

STATISTICAL
RELEASE

P0301

COMMUNITY
SURVEY
2016



www.statssa.gov.za

 Stats SA

 @statssa



Statistics
South Africa



The South Africa I know, the home I understand

Community Survey 2016
Statistical release

Community Survey 2016, Statistical release P0301 / Statistics South Africa

Published by Statistics South Africa, Private Bag X44, Pretoria 0001

© Statistics South Africa, 2016

Users may apply or process this data, provided Statistics South Africa (Stats SA) is acknowledged as the original source of the data; that it is specified that the application and/or analysis is the result of the user's independent processing of the data; and that neither the basic data nor any reprocessed version or application thereof may be sold or offered for sale in any form whatsoever without prior permission from Stats SA.

Stats SA Library Cataloguing-in-Publication (CIP) Data

Community Survey 2016, Statistical release P0301 / Statistics South Africa. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa, 2016

Statistical release P0301

107 pp

A complete set of Stats SA publications is available at Stats SA Library and the following libraries:

National Library of South Africa, Pretoria Division
National Library of South Africa, Cape Town Division
Library of Parliament, Cape Town
Bloemfontein Public Library
Natal Society Library, Pietermaritzburg
Johannesburg Public Library
Eastern Cape Library Services, King William's Town
Central Regional Library, Polokwane
Central Reference Library, Mbombela
Central Reference Collection, Kimberley
Central Reference Library, Mmabatho

This release is available on the Stats SA website: www.statssa.gov.za

For technical enquiries please contact:**Christine Khoza**

Tel. nr. (012) 310

Email: christinek@statssa.gov.za

Angela Ngyende

Email: angelan@statssa.gov.za

Tel. nr.: (012) 310 4699

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	viii
PREFACE	ix
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.1.1 Geography frame.....	2
1.1.2 Community Survey 2016 sampling methodology	2
1.1.3 Questionnaire development processes for CS 2016	3
1.1.4 Survey Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation (SCM&E)	4
1.1.5 Data editing strategy.....	4
1.1.6 Objectives of the report.....	5
1.1.7 Data evaluation procedure.....	5
1.1.8 Priority indicators for this release.....	6
1.2 Methods of analysis.....	6
1.3 Local municipalities by MIIF classification, proportionate share of government grants and poverty headcount, 2011 versus 2016	8
1.4 Overview of sections	15
SECTION 2: POPULATION STRUCTURE	16
2.1 Comparison of CS 2016 population with Census 2011	16
2.2 Comparison of CS 2016 population by province with previous censuses.....	17
2.3 Comparison of population between Census 2011 and CS 2016 by population group	20
2.4 Conclusion.....	23
SECTION 3: LIFETIME IMMIGRATION AND INTERNAL MIGRATION	24
3.1 Introduction.....	24
3.1.1 Country of birth	27
3.2 Internal migration.....	28
3.3 Previous residential municipality and the main reason for leaving.....	30
3.4 Conclusion.....	30
SECTION 4: GENERAL HEALTH AND FUNCTIONING AND PARENTAL SURVIVAL	31
4.1 Introduction.....	31
4.2 Disability prevalence by province	33
4.3 Disability prevalence by age.....	33
4.4 Disability prevalence by sex	34
4.5 Disability prevalence by population group.....	35
4.6 Assistive devices	35

4.7 Parental survival status	36
4.8 Conclusion.....	37
SECTION 5: EDUCATION	38
5.1 Introduction.....	38
5.2 Attendance	38
5.3 Educational attainment.....	43
5.4 Conclusion.....	45
SECTION 6: FERTILITY, MORTALITY AND EMIGRATION.....	46
6.1 Introduction.....	46
6.2 Children ever born.....	47
6.3 Mortality data: Household deaths in the last 12 months.....	48
6.4 Emigrants	48
6.4.1 Introduction	48
6.5 Conclusion.....	54
SECTION 7: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS	55
7.1 Introduction.....	55
7.2 Perception on municipal challenges.....	56
7.3 Housing and access to basic services	58
7.3.1 Access to water	64
7.4 Access and quality on service delivery (water and sanitation, energy)	68
7.4.1 Introduction	68
7.4.2 Sanitation.....	68
7.4.3 Electricity and energy sources.....	74
7.4.4 Household goods.....	81
7.5 Household Involvement in agricultural activities.....	82
7.6 Food security.....	87
7.7 Crime statistics	90
7.7.1 Introduction	90
7.7.2 Households' experience of crime.....	90
7.7.3 Households' feelings of safety when walking alone.....	92
7.7.4 Types of crime experienced by households	93
7.8 Conclusion.....	96

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 2.1: POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY PROVINCE, CENSUS 2011 AND COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016	18
TABLE 2.2: COMPARISON OF POPULATION BY AGE AND POPULATION GROUP BETWEEN 2011 AND 2016.....	21
TABLE 3.1: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS BORN OUTSIDE SOUTH AFRICA BY AGE AND SEX.....	25
TABLE 3.2: A COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO REPORTED THAT THEY WERE BORN OUTSIDE SOUTH AFRICA.....	26
TABLE 3.3: DISTRIBUTION OF TOP 20 SENDING COUNTRIES, 2011 AND 2016.....	27
TABLE 3.4: DISTRIBUTION OF PROVINCE OF BIRTH BY PROVINCE OF ENUMERATION, CENSUS 2011.....	29
TABLE 3.5: DISTRIBUTION OF PROVINCE OF BIRTH BY PROVINCE OF ENUMERATION, CS 2016	29
TABLE 3.6: MAIN REASON FOR MOVING TO THE CURRENT PLACE BY MIIF CODE.....	30
TABLE 4.1: DISABILITY TYPE AND DEGREE OF DIFFICULTY IN FUNCTIONING, CENSUS 2011 AND COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016.....	32
TABLE 4.2: ASSISTIVE DEVICE USAGE, CENSUS 2011 AND COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016	36
TABLE 5.1: POPULATION DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS AGED 5 YEARS AND OLDER ATTENDING AT AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION BY SEX.....	39
TABLE 5.2: POPULATION DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS AGED 5 YEARS AND OLDER ATTENDING AT AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.....	39
TABLE 5.3: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AGED 5 AND OLDER BY ATTENDANCE AT AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION, PROVINCE AND SEX - NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE.....	40
TABLE 5.4: POPULATION DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS AGED 5 YEARS AND OLDER ATTENDING AT AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION BY PROVINCE	41
TABLE 5.5: POPULATION DISTRIBUTION FOR PERSONS 5 YEARS AND OLDER BY TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION	42
TABLE 5.6: DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION AGED 25 YEARS AND OLDER BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	43
TABLE 5.7: DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION AGED 25 YEARS AND OLDER IN TEN YEAR AGE GROUPS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	44
TABLE 6.1: THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE PROPORTION OF WOMEN WHO EVER HAD CHILDREN BY AGE AND PROVINCE, 2011.....	47
TABLE 6.2: THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE PROPORTION OF WOMEN WHO EVER HAD CHILDREN BY AGE AND PROVINCE, 2016.....	47
TABLE 6.3: NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS REPORTING DEATH OCCURRENCE BY PROVINCE, CENSUS 2011 AND CS 2016	48
TABLE 7.1: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS PER PROVINCE, CENSUSES 1996, 2001, 2011 AND COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016.....	55
TABLE 7.2: FIVE LEADING CHALLENGES FACING THE MUNICIPALITY AS PERCEIVED BY THE HOUSEHOLD, CS 2016 ...	56
TABLE 7.3: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADSHIP BY PROVINCE AND SEX OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD, CS 2016	58
TABLE 7.4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADSHIP BY AGE AND SEX, CENSUS 2011 AND CS 2016	58
TABLE 7.5: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE OF MAIN DWELLING: CENSUS 1996 - CS 2016.....	59
TABLE 7.6: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE AND TYPE OF MAIN DWELLING - CS 2016	60
TABLE 7.7: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WHOSE MAIN DWELLING IS AN RDP OR GOVERNMENT SUBSIDISED DWELLING BY PROVINCE: CS 2016.....	61
TABLE 7.8: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TENURE STATUS: CENSUSES 2001–CS 2016	62
TABLE 7.9: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE AND TENURE STATUS - CS 2016.....	63
TABLE 7.10: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY ACCESS TO PIPED WATER: CENSUS 1996 - CS 2016.....	64
TABLE 7.11: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE AND ACCESS TO PIPED WATER: CS 2016	65
TABLE 7.12: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE AND ACCESS TO SAFE DRINKING WATER SUPPLY SERVICE: CS 2016	66
TABLE 7.13: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TOILET FACILITIES	68
TABLE 7.14: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY LOCATION OF TOILET FACILITIES – CS 2016	69
TABLE 7.15: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY LOCATION OF TOILET FACILITIES AND TYPE OF MAIN DWELLING – CS 2016.....	69
TABLE 7.16: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY MAINTENANCE OF TOILET FACILITIES AND TYPE OF MAIN DWELLING, CS 2016	70
TABLE 7.17: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY REFUSE REMOVAL [BOTH NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE]	72
TABLE 7.18: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY REFUSE REMOVAL AND TYPE OF MAIN DWELLING, CS 2016.....	73
TABLE 7.19: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY BY ELECTRICITY SUPPLIER: [GHS 2014- CS 2016].....	74
TABLE 7.20: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY ENERGY SOURCE FOR COOKING: [CENSUS 1996–CS 2016]	76
TABLE 7.21: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY ENERGY SOURCE FOR LIGHTING: [CENSUS 1996–CS 2016].....	77
TABLE 7.22: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY USE OF ENERGY SOURCES.....	79
TABLE 7.23: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY OVERALL USE OF ELECTRICITY PER PROVINCE	80
TABLE 7.24: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY OWNERSHIP OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS.....	81

TABLE 7.25: NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE, CENSUS 2011 AND CS 2016	82
TABLE 7.26(A): NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL AND NON-AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE	83
TABLE 7.26(B): NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL AND NON-AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS BY POPULATION GROUP OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD	83
TABLE 7.27(A): NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS INVOLVED IN A SPECIFIC ACTIVITY BY PROVINCE	84
TABLE 7.27(B): NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS INVOLVED IN A SPECIFIC ACTIVITY BY POPULATION GROUP OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD	84
TABLE 7.28(A): DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS BY MAIN PLACE OF AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PROVINCE	84
TABLE 7.28(B): DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS BY MAIN PLACE OF AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND POPULATION GROUP OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD	85
TABLE 7.29(A): DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS BY MAIN PURPOSE OF INVOLVEMENT IN AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PROVINCE	85
TABLE 7.29(B): DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS BY MAIN PURPOSE OF INVOLVEMENT IN AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND POPULATION GROUP OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD	85
TABLE 7.30(A): NUMBERS OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS BY FARMING PRACTICE AND PROVINCE	86
TABLE 7.30(B): NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS BY FARMING PRACTICE AND POPULATION GROUP OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD	86
TABLE 7.31(A): NUMBER OF LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY BY TYPE AT HOUSEHOLD LEVEL AND PROVINCE AS ON 07 MARCH 2016	86
TABLE 7.31(B): NUMBER OF LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY BY TYPE AT HOUSEHOLD LEVEL AND POPULATION GROUP OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD AS ON 07 MARCH 2016	87
TABLE 7.32: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WHO RAN OUT OF MONEY TO BUY FOOD IN PAST 12 MONTHS BY PROVINCE, CS 2016	87
TABLE 7.33: HOUSEHOLDS WHO SKIPPED A MEAL IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, GHS 2015, CS 2016	88
TABLE 7.34: HOUSEHOLDS WHO SKIPPED A MEAL IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS BY HOUSEHOLD HEAD SEX, CS 2016	88
TABLE 7.35: HOUSEHOLDS WHO SKIPPED A MEAL IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS BY HOUSEHOLD HEAD SEX AND PROVINCE, CS 2016	88
TABLE 7.36: HOUSEHOLDS WHO SKIPPED A MEAL IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS BY PROVINCE, GHS 2015, CS 2016	89
TABLE 7.37: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WHO EXPERIENCED CRIME BY PROVINCE, COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016	91
TABLE 7.38: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS THAT EXPERIENCED CRIME BY POPULATION GROUP OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD, COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016	91
TABLE 7.39: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WHO EXPERIENCED CRIME BY SEX OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD, COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016	92
TABLE 7.40: HOUSEHOLDS' FEELINGS OF SAFETY BY PROVINCE, COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016	92
TABLE 7.41: HOUSEHOLDS' FEELINGS OF SAFETY BY POPULATION GROUP OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD, COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016	93
TABLE 7.42: HOUSEHOLDS' FEELINGS OF SAFETY BY SEX OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD, COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016 ...	93
TABLE 7.43: CRIME EXPERIENCED BY HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE, COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016	94
TABLE 7.44: CRIME EXPERIENCED BY HOUSEHOLDS BY POPULATION GROUP OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD, COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016	95
TABLE 7.45: CRIME EXPERIENCED BY HOUSEHOLDS IN 2015 BY SEX OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD, COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016	95

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 2.1: COMPARISON OF POPULATION AGE STRUCTURE BETWEEN CENSUS 2011 AND CS 2016..... 16

FIGURE 2.2: POPULATION STRUCTURE OF SOUTH AFRICA CENSUS 2011 (SHADED) AND SOUTH AFRICA CS 2016. 17

FIGURE 2.3: COMPARISON OF POPULATION BY AGE AND POPULATION GROUP BETWEEN 2011 AND 2016 22

FIGURE 4.1: DISABILITY PREVALENCE BY PROVINCE, CENSUS 2011 AND COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016 33

FIGURE 4.2: DISABILITY PREVALENCE BY AGE 34

FIGURE 4.3: DISABILITY PREVALENCE BY SEX 34

FIGURE 4.4: DISABILITY BY POPULATION GROUP 35

FIGURE 4.5: ORPHAN TYPE, CENSUS 1996, 2001, 2001 AND COMMUNITY SURVEY 2016 37

FIGURE 6.1: EMIGRATION IN SOUTH AFRICA 50

FIGURE 6.2: EMIGRANTS BY SEX 50

FIGURE 6.3: EMIGRANTS BY PROVINCE 51

FIGURE 6.4: EMIGRANTS BY AGE GROUP 51

FIGURE 6.5: EMIGRANTS BY WORKING AGE GROUP AND YEAR MOVED 52

FIGURE 6.6: TOP TEN DESTINATIONS OF EMIGRANTS 52

FIGURE 6.7: TOP TEN AFRICAN DESTINATIONS OF EMIGRANTS 53

FIGURE 6.8: TOP TEN OVERSEAS DESTINATIONS OF EMIGRANTS 53

FIGURE 7.1: FIVE LEADING CHALLENGES FACING THE MUNICIPALITY PRESENTLY AS PERCEIVED BY HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE, AS PERCENTAGE OF ALL MAIN CHALLENGES, CS 2016..... 57

FIGURE 7.2: AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY PROVINCE, CENSUS 1996, 2001, 2011 AND CS 2016..... 59

FIGURE 7.3: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE OF MAIN DWELLING: CENSUS 1996–CS 2016 . 60

FIGURE 7.4: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE OF MAIN DWELLING BY PROVINCE, CS 2016 61

FIGURE 7.5: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WHOSE MAIN DWELLING IS AN RDP OR GOVERNMENT SUBSIDISED DWELLING BY PROVINCE: CS 2016 62

FIGURE 7.6: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TENURE STATUS, CENSUSES 2001, 2011 AND CS 2016 63

FIGURE 7.7: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE AND TENURE STATUS, CS 2016 64

FIGURE 7.8: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS BY ACCESS TO PIPED WATER: CENSUS 1996–CS 2016 65

FIGURE 7.9: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE AND ACCESS TO PIPED WATER: CS 2016 66

FIGURE 7.10: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH ACCESS TO SAFE DRINKING WATER BY PROVINCE, CS 2016..... 67

FIGURE 7.11: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY LOCATION OF TOILET FACILITIES 69

FIGURE 7.12: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY LOCATION OF TOILET FACILITIES AND TYPE OF MAIN DWELLING 70

FIGURE 7.13: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY MAINTENANCE OF TOILET FACILITIES AND TYPE OF MAIN DWELLING 71

FIGURE 7.14: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY REFUSE REMOVAL 72

FIGURE 7.15: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY REFUSE REMOVAL AND TYPE OF MAIN DWELLING 73

FIGURE 7.16: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY BY ELECTRICITY SUPPLIER: [GHS 2014-CS 2016] 74

FIGURE 7.17: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY BY PROVINCE AND ELECTRICITY SUPPLIER: [GHS 2014-CS 2016] 75

FIGURE 7.18: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY ENERGY SOURCE FOR COOKING: [CENSUS 1996-CS 2016].. 76

FIGURE 7.19: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY FOR COOKING BY PROVINCE: [CENSUS 1996–CS 2016]..... 77

FIGURE 7.20: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS BY ENERGY SOURCE FOR LIGHTING: [CENSUS 1996–CS 2016] 78

FIGURE 7.21: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY FOR LIGHTING BY PROVINCE: [CENSUS 1996–CS 2016]..... 79

FIGURE 7.22: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY OVERALL USE OF ELECTRICITY PER PROVINCE 80

FIGURE 7.23: THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY OWNERSHIP OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS..... 81

FIGURE 7.24: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS BY PROVINCE, 2011 AND 2016 82


LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CAPI	Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing
CS	Community Survey
DF	Dwelling Frame
DSC	District Survey Coordinator
DURF	Dwelling Unit Record Form
DUs	Dwelling units
EA	Enumeration area
FW	Fieldworker
FWS	Fieldwork Supervisor
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
MIIF	Municipal Infrastructure Investment Framework

PREFACE

Community Survey 2016 (CS) is the second largest survey undertaken by Statistics South Africa following the one conducted in 2007. The survey remains one of the main data sources that provide indicators at national, provincial and municipal levels for planning and monitoring the performance of specific development programmes such as education, health, sanitation, water supply, housing and transport. In addition, the survey provides demographic information critical in understanding population-development nexus. The objective of the community survey was thus to provide population estimates as well as household characteristics. The information will be used to inform Integrated Development Plans and infrastructure investment budgeting.

The purpose of this report is to provide a profile of the country, as portrayed by the 2016 Community Survey. The CS 2016 not only adds to the trend in data regarding socio economic aspects but more importantly provides the latest evidence on the levels and differentials regarding demographic drivers (fertility, migration and mortality). CS 2016 is the first survey to provide a module ascertaining information on emigration that the country has conducted.



P J Lehohla

Statistician-General

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Community Survey 2016 is the second intercensal survey in a democratic South Africa. This household based survey is one of the few available data sources providing data at municipal level. Provision of data at this level supports evidence-based decision making that has become increasingly a best practice which many countries, including South Africa, embrace. CS 2016 results are thus critical in promoting optimal resource allocation and utilisation in all spheres of government in order to reduce poverty and vulnerability among South Africa's most marginalised. Secondly, the development and implementation of policy, implementation of legislature deems it necessary to have reliable statistics that inform social, demographic and economic standing of the country.

