995 and 2002. We observe a larger proportion of employed to live in a two-adult or nuclear household type. We also note that over 60 percent of jobless individuals reside in households with more than two adult members (other). The share of couples without children living together (these are likely to mostly make up the category '2 working age adults') has increased for individuals in all labour market states. Amongst the employed and strictly unemployed, fewer are living with a partner and children. The significant increase in single households appears to be the driving factor in the declining household size.⁶ We summarise as a general trend that more individuals live on their own or with a partner, and work or seek to work instead of having children.⁷ Labour force participation rates of members of smaller households are consequently higher than for households with more than two working age adults (category 'other'), regardless of the presence of children. Participation rates are highest in single working age households. The average size of households that individuals in each labour market state reside in has decreased for all states (statistically significant). The employed live together with fewer people whereas the non searching unemployed on average live in the largest households.

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% lived with their parent(s), and a further 21% 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

⁶ The increase in single households is mainly among the African population group. It is known that Stats SA improved on their sampling frame over the years and we may therefore see the increase in single households due to the inclusion of mining hostels (where single workers live) in the sample. A more detailed analysis of single households could clarify.

⁷ A look at marriage age and child bearing age could corroborate this suggestion.

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% and for non searching unemployed to 4% 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% whereas living with the parent(s) has decreased. Of all non searching unemployed in 1995, 19.3% were children under 24 living with a parent as household head and 30.8% were children over the age of 24. These percentages decreased to 14.8% and 12.9% 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 now want work as an added worker effect when 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 1.1b-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% of unemployed headed their own household, compared to 21.2% 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% of the employed in the LFS 2002 were household head. Household headship has remained relatively stable at around 18% of non-economically active individuals since 1997. The result that 75% 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.⁸

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 showed a trend for individuals in all labour market states to live in smaller households with up to one other working age adult and labour force participation rates in these smaller households remain distinctly greater than in households with more than two working age adults.

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% to 16.5% over 1995-2002. For employed in the same age group, headship has increased from 22.4% to 48.4%. 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.⁹ 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 1 year older in 2002 than in 1995.¹⁰ 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

⁸ Wittenberg (2001) develops a model in which conflictual intra-household allocations lead to more productive members leaving larger households.

⁹ The increase in the age of single working age households is not statistically significant.

¹⁰ Employed are approximately 7 years older on average (37.5 in 2002) than unemployed and non participating individuals of working age.

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.

Conclusions

The descriptive analysis has discussed two important findings. Firstly, the declining household size in South Africa is driven by an increasing share of single households and two-adult households over the 1995-2002 period. In particular, more individuals live on their own or with a partner, and work or seek to work instead of having children. In these 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% 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. It is important to understand that changes in household structure cannot be interpreted as a behavioural change of labour market participants only. These changes 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.

However, this work provides some of the groundwork for further study of the link between household formation and labour market outcomes. 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 could be applied to South African data. Another area of concern in South Africa is how the poorest households have fared in the post apartheid period. A

descriptive analysis of poor households is likely to bring out some hypotheses for further analysis. The substantial changes in household size and composition have consequences for policy-making when considering the effects of employment generation on household welfare.

References

Altman, Miriam and Woolard, Ingrid (2004), "Employment & Unemployment Trends in South Africa, 1995-2002, Employment and Economic Policy Research Programme (EEPR), 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) forthcoming.

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

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	4.02
Pensioner head of hh	-	5.03	4.82	4.60	4.58
N households (in '000)	7155	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	4.26	4.56	4.02	3.83	3.84
No. of working age adults	2.47	2.37	2.18	2.13	2.13
No. of elderly >64	0.10	0.26	0.22	0.20	0.21
No. of children <18	1.74	1.90	1.61	1.50	1.48
No. of employed	1.20	0.91	0.96	0.95	0.93
No. of unemployed	0.18	0.24	0.28	0.39	0.39
N households (in '000)	7155	9257	10810	10886	10818

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	4.26	3.84	4.52	4.00	4.51	4.24	4.25	3.85	3.10	2.77
No. of working age adults	2.47	2.13	2.54	2.14	2.61	2.50	2.69	2.61	2.07	1.91
No. of elderly >64	0.10	0.21	0.10	0.20	0.10	0.20	0.12	0.16	0.08	0.31
No. of children <18	1.74	1.48	1.93	1.64	1.84	1.53	1.47	1.06	0.98	0.63
No. of employed	1.20	0.93	1.09	0.82	1.49	1.34	1.50	1.39	1.44	1.21
No. of unemployed	0.18	0.39	0.21	0.45	0.22	0.35	0.16	0.37	0.04	0.08
N households (in '000)	7155	10852	5017	8138	652	948	222	275	1262	1446