The CS 2016 is the second large sample survey Statistics South Africa undertook after CS 2007, but this time around the data are collected electronically using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) system as opposed to the paper collection method used in CS 2007. The new initiative in the organisation is expected to reduce financial and time costs in data processing as well as data quality enhancement. Eligible persons for enumeration are all persons present in the household(s) of the sampled dwelling units on the reference night (midnight 6th March 2016 to 7th March 2016) including visitors. Members of the household who were absent overnight, for example, working, travelling, at entertainment or religious gatherings but returned the next day should also be counted. For purposes of Stats SA a household is a group of persons who live together, and provide for themselves jointly with food and other essentials for living, or a person who lives alone. Babies born before the reference night should also be included in the count, the reason being that they were already born by the midnight 6th March to 7th March 2016. Members of the household who died after the reference night were counted in as they were alive during the midnight of the reference period. In contrast, those born after the reference night were excluded.

The use of the CAPI system is not the only new process used, others include utilisation of the present updated dwelling frame data captured from the Census 2011 listing process. Newly incorporated in the CS questionnaire include:

- main religious affiliation
- main reason for leaving the country
- mode of transport used for to reach the person's destination for going to school or work and time taken to reach the destination

- main challenges/problems/difficulties facing a municipality
- quality and satisfaction with basic services
- opinion on improving standards of living in households
- sources of income
- year of death of mother and/ father if reported deceased
- perceptions of safety and crime experienced in households
- food security measures
- extended additional questions on agricultural activities in households
- characteristics of emigrants (persons who left the country to live elsewhere)

This section highlights the planning processes for CS 2016. During the planning phase, the focus in the early stages was primarily on setting strategic directions and ensuring that all dependencies between the different phases and role players were identified, potential risks highlighted and control measures put in place to minimise their adverse effects. This facilitated effective integration and implementation of various activities by ensuring that each phase was properly resourced. During the planning phase, all work streams and focus areas prepared operational plans which provided detailed lists of activities that were to be undertaken to achieve specific objectives and outputs as profiled in the CS 2016 Project Charter.

1.1.1 Geography frame

The Dwelling Frame (DF) is a structures frame, and dwelling units (DUs) form part of the feature classification of structures. Datasets in the integrated DF base layer include: Dwelling Frame 2011 (formal and informal), Listing Census 2011, Spot Building Count 2012, Address Assignments and Municipal data. Worth mentioning is the fact that the use of existing updated dwelling frame for a large sample survey such as CS 2016 is the first of its kind in line with other first time data collection processes in the case of Stats SA. It is also accepted that ongoing improvement is expected as it is not that perfect at this stage.

1.1.2 Community Survey 2016 sampling methodology

The sample design for CS 2016 was a stratified single stage sample design. At EA level, all in-scope EAs were included in the sample and a sample of dwelling units was taken within each EA (i.e. there was no sub-sampling of EAs). The EA frame was based on the Census 2011 information. The updated dwelling unit (DU) frame was constructed by the Geography team using geo-referenced spatial systems.

1.1.3 Questionnaire development processes for CS 2016

The development and design processes of the CS 2016 questionnaire was informed by national priorities, global and continental emerging population issues embedded in the SDGs, data needs of both existing and prospective users and comparability with the previous community survey (i.e. CS 2007) and censuses. The development of the CS Questionnaire involved a number of phases as mentioned below:

- Stakeholder needs assessment is an international best practice in survey and census planning aimed at producing products that meet user needs. Stakeholders play a fundamental role in providing information on questions to be asked in a survey. During this phase, processes including review of previous censuses' data items and questionnaires were undertaken, and user consultations were held with key internal stakeholders on what needed to be measured in CS 2016.
- Through the consultation process, it became clear that there is increased demand for data at municipal level. Following the consultation process, Community Survey data Items were finalised and categorised into broader themes of demographics, migration, general health and functioning, parental survival, education, income and social grants, employment, fertility, mortality, housing conditions, access and quality of basic service provision.

Community survey 2016 questionnaire was designed using the World Bank Survey Solutions application, which is an on-line based questionnaire design application. During the design, skipping patterns and validation rules were predetermined and embedded in the electronic questionnaire. Data collection instruments, questionnaires in particular must be developed and subjected to thorough testing and review processes to ensure that the final product (questionnaire) solicits accurate information. Community Survey 2016 questionnaire consists of new questions while some other questions have been adopted from existing household based surveys and Census 2011. Two-stage testing was adopted for CS; Behind-the-glass test and field testing. The results of each test were used to improve the quality of the draft questions and CS 2016 indicators. The draft CS questionnaire was presented at different fora for approval. These include CS Technical committee, Questionnaire Clearance Committee, CS Management, Population & Social Statistics Cluster, Statistics Council Population sub-committee and Statistics Council.

1.1.4 Survey Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation (SCM&E)

The Survey Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation (SCM&E) Division in the Survey Operations Cluster is responsible for the Monitoring and evaluation of the quality aspects of all population and household surveys processes in the Survey Operations and Population and Social Statistics Cluster. As part of the enhancement of quality, SCM&E Division monitored CS 2016 Field Operations activities in all provinces. The objectives of the CS 2016 Monitoring included conducting quality checks on the collected data, conducting verification on in and out-of-scope cases and monitoring any other issues that can have impact on data quality with the purpose of compiling lessons learnt. For the purpose of the study, Monitors also used the tablets to conduct the Monitoring activities. Their tablets were loaded with Observation, Questionnaire Quality Check, Out-of-scope Verification and Control Visit forms.

A total of 7 184 questionnaires were checked in the entire data collection period and 5 376 (74,8%) errors were identified. During the interview observations, 1 852 observations and 3 501 control visits were conducted while a total of 7 870 points were verified and 3 787 DUs were in agreement while 4 083 were not out of scope.

Intensive training is required during the use of technology, from the Questionnaire, Navigation system and CAPI. In addition, the administration of DURF in a point needs close Monitoring because in instances where there is growth or shrinkage, the FWs might decide to leave the DUs unlisted to avoid more work load. Intensive and continuous training on the use of DURF should be encouraged. The FWSs and DSCs should take a responsibility of observing the FWs especially during the first two weeks of data collection. DSCs should conduct immediate and continuous quality checks and identify the non-response cases which should immediately be verified by the FWSs.

1.1.5 Data editing strategy

Quality assurance in CS 2016 was largely automated and handled in two phases. The first phase of quality assurance involved the electronic questionnaire being subjected to conditions and validation rules. This process eliminated unnecessary inconsistencies in the data during data collection. An additional automated quality assurance process was used during data collection where completed questionnaires were flagged as REJECTED or ACCEPTED based on minimum processability rule. Any questionnaire submitted to database that did not meet the set minimum rules were marked as REJECTED, and sent back to the fieldworker for verification and correction. The fieldwork supervisors were involved in taking note of the flagged questionnaires and assist the

fieldworker in correcting the mistakes accordingly. For any record marked as REJECTED once, the running of the rejection was done at least for four different times and at different dates. This was necessary for the fieldworker to try and correct mistakes before a particular questionnaire could be declared "Complete". This process contributed tremendously in reducing missing values on a number of questions.

1.1.6 Objectives of the report

- To provide extent of comparability between CS 2016 and at least the previous Census
- To provide the extent of comparability between CS 2016 and at least the previous Census and data regarding priority socio-economic indicators
- To provide a comparison of figures for access to basic household services between CS 2016 the previous censuses
- To provide figures for newly incorporated questions for the purpose of narrowing the information gap.

1.1.7 Data evaluation procedure

Interrogations commenced at around the third week of data collection using incoming data. Direct (consistency checks within the same data) and indirect analysis (comparability with other data) techniques were utilised. Towards the end of data collection international consultants were recruited for the purpose of providing expert advice to both the Statistics Council and the Statistician-General. Areas of assessment included evaluation of pre-enumeration processes, data collection systems used during different phases, sample size and weighting strategies used as well as plausibility of demographic estimation outcomes.

Broadly, CS 2016 data show expected trends for a substantial number of variables when compared to Census time series data over time. That notwithstanding, there are some indicators that reflect unexpected results. The total number of persons who reported that they were born outside South Africa is much lower (1,6 million) compared to 2,1 million collected during Census 2011. In addition, there seems to be unexpectedly fewer persons reporting internal migration even to the two known receiving provinces namely, Gauteng and Western Cape relative to previous censuses. Interestingly, the proportion of the employed is much lower than that provided by Quarterly Labour Force Survey (QLFS) collected in the first quarter of 2016. As a result, such data would need to be subjected to be first subjected to coding as it was done for Census 2011 prior to further evaluation. Another unexpected finding relates to fewer children reporting deceased parents compared to Census 2011 data.

1.1.8 Priority indicators for this release

1.1.8.1 Person data file

- Population structure
- Lifetime and internal migration
- General health and functioning
- Education attendance and attainment
- Births in the last 12 months by age of mother

1.1.8.2 Household data file

- Perceptions on municipal challenges and improving standards of living
- Housing (type of dwelling and tenure status)
- Access and quality of basic service delivery to households
- Households' involvement in agricultural activities
- Food security measures
- Characteristics of emigrants
- Household members' deaths in the last 12 months by province and population group

1.2 Methods of analysis

Frequencies and proportions of selected indicators are provided in tables or/and charts. Where applicable, ranking of responses are provided by province or municipality. Owing to the large number of municipalities, grouped geographical categories (A, B1, B2, B3, B4, C1 and C2) provided by the Municipal Demarcation Board in 2010/11 may alternatively be used (see list of municipal names by geographical code in Appendix A). It should be noted though that edited and weighted data are utilised in this report. Users are referred to the accompanying Community Survey 2016 Technical Report for sample design, weighting procedure and data quality.

In cases where analysis has been done at municipal level, municipal codes, names and category have been utilised to profile the results. Municipal categories are explained below.

Municipal categorisation

The Constitution of South Africa classifies municipalities into 3 categories (A, B and C). Category A municipalities have exclusive municipal executive and legislative authority in their areas while a Category B municipality shares municipal executive and legislative authority in its area with a Category C municipality within whose area it falls. A Category C municipality is one that has municipal executive and legislative authority in an area that includes more than one municipality.

Typically, Category A is made up of metros, C district municipalities and B local municipalities. The MIIF further classifies local municipalities into 4 sub-categories B1, B2, B3 and B4. The B1 category comprises secondary cities and local municipalities with the largest budgets; B2 category refers to local municipalities with a large town as core; B3 category defines local municipalities with small towns, with relatively small populations and significant proportions of urban population but with no large town as core and lastly B4 category is made up of local municipalities which are mainly rural with communal tenure and with, at most, one or two small towns in their area.

Still the MIIF classifies district municipalities into 2 categories (C1 which refers to district municipalities that are not water services authorities and C2 which defines district municipalities that are water services authorities (Municipal Demarcation Board, 2012).

1.3 Local municipalities by MIIF classification, proportionate share of government grants and poverty headcount, 2011 versus 2016

Province/District/Local municipality	Municipal sub-category	2015 Grants and subsidies received as a % of Total income	Poverty			
			2011		2016	
			Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty	Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty
1. Western Cape			3,6%	42,6%	2,7%	40,1%
101 DC1: West Coast	C1	25,6%	2,0%	41,9%	2,9%	44,5%
160 WC011: Matzikama	B3	28,0%	3,4%	42,4%	0,8%	42,5%
161 WC012: Cederberg	B3	35,2%	2,8%	42,9%	3,6%	45,7%
162 WC013: Bergrivier	B3	23,9%	1,0%	43,7%	1,6%	41,5%
163 WC014: Saldanha Bay	B2	11,8%	2,2%	41,0%	6,7%	45,4%
164 WC015: Swartland	B3	18,0%	1,0%	40,6%	0,9%	39,9%
102 DC2: Cape Winelands	C1	62,6%	2,5%	42,0%	3,1%	41,3%
165 WC022: Witzenberg	B3	26,9%	1,8%	40,6%	2,5%	40,8%
166 WC023: Drakenstein	B1	11,1%	2,1%	42,5%	2,5%	42,7%
167 WC024: Stellenbosch	B1	11,2%	3,8%	42,1%	6,1%	39,8%
168 WC025: Breede Valley	B2	24,0%	2,8%	41,8%	2,4%	44,3%
169 WC026: Langeberg	B3	18,9%	1,7%	42,4%	1,0%	39,8%
103 DC3: Overberg	C1	80,2%	3,7%	42,2%	2,6%	40,3%
170 WC034: Swellendam	B3	35,6%	2,5%	41,4%	1,9%	40,4%
171 WC031: Theewaterskloof	B3	37,9%	3,7%	41,9%	2,8%	40,7%
172 WC032: Overstrand	B2	12,9%	4,6%	42,8%	3,3%	40,1%
173 WC033: Cape Agulhas	B3	27,6%	2,1%	40,7%	0,9%	38,5%
104 DC4: Eden	C1	51,4%	3,9%	42,2%	2,2%	40,5%
174 WC041: Kannaland	B3	40,5%	2,5%	38,5%	1,2%	36,3%
175 WC042: Hessequa	B3	19,9%	1,5%	39,4%	1,2%	39,6%
176 WC043: Mossel Bay	B2	15,6%	3,2%	43,5%	2,1%	43,0%
177 WC044: George	B1	28,2%	3,3%	42,6%	1,5%	40,4%
178 WC045: Oudtshoorn	B2	23,3%	3,9%	41,2%	2,2%	43,2%
179 WC047: Bitou	B3	26,2%	6,3%	41,8%	4,2%	37,9%
180 WC048: Knysna	B2	16,9%	6,2%	42,9%	3,3%	40,2%
105 DC5: Central Karoo	C1	37,9%	2,4%	40,6%	3,1%	41,1%
181 WC051: Laingsburg	B3	41,9%	1,5%	37,3%	4,2%	37,4%
182 WC052: Prince Albert	B3	62,1%	2,5%	42,4%	2,9%	40,5%
183 WC053: Beaufort West	B3	31,2%	2,5%	40,5%	3,0%	42,3%
199 CPT: City of Cape Town	A	17,2%	3,9%	42,8%	2,6%	39,3%
2. Eastern Cape			14,4%	41,9%	12,7%	43,3%
210 DC10: Cacadu (Sarah Baartman)	C1	81,7%	5,2%	42,1%	4,5%	42,2%
261 EC101: Camdeboo	B3	35,0%	2,8%	41,7%	2,7%	39,0%
262 EC102: Blue Crane Route	B3	39,1%	4,7%	41,4%	5,7%	41,9%
263 EC103: Ikwezi	B3	68,1%	4,2%	40,6%	2,1%	38,0%
264 EC104: Makana	B2	30,8%	5,1%	42,3%	2,2%	41,6%
265 EC105: Ndlambe	B3	32,5%	7,4%	42,4%	6,1%	42,6%

Province/District/Local municipality	Municipal sub-category	2015 Grants and subsidies received as a % of Total income	Poverty			
			2011		2016	
			Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty	Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty
266 EC106: Sundays River Valley	B3	43,5%	5,7%	39,9%	6,3%	44,4%
267 EC107: Baviaans	B3	72,3%	3,1%	40,9%	3,5%	40,1%
268 EC108: Kouga	B3	28,7%	5,9%	43,7%	5,7%	42,4%
269 EC109: Kou-Kamma	B3	62,8%	3,2%	40,0%	2,3%	38,1%
212 DC12: Amathole	C2	78,2%	18,7%	41,4%	18,7%	42,5%
270 EC121: Mbhashe	B4	91,5%	25,6%	41,0%	22,0%	44,1%
271 EC122: Mngquma	B4	86,0%	20,7%	41,7%	20,3%	43,2%
272 EC123: Great Kei	B3	62,1%	12,2%	41,3%	12,2%	43,5%
273 EC124: Amahlathi	B3	69,6%	14,3%	41,5%	17,2%	40,8%
274 EC126: Ngqushwa	B4	84,6%	14,6%	41,4%	21,7%	40,5%
276 EC127: Nkonkobe	B3	57,2%	13,9%	41,2%	15,0%	39,6%
277 EC128: Nxuba	B3	51,2%	6,4%	42,6%	3,4%	39,7%
213 DC13: Chris Hani	C2	59,7%	15,6%	41,4%	16,4%	43,1%
278 EC131: Inxuba Yethemba	B3	37,4%	3,0%	41,2%	3,5%	40,4%
279 EC132: Tsolwana	B3	68,9%	11,7%	41,4%	13,2%	40,8%
280 EC133: Inkwanca	B3	58,0%	5,5%	41,9%	7,5%	42,5%
281 EC134: Lukanji	B2	33,3%	7,1%	41,7%	8,1%	41,5%
282 EC135: Intsika Yethu	B4	92,5%	22,9%	41,1%	27,7%	43,2%
283 EC136: Emalahleni	B4	83,7%	17,2%	41,4%	22,6%	42,5%
284 EC137: Engcobo	B4	93,2%	27,4%	41,4%	23,3%	45,0%
285 EC138: Sakhisizwe	B3	73,0%	14,3%	41,9%	12,9%	42,4%
214 DC14: Joe Gqabi	C2	78,7%	16,8%	41,3%	13,4%	43,7%
286 EC141: Elundini	B4	75,5%	24,7%	41,1%	19,1%	44,8%
287 EC142: Senqu	B4	69,3%	14,5%	41,4%	13,2%	42,6%
288 EC143: Maletswai	B3	29,3%	8,9%	42,4%	5,2%	43,2%
289 EC144: Gariep	B3	48,3%	5,2%	42,9%	5,0%	40,4%
215 DC15: O.R.Tambo	C2	78,7%	21,1%	41,7%	19,2%	43,5%
290 EC153: Ngquza Hill	B4	86,7%	27,3%	42,4%	22,3%	43,5%
291 EC154: Port St Johns	B4	92,9%	28,2%	42,2%	23,4%	44,5%
292 EC155: Nyandeni	B4	92,8%	21,2%	41,1%	20,9%	44,2%
293 EC156: Mhlontlo	B4	91,5%	21,4%	41,7%	21,2%	42,6%
294 EC157: King Sabata Dalindyebo	B2	42,3%	15,5%	41,3%	14,7%	43,1%
244 DC44: Alfred Nzo	C2	94,2%	25,6%	41,9%	22,0%	44,3%
295 EC441: Matatiele	B3	71,1%	22,4%	41,6%	18,7%	44,0%
296 EC442: Umzimvubu	B4	89,2%	25,3%	42,2%	24,2%	43,8%
297 EC443: Mbizana	B4	82,0%	25,0%	41,9%	22,8%	44,4%
298 EC444: Ntabankulu	B4	94,7%	33,6%	41,9%	23,3%	45,6%
260 BUF: Buffalo City	A	25,3%	9,3%	43,3%	7,3%	42,8%
299 NMA: Nelson Mandela Bay	A	27,9%	4,6%	44,3%	3,0%	42,3%
3. Northern Cape			7,1%	42,1%	6,6%	42,0%
306 DC6: Namakwa	C1	91,0%	3,2%	40,2%	2,8%	41,6%

Province/District/Local municipality	Municipal sub-category	2015 Grants and subsidies received as a % of Total income	Poverty			
			2011		2016	
			Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty	Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty
363 NC061: Richtersveld	B3	44,3%	3,1%	39,9%	1,9%	38,3%
364 NC062: Nama Khoi	B3	20,5%	2,5%	40,4%	2,5%	41,7%
365 NC064: Kamiesberg	B3	51,6%	5,1%	40,0%	3,0%	39,0%
366 NC065: Hantam	B3	48,7%	2,3%	39,3%	2,1%	45,4%
367 NC066: Karoo Hoogland	B3	55,6%	4,2%	40,2%	2,8%	39,5%
368 NC067: Khâi-Ma	B3	43,5%	4,4%	40,8%	5,9%	42,4%
307 DC7: Pixley ka Seme	C1	90,9%	7,2%	42,7%	6,0%	41,7%
369 NC071: Ubuntu	B3	33,3%	6,9%	42,8%	6,5%	42,5%
370 NC072: Umsobomvu	B3	49,7%	9,2%	44,2%	7,8%	43,7%
371 NC073: Emthanjeni	B3	24,9%	3,3%	41,1%	4,2%	40,2%
372 NC074: Kareeberg	B3	50,3%	6,0%	43,4%	8,5%	38,8%
373 NC075: Renosterberg	B3	73,0%	6,0%	44,3%	2,9%	46,0%
374 NC076: Thembelihle	B3	63,0%	11,7%	42,4%	6,8%	44,9%
375 NC077: Siyathemba	B3	49,0%	5,6%	41,8%	5,9%	41,1%
376 NC078: Siyancuma	B3	52,6%	9,8%	42,0%	6,1%	39,4%
308 DC8: Siyanda	C1	98,2%	4,7%	41,0%	5,3%	40,7%
377 NC081: Mier	B3	77,6%	6,7%	40,4%	5,3%	43,3%
378 NC082: Kai !Garib	B3	37,6%	3,5%	40,0%	5,3%	41,1%
379 NC083: //Khara Hais	B2	20,6%	3,7%	41,0%	4,0%	39,8%
380 NC084: !Kheis	B3	75,3%	12,3%	41,4%	13,5%	40,4%
381 NC085: Tsantsabane	B3	26,0%	6,5%	41,6%	6,7%	41,9%
382 NC086: Kgatelopele	B3	39,6%	2,6%	41,5%	3,1%	38,9%
309 DC9: Frances Baard	C1	92,7%	7,2%	42,9%	5,4%	42,1%
383 NC091: Sol Plaatjie	B1	16,2%	5,6%	44,1%	3,6%	42,3%
384 NC092: Dikgatlong	B3	48,4%	11,0%	42,1%	9,8%	43,4%
385 NC093: Magareng	B3	59,8%	7,6%	40,2%	8,1%	38,7%
386 NC094: Phokwane	B3	47,3%	10,0%	42,1%	7,6%	41,6%
345 DC45: John Taolo Gaetsewe	C1	85,4%	11,4%	41,7%	12,3%	42,7%
360 NC451: Joe Morolong	B4	78,0%	18,2%	41,8%	18,3%	42,7%
361 NC452: Ga-Segonyana	B3	46,3%	8,9%	41,4%	11,5%	42,7%
362 NC453: Gamagara	B3	6,6%	2,5%	42,5%	4,6%	42,5%
4. Free State			5,5%	42,2%	5,5%	41,7%
416 DC16: Xhariep	C1	96,4%	4,9%	42,3%	5,3%	42,3%
460 FS161: Letsemeng	B3	52,4%	5,6%	42,4%	4,4%	42,1%
461 FS162: Kopanong	B3	50,5%	3,8%	41,6%	6,2%	41,9%
462 FS163: Mohokare	B3	60,2%	6,2%	42,7%	5,2%	41,7%
463 FS164: Naledi	B3	57,7%	4,4%	42,2%	5,0%	44,3%
418 DC18: Lejweleputswa	C1	95,8%	5,6%	42,8%	4,8%	42,2%
464 FS181: Masilonyana	B3	65,2%	5,3%	41,8%	6,5%	41,8%
465 FS182: Tokologo	B3	67,0%	7,7%	42,1%	7,4%	43,6%
466 FS183: Tswelopele	B3	63,2%	4,8%	41,9%	4,6%	41,0%

Province/District/Local municipality	Municipal sub-category	2015 Grants and subsidies received as a % of Total income	Poverty			
			2011		2016	
			Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty	Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty
467 FS184: Matjhabeng	B1	30,7%	5,5%	43,0%	4,3%	41,8%
468 FS185: Nala	B3	48,6%	5,6%	42,6%	5,3%	44,2%
419 DC19: Thabo Mofutsanyane	C1	98,0%	7,1%	41,7%	7,0%	41,7%
469 FS191: Setsoto	B3	53,4%	6,6%	42,3%	6,4%	41,3%
470 FS192: Dihlabeng	B2	29,6%	6,1%	42,3%	5,2%	42,4%
471 FS193: Nketoana	B3	48,8%	6,3%	41,5%	8,0%	44,0%
472 FS194: Maluti a Phofung	B3	57,1%	7,9%	41,4%	8,1%	40,8%
473 FS195: Phumelela	B3	65,2%	8,5%	41,2%	8,7%	44,5%
474 FS196: Mantsopa	B3	45,5%	4,6%	41,1%	4,0%	41,7%
420 DC20: Fezile Dabi	C1	93,9%	4,4%	42,2%	4,9%	41,9%
475 FS201: Moqhaka	B2	35,3%	2,7%	41,4%	2,9%	42,7%
477 FS203: Ngwathe	B3	31,9%	4,7%	42,2%	5,4%	42,5%
478 FS204: Metsimaholo	B2	30,8%	5,1%	42,8%	5,8%	41,6%
479 FS205: Mafube	B3	46,0%	6,8%	41,8%	6,8%	40,6%
499 MAN: Mangaung	A	27,8%	4,8%	42,2%	5,0%	41,1%
5. KwaZulu-Natal			10,9%	42%	7,7%	42,5%
521 DC21: Ugu	C2	66,5%	15,1%	41,7%	11,9%	42,3%
503 KZN213: Umzumbe	B4	93,0%	22,8%	41,2%	18,9%	43,0%
504 KZN214: UMuziwabantu	B3	58,2%	17,4%	41,5%	17,4%	43,2%
505 KZN215: Ezingoleni	B4	89,3%	15,0%	41,0%	14,1%	42,4%
506 KZN216: Hibiscus Coast	B2	22,8%	8,0%	41,8%	7,6%	41,4%
560 KZN211: Vulamehlo	B4	94,1%	29,0%	41,2%	15,7%	42,8%
561 KZN212: Umdoni	B2	39,2%	13,8%	43,8%	9,5%	40,9%
522 DC22: UMgungundlovu	C2	80,0%	7,7%	41,7%	5,9%	42,1%
562 KZN221: uMshwathi	B4	36,1%	10,6%	40,3%	10,8%	41,3%
563 KZN222: uMngeni	B2	28,5%	5,7%	43,4%	5,2%	44,0%
564 KZN223: Mpofana	B3	35,6%	10,8%	41,0%	7,6%	47,5%
565 KZN224: Impendle	B4	87,1%	14,2%	41,3%	13,3%	40,3%
566 KZN225: The Msunduzi	B1	20,9%	5,9%	42,5%	3,8%	41,9%
567 KZN226: Mkhambathini	B3	77,1%	14,8%	40,7%	10,7%	41,9%
568 KZN227: Richmond	B4	77,4%	13,0%	39,9%	12,0%	41,0%
523 DC23: Uthukela	C2	78,8%	13,7%	42,3%	10,1%	42,5%
514 KZN232: Emnambithi/Ladysmith	B2	34,2%	8,1%	41,6%	7,1%	41,9%
569 KZN233: Indaka	B4	84,8%	18,3%	42,7%	12,3%	42,3%
570 KZN234: Umtshezi	B3	25,9%	15,5%	43,3%	8,3%	45,3%
571 KZN235: Okhahlamba	B4	74,9%	18,7%	42,5%	12,9%	43,1%
573 KZN236: Imbabazane	B4	81,1%	16,1%	41,5%	14,9%	41,1%
527 DC27: Umkhanyakude	C2	90,5%	20,4%	42,4%	15,7%	44,1%
582 KZN271: Umhlabuyalingana	B4	75,4%	29,5%	42,7%	22,7%	45,9%
583 KZN272: Jozini	B4	74,3%	22,3%	42,6%	16,4%	43,8%
584 KZN273: The Big 5 False Bay	B3	69,6%	17,6%	42,1%	16,2%	43,8%

Province/District/Local municipality	Municipal sub-category	2015 Grants and subsidies received as a % of Total income	Poverty			
			2011		2016	
			Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty	Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty
585 KZN274: Hlabisa	B4	92,7%	16,2%	41,8%	10,3%	41,7%
586 KZN275: Mtubatuba	B3	71,1%	11,7%	41,5%	10,0%	41,4%
528 DC28: Uthungulu	C2	86,8%	11,1%	41,0%	7,7%	43,1%
538 KZN282: uMhlatuze	B1	16,4%	4,1%	41,6%	2,3%	39,6%
542 KZN286: Nkandla	B4	74,5%	24,2%	41,2%	17,9%	44,2%
587 KZN281: Mfobozi	B4	83,7%	10,0%	41,5%	7,2%	42,7%
588 KZN283: Ntambanana	B4	92,9%	16,9%	41,3%	15,0%	41,9%
589 KZN284: uMlalazi	B4	36,6%	15,6%	40,4%	12,7%	44,2%
590 KZN285: Mthonjaneni	B3	48,2%	16,4%	40,9%	11,4%	43,0%
543 DC43: Harry Gwala(Sisonke)	C2	89,1%	19,3%	41,9%	14,3%	43,5%
594 KZN431: Ingwe	B4	88,6%	21,4%	41,3%	17,9%	45,0%
595 KZN432: Kwa Sani	B4	50,5%	10,9%	40,8%	10,6%	39,7%
596 KZN433: Greater Kokstad	B2	33,5%	9,2%	42,9%	4,8%	42,7%
597 KZN434: Ubuhlebezwe	B4	81,0%	21,7%	41,5%	15,1%	43,7%
598 KZN435: Umzimkhulu	B4	91,6%	22,2%	42,2%	17,7%	43,0%
554 DC24: Umzinyathi	C2	59,3%	23,7%	42,4%	15,5%	43,7%
574 KZN241: Endumeni	B3	26,8%	7,3%	43,3%	4,5%	42,3%
575 KZN242: Nqutu	B4	75,9%	19,5%	41,6%	13,7%	43,1%
576 KZN244: Msinga	B4	88,0%	37,2%	43,1%	24,5%	44,1%
577 KZN245: Umvoti	B3	53,9%	19,9%	41,4%	13,3%	43,6%
555 DC25: Amajuba	C2	89,4%	7,5%	42,0%	4,7%	41,4%
524 KZN252: Newcastle	B1	22,6%	5,5%	42,1%	3,9%	40,8%
525 KZN253: Emadlangeni	B3	57,0%	21,4%	42,1%	6,8%	42,1%
526 KZN254: Dannhauser	B4	68,3%	11,6%	41,6%	7,5%	42,6%
556 DC26: Zululand	C2	93,5%	12,9%	41,6%	10,4%	42,8%
529 KZN263: Abaqulusi	B3	35,2%	11,2%	41,9%	11,4%	43,3%
578 KZN261: eDumbe	B3	72,0%	13,4%	41,2%	9,3%	43,3%
579 KZN262: UPhongolo	B4	57,8%	12,5%	41,4%	10,6%	41,9%
580 KZN265: Nongoma	B4	86,1%	15,3%	41,7%	9,2%	43,4%
581 KZN266: Ulundi	B4	50,4%	12,4%	41,6%	10,4%	42,3%
559 DC29: iLembe	C2	69,8%	13,2%	41,0%	10,1%	43,0%
546 KZN294: Maphumulo	B4	80,8%	25,4%	40,6%	19,8%	44,8%
591 KZN291: Mandeni	B4	68,4%	8,8%	41,2%	7,2%	41,5%
592 KZN292: KwaDukuza	B2	15,6%	8,6%	41,2%	7,9%	41,6%
593 KZN293: Ndwedwe	B4	91,7%	21,7%	41,0%	13,8%	44,8%
599 ETH: eThekwini	A	18,3%	6,6%	42,8%	3,8%	40,8%
6. North West			9,2%	42%	8,8%	42,5%
637 DC37: Bojanala	C1	99,3%	8,2%	42,1%	8,8%	42,9%
660 NW371: Moretele	B4	81,3%	7,9%	41,2%	11,7%	40,4%
661 NW372: Madibeng	B1	38,7%	9,5%	42,0%	8,5%	42,1%
662 NW373: Rustenburg	B1	29,3%	7,2%	42,9%	8,0%	44,6%

Province/District/Local municipality	Municipal sub-category	2015 Grants and subsidies received as a % of Total income	Poverty			
			2011		2016	
			Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty	Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty
663 NW374: Kgetlengrivier	B3	58,3%	8,2%	41,3%	6,1%	41,2%
664 NW375: Moses Kotane	B4	65,3%	8,3%	41,3%	10,6%	42,5%
638 DC38: Ngaka Modiri Molema	C2	98,7%	12,3%	42,1%	10,6%	41,9%
665 NW381: Ratlou	B4	65,6%	16,6%	42,4%	16,9%	42,3%
666 NW382: Tswaing	B3	61,5%	13,4%	41,6%	10,8%	41,7%
667 NW383: Mafikeng	B2	32,2%	10,6%	42,5%	8,2%	41,4%
668 NW384: Ditsobotla	B3	29,9%	11,6%	41,8%	9,3%	42,3%
669 NW385: Ramotshere Moiloa	B3	62,5%	13,2%	42,0%	13,0%	42,0%
639 DC39: Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompoti	C2	98,8%	13,7%	41,9%	12,8%	42,2%
670 NW392: Naledi	B3	38,5%	10,7%	41,9%	10,5%	43,0%
671 NW393: Mamusa	B3	46,8%	10,1%	42,0%	8,8%	44,2%
672 NW394: Greater Taung	B4	84,0%	16,6%	42,2%	17,3%	41,6%
673 NW396: Lekwa-Teemane	B3	24,4%	5,1%	42,0%	3,6%	40,5%
674 NW397: Kagisano/Molopo	B4	85,2%	17,0%	41,3%	14,8%	42,5%
640 DC40: Dr Kenneth Kaunda	C1	92,2%	5,2%	41,4%	4,9%	42,5%
675 NW401: Ventersdorp	B3	48,2%	11,4%	40,6%	12,4%	43,2%
676 NW402: Tlokwe City Council	B1	17,3%	3,9%	42,7%	4,8%	41,1%
677 NW403: City of Matlosana	B1	22,8%	4,6%	41,4%	3,7%	42,9%
678 NW404: Maquassi Hills	B3	35,3%	8,1%	40,8%	6,4%	42,5%
7. Gauteng			4,8%	43,8%	4,6%	44,1%
742 DC42: Sedibeng	C1	71,4%	3,9%	42,5%	3,5%	42,9%
760 GT421: Emfuleni	B1	17,0%	3,4%	42,3%	3,2%	43,0%
761 GT422: Midvaal	B2	12,5%	6,5%	44,1%	5,1%	42,2%
762 GT423: Lesedi	B3	22,0%	4,8%	41,8%	3,8%	43,2%
748 DC48: West Rand	C1	79,3%	7,8%	44,3%	6,3%	44,7%
763 GT481: Mogale City	B1	14,0%	5,8%	43,8%	4,3%	44,2%
764 GT482: Randfontein	B2	17,6%	4,9%	43,3%	4,2%	42,4%
765 GT483: Westonaria	B2	25,9%	15,4%	45,0%	14,9%	46,7%
766 GT484: Merafong City	B2	38,3%	8,5%	44,5%	6,4%	43,6%
797 Eku: Ekurhuleni	A	20,5%	6,4%	44,5%	6,6%	44,7%
798 JHB: City of Johannesburg	A	21,2%	3,7%	43,3%	3,5%	44,1%
799 TSH: City of Tshwane	A	21,9%	4,2%	43,4%	4,1%	43,1%
8. Mpumalanga			7,9%	41,8%	7,8%	42,7%
830 DC30: Gert Sibande	C1	91,4%	8,4%	41,6%	7,2%	43,1%
860 MP301: Albert Luthuli	B4	75,1%	10,9%	41,3%	10,3%	41,8%
861 MP302: Msukaligwa	B2	31,7%	9,2%	41,4%	6,7%	45,0%
862 MP303: Mkhondo	B3	52,4%	15,8%	41,5%	11,9%	43,7%
863 MP304: Pixley Ka Seme	B3	40,3%	9,2%	41,8%	10,2%	41,8%
864 MP305: Lekwa	B3	28,0%	4,5%	41,5%	5,0%	42,8%
865 MP306: Dipaleseng	B3	46,2%	8,3%	42,3%	8,4%	45,3%
866 MP307: Govan Mbeki	B1	24,2%	4,5%	42,0%	3,9%	42,5%