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	11.1	9.9	11.8	11.5	11.2
2 work. age adults, child(ren) aged 5-18	16.2	13.2	12.3	12.1	12.6
2 work. age adults, child(ren) < 5yrs	17.5	14.9	12.9	11.7	11.3
Single work.age adult	12.0	8.1	15.5	19.0	18.4
Single pensioner	0.5	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.1
Single adult, child(ren)	7.2	10.6	10.2	10.2	9.8
Pensioner/s, no work. age, child(ren)	0.0	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.1
Other	35.5	40.3	34.2	32.7	33.5
	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 7b: Household types by composition, African households

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002
[%]					
2 work.age adults, no child	8.1	8.2	10.2	10.2	9.5
2 work. age adults, child/ren aged 5-18	13.7	11.4	10.8	10.7	11.3
2 work. age adults, child/ren < 5yrs	17.1	15.4	12.8	11.5	11.3
Single work.age adult	13.6	8.8	17.8	21.9	21.4
Single pensioner	0.3	0.9	1.2	1.3	1.4
Single adult, child/ren	9.6	13.2	12.4	11.8	11.6
Pensioner/s, no work. age, child/ren	0.0	1.7	1.4	1.2	1.4
Other	38.4	40.4	33.4	31.5	32.2
	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 8: Household types by number of employed and unemployed members

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002
[%]					
Workless households	18.5	34.14	29.8	28.4	29.5
Fully employed households	28.9	17.4	27.5	29.2	28.0
'Fully participating' households	33.7	24.0	36.9	42.7	41.4
'Non participating' households	22.1	30.3	24.4	20.4	21.7
Households with unemployed members	13.4	16.9	20.1	27.0	27.0
Households with unemployed members, no one employed	4.7	7.1	8.7	11.4	11.6

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. Non participating households refer to households in which no member is a labour force participant, i.e. neither employed nor strictly unemployed.

Table 9: Employment and unemployment rates across household types

	Employment rate		Strict unemployment rate	
	1995	2002	1995	2002
[%]				
2 work.age adults, no child	59.4	57.8	8.4	20.4
2 work. Age adults, child/ren aged 5-18	53.0	45.6	8.9	22.3
2 work. Age adults, child/ren < 5yrs	54.5	46.2	9.9	25.0
Single work.age adult	84.4	72.4	2.3	14.3
Single adult, child/ren	32.6	31.0	16.6	31.0
Other	32.7	32.2	22.6	40.0

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: Individuals' labour market state and the households they live in (Working age adults: aged 18-64), 1995

	Not economically active	Employed	Strictly unemployed	Non searching unemployed	Labour force participation rate
[%]					
2 work.age adults, no child	6.4	10.9	5.4	5.5	64.9
2 work. Age adults, child/ren aged 5-18	9.0	15.7	8.2	7.4	65.7
2 work. Age adults, child/ren < 5yrs	9.3	15.9	9.2	10.5	63.9
Single work.age adult	1.2	7.8	1.2	1.1	86.8
Single adult, child/ren	3.4	3.1	3.2	4.8	55.5
Other	70.8	46.7	72.9	70.7	49.0
Mean hhold size (Std. Error) (N= 21.3m)	6.1 (.04)	4.7 (.04)	6.3 (.08)	6.5 (.07)	

Source: October Household Survey 1995. Own calculations using StatsSA weights, percentages may not add up due to rounding. Mean household size is larger because individual weights were used. Labour force participation rates are for working age adults living in a particular household type.

Table 11b: Individuals' labour market state and the households they live in (Working age adults: aged 18-64), 2002

	Not economically active	Employed	Strictly unemployed	Non searching unemployed	Labour force participation rate
[%]					
2 work.age adults, no child	8.5	13.6	7.9	6.4	72.6
2 work. Age adults, child/ren aged 5-18	11.4	14.2	9.2	10.3	66.6
2 work. Age adults, child/ren < 5yrs	9.3	12.5	9.5	11.8	66.4
Single work.age adult	3.7	14.0	5.4	3.5	84.5
Single adult, child/ren	5.4	4.3	4.3	6.6	55.8
Other	61.8	41.4	63.7	61.4	57.5
Mean hhold size (Std. Error) (N= 24.7m)	5.6 (.05)	4.2 (.04)	5.9 (.07)	6.1 (.08)	

Source: Labour Force Surveys 2002:2. Own calculations using StatsSA individual weights, percentages may not add up due to rounding. Mean household size is larger because individual weights were used. Labour force participation rates are for working age adults living in a particular household type.

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.