Province/District/Local municipality	Municipal sub-category	2015 Grants and subsidies received as a % of Total income	Poverty			
			2011		2016	
			Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty	Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty
831 DC31: Nkangala	C1	88,5%	6,3%	42,6%	8,2%	43,5%
867 MP311: Victor Khanye	B3	23,8%	6,9%	43,1%	4,7%	41,2%
868 MP312: Emalahleni	B1	16,7%	8,0%	43,6%	10,9%	45,4%
869 MP313: Steve Tshwete	B1	12,8%	4,3%	42,0%	5,1%	41,7%
870 MP314: Emakhazeni	B2	26,1%	6,4%	41,3%	8,7%	43,1%
871 MP315: Thembisile	B4	67,4%	5,6%	42,2%	6,1%	42,4%
872 MP316: Dr JS Moroka	B4	76,2%	6,0%	41,1%	10,2%	41,0%
832 DC32: Ehlanzeni	C1	95,9%	8,9%	41,5%	7,8%	41,8%
873 MP321: Thaba Chweu	B3	29,8%	6,6%	40,9%	5,5%	42,3%
874 MP322: Mbombela	B1	38,8%	6,0%	42,0%	5,9%	42,1%
875 MP323: Umjindi	B3	39,7%	9,1%	42,3%	8,5%	43,0%
876 MP324: Nkomazi	B4	69,9%	10,4%	41,7%	9,3%	41,1%
877 MP325: Bushbuckridge	B4	79,8%	11,8%	41,0%	9,7%	41,8%
9. Limpopo			10,1%	41,6%	11,5%	42,3%
933 DC33: Mopani	C2	78,8%	11,3%	41,5%	13,1%	42,1%
960 LIM331: Greater Giyani	B4	71,9%	17,4%	41,5%	17,4%	43,2%
961 LIM332: Greater Letaba	B4	81,9%	22,2%	42,2%	17,7%	43,0%
962 LIM333: Greater Tzaneen	B4	38,5%	21,4%	41,3%	17,9%	45,0%
963 LIM334: Ba-Phalaborwa	B3	36,6%	24,2%	41,2%	17,9%	44,2%
964 LIM335: Maruleng	B4	71,9%	18,2%	41,8%	18,3%	42,7%
934 DC34: Vhembe	C2	88,7%	13,0%	41,5%	12,8%	42,4%
965 LIM342: Mutale	B4	88,4%	22,4%	41,6%	18,7%	44,0%
966 LIM343: Thulamela	B4	66,2%	22,8%	41,2%	18,9%	43,0%
967 LIM341: Musina	B3	25,9%	24,7%	41,1%	19,1%	44,8%
968 LIM344: Makhado	B4	57,4%	25,4%	40,6%	19,8%	44,8%
935 DC35: Capricorn	C2	91,1%	7,2%	41,6%	8,5%	41,8%
969 LIM351: Blouberg	B4	80,8%	20,7%	41,7%	20,3%	43,2%
970 LIM352: Aganang	B4	86,8%	21,2%	41,1%	20,9%	44,2%
973 LIM353: Molemole	B4	79,4%	21,4%	41,7%	21,2%	42,6%
974 LIM354: Polokwane	B1	43,6%	20,1%	42,2%	21,3%	42,2%
976 LIM355: Lepele-Nkumpi	B4	67,8%	14,6%	41,4%	21,7%	40,5%
936 DC36: Waterberg	C1	91,4%	6,5%	41,6%	9,0%	42,7%
977 LIM361: Thabazimbi	B3	31,3%	25,6%	41,0%	22,0%	44,1%
978 LIM362: Lephalale	B3	26,3%	27,3%	42,4%	22,3%	43,5%
979 LIM364: Mookgopong	B3	44,7%	17,2%	41,4%	22,6%	42,5%
980 LIM365: Modimolle	B3	36,8%	29,5%	42,7%	22,7%	45,9%
981 LIM366: Bela-Bela	B3	29,0%	25,0%	41,9%	22,8%	44,4%
982 LIM367: Mogalakwena	B2	55,8%	33,6%	41,9%	23,3%	45,6%
947 DC47: Greater Sekhukhune	C2	87,1%	11,3%	41,6%	13,6%	42,4%
983 LIM471: Ephraim Mogale	B4	55,9%	27,4%	41,4%	23,3%	45,0%
984 LIM472: Elias Motsoaledi	B4	66,0%	28,2%	42,2%	23,4%	44,5%

Province/District/Local municipality	Municipal sub-category	2015 Grants and subsidies received as a % of Total income	Poverty			
			2011		2016	
			Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty	Poverty headcount	Intensity of poverty
985 LIM473: Makhuduthamaga	B4	79,3%	25,3%	42,2%	24,2%	43,8%
986 LIM474: Fetakgomo	B4	80,5%	37,2%	43,1%	24,5%	44,1%
987 LIM475: Greater Tubatse	B4	65,0%	22,9%	41,1%	27,7%	43,2%

1.4 Overview of sections


This section provides an overview of important enumeration processes and objectives of the report. Section 2 provides census time series versus CS 2016 population structure by province and population group. Lifetime and internal migration are provided in Section 3. Findings of general health and functioning are highlighted in Section 4. Education attendance and attainment is provided in Section 5. Descriptive tables for analysis of fertility, emigration and mortality are provided in Section 6. Lastly, household indicators are provided in Section 7.

SECTION 2: POPULATION STRUCTURE

2.1 Comparison of CS 2016 population with Census 2011


A question on date of birth followed by completed age was asked of all members who were present in the sampled dwelling unit on the night of 6th to 7th March 2016 was asked of all household members during CS 2016 data collection. Age is expressed as the number of years lived by an individual; the person’s age at their last birthday. Responses for this questionnaire enable analysis of the population structure by age. Results of responses provided the total population by age as compared to that of Census 2011 presented in Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1: Comparison of population age structure between Census 2011 and CS 2016



On one hand, Census 2011 reflected a somewhat fluctuating dip in the age structure for persons aged around 7 to 17 years old. At face value, this may be interpreted as the impact of missed school children since there may be no explanation for it. On the other hand, Community Survey 2016 reflects a slight shift in ages of missed children during Census 2011 from around 11 to 19 years old. This finding suggests that part of the CS 2016 missed ages constitute the cohort missed during enumeration of Census 2011. There is a need therefore, for further investigation of the aforementioned age scenarios as presented in Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2.

Figure 2.2: Population structure of South Africa Census 2011 (shaded) and South Africa CS 2016



Population age groups are at different development levels socio-economically, suggesting diversity in mortality patterns and morbidity experiences.

2.2 Comparison of CS 2016 population by province with previous censuses

In the case of South Africa, the importance of provinces lies with spatial and level of economic development variations. Each of the nine provinces has its own Legislature and Premier. These provinces, with their distinctive landscapes, vegetation and climate are the Western Cape, Eastern Cape, Northern Cape, Free State, KwaZulu-Natal, North West, Gauteng, Mpumalanga and Limpopo.

Table 2.1: Population distribution by province, Census 2011 and Community Survey 2016

Age group	Western Cape		Eastern Cape		Northern Cape		Free State		KwaZulu-Natal	
	2011	2016	2011	2016	2011	2016	2011	2016	2011	2016
0-4	564 800	570 371	767 216	815 885	121 918	117 663	295 896	273 329	1 198 134	1 343 532
5-9	460 161	546 410	715 992	848 302	114 007	107 674	262 522	269 094	1 042 528	1 291 700
10-14	438 843	517 934	684 282	795 212	109 448	106 210	240 497	254 841	1 038 857	1 213 716
15-19	480 122	495 982	740 514	789 607	107 676	117 027	262 898	270 247	1 119 535	1 079 257
20-24	583 551	566 934	608 372	699 765	104 631	111 377	282 479	275 982	1 102 388	1 071 893
25-29	592 548	556 794	490 306	623 584	100 373	108 958	251 668	276 708	980 929	1 044 784
30-34	481 600	511 330	388 587	511 477	85 996	97 842	205 740	236 010	729 230	853 251
35-39	436 638	484 911	359 404	322 991	75 222	83 020	178 980	191 327	612 615	665 736
40-44	395 037	455 016	327 336	291 894	68 424	71 691	161 378	160 489	499 102	538 152
45-49	347 866	385 833	308 608	265 189	61 819	61 764	146 990	146 283	454 637	446 144
50-54	292 685	324 282	290 805	237 945	53 979	52 373	125 330	126 884	384 397	383 581
55-59	228 098	269 666	242 405	231 679	43 976	44 161	102 422	107 880	325 571	327 522
60-64	178 558	205 197	196 630	190 884	33 622	35 261	78 033	87 282	271 326	278 361
65-69	125 210	155 009	140 470	141 317	23 792	30 803	54 101	64 549	175 673	220 261
70-74	93 193	105 273	125 950	100 433	17 243	22 086	40 084	45 800	137 821	144 852
75-79	59 940	73 023	81 236	65 306	11 474	13 102	27 459	24 261	86 378	84 492
80-84	36 435	34 391	53 727	34 792	6 487	7 597	15 755	14 286	62 126	41 355
85+	27 448	21 373	40 211	30 715	5 774	5 171	13 357	9 461	46 054	36 650
Total	5 822 734	6 279 730	6 562 053	6 996 976	1 145 861	1 193 780	2 745 590	2 834 714	10 267 300	11 065 240

Table 2.1: Population distribution by province, Census 2011 and Community Survey 2016 (continued)

Age group	North West		Gauteng		Mpumalanga		Limpopo		Total	
	2011	2016	2011	2016	2011	2016	2011	2016	2011	2016
0-4	404 347	407 509	1 191 418	1 242 040	461 559	491 791	680 163	714 399	5 685 452	5 976 519
5-9	332 303	373 184	905 501	1 094 379	402 772	446 983	583 964	642 069	4 819 751	5 619 796
10-14	303 713	335 658	812 012	979 790	396 348	415 968	570 885	570 474	4 594 886	5 189 803
15-19	316 532	347 520	924 588	912 157	424 278	421 880	627 334	670 804	5 003 477	5 104 482
20-24	343 391	348 714	1 374 623	1 192 598	427 541	434 020	547 565	601 052	5 374 542	5 302 335
25-29	327 662	352 737	1 480 847	1 325 151	393 096	451 165	441 889	540 623	5 059 317	5 280 504
30-34	271 683	300 579	1 224 772	1 153 243	297 563	357 593	343 839	433 362	4 029 010	4 454 688
35-39	236 739	256 732	1 012 021	1 244 171	255 908	284 528	300 239	314 544	3 467 767	3 847 961
40-44	204 926	220 117	819 854	1 020 566	216 839	234 845	255 723	267 815	2 948 618	3 260 584
45-49	187 119	195 485	683 092	843 470	193 839	201 311	236 314	237 451	2 620 283	2 782 930
50-54	160 567	165 037	562 852	673 927	156 680	167 972	190 994	202 509	2 218 289	2 334 509
55-59	128 578	144 338	438 401	551 166	129 362	132 456	158 595	165 328	1 797 408	1 974 196
60-64	94 537	111 108	309 674	414 857	94 442	107 683	128 946	142 285	1 385 768	1 572 917
65-69	71 692	74 294	201 628	319 548	64 216	73 782	101 022	99 723	957 805	1 179 287
70-74	51 710	55 498	142 909	217 667	51 763	52 192	87 658	80 932	748 331	824 733
75-79	34 216	29 087	89 355	117 528	31 215	29 405	59 993	50 133	481 267	486 337
80-84	21 483	17 100	55 460	56 355	23 550	16 000	47 895	29 130	322 916	251 007
85+	18 754	13 738	43 255	41 113	18 970	16 388	41 848	36 456	255 673	211 064
Total	3 509 953	3 748 435	12 272 263	13 399 724	4 039 939	4 335 964	5 404 868	5 799 090	51 770 560	55 653 654

2.3 Comparison of population between Census 2011 and CS 2016 by population group


The classification of population by population group is useful as a means of stratifying the population given the country's history has been accepted as the best measure of previous socio economic deprivation. There are four distinct black African, coloured, Indian/Asian and white population groups in South Africa. This report retains the classification by population group where applicable.

Comparison of population structure by population group is presented in Table 2.2 and Figure 2.3. Noticeable is substantial growth of above 1,5 million for both black Africans and Asians. The white population group reflects a slightly negative growth during the same period.

Table 2.2: Comparison of population by age and population group between 2011 and 2016

Age group	Census 2011						CS 2016					
	Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	Other	Total	Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	Total	
0-4	4 830 442	470 090	90 795	268 267	25 857	5 685 452	5 198 715	425 736	99 033	253 035	5 976 519	
5-9	4 054 019	421 038	82 584	245 567	16 543	4 819 751	4 830 123	429 693	97 642	262 337	5 619 796	
10-14	3 817 863	420 683	85 223	257 353	13 764	4 594 886	4 394 841	432 046	94 389	268 527	5 189 803	
15-19	4 171 450	431 263	98 556	284 896	17 312	5 003 477	4 280 505	435 718	97 503	290 756	5 104 482	
20-24	4 479 848	428 159	115 949	313 616	36 970	5 374 542	4 461 738	429 435	107 905	303 257	5 302 335	
25-29	4 156 759	395 750	125 521	336 355	44 932	5 059 317	4 480 050	394 900	117 762	287 792	5 280 504	
30-34	3 237 677	326 803	113 398	318 329	32 802	4 029 010	3 684 311	365 969	124 933	279 475	4 454 688	
35-39	2 674 154	319 231	108 120	342 316	23 945	3 467 767	3 076 199	373 672	119 302	278 789	3 847 961	
40-44	2 164 738	319 279	95 904	351 473	17 225	2 948 618	2 501 203	371 467	104 947	282 967	3 260 584	
45-49	1 902 133	294 467	85 621	325 185	12 877	2 620 283	2 047 049	314 268	93 272	328 341	2 782 930	
50-54	1 559 926	247 535	75 783	324 539	10 506	2 218 289	1 651 800	269 044	82 138	331 527	2 334 509	
55-59	1 242 201	186 148	65 332	295 596	8 132	1 797 408	1 359 060	216 131	70 394	328 611	1 974 196	
60-64	913 441	137 050	55 194	273 657	6 425	1 385 768	1 064 664	158 159	58 907	291 188	1 572 917	
65-69	601 060	86 285	38 277	227 308	4 875	957 805	758 139	109 354	45 604	266 190	1 179 287	
70-74	485 852	60 311	25 084	173 434	3 649	748 331	522 978	67 901	30 093	203 762	824 733	
75-79	310 708	37 441	13 954	116 922	2 242	481 267	277 528	42 013	19 407	147 389	486 337	
80-84	218 145	19 278	7 155	77 073	1 265	322 916	152 206	20 150	7 851	70 800	251 007	
85+	180 520	14 591	4 479	54 949	1 133	255 673	150 495	13 871	4 750	41 949	211 064	
Total	41 000 938	4 615 401	1 286 930	4 586 838	280 454	51 770 560	44 891 603	4 869 526	1 375 834	4 516 691	55 653 654	

Figure 2.3: Comparison of population by age and population group between 2011 and 2016



2.4 Conclusion

The population of South Africa increased from 40,6 million in 1996 to 51,7 million in 2011 and 55,6 million in 2016. Age-sex distribution indicates a youthful population, with the highest proportion of both the male and female population in the 0–4 and 5–9 year age groups. Analysis by age groups show the largest increase in population amongst those aged 5–9 years (from 4,8 million in 2011 to 5,6 million in 2016). Gauteng remained the most populous province in the country with a population of 13,4 million (24,1%). Population group distribution across provinces remained relatively constant from 2011, with Black Africans accounting for over four-fifths of the population in all provinces, with the exception of Western Cape and Northern Cape. The sex ratio has remained relatively stable (95 in 2011 and 95 in 2016).

SECTION 3: LIFETIME IMMIGRATION AND INTERNAL MIGRATION

3.1 Introduction

Migration can be defined as a change in a person's permanent or usual place of residence. Along with fertility and mortality, migration is one of the components of population change. Information on previous province and province of enumeration refers to migration between the Census 2011 and Community Survey 2016. Lifetime migration looks at movements based on where the person was born and where they were enumerated. This section provides information on internal migration as well as immigration.

Research has anecdotally reported more immigration numbers relative to emigration ones in the case of South Africa. This scenario has been observed since the onset of democracy where neighbouring African countries are accepted into the country relative to before liberation. Although accepted, uncontrolled influx comes at a high cost for the poor masses expecting improved standards of living from the present government. It is important to note that the migration flows and patterns in this section of the report need further investigation as they do not conform to expected outcomes. Fewer numbers of immigrants in CS 2016 data may highlight instilled fear of disclosure of one's origin. The question 'in which province was a person born' was asked with about 11 response categories, nine of whom represented the provinces and the 'born outside' referring to foreign-born nationals. Allowance was provided to those who responded that they did not know. A comparison of number of persons who reported that they were born outside South Africa between Census 2011 and CS 2016 is presented in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2.

The results presented in Table 3.1 show that the number of foreign-born persons declined from about 2,2 million (4,2%) in Census 2011 to 1,6 million (2,8%) in CS 2016. There is a need therefore, for further investigation in enumerator capability to solicit plausible response in the light of the sensitivity of the question.

Table 3.1: Distribution of persons born outside South Africa by age and sex

Age group	Census 2011			CS 2016		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
0-4	39 724	38 707	78 432	19 154	18 708	37 863
5-9	29 054	28 852	57 906	18 968	19 512	38 479
10-14	24 888	23 911	48 799	18 687	21 213	39 900
15-19	51 090	42 041	93 130	29 972	29 495	59 467
20-24	182 258	126 915	309 172	82 205	75 919	158 123
25-29	260 124	160 588	420 712	144 442	107 459	251 900
30-34	212 943	114 879	327 822	147 201	99 531	246 732
35-39	150 729	78 436	229 165	141 582	77 844	219 426
40-44	98 860	55 523	154 383	97 071	49 741	146 812
45-49	68 062	44 592	112 655	65 110	34 240	99 350
50-54	52 088	37 775	89 863	44 155	26 722	70 877
55-59	38 785	29 850	68 634	32 314	24 222	56 535
60-64	32 242	27 304	59 546	23 269	18 035	41 305
65-69	25 769	22 342	48 111	21 163	17 977	39 140
70-74	19 586	17 311	36 898	15 597	16 566	32 163
75+	25 078	28 566	53 643	17 151	23 318	40 469
Total	1 311 280	877 592	*2 188 872	918 040	660 501	*1 578 541

*Total numbers of persons who reported that they were born outside South Africa includes those who did not respond on year moved into South Africa.

Looking at year of arrival of foreign-born persons to South Africa presented in Table 3.2, there seem to be discrepancies between Census 2011 and CS 2016. While issues of sampling and non-sampling errors may not be ignored in the case of CS 2016, other factors may be at play.

Table 3.2: A comparison of number of persons who reported that they were born outside South Africa

Year moved to SA	Census 2011	Community Survey 2016
1996	30 336	22 232
1997	27 375	14 612
1998	35 731	24 170
1999	41 381	33 271
2000	66 485	56 599
2001	45 459	25 183
2002	43 396	28 119
2003	54 109	30 391
2004	65 283	37 303
2005	85 482	51 383
2006	107 881	63 908
2007	139 195	66 591
2008	173 091	91 524
2009	183 435	87 579
2010	189 125	112 438
2011	236 316	61 029
2012	n/a	66 509
2013	n/a	83 058
2014	n/a	77 891
2015	n/a	121 161
2016	n/a	56 875
Total	1 524 080	*1 211 824

*Total number of persons who reported that they were born outside South Africa excludes those who did not respond to year moved into South Africa

3.1.1 Country of birth

For persons born outside South Africa, Table 3.3 indicates the distribution of the top twenty sending countries. In both Census 2011 and CS 2016, Zimbabwe reported the highest number of foreign-born nationals. Mozambique, Lesotho, Malawi and United Kingdom/ Great Britain were consistently part of the top five countries for Census 2011 and CS 2016.

Table 3.3: Distribution of top 20 sending countries, 2011 and 2016

2011			2016		
Sending country	N	%	Sending country	N	%
Zimbabwe	672 308	38,1	Zimbabwe	574 047	39,6
Mozambique	393 231	22,3	Mozambique	293 405	20,2
Lesotho	160 806	9,1	Lesotho	160 749	11,1
Malawi	86 606	4,9	Malawi	78 796	5,4
United Kingdom/Great Britain	81 720	4,6	United Kingdom	56 412	3,9
Namibia	40 575	2,3	Swaziland	38 038	2,6
Swaziland	36 377	2,1	Congo Democratic Republic of	31 504	2,2
India	31 165	1,8	Namibia	30 701	2,1
Zambia	30 054	1,7	Nigeria	30 314	2,1
Ethiopia	28 230	1,6	India	25 063	1,7
Nigeria	26 341	1,5	Ethiopia	22 148	1,5
Somalia	26 116	1,5	Zambia	19 119	1,3
Congo	26 061	1,5	Germany	13 894	1,0
Democratic Republic Of The Congo (Zaire)	25 630	1,5	Bangladesh	12 764	0,9
Germany	20 494	1,2	Pakistan	11 157	0,8
Bangladesh	19 696	1,1	Somalia	10 954	0,8
Pakistan	17 241	1,0	Botswana	10 759	0,7
Portugal	15 626	0,9	Congo	10 686	0,7
China	15 071	0,9	Portugal	9 931	0,7
Botswana	12 316	0,7	Ghana	8 943	0,6

3.2 Internal migration

South Africa shows circulatory internal mobility patterns in line with the stage of the demographic transition. This phenomenon may also involve neighbouring African nationals who settle for seasonal work in the country and return back to their countries of origin when such work is no longer available or is completed. International persons are also involved in circulatory migration. Yet another noticeable internal migration trend involves younger job seekers for whom job markets have recently diminished. Upon asking whether ‘in which province did the person live before moving to this place’, a question on the main reason for leaving previous municipality was also asked in CS 2016.

Overall, there are persons who reported that they left their previous residential municipalities for others.

Looking at province of birth by province of enumeration, the tables below show that Gauteng and Western Cape have the highest number of persons who move into these two provinces as shown by the high net migration.

Table 3.4: Distribution of province of birth by province of enumeration, Census 2011

Province of birth	Province of enumeration											
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	In-migration	Out-migration	Net-migration
WC	4 027 923	104 829	27 156	19 488	32 616	15 120	185 930	16 844	20 067	1 568 642	422 050	1 146 592
EC	893 529	5 979 009	22 056	67 545	281 416	93 238	534 385	62 590	21 043	383 004	1 975 802	-1 592 798
NC	85 014	23 193	952 717	27 697	58 108	46 682	92 266	26 218	6 309	164 658	365 487	-200 829
FS	47 167	23 612	20 894	2 314 555	37 550	96 067	381 840	47 428	18 638	336 555	673 196	-336 641
KZN	61 649	44 984	8 427	27 294	9 147 419	34 461	702 518	105 416	13 057	788 935	997 806	-208 871
NW	17 624	7 156	42 045	26 543	22 399	2 678 922	418 353	31 845	30 401	739 918	596 366	143 552
GP	166 734	82 701	17 317	71 272	123 606	163 615	6 673 980	181 307	128 105	5 246 861	934 657	4 312 204
MP	23 251	14 608	3 918	12 220	43 946	41 551	510 177	3 155 868	77 851	789 621	727 522	62 099
LP	15 201	7 033	3 302	16 280	20 951	97 368	1 288 883	166 072	4 802 602	478 654	1 615 090	-1 136 436
Outside SA	258 473	74 888	19 543	68 216	168 343	151 816	1 132 509	151 901	163 183			

Table 3.5: Distribution of province of birth by province of enumeration, CS 2016

Province of birth	Province of enumeration											
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	In-migration	Out-migration	Net-migration
WC	4 667 202	101 400	30 379	13 304	16 725	8 872	104 752	9 474	4 034	1 593 553	288 939	1 304 614
EC	1 022 178	6 674 799	15 269	54 870	175 617	87 652	505 357	38 206	14 887	320 619	1 914 036	-1 593 417
NC	76 246	9 611	1 044 027	23 386	7 292	38 393	69 820	7 022	3 756	149 394	235 525	-86 130
FS	44 786	19 259	21 845	2 555 765	31 798	88 371	366 840	37 855	11 753	275 149	622 507	-347 358
KZN	55 921	45 089	3 563	23 326	10 607 748	22 634	703 901	76 518	8 812	450 078	939 765	-489 686
NW	17 208	5 893	36 376	21 711	9 382	3 045 169	402 127	20 695	27 508	700 035	540 900	159 135
GP	157 049	72 921	19 176	64 953	97 648	198 966	8 648 974	169 172	105 994	4 732 032	885 878	3 846 154
MP	14 984	5 954	2 627	11 602	20 796	38 208	495 574	3 702 290	78 596	630 074	668 341	-38 267
LP	12 163	3 270	3 406	8 334	6 474	94 656	1 282 351	155 000	5 401 752	389 151	1 565 654	-1 176 503
Outside SA	193 020	57 222	16 754	53 665	84 346	122 284	801 308	116 132	133 811			

3.3 Previous residential municipality and the main reason for leaving

To better understand the reasons for inter-provincial migration, persons who had moved since October 2011 were asked for their reasons for moving into their current place. The majority of persons moved because the household had to move into a new dwelling, followed by those who moved to be closer to their loved ones.

Table 3.6: Main reason for moving to the current place by MIIF¹ code

Main reason for moving to the current place	A	B1	B2	B3	B4	Total
Divorce/Separation	37 226	8 487	3 939	5 508	4 828	59 988
Education	201 295	69 575	38 816	45 251	74 235	429 172
For better municipal services	53 793	9 734	6 170	8 938	5 604	84 240
Health	15 613	7 033	4 303	7 779	9 303	44 030
High levels of crime	26 057	5 554	2 874	3 709	1 760	39 955
Job loss/retrenchment/contract ended	23 113	9 091	5 529	12 349	16 551	66 632
Job transfer/take up new job opportunity	158 846	66 654	36 529	67 460	35 459	364 948
Look for paid work	215 317	73 283	36 530	58 461	40 551	424 141
Moving as a household with a household member	152 401	52 815	32 665	50 895	39 038	327 814
Moving to live with or be closer to relatives/friends	299 876	102 857	56 608	98 351	108 845	666 537
New dwelling for household	546 540	159 341	81 039	102 732	62 377	952 029
Other business reasons	18 459	4 672	3 426	5 016	3 365	34 937
Political instability/religious conflict/persecution	5 091	1 490	1 069	1 390	1 944	10 983
Retirement	13 790	3 491	6 586	6 054	2 326	32 247
Start a business	8 382	3 572	1 758	3 846	3 144	20 702
Other	101 715	31 534	16 050	26 504	20 101	195 904
Total	1 877 514	609 183	333 892	504 241	429 429	3 754 260

3.4 Conclusion

The total number of persons reported to have been born outside the country has decreased from 1,5 million in Census 2011 to 1,2 million in CS 2016. This decrease may be due to underreporting from respondents or enumerator training deficiencies. Proportionally, Gauteng received most migrants, followed by the Western Cape. Eastern Cape and Limpopo had the highest number of out-migrants. Information on the specific flow of internal migrants between the provinces shows that Gauteng received the largest proportions of migrants from all provinces, except for those born in the Northern Cape, Eastern Cape and Western Cape. The highest proportion of those that migrated from the Eastern Cape and Northern Cape went to Western Cape. The highest proportion of those who migrated from the Western Cape left to the Eastern Cape, a change from 2011, where the highest proportion had moved to Gauteng. The largest proportions of those born outside of South Africa could be found in Gauteng and Western Cape. Moving into a new dwelling or moving to be closer to friends and family was cited as the main reason to have moved.

¹ Municipal Infrastructure Investment Framework

SECTION 4: GENERAL HEALTH AND FUNCTIONING AND PARENTAL SURVIVAL

4.1 Introduction

The South African National Development Plan (NDP, 2030) outlines the roadmap towards disability strategies and interventions aimed at improving the lives of persons with disabilities. In addition to this long term strategic roadmap, the government's approach to the Post 2015 Development Agenda stresses the relevance and importance of disability statistics and data management for advocacy and monitoring purposes. Among the critical disability indicators required to implement disability related programmes is disability prevalence, characteristics of persons with disabilities and the geo-spatial distribution.

Statistics South Africa, the official statistics provider is thus mandated to include questions on disability in household based surveys and Censuses for the purposes of generating some indicators that provide insights on the extent to which social economic needs of persons with disabilities have been met. Based on the recommended Washington Group (WG) questions, six (6) dimensions of disability (described as difficulty in seeing, hearing, walking, remembering and concentrating, self-care, and communicating) have been used since 2009. Although the WG questions focus on the level of difficulty experienced in each of the six functional domains, Stats SA further computes indicator of disability index, a UN recommended indicator on disability prevalence.

This section highlights some of the Community Survey 2016 disability indicators and how they compare with Census 2011 data point. In addition to the generated disability indicators, some access related indicators were also generated based on the question on assistive devices. Analysis on disability is based on population aged 5 years and older. In 2016, the question on disability asked "Does '*name*' have difficulty with seeing/hearing/communicating in his/her language/walking a kilometre/remembering or concentrating and self-care such as washing, dressing or feeding himself/ herself?" Disability status was computed from the reported six functional domains (seeing, hearing, communication, walking/climbing, remembering or concentrating, and self-care). Persons who indicated that they had some difficulty in two or more of the functional domains, had a lot of difficulty or were unable to perform any one functional domain at all, were computed as persons with disabilities.

4.1 Comparison of persons with disabilities between Census 2011 and CS 2016

Table 4.1: Disability type and degree of difficulty in functioning, Census 2011 and Community Survey 2016


Disability type	Degree of difficulty	Census 2011		CS 2016	
		N	%	N	%
Seeing	No difficulty	39 064 837	89,0	44 515 133	89,7
	Some difficulty	4 085 901	9,3	4 214 162	8,5
	A lot of difficulty	660 874	1,5	827 550	1,7
	Cannot do at all	77 205	0,2	69 603	0,1
	Do not know	23 372	0,1	17 485	0,0
	Total	43 912 188	100,0	49 643 933	100,0
Hearing	No difficulty	42 257 810	96,4	47 740 157	96,2
	Some difficulty	1 251 909	2,9	1 515 214	3,1
	A lot of difficulty	229 919	0,5	307 786	0,6
	Cannot do at all	58 451	0,1	62 653	0,1
	Do not know	20 791	0,0	17 781	0,0
	Total	43 818 881	100,0	49 643 590	100,0
Communication	No difficulty	43 014 947	98,4	48 726 836	98,2
	Some difficulty	473 453	1,1	650 214	1,3
	A lot of difficulty	115 700	0,3	164 303	0,3
	Cannot do at all	75 583	0,2	87 165	0,2
	Do not know	21 864	0,1	13 401	0,0
	Total	43 701 548	100,0	49 641 921	100,0
Walking or climbing stairs	No difficulty	42 318 506	96,5	46 949 307	94,6
	Some difficulty	1 100 136	2,5	1 774 060	3,6
	A lot of difficulty	317 216	0,7	727 528	1,5
	Cannot do at all	105 964	0,2	172 647	0,3
	Do not know	16 340	0,0	19 057	0,0
	Total	43 858 161	100,0	49 642 600	100,0
Remembering	No difficulty	41 866 602	95,7	47 480 688	95,6
	Some difficulty	1 405 102	3,2	1 632 356	3,3
	A lot of difficulty	365 019	0,8	442 065	0,9
	Cannot do at all	91 163	0,2	61 519	0,1
	Do not know	35 694	0,1	24 853	0,1
	Total	43 763 580	100,0	49 641 481	100,0
Self-Care	No difficulty	41 204 360	96,5	48 275 530	97,2
	Some difficulty	837 368	2,0	932 437	1,9
	A lot of difficulty	266 762	0,6	280 251	0,6
	Cannot do at all	322 104	0,8	142 114	0,3
	Do not know	63 164	0,1	12 302	0,0
	Total	42 693 758	100,0	49 642 635	100,0

The results in Table 4.1 show that over the period 2011–2016, the profile of persons with no difficulty, some difficulty and a lot of difficulty in the six functional domains almost remained unchanged. Of the six functional domains, results show that about 10% of persons experienced some degree of difficulty seeing.

4.2 Disability prevalence by province

The national disability prevalence increased slightly from 7,5% in Census 2011 to 7,7% in Community Survey 2016. The provincial variations show that Free State and Northern Cape provinces had the highest prevalence of persons with disabilities (11%), followed by North West and KwaZulu-Natal (8,7% and 8,6% respectively). Western Cape recorded the lowest percentage of persons with disabilities (6,3%).


Figure 4.1: Disability prevalence by province, Census 2011 and Community Survey 2016



4.3 Disability prevalence by age

Community Survey results show a pattern similar to that of Census 2011, depicting disability prevalence at older ages. The results show slight decrease in children with disabilities 5–9-year-old age group. The results may be attributed to improved reporting on children.


Figure 4.2: Disability prevalence by age



4.4 Disability prevalence by sex

Disability is more prevalent among females (8,9%) compared to males (6,5%) and the pattern has remained similar for both Census 2011 and CS 2016.


Figure 4.3: Disability prevalence by sex



4.5 Disability prevalence by population group

Figure 4.4 shows noticeable differences in disability prevalence across the four population groups. Trends show that there has been increase in persons with disabilities among whites, Indians/Asians and coloured people. In Community Survey 2016, disability was more prevalent among the white population group (9,2%) and Indian/Asian population (8,4%).

Figure 4.4: Disability by population group



4.6 Assistive devices

Successful policy development and their implementation towards promotion of accessibility for persons with disabilities hinges on availability of statistics on assistive device usage. The National Health Rehabilitation Policy implementation in particular requires statistics on access to assistive devices. Provision of assistive devices is an integral part of the national health-care system. Lack of access to assistive devices translates into social and economic isolation, leading to limited participation in community life and advancement in other spheres of life. Since the inception of democracy in South Africa, a number of policies and programmes have been put in place to mitigate barriers that limit participation and inclusion of persons with disabilities.

The results in Table 4.2 showed that generally, there has been a decrease in proportions of persons using eye glasses, hearing aids, walking sticks/frames and wheelchairs. The profile of persons using eye glasses showed a five percentage point decrease over the period 2011 and 2016. Among those using hearing aid, the proportions more than halved.

Table 4.2: Assistive device usage, Census 2011 and Community Survey 2016


Assistive devices	Usage	Census 2011		CS 2016	
		N	%	N	%
Eye glasses	Yes	6 142 804	14,0	4 545 687	9,2
	No	37 606 365	85,8	45 071 167	90,8
	Do not know	98 223	0,2	25 221	0,1
	Total	43 847 391	100,0	49 642 074	100,0
Hearing Aid	Yes	1 243 275	2,8	282 034	0,6
	No	42 382 644	96,9	49 328 246	99,4
	Do not know	105 159	0,2	30 004	0,1
	Total	43 731 078	100,0	49 640 284	100,0
Walking stick	Yes	1 397 314	3,2	697 444	1,4
	No	42 261 918	96,6	48 916 029	98,5
	Do not know	76 301	0,2	26 969	0,1
	Total	43 735 532	100,0	49 640 443	100,0
Wheelchair	Yes	1 012 706	2,3	184 631	0,4
	No	42 574 017	97,5	49 430 137	99,6
	Do not know	84 159	0,2	26 657	0,1
	Total	43 670 882	100,0	49 641 425	100,0

The downward trend in usage of assistive devices shown in the above table needs to be interpreted with caution. The observed trend may be as a result of sampling-related issues given the fact that disability is a rare event and closely linked to this is use of assistive devices. It is acknowledged that in surveys, rare events such as disability, mortality, are affected by sample size and as a result, very few individuals are usually identified, leading to measurement issues.

4.7 Parental survival status

Orphanhood Estimates have become critical with the advent of HIV/AIDS which has resulted in the number of children that are orphaned especially in Southern Africa. The estimates provide an indication of the number of children who are vulnerable and has significant policy implications. Although the question on parental survival was asked of everybody; the focus of this section is on children aged 0–17 who reported to have lost one or both biological parents.

Figure 4.5: Orphan type, Census 1996, 2001, 2001 and Community Survey 2016



4.8 Conclusion

The national disability prevalence increased slightly from 7,5% in 2011 to 7,7% in 2016. Provincial variations show that Free State and Northern Cape had the highest prevalence of persons with disabilities. There has been an increase in persons with disabilities among the white, Indian/Asian and coloured population.

The number of children aged 17 years and younger who reported that they had lost one or both parents declined from 3,4 million in 2011 to 2,4 million in 2016, possibly from misreporting of parental survival status by children. Paternal orphanhood is consistently higher than maternal orphanhood.

SECTION 5: EDUCATION

5.1 Introduction

The major overhaul of the educational sector that took place between 1994 and 2016 has transformed the sector. Government commitment to the sector is demonstrated not only by the numerous pro-equity and pro-poor educational and other policies, but also by the substantial amount of resources that are made available to transform and maintain the sector. One of the primary outcomes of these interventions has been that access to education has increased significantly.

The primary process to evaluate the success of these policies is by examining education data specifically in regard to school attendance and educational attainment trends. This section focuses on trends in educational attainment and attendance between 1996 and 2016 by comparing population groups, age and sex. The report also highlights regional variations on attendance and attainment as well as enrolment by types of institutions.

5.2 Attendance

The number of persons attending an educational institution has increased over time for persons 5 years and older. There are more females attending educational institutions than males. A comparison of number of persons attending an educational institution between males and females over time is presented in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Population distribution of persons aged 5 years and older attending at an educational institution by sex

		Male	Female	Total
Census 1996	Attending	6 287 031	6 554 440	12 841 471
	Not Attending	9 931 337	11 383 638	21 314 975
	Total	16 218 368	17 938 079	34 156 447
Census 2001	Attending	7 228 100	7 286 653	14 514 754
	Not Attending	11 982 209	13 872 999	25 855 209
	Total	19 210 310	21 159 653	40 369 962
Census 2011	Attending	7 678 772	7 675 732	15 354 504
	Not Attending	13 202 450	14 604 735	27 807 185
	Total	20 881 221	22 280 467	43 161 688
CS 2016	Attending	8 589 596	8 684 415	17 274 011
	Not Attending	15 598 977	16 723 903	32 322 881
	Total	24 188 574	25 408 318	49 596 892

Note: CS 2016 total excludes Do not know (75,301) and unspecified (4,942), census 1996 total excludes unspecified (782,711); census 2011 total excludes unspecified (2,102,472) and do not know (29 166)

Table 5.2: Population distribution of persons aged 5 years and older attending at an educational institution

		Black African	Coloured	Indian or Asian	White
Census 1996	Attending	10 456 555	959 793	300 775	1 017 313
	Not attending	15 685 772	2 072 484	617 767	2 778 662
	Total	26 142 327	3 032 277	918 543	3 795 975
Census 2001	Attending	12 108 872	1 073 797	298 365	1 033 720
	Not attending	19 555 099	2 527 821	742 493	3 029 795
	Total	31 663 971	3 601 618	1 040 857	4 063 515
Census 2011	Attending	12 865 600	1 152 058	305 817	980 474
	Not attending	21 236 055	2 635 963	788 681	2 964 062
	Total	34 101 655	3 788 022	1 094 498	3 944 536
CS 2016	Attending	14 771 063	1 213 588	323 986	965 374
	Not attending	24 862 667	3 223 438	950 011	3 286 764
	Total	39 633 730	4 437 026	1 273 997	4 252 138

Across population groups there is an increase of persons attending at an educational institution from 1996 to 2016. The number of black Africans attending an educational institution increased from 10,5 million in 1996 to 14,8 million in 2016. The Indian/Asian population had the lowest increase from 300 775 in 1996 to 323 986 in 2016. The number of white persons attending an education institution decrease from 980 474 in 2011 to 965 374 in 2016.

Table 5.3: Distribution of population aged 5 and older by attendance at an educational institution, province and sex - Numbers and percentage

Province	Statistics	Attending			Not attending			Do not know			Total		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Western Cape	Number	764 217	781 954	1 546 172	2 036 636	2 115 683	4 152 319	5 014	4 006	9 020	2 805 868	2 901 642	5 707 511
	Percentage	49.4	50.6	100.0	49.0	51.0	100.0	55.6	44.4	100.0	49.2	50.8	100.0
Eastern Cape	Number	1 265 605	1 277 644	2 543 249	1 644 316	1 988 512	3 632 828	2 238	2 432	4 670	2 912 160	3 268 587	6 180 747
	Percentage	49.8	50.2	100.0	45.3	54.7	100.0	47.9	52.1	100.0	47.1	52.9	100.0
Northern Cape	Number	164 020	159 571	323 591	373 190	378 206	751 396	610	493	1 104	537 820	538 270	1 076 091
	Percentage	50.7	49.3	100.0	49.7	50.3	100.0	55.3	44.7	100.0	50.0	50.0	100.0
Free State	Number	426 691	432 655	859 346	815 268	884 190	1 699 458	1 218	1 184	2 402	1 243 176	1 318 030	2 561 206
	Percentage	49.7	50.3	100.0	48.0	52.0	100.0	50.7	49.3	100.0	48.5	51.5	100.0
KwaZulu-Natal	Number	1 955 956	1 993 904	3 949 860	2 665 682	3 098 915	5 764 597	3 681	3 245	6 926	4 625 319	5 096 064	9 721 383
	Percentage	49.5	50.5	100.0	46.2	53.8	100.0	53.1	46.9	100.0	47.6	52.4	100.0
North West	Number	548 571	545 546	1 094 117	1 154 046	1 089 281	2 243 327	1 980	1 368	3 348	1 704 598	1 636 195	3 340 793
	Percentage	50.1	49.9	100.0	51.4	48.6	100.0	59.1	40.9	100.0	51.0	49.0	100.0
Gauteng	Number	1 665 196	1 712 599	3 377 795	4 448 393	4 298 778	8 747 171	16 631	14 560	31 191	6 130 220	6 025 937	12 156 158
	Percentage	49.3	50.7	100.0	50.9	49.1	100.0	53.3	46.7	100.0	50.4	49.6	100.0
Mpumalanga	Number	694 361	691 106	1 385 467	1 193 231	1 256 101	2 449 332	4 385	4 692	9 077	1 891 977	1 951 899	3 843 876
	Percentage	50.1	49.9	100.0	48.7	51.3	100.0	48.3	51.7	100.0	49.2	50.8	100.0
Limpopo	Number	1 104 979	1 089 436	2 194 415	1 268 214	1 614 237	2 882 451	3 843	3 719	7 562	2 377 036	2 707 393	5 084 428
	Percentage	50.4	49.6	100.0	44.0	56.0	100.0	50.8	49.2	100.0	46.8	53.2	100.0
South Africa	Number	8 589 596	8 684 415	17 274 011	15 598 977	16 723 903	32 322 881	39 602	35 700	75 301	24 228 176	25 444 018	49 672 193
	Percentage	49.7	50.3	100.0	48.3	51.7	100.0	52.6	47.4	100.0	48.8	51.2	100.0

Source: Community Survey 2016

Table 5.3 displays the educational attendance patterns among individuals 5 years and older. Overall, over to 17 million individuals (35%) were attending an educational institution in 2016. The proportions of males and females that attend educational institutions are similar in all provinces as shown in Table 5.3 indicating an almost even level of participation among females and males. Furthermore, the table shows that females (51,7%) were more likely to not attend educational institutions than males (48,3%). Provincial statistics show that in Limpopo (56,0%), Eastern Cape (54,7%) and KwaZulu-Natal (53,8%) were the three provinces with the highest female non-attendance rates.

Table 5.4: Population distribution of persons aged 5 years and older attending at an educational institution by province

Census year	Attending status	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Census 1996	Attending	1 002 787	2 193 497	279 043	853 687	2 782 070	831 538	2 002 213	1 099 849	1 796 788	12 841 471
	Not Attending	2 333 647	2 992 916	569 634	1 419 317	4 405 280	1 481 839	4 623 768	1 527 392	1 961 182	21 314 975
	Total	3 336 434	5 186 413	848 677	2 273 004	7 187 351	2 313 376	6 625 981	2 627 241	3 757 970	34 156 447
Census 2001	Attending	1 184 013	2 381 313	282 721	876 331	3 288 119	878 806	2 416 263	1 188 616	2 018 571	14 514 754
	Not Attending	2 934 780	3 260 053	607 164	1 577 153	5 262 522	1 811 545	6 195 580	1 797 250	2 409 163	25 855 209
	Total	4 118 793	5 641 366	889 885	2 453 484	8 550 640	2 690 350	8 611 843	2 985 866	4 427 734	40 369 962
Census 2011	Attending	1 347 723	2 205 993	306 511	794 161	3 393 780	950 731	3 090 057	1 297 379	1 968 169	15 354 504
	Not Attending	3 413 145	3 276 433	663 059	1 525 012	5 067 940	1 999 045	7 168 946	2 115 741	2 577 864	27 807 185
	Total	4 760 868	5 482 426	969 570	2 319 173	8 461 719	2 949 776	10 259 003	3 413 120	4 546 033	43 161 688
CS 2016	Attending	1 546 172	2 543 249	323 591	859 346	3 949 860	1 094 117	3 377 795	1 385 467	2 194 415	17 274 011
	Not Attending	4 152 319	3 632 828	751 396	1 699 458	5 764 597	2 243 327	8 747 171	2 449 332	2 882 451	32 322 881
	Total	5 698 491	6 176 077	1 074 987	2 558 804	9 714 457	3 337 444	12 124 966	3 834 799	5 076 866	49 596 892

Source: Statistics South Africa

Note: CS 2016 total excludes Do not know (75 301), other (97 640) and unspecified (421); Census 2011 total exclude other population group (50 555) and unspecified (2,102,472) and do not know (29 146); Census 1996 (782,711)

Over time there has been an increase in the number of persons aged 5 years attending at an educational institution. Gauteng and Western Cape have the lowest number of persons attending at an educational institution, while Limpopo and Eastern Cape have a higher number of persons attending an educational institution.

Table 5.5: Population distribution for persons 5 years and older by type of educational institution

	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Census 2001	Public	1,114,256	2,303,249	272,420	839,641	3,150,448	2,093,835	1,139,564	1,950,620	13,706,999
	Private	69,750	78,122	10,301	36,690	137,671	322,429	49,053	67,951	807,807
Census 2011	Public	1,120,079	1,946,736	271,359	687,579	2,941,730	2,269,846	1,130,186	1,773,979	12,971,357
	Private	101,793	100,864	13,980	54,730	163,197	491,150	82,705	92,055	1,157,867
CS 2016	Public	1,396,702	2,405,643	306,126	788,653	3,715,442	2,751,207	1,270,696	2,067,246	15,708,772
	Private	142,252	132,565	16,716	68,754	228,987	609,059	109,896	124,224	1,516,076

Source: Statistics South Africa Note: Total excludes CS 2016 Do not know (48218), unspecified (945), Census 2011 do not know (55 786), unspecified (1 169 494)

The number of people aged 5 years and older attending private educational institutions has increased over time across all provinces and South Africa as a whole. In 2016, Gauteng and KwaZulu-Natal have the highest number of persons aged 5 years and older attending private educational institutions, 609 059 and 228 987 respectively. Whereas, other remaining provinces had private institutions attendance of less than 200 000 persons aged 5 years and older. The number of person aged 5 years and older attending public educational institutions has increased slightly over time (between 2001 and 2016) across all provinces and South Africa as a whole. A large number of persons aged 5 years and older who are attending public educational institutions is remarkably high in Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, Gauteng and Limpopo, approximately with 2,4 million; 3,7 million; 2,7 million and 2,0 million respectively.

5.3 Educational attainment

This section profiles the educational attainment for persons aged 25 years and older. Furthermore, the educational attainment is represented for the 10 years age groups resulting in 6 categories (25–34 years, 35–44 years, 45–54 years, 55–64 years, 65–74 years and 75+). The educational attainment levels are defined as “No schooling”, “Primary education”, “Secondary education” and “Bachelor’s degree”. The “no schooling” level is the number of people who stated their highest level of education successfully completed as “No schooling”. The “primary education” level is computed by taking the number of persons who reported having completed grade 7 and higher educational levels, since those who reported to have completed grade 12 or a Bachelor’s degree or a higher degree had already completed grade 7 due to the progressive nature of education levels. The total number of persons who attained “Secondary education” are those who reported that they had completed grade 12 and higher education levels, excluding those that had certificates and diplomas with less than grade 12. Also, the total number of persons completing a Bachelor’s degree include those who reported to have completed a Bachelor’s degree and higher education level such as Masters, PHDs etc. The rationale for including those who reported that they had completed higher levels than the one sought after grade/level emanates from the highest level completed asked for that provide such information and not all previously completed ones. As a result, excluding that group introduces bias in the proportion that completed the sought after level, e.g. primary education. (A profile of education enrolment, attainment and progression in South Africa, 47). All figures related to Census 1996, Census 2001 and Census 2011 were obtained from persons within households.

Table 5.6: Distribution of the population aged 25 years and older by educational attainment

	No schooling	Primary education	Secondary education	Bachelor's degree
Census 1996	3 714 068	10 048 472	3 575 171	410 686
Census 2001	4 240 193	12 987 084	5 636 626	697 225
Census 2011	2 564 209	19 580 037	9 999 537	1 184 310
CS 2016	2 269 421	22 465 086	11 886 912	1 235 250

Source: Censuses 1996, 2001, 2011 and CS 2016

**Totals completing secondary education include persons who have completed grade 12 and higher education levels as those are considered to have completed the particular level as well due to education progression, although those that had completed certificates or diplomas less than grade 12 are excluded. Totals for those completing a bachelor’s degree include those that reported that they had completed a bachelor’s degree and higher.*

Over the period of 20 years, the South African government has made progress in the number of persons who attained different educational levels. Thus, there is a considerable decrease of 1,4 million people with no schooling between 1996 and 2016. The number of persons who attained primary education and secondary education has also increased over time (1996–2016); 12,4 million and 8,3 million respectively. People who attained at least a Bachelor’s degree have increased greatly between 1996 and 2016; (by 824 564 thousand).

Table 5.7: Distribution of the population aged 25 years and older in ten year age groups by educational attainment

	No schooling	Primary education	Secondary education	Bachelor's degree
25-34 year olds				
Census 1996	625 151	4 417 602	1 793 183	157 154
Census 2001	698 893	5 586 553	2 805 149	240 712
Census 2011	264 436	8 057 360	4 473 288	382 261
CS 2016	287 655	8 907 088	5 028 022	343 116
35-44 year olds				
Census 1996	789 246	2 743 702	896 344	124 748
Census 2001	918 762	3 618 495	1 458 287	213 588
Census 2011	350 215	5 232 081	2 819 933	347 739
CS 2016	292 099	6 180 422	3 451 728	331 169
45-54 year olds				
Census 1996	703 320	1 468 677	455 874	69 797
Census 2001	881 555	1 970 797	710 439	129 647
Census 2011	526 275	3 280 327	1 464 157	243 979
CS 2016	403 453	3 821 923	1 882 400	282 314
55-64 year olds				
Census 1996	688 177	806 004	236 064	33 549
Census 2001	733 591	1 035 313	375 879	67 183
Census 2011	578 810	1 780 846	727 024	129 546
CS 2016	518 349	2 130 717	913 496	171 424
65-74 year olds				
Census 1996	555 783	425 641	133 567	17 570
Census 2001	613 862	526 686	189 347	30 440
Census 2011	448 054	829 541	347 135	57 055
CS 2016	447 350	1 024 483	431 639	75 603
75 years and older				
Census 1996	352 391	186 846	60 139	7 868
Census 2001	393 530	249 240	97 525	15 655
Census 2011	396 419	399 882	168 000	23 730
CS 2016	320 515	400 454	179 627	31 624

Source: Censuses 1996, 2001, 2011 and CS 2016

There is an increase in the number of persons who attained primary education, secondary education and Bachelor's degrees across all age groups. There is a decrease in the number of persons with no schooling across all age groups. The number of persons aged 75 years and older with no schooling has decreased slightly by 31 876 thousand within 20 years and those with at least Bachelor's degrees has increased by 23 756 thousand. The number of youth i.e. persons aged 25–34 years with at least Bachelor's degrees has doubled within a period of 20 years (1996–2016). Approximately 206 thousand persons aged 35–44 years have acquired at least a Bachelor's degree.

There is an increase of approximately 212 thousand and 137 thousand in the number of persons aged 45–54 years and 55–64 years respectively who attained at least bachelor's degrees between 1996 and 2016.

5.4 Conclusion

The analysis of data pertaining to school attendance of the population aged 5 years and older shows an improvement in attendance levels from 1996 to 2016. Close to 17 million individuals (35%) were attending an educational institution in 2016. Provincial and sex differences in school attendance are minimal. Disparities in population groups however still do exist amongst those attending and those not attending an educational institution. Educational attainment has improved showing a decrease of 1,4 million people with no schooling between 1996 and 2016, while primary and secondary education has increased. The number of youth (aged 25–34 years) obtaining Bachelor degrees has increased over the period of 1996 to 2016.

SECTION 6: FERTILITY, MORTALITY AND EMIGRATION

6.1 Introduction

Demographic information constitutes the foundation of all socio-economic planning and as such National development priorities can only be realised with an understanding of demographic phenomena i.e. mortality, fertility and migration. The purpose of this report is to provide a profile of the country, as portrayed by the 2016 Community Survey. The CS 2016 not only adds to the trend analysis in data regarding fertility, mortality and migration but more importantly provides the latest evidence on the levels and differentials regarding these demographic drivers.

The demographics chapter is organised into four sections each of which not only provides descriptive results but also provide preliminary evaluation results of the CS data. Much of the results are presented at four levels of disaggregation (national, provincial, population group and sex). Section 1 describes the age and sex profile of the population based on the CS 2016 data. The tools employed in the analysis include the median age, age pyramids, age dependency ratios, and sex ratios. Section 2 indicates the levels, trends and differentials of fertility in South Africa inclusive of the CS 2016 fertility information. Section 3 describes the internal and international profile of migrants of South Africa. CS 2016 is the first survey to provide a module ascertaining information on emigration experienced by South Africa. Section 4 reviews the trend and level of Mortality and orphanhood derived from the CS 2016 data.

The organisation believes that methodology and the results presented in this study will generate further debate and research regarding the emerging trends in migration and fertility.

6.2 Children ever born

Table 6.1: The distribution of the proportion of women who ever had children by age and province, 2011

Age	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	SA
15-19	2,8	5,0	3,9	3,4	4,6	3,7	2,3	4,8	4,5	3,7
20-24	11,5	14,3	14,2	14,0	16,2	14,6	12,2	15,7	15,5	14,1
25-29	18,0	17,0	18,2	18,6	20,0	19,5	20,1	19,8	19,2	19,2
30-34	17,5	15,9	17,6	17,2	16,9	17,5	19,3	16,9	17,0	17,5
35-39	17,6	16,4	16,5	16,6	15,3	16,5	17,5	15,8	16,2	16,6
40-44	17,0	16,0	15,4	15,7	13,7	14,8	15,2	14,1	14,2	15,0
45-49	15,6	15,4	14,3	14,5	13,3	13,5	13,4	12,8	13,5	13,9

Table 6.2: The distribution of the proportion of women who ever had children by age and province, 2016

Age	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	SA
15-19	2,3	5,3	3,7	2,8	4,2	3,3	1,7	3,8	4,1	3,3
20-24	10,9	16,5	14,2	12,8	15,4	14,1	10,3	14,8	15,6	13,4
25-29	16,6	20,4	19,1	20,0	20,4	20,1	17,6	20,6	20,6	19,2
30-34	18,3	20,0	19,4	20,0	19,4	20,0	18,4	19,1	19,6	19,1
35-39	18,5	13,3	16,7	16,9	15,6	16,0	20,7	15,9	15,4	17,1
40-44	18,0	12,6	14,6	14,3	13,4	13,9	17,1	13,8	13,1	14,9
45-49	15,4	11,9	12,3	13,3	11,6	12,6	14,3	12,0	11,5	13,0

The tables present the proportion of women who reported to have given birth by age and province in 2011 and 2016. As expected, the distribution across provinces shows the lowest proportion of women who ever had children in the teen age group (15–19) overtime. The proportions of women who had children begin to increase from age group 25–29 to 35–39 and decline in elderly age groups.

Gauteng and Western Cape, relative to other provinces, indicate a decline in the proportion of women who ever had children from 2011 to 2016. The decline in Gauteng is evident in the age group 15–34 whilst in Western Cape it is from 15–29. However in the Western Cape the proportion of women aged 30–44 who had children remained stable in 2016.

At national level, a pattern of the distribution in the proportion of women who ever had children is similar to that of provinces. The age distributions indicate the lowest proportion of women who had children at the youngest age group that increased amongst women aged 25–34 and decreased at elderly age groups.

6.3 Mortality data: Household deaths in the last 12 months

Table 6.3 below presents the number of households by whether death occurred in the 12 months preceding the Census 2011 and the Community Survey 2016. The table further shows that 432 650 of the total households reported a death during the 2011 Census, while 428 983 of the total households reported a death during the Community Survey 2016. Owing to the negative nature of the question, very few households reported a death during the two reference period (2,5% and 3% respectively).

The absolute number of deaths cannot be compared across provinces because mortality levels are affected by the population size and age distribution of the population. Readers are cautioned that numbers may slightly differ between tables because of rounding off.

Table 6.3: Number of households reporting death occurrence by province, census 2011 and CS 2016

Province	2011 Census				Community survey 2016		
	Yes	No	Do not know	Total	Yes	No	Total
Western Cape	32 166	1 598 605	3 154	1 633 925	33 212	1 900 665	1 933 876
Eastern Cape	72 199	1 612 447	2 697	1 687 343	66 596	1 706 798	1 773 395
Northern Cape	11 240	289 613	547	301 400	12 140	341 570	353 709
Free State	33 211	788 523	1 551	823 285	28 307	918 332	946 638
KwaZulu-Natal	99 641	2 435 052	4 644	2 539 337	87 778	2 788 065	2 875 843
North West	34 971	1 024 772	2 256	1 061 998	40 201	1 208 565	1 248 766
Gauteng	74 779	3 824 209	9 839	3 908 826	84 299	4 866 838	4 951 137
Mpumalanga	35 483	1 038 153	1 830	1 075 466	34 827	1 204 034	1 238 861
Limpopo	38 961	1 377 070	2 054	1 418 085	41 624	1 559 460	1 601 083
South Africa	432 650	13 988 444	28 571	14 449 664	428 983	16 490 000	16 920 000

6.4 Emigrants

6.4.1 Introduction

This section provides analysis of emigrants who left South Africa to reside in other countries. For the purposes of this report an emigrant is an international migrant departing to another country by crossing the international boundary. In this case the departing country is South Africa. Respondents were asked about people who were members of their household that left South Africa to reside in another country in the years 2006–2016. The analysis below provides the distribution of emigrants by sex, province of origin, age groups, year moved and country of residence.

A long-term migrant is defined as “a person who moves to a country other than that of his or her usual residence for a period of at least a year (12 months), so that the country of destination effectively becomes his or her new country of usual residence. From the perspective of the country of departure, the person will be an emigrant and from that of the country of arrival the person will be an immigrant” (Statistics International Migration, UN 2011).


According to the UN Recommendations, to determine the impact of international migration using the population census, two sub-groups of the population represent the primary focus of interest. The first group consists of the foreign-born and the second comprises foreigners living in the country. In order to identify members of those groups, two items must be recorded in the census: (a) country of birth, and (b) country of citizenship. Country of birth will distinguish the native born from the foreign-born population, while citizenship will permit the classification of the population into (a) citizens by birth, (b) citizens by naturalization. In addition questions such as reason for leaving the country and the length of stay in the country may be included. This questions forms the basis for both immigration and emigration. (Principles and Recommendations for population and housing Censuses revision 2, UN, 2008)

The focus of this chapter is on emigration of South Africans to other countries for the period 2006 to 2016. Measuring emigration remains a challenge as many emigrants do not declare their departure to authorities of their countries and most countries have no working mechanisms to oblige migrants to declare their departure.

The objective of this chapter was mainly to profile the head count of people leaving the country on a periodic basis, as a result indicators such as net migration cannot be derived using this information. However it is anticipated that the next census will expand on the questions asked in order to enable a better analysis of emigration patterns in the country.

Limitations of this chapter include the fact that questions on citizenship and country of birth did not form part of the profile of emigrants, hence it cannot be established with certainty that these emigrants are South African nationals. Furthermore an undercount is highly possible since the count is limited to those individuals who still have family members remaining in the country. As a result if the whole family emigrated then such statistics could not be collected.

Figure 6.1: Emigration in South Africa



***Analysis does not include unspecified*

Figure 6.1 shows the distribution of emigrants between 2006 and 2016. The proportions reflect that most emigrants left South Africa between 2011 and 2015. The highest proportion was observed during 2015 at 25,7 % while the lowest was observed in 2009 at 4,6%.

Figure 6.2: Emigrants by sex




Figure 6.2 shows the distribution of emigrants by sex. The proportions reflect that more males (54,1%) compared to females (45,9%) emigrated from South Africa between 2006 and 2016.

Figure 6.3: Emigrants by province





Figure 6.3 shows the distribution of emigrants disaggregated by province. Provincial variations indicate that Gauteng has the highest proportion of emigrants at 36,2% while Northern Cape reflects the lowest at 1,5% compared to other provinces.

Figure 6.4: Emigrants by age group



****Analysis does not include unspecified**

Figure 6.4 reflects the highest proportion of emigrants in the age group 25 to 29 at 16,1% followed by the age groups 30 to 34 and 35 to 39 at 15,7% and 12,7% respectively. Generally the youth and adults reflect higher proportions while children and the elderly reflect lower proportions.

Figure 6.5: Emigrants by working age group and year moved




Figure 6.5 illustrates the distribution of emigrants by working age group over the period 2006 to 2016. On average the youth in the age group 25 to 34 reflects the highest proportions for most of the period followed by adults in the age group 35 to 44. Adults in the age group 55 to 64 reflect lower proportion over the same period.

Figure 6.6: Top ten destinations of emigrants




Figure 6.6 shows the top ten destinations of emigrants over the period 2006 to 2016. The highest proportion of emigrants moved to Mozambique at 17,7% followed by Zimbabwe and Australia at 17,1% and 12,5% respectively. Individuals may emigrate for a wide variety of reasons which may include employment, study and business.

Figure 6.7: Top ten African destinations of emigrants




Figure 6.7 shows the top ten African destinations of emigrants. The highest proportion of emigrants moved to Mozambique at 24,9% followed by Zimbabwe and Lesotho at 24,2% and 17,3% respectively. Given the limitations of the data collected, it is difficult to establish whether these emigrants are South African citizens or foreign nationals. Caution should be taken since issues such as reasons for emigrations and citizenship of emigrants were not established. Individuals may therefore emigrate for a wide variety of reasons which cannot be established by this study.

Figure 6.8: Top ten overseas destinations of emigrants




Figure 6.8 illustrates the top ten overseas destinations of emigrants over the period 2006 to 2016. The highest proportion of emigrants moved to Australia at 26,0% followed by United Kingdom and United States at 25,0% and 13,4% respectively.

6.5 Conclusion

There has been a decline in the crude birth rate (CBR) from 25 births per 1 000 people in 2002 to 23 births per 1 000 people in 2015. The distribution across provinces shows the lowest proportion of women who ever had children in the teen age group (15–19) over time. The proportions of women who had children begin to increase from age group 25–29 to 35–39 and decline in elderly age groups. Gauteng and Western Cape, relative to other provinces, indicate a decline in the proportion of women who ever had children from 2011 to 2016.

The number of households that reported that a death occurred in the 12 months preceding the Census 2011 and the CS 2016, decreased from 432 650 households in 2011 to 428 983 households in 2016.

Data on emigrants which left the country between 2006 and 2016 show that most emigrants were aged between 25 and 29 years old and left South Africa between 2011 and 2015, with the highest proportion leaving in 2015. Gauteng reported the highest proportion of emigrants. The highest proportion of emigrants moved to Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Australia. Individuals emigrated for a wide variety of reasons which included employment, study and business.

SECTION 7: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

7.1 Introduction

A key feature of a developmental state such as South Africa is to ensure that all citizens have access to basic services such as housing, water and sanitation. The country has inherited high levels of inequality and poverty, which left a large proportion of the population without access to basic services and resources. The Constitution places the responsibility on government to ensure that these services are provided to the entire population within the limits of available resources.

As can be seen from the data, there has been considerable improvements in the access to housing and other basic services such as electricity and sanitation, however it is critical that we continue to monitor access and quality, so that the goals and targets outlined in policy documents such as the National Development Plan 2030 can be reached. The findings of the CS 2016 provide an assessment of the levels of development in the country as well as the extent of service delivery and the quality of the services provided.

Table 7.1: Distribution of households per province, Censuses 1996, 2001, 2011 and Community Survey 2016

Province	Census 1996		Census 2001		Census 2011		CS 2016	
	Households	(%)	Households	(%)	Households	(%)	Households	(%)
Western Cape	983 015	10,9	1 173 304	10,5	1 634 000	11,3	1 933 876	11,4
Eastern Cape	1 303 287	14,4	1 481 640	13,2	1 687 385	11,7	1 773 395	10,5
Northern Cape	218 339	2,4	245 086	2,2	301 405	2,1	353 709	2,1
Free State	625 011	6,9	733 302	6,5	823 316	5,7	946 639	5,6
KwaZulu-Natal	1 689 995	18,7	2 117 274	18,9	2 539 429	17,6	2 875 843	17,0
North West	591 240	6,5	760 588	6,8	1 062 015	7,3	1 248 766	7,4
Gauteng	2 069 512	22,8	2 791 270	24,9	3 909 022	27,1	4 951 137	29,3
Mpumalanga	669 801	7,4	785 424	7,0	1 075 488	7,4	1 238 861	7,3
Limpopo	909 371	10,0	1 117 818	10,0	1 418 102	9,8	1 601 083	9,5
South Africa	9 059 571	100,0	11 205 705	100,0	14 450 161	100,0	16 923 309	100,0

Source: Statistics South Africa, Census 1996; Census 2001; Census 2011; CS 2016

Note: Number of households for censuses based on population in conventional housing units.

Table 7.1 above shows the distribution of households by province between 1996 and 2016. Overall, the total number of households has increased from 9 059 571 in 1996 to 16 923 309 in 2016. KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng have consistently over the years, had the highest number of households, whilst the Northern Cape and Free State had the lowest number of households in 2016. Gauteng had the highest percentage increase in the number of households between 2011 and 2016, increasing from 27,1% in 2011 to 29,3% in 2016. The Eastern Cape had the highest percentage decrease in households from 11,7% in 2011 to 10,5% in 2016.

7.2 Perception on municipal challenges

Table 7.2: Five leading challenges facing the municipality as perceived by the household, CS 2016

Top-5 challenges	Main challenge/difficulty in municipality	Number
Challenge 1	Lack of safe and reliable water supply	2 683 048
Challenge 2	Lack of or inadequate employment opportunities	1 963 104
Challenge 3	Cost of electricity	1 706 313
Challenge 4	Inadequate housing	1 199 692
Challenge 5	Violence and crime	867 155

A question was introduced in the CS 2016 that asked households what they considered to be the main problem or difficulty they were facing in their municipality presently. In addition to collecting data about the actual services and the quality of services that households have access to, asking households what they perceive as their main challenge or difficulty provides policymakers and planners with key data on how households understand or feel about their environment and the services in their municipality. Alongside the statistics of household services, employment and crime statistics, the results from this question could be useful to assess needs and analyse trends. As shown in Table 7.2 above, overall, households listed the (1) lack of a safe and reliable water supply, (2) lack of or inadequate employment opportunities, (3) the cost of electricity, (4) inadequate housing and (5) violence and crime as the main challenges that they presently faced in their municipality.

Figure 7.1: Five leading challenges facing the municipality presently as perceived by households by province, as percentage of all main challenges, CS 2016




Figure 7.1 above shows the five leading challenges as perceived by households across the nine provinces. All provinces indicated the lack of, or inadequate employment opportunities as a challenge, with more than one-tenth of households in all provinces, except for the Western Cape (9,4%), selecting this challenge as the main challenge in their municipalities. Provincial variations are notable – in Gauteng and Western Cape, households did not perceive lack of safe and reliable water supply as a challenge, in stark comparison to 43,9% of households in Limpopo who listed it as the main challenge in their municipalities. The cost of electricity was seen as a challenge for 16,2% and 18,7% of households in Gauteng and Western Cape respectively, whilst in North West and Free State the cost of electricity was not reported as one of the main challenges. Inadequate housing was not seen as a challenge in Limpopo, North West and Mpumalanga, but for 13,2% of households in the Western Cape this was reported as one of the main challenges. The challenge of violence and crime was listed as a main challenge for 16,8% of households in the Western Cape, 9% of those in Gauteng and 7% in KwaZulu-Natal. The only province where the challenge of inadequate sanitation/sewerage/toilet facilities was raised as a main challenge was the Free State, where over one-tenth of households reported it as one of their main challenges. As can be seen, perceived challenges in municipalities differ vastly by province and the analysis of these challenges is key to understanding and delivering services accordingly in the respective province and municipalities.

7.3 Housing and access to basic services

Table 7.3: Distribution of household headship by province and sex of household head, CS 2016

Province	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Western Cape	1 198 208	62,0	735 669	38,0	1 933 876
Eastern Cape	902 698	50,9	870 697	49,1	1 773 395
Northern Cape	216 173	61,1	137 536	38,9	353 709
Free State	551 904	58,3	394 734	41,7	946 638
KwaZulu-Natal	1 511 409	52,6	1 364 434	47,4	2 875 843
North West	809 218	64,8	439 548	35,2	1 248 766
Gauteng	3 175 490	64,1	1 775 647	35,9	4 951 137
Mpumalanga	746 940	60,3	491 921	39,7	1 238 861
Limpopo	818 993	51,2	782 090	48,8	1 601 083
South Africa	9 931 034	58,7	6 992 275	41,3	16 923 309

Source: Statistics South Africa, CS 2016


Table 7.4: Distribution of household headship by age and sex, Census 2011 and CS 2016

Age group	Census 2011					CS 2016				
	Male		Female		Total	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
10-19	128 485	57,0	96 978	43,0	225 463	172 867	61,9	106 430	38,1	279 297
20 - 29	1 539 145	65,2	821 148	34,8	2 360 293	1 604 507	64,1	899 566	35,9	2 504 074
30 - 39	2 192 515	65,6	1 150 680	34,4	3 343 194	2 612 612	64,5	1 437 363	35,5	4 049 975
40 - 49	1 864 869	59,8	1 256 115	40,2	3 120 985	2 301 241	60,6	1 494 934	39,4	3 796 175
50 - 59	1 428 689	56,6	1 094 745	43,4	2 523 434	1 649 318	56,8	1 256 359	43,2	2 905 678
60 - 69	835 474	52,3	763 055	47,7	1 598 529	1 040 406	52,2	953 927	47,8	1 994 334
70 - 79	377 294	42,4	513 114	57,6	890 408	423 383	42,5	572 277	57,5	995 661
80+	132 023	34,0	255 803	66,0	387 826	110 316	32,3	231 088	67,7	341 404
Total	8 498 495	58,8	5 951 639	41,2	14 450 133	9 931 034	58,7	6 992 275	41,3	16 923 309

Source: Statistics South Africa, Census 2011; CS 2016

Table 7.4 above profiles household headship by ten-year age groups and sex of household head from Census 2011 and CS 2016. The results show that almost three-fifths (59%) of households were male-headed for Census 2011 and CS 2016). The increase of male child-headed household from 57,0% in 2011 to 61,9% in 2016 is noted. On the other hand, households headed by older persons are dominated by females. In general, majority of South African households are headed by males, while female-headed households become more apparent among the oldest of the age groups. Such a pattern is reflective of a higher male mortality as the population progresses into old age.

Figure 7.2: Average household size by province, Census 1996, 2001, 2011 and CS 2016




Source: Statistics South Africa, Census 1996; Census 2001; Census 2011; CS 2016

Figure 7.2 compares the average household size in 1996, 2001 and 2011 with the average household size in 2016 by province. Overall, the average household size has decreased from 4,5 in 1996 to 3,3 in 2016. The largest households can be found in the Eastern Cape (3,9), KwaZulu-Natal (3,8), Limpopo (3,6) and Mpumalanga (3,5). Gauteng had the lowest household size of 2,7.

Table 7.5: Distribution of households by type of main dwelling: Census 1996 - CS 2016

Main dwelling	Census 1996		Census 2001		Census 2011		CS 2016	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Formal dwelling	5 834 819	65,1	7 680 421	68,5	11 219 247	77,6	13 404 199	79,2
Traditional dwelling	1 644 388	18,3	1 654 787	14,8	1 139 916	7,9	1 180 745	7,0
Informal dwelling	1 453 015	16,2	1 836 231	16,4	1 962 732	13,6	2 193 968	13,0
Other	35 290	0,4	46 628	0,4	128 266	0,9	142 271	0,8
Total	8 967 512	100	11 218 067	100	14 450 161	100	16 921 183	100

Figure 7.3: Percentage distribution of households by type of main dwelling: Census 1996–CS 2016



Source: Statistics South Africa, Census 1996; Census 2001; Census 2011; CS 2016

Note: Formal dwelling includes: Formal dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on a farm, Flat or apartment in a block of flats, Cluster house in complex, Townhouse (semi-detached house in a complex), Semi-detached house, Formal dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard, Room/flatlet on a property or larger dwelling/servants quarters/granny flat/cottage)

Informal dwelling includes: Informal dwelling/shack in backyard, Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard (e.g. in an informal/squatter settlement or on a farm)


Other dwelling includes Caravan/tent and other

Table 7.5 and Figure 7.3 above show the gradual increase in the number of households living in formal dwellings over time from 65,1% in 1996 to 79,2% in 2016. The percentage of households living in traditional dwellings has declined sharply from 18,3% in 1996 to 7% in 2016. Those living in informal dwellings have decreased slightly from 16,2% in 1996 to 13% in 2016.

Table 7.6: Distribution of households by province and type of main dwelling - CS 2016

Province	Formal dwelling	Informal dwelling	Other dwelling	Traditional dwelling	Total
Western Cape	1 593 891	320 022	10 302	9 401	1 933 616
Eastern Cape	1 154 843	130 885	15 828	471 699	1 773 255
Northern Cape	295 318	45 246	4 858	8 245	353 667
Free State	791 485	132 448	7 137	15 509	946 579
KwaZulu-Natal	2 090 067	245 167	20 166	520 244	2 875 645
North West	977 031	229 544	18 799	23 146	1 248 519
Gauteng	4 029 069	878 246	32 129	10 763	4 950 207
Mpumalanga	1 048 973	135 039	14 747	39 992	1 238 751
Limpopo	1 423 523	77 371	18 304	81 747	1 600 945
South Africa	13 404 200	2 193 968	142 270	1 180 746	16 921 184

Figure 7.4: Percentage distribution of type of main dwelling by province, CS 2016




Source: Statistics South Africa, CS 2016

With regard to the type of main dwelling by province, there are slight differences across provinces, as can be seen in Figure 7.4. Limpopo has the highest proportion (88,9%) of households living in formal dwellings, whilst the rural provinces of the Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal have the highest proportions of households living in traditional dwellings, 26,6% and 18,1% respectively. The highest proportion of households living in informal dwellings are in the North West (18,4%), Gauteng (17,7%) and Western Cape (16,6%).

Table 7.7: Distribution of households whose main dwelling is an RDP or government subsidised dwelling by province: CS 2016

Province	RDP	NOT RDP	Do not know	Total
Western Cape	571 997	1 335 243	25 023	1 932 263
Eastern Cape	386 802	1 372 311	13 423	1 772 536
Northern Cape	105 541	244 759	2 987	353 287
Free State	289 414	652 680	3 966	946 060
KwaZulu-Natal	559 302	2 300 600	14 335	2 874 237
North West	261 693	976 842	9 184	1 247 718
Gauteng	1 227 729	3 641 899	77 162	4 946 791
Mpumalanga	241 801	987 316	9 110	1 238 227
Limpopo	260 976	1 331 224	7 412	1 599 612
South Africa	3 905 254	12 842 874	162 602	16 910 730

Figure 7.5: Percentage distribution of households whose main dwelling is an RDP or government subsidised dwelling by province: CS 2016




Source: Statistics South Africa, CS 2016

Table 7.8: Percentage distribution of households by tenure status: Censuses 2001–CS 2016

Tenure status	Census 2001		Census 2011		CS 2016	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Owned and fully paid off	4 625 301	41,3	5 970 872	41,3	9 155 242	54,7
Owned but not yet paid off	1 685 572	15,0	1 701 467	11,8	1 840 345	11,0
Rented	2 097 795	18,7	3 610 222	25,0	3 081 477	18,4
Occupied rent-free	2 797 037	25,0	2 682 392	18,6	1 636 139	9,8
Other	-		485 208	3,4	1 027 543	6,1
Total	11 205 705	100	14 450 161	100	16 740 746	100

Figure 7.6: Percentage distribution of households by tenure status, Censuses 2001, 2011 and CS 2016




Source: Statistics South Africa, Census 1996; Census 2001; Census 2011; CS 2016

Table 7.8 and Figure 7.6 show an increase in the number and proportion of households who owned and fully paid off their dwellings from 41,3% in 2001 to 54,7% in 2016. The proportion of households who owned their dwellings, but had not yet paid them off, has declined from 15% in 2001 to 11% in 2016. There is slight decline of households that are living in dwellings that are rented, from 25% in 2011 to 18,4% in 2016. The percentage of households that occupy dwellings that are rent-free has decreased significantly from 25% in 1996, to 18,6% in 2011 and 9,8% in 2016.

Table 7.9: The distribution of households by province and tenure status - CS 2016

Province	Owned and fully paid off	Owned, but not yet paid off	rented	Occupied rent-free	Other	Total
Western Cape	992 242	266 376	370 349	192 835	94 492	1 916 294
Eastern Cape	1 046 294	180 175	223 943	162 331	145 866	1 758 609
Northern Cape	216 931	28 601	50 522	33 159	21 933	351 146
Free State	576 442	82 553	143 553	90 320	46 012	938 880
KwaZulu-Natal	1 780 990	318 921	382 353	183 312	183 965	2 849 541
North West	703 415	96 497	223 972	122 601	91 396	1 237 881
Gauteng	2 037 550	665 763	1 340 806	562 109	274 643	4 880 871
Mpumalanga	762 588	87 232	189 591	108 878	71 493	1 219 782
Limpopo	1 037 691	114 136	156 123	180 373	97 636	1 585 959
South Africa	9 154 143	1 840 254	3 081 212	1 635 918	1 027 436	16 738 963

Figure 7.7: Percentage distribution of households by province and tenure status, CS 2016



Source: Statistics South Africa, CS 2016

Limpopo has the highest proportion (65,4%) of households living in owned and fully paid off homes, followed by KwaZulu-Natal (62,5%) and Mpumalanga (62,5%). Gauteng (27,5%) and the Western Cape (19,3%) have relatively high proportions of households who rent their dwellings.


7.3.1 Access to water

Access to safe drinking water is fundamental right that also links to the health, well-being and safety of the population of the country. The quality and availability of the water services are of extreme importance for the quality of human life and living standards. The CS 2016 asked questions related to the households' main source of water, as well as the safety of drinking water that households had access to.

Table 7.10: Distribution of households by access to piped water: Census 1996 - CS 2016

Access to piped water	Census 1996	Census 2001	Census 2011	CS 2016
Inside the dwelling	3 976 855	3 617 603	6 684 621	7 511 853
Inside the yard	1 491 228	3 253 861	3 918 480	5 081 255
Access point outside the yard	1 765 945	2 594 904	2 581 146	2 625 645
No access to piped water	1 773 520	1 739 337	1 265 915	1 704 556
Total	9 007 548	11 205 705	14 450 162	16 925 325

Figure 7.8: Percentage of households by access to piped water: Census 1996–CS 2016



Source: Statistics South Africa, Census 1996; Census 2001; Census 2011; CS 2016

Note: Piped water from access point outside the yard includes Piped water on community stand, Neighbour’s tap and Public/communal tap

No access to piped water includes Borehole in the yard, Rain-water tank in the yard, water-carrier/tanker, Borehole outside the yard, Flowing water/stream/river, Well, Spring, Other


CS 2016 asked households about their main source of water for drinking, whilst the Censuses asked whether the household had access to piped water.

The proportion of households whose main source of water for drinking is piped water inside the yard has almost doubled from 16,6% in 1996 to 30% in 2016. There is a slight decline of 0,2% from 2011 to 2016 of households whose main source of water for drinking is piped water inside the dwellings. Just less than three-quarters of households use piped water inside the dwellings/yards as their main source of water.

Table 7.11: Distribution of households by province and access to piped water: CS 2016

Province	Inside dwelling	Inside yard	Access point outside the yard	No access to piped water	Total
Western Cape	1 487 774	224 317	201 963	19 822	1 933 876
Eastern Cape	592 428	318 877	419 922	442 167	1 773 394
Northern Cape	154 529	118 603	60 276	20 301	353 709
Free State	357 926	499 067	53 589	36 056	946 638
KwaZulu-Natal	1 076 667	828 016	552 667	418 493	2 875 843
North West	300 221	496 725	278 021	173 799	1 248 766
Gauteng	2 972 973	1 472 450	380 771	124 943	4 951 137
Mpumalanga	359 033	550 353	181 507	147 969	1 238 862
Limpopo	210 302	572 846	496 929	321 006	1 601 083
South Africa	7 511 853	5 081 254	2 625 645	1 704 556	16 923 308

Figure 7.9: Percentage distribution of households by province and access to piped water: CS 2016




Source: Statistics South Africa, CS 2016

The highest proportion of households whose main source of water for drinking is piped water inside the dwelling is in the Western Cape (76,9%) followed by Gauteng, (60%) respectively. Households that reported to have no access to piped water are highest in the Eastern Cape (24,9%) and Limpopo (20,0%).

Table 7.12: Distribution of households by province and access to safe drinking water supply service: CS 2016

Province	Access to safe drinking water	No access to safe drinking water	Total
Western Cape	1 791 412	131 518	1 922 930
Eastern Cape	1 277 199	480 604	1 757 803
Northern Cape	310 858	40 435	351 293
Free State	795 295	145 815	941 110
KwaZulu-Natal	2 310 487	540 966	2 851 453
North West	987 753	243 988	1 231 741
Gauteng	4 566 707	347 690	4 914 397
Mpumalanga	944 790	276 879	1 221 669
Limpopo	1 195 652	384 210	1 579 862
South Africa	14 180 153	2 592 106	16 772 259

Figure 7.10: Percentage of households with access to safe drinking water by province, CS 2016



Source: Statistics South Africa, CS 2016

Figure 7.10 above shows that the majority of households (93,2%) in Western Cape and Gauteng (92,9%) reported to have access to safe drinking water. Provinces with the lowest percentage of households who reported that they had access to safe drinking water were the Eastern Cape (72,7%), Limpopo (75,7%) and Mpumalanga (77,3%).

7.4 Access and quality on service delivery (water and sanitation, energy)

7.4.1 Introduction

Efforts in alleviating poverty and inequality in South Africa will never be realised unless the municipalities address the issue of service delivery in different communities, particularly sanitation and provision of energy. Since basic sanitation is a human right, it is therefore responsibility of government to create better environment which is allowing to all its citizens –the clean environment that remain free of harmful impacts of sanitation systems. It is also government responsibility in ensuring that there is sustainability of energy in the country in terms of both capital and lower costs to consumers. Besides progress that has been made since 1994, there are still challenges that are lying ahead. Therefore, this chapter will focus on access to household sanitation, energy as well as household goods which are more vital when measuring living standard of the household. The analysis involves time series from various data sources produced by Stats SA in tracking progress achieved as far as sanitation, energy and household ownership of goods are concerned.

7.4.2 Sanitation

Table 7.13: The distribution of households by toilet facilities


Toilet facilities	Census 2001		Census 2011		CS 2016	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Flush toilet (connected to sewerage)	5 500 012	49,1	8 242 924	57,0	10 260 829	60,6
Flush toilet (with septic tank)	312 986	2,8	442 481	3,1	461 934	2,7
Chemical toilet	218 387	1,9	360 703	2,5	713 856	4,2
Pit toilet with ventilation (VIP)	635 957	5,7	1 266 102	8,8	2 063 128	12,2
Pit toilet without ventilation	2 557 476	22,8	2 786 068	19,3	2 315 279	13,7
Ecological toilet	0	0,0	0	0,0	49 277	0,3
Bucket toilet	457 376	4,1	297 847	2,1	377 231	2,2
Other	-	0,0	305 444	2,1	271 895	1,6
None	1 523 512	13,6	748 592	5,2	409 881	2,4
Total	11 205 705	100,0	14 450 161	100,0	16 923 309	100,0

The main aim of government is to ensure that all households in the country have access to decent toilets. This helps to improve quality of life of the population of South Africa. Table 7.13 indicates that 60,6% of households in 2016 have access to flush toilets connected to sewerage system as compared to 57% in 2011. Similarly, there is an increase in the proportion of households using pit toilets with ventilation and the decline among those using pit toilets without ventilation. Also, there is decline of households with no toilets. This trend is seen across all periods since 2001. Finally, there is upward trend of households using chemical toilets. The use of chemical toilet increased from 1,9% in 1996 to 4,2% in 2016 – the increase of 1,7%.

Table 7.14: distribution of households by location of toilet facilities – CS 2016

Toilet Location	N	%
In the dwelling/house	7 519 804	45,6
In the yard	8 167 115	49,5
Outside the yard	810 144	4,9
Total	16 497 063	100,0

Figure 7.11: The distribution of households by location of toilet facilities




**Unspecified not included in the analysis*

The location of toilet facilities is very important for various reasons. It must be accessed by everyone including children and persons with disabilities. It is crucial that location of toilet facilities that are used by household members be positioned on a safer place so as to avoid endangering members who are vulnerable. Therefore, the location should be suitable and sufficient to everyone in the household. Table 7.15 shows that higher proportions (i.e. 49,5%) of toilets are located in the yard as compared to 45,6% of those that are in the dwelling/house – the difference of 3,9%. Lastly, only toilets accessed from outside the yard makes 4,9%.

Table 7.15: Distribution of households by location of toilet facilities and type of main dwelling – CS 2016

Toilet location	Formal dwelling		Traditional dwelling		Informal dwelling		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
In the dwelling	7 319 207	55,4	32 412	3,0	136 544	6,6	30 818	23,1	7 518 981	45,6
In the yard	5 724 269	43,3	951 805	88,5	1 400 167	67,8	89 752	67,3	8 165 993	49,5
Outside the yard	177 250	1,3	91 611	8,5	528 295	25,6	12 866	9,6	810 022	4,9
Total	13 220 726	100,0	1 075 828	100,0	2 065 007	100,0	133 436	100,0	16 494 996	100,0

Figure 7.12: The distribution of households by location of toilet facilities and type of main dwelling




**Unspecified not included in the analysis*

Table 7.15 and Figure 7.12 show the location of toilet facilities by type of main dwelling. In total, about 49,5% of toilet facilities are located in the yard as compared to 45,6% of those in the dwelling/house. Comparison by type of main dwelling shows that 55,4% are in the formal dwelling – highest as compared to those in traditional, informal and other dwellings. Households living in traditional dwellings have higher proportions of toilet facilities being located in the yard (i.e. 88,5%) followed by those in the informal and other dwellings respectively with just over 67%. Toilets that are located outside the yard are highest among households living in informal dwellings (i.e. 25,6%) as compared to only 1,3% of those in formal dwellings.

Table 7.16: Distribution of households by maintenance of toilet facilities and type of main dwelling, CS 2016

Maintenance of the toilet facility	Formal dwelling		Traditional dwelling		Informal dwelling		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Household	11 106 560	84,0	759 463	70,6	1 087 474	52,7	84 890	63,6	13 038 387	79,1
The community	273 539	2,1	85 662	8,0	168 007	8,1	7 912	5,9	535 120	3,2
The municipality	1 574 115	11,9	187 646	17,4	736 204	35,7	28 659	21,5	2 526 624	15,3
Do not know	263 213	2,0	43 163	4,0	73 296	3,6	12 000	9,0	391 672	2,4
Total	13 217 426	100	1 075 935	100	2 064 981	100	133 461	100	16 491 802	100

Figure 7.13: The distribution of households by maintenance of toilet facilities and type of main dwelling




**Unspecified not included in the analysis*

Table 7.16 and Figure 7.13 indicate how toilet facilities are maintained in cases of damage, comparison being made across type of main dwelling. The results show that 84% of toilet facilities using by households living in formal dwellings are maintained by households themselves –highest than even national total of 79,1%. Toilet facilities maintaining by the community are common among households living in traditional and informal dwellings with each having 8% compared to those in formal and other dwellings respectively. Likewise, the toilets maintaining by the municipality are highest in households living in informal dwellings (i.e. 35,7%) followed by those in other dwellings (21,1%) and traditional dwellings (17,4%) – all these exceed the national total of 15,3%.

Table 7.17: Distribution of households by refuse removal [Both numbers and percentage]

Refuse removal	Census 1996		Census 2001		Census 2011		CS 2016	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Removed at least once a week	4 641 115	52,1	6 210 215	55,4	8 972 934	62,1	10 322 257	61,0
Removed less often than once a week	200 477	2,2	172 027	1,5	218 302	1,5	488 193	2,9
Communal refuse dump	287 199	3,2	195 679	1,7	271 787	1,9	535 474	3,2
Communal container/central collection point	-	-	-	-	-	-	314 907	1,9
Own refuse dump	2 905 586	32,6	3 655 043	32,6	4 075 939	28,2	4 416 606	26,1
No rubbish disposal	862 726	9,7	972 741	8,7	781 999	5,4	669 485	4,0
Other	15 481	0,2	-	0,0	129 201	0,9	176 389	1,0
Total	8 912 583	100	11 205 705	100	14 450 161	100	16 923 310	100

Figure 7.14: Distribution of households by refuse removal




Refuse removal remains one of the important aspects of municipalities in dealing with dirty environment across communities. Figure 7.14 highlights the trend on refuse removal since 1996. The percentages of households whose refuse is removed once a week has increased – although at a slower pace since 1996. There is a steady decline in the households using own refuse as well as those with no rubbish disposal. Moreover, there is insignificant number of households whose refuse is removed less often than once a week – similarly among those using communal refuse dump.

Table 7.18: Distribution of households by refuse removal and type of main dwelling, CS 2016

Refuse removal	Formal dwelling		Traditional dwelling		Informal dwelling		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Removed at least once a week	9 191 758	68,6	60 362	5,1	1 004 236	45,8	64 802	45,6	10 321 158	61,0
Removed (less often)	395 046	3,0	12 456	1,1	76 811	3,5	3 803	2,7	488 117	2,9
Communal refuse dump	298 503	2,2	39 876	3,4	191 898	8,8	4 881	3,4	535 159	3,2
Communal container	156 065	1,2	6 060	0,5	149 132	6,8	3 613	2,5	314 870	1,9
Own refuse dump	2 951 585	22,0	929 356	78,7	488 421	22,3	46 722	32,8	4 416 083	26,1
No rubbish disposal	291 694	2,2	112 304	9,5	256 842	11,7	8 582	6,0	669 422	4,0
Other	119 548	0,9	20 331	1,7	26 628	1,2	9 867	6,9	176 373	1,0
Total	13 404 199	100	1 180 745	100	2 193 968	100	142 271	100	16 921 183	100

Figure 7.15: The distribution of households by refuse removal and type of main dwelling



**Unspecified not included in the analysis*


As stipulated, the refuse removal is important for the country to maintain the cleanliness of the environment. Figure 7.15 shows that 68,6% of refuse is removed at least once a week among households living in formal dwellings – extra by 7,6% as compared to national average. Furthermore, about 78,7% of own refuse dump is utilised by households living in traditional dwellings. Communal container is mostly used by households living in informal dwellings (i.e. 6,8%) – furthermore, about 11,7% of these households have no rubbish disposal followed by 9,5% of those living in traditional dwellings as well as those in other dwellings (6%). All these statistics on households with no rubbish disposal exceed national average of 4% – showing a huge gap of service delivery that need to be dealt with by the municipalities as far as service delivery is concerned.

7.4.3 Electricity and energy sources

Table 7.19: Distribution of households with access to electricity by electricity supplier: [GHS 2014-CS 2016]

Electricity Supplier	GHS 2014		CS 2016	
	N	%	N	%
Municipality-Prepaid	4 271 338	33,7	5 723 546	38,7
Municipality-Receive bill from municipality	1 782 716	14,1	1 511 348	10,2
Eskom-Pre-paid	5 783 031	45,7	6 891 183	46,6
Eskom-Receive bill from Eskom	474 617	3,7	450 978	3,1
Other supplier (e.g. metering services such as Impact Meters)	173 500	1,4	117 176	0,8
Do not know	175 993	1,4	101 596	0,7
Total	12 661 194	100,0	14 795 827	100,0


Figure 7.16: The distribution of households with access to electricity by electricity supplier: [GHS 2014-CS 2016]



**Unspecified not included in the analysis*

The results in Figure 7.16 show the increase in the percentage of households using both Eskom and municipality prepaid electricity supply, respectively between 2014 and 2016. However, about 10,2% and 3,1% of households obtain their electricity from municipality and Eskom bill in 2016 – the decline of 3,9% and 0,6% respectively as compared to in 2014. The results further indicate the decline of 0,6% in households using other suppliers such as Impact meters in 2016. Finally, less than 1% of households with access to electricity in 2016 did not know their electricity supplier.

Figure 7.17: Percentage of households with access to electricity by province and electricity supplier: [GHS 2014-CS 2016]



**Unspecified not included in the analysis*

Figure 7.17 shows that over 80% of households with access to electricity in Limpopo are using Eskom prepaid electricity than any other provinces in South Africa, followed by North West province with over 70%. Likewise, households using bill from municipality are mostly located in Gauteng and KwaZulu-Natal respectively. Lastly, Free State and Western Cape have higher proportions (i.e. over 50%) of households using municipality prepaid electricity as compared to other provinces.

Table 7.20: Distribution of households by energy source for cooking: [Census 1996–CS 2016]

Energy for cooking	Census 1996	Census 2001	Census 2011	GHS 2014	CS 2016
Electricity	4 265 306	5 761 354	10 675 094	12 632 027	14 012 036
Gas	286 657	284 295	507 616	418 980	502 216
Paraffin	1 943 862	2 394 919	1 227 337	792 346	908 943
Wood	2 073 219	2 292 674	1 807 606	1 527 379	1 353 991
Coal	320 830	310 059	104 171	90 143	48 580
Animal dung	106 068	110 969	45 349	11 543	8 491
Solar	-	24 225	22 255	16 552	12 040
Other	987	27 210	29 344	85 804	19 606
None	-	-	31 390	17 637	52 625
Total	8 996 930	11 205 705	14 450 161	15 592 411	16 918 529
%					
Electricity	47,4	51,4	73,9	81,0	82,7
Gas	3,2	2,5	3,5	2,7	3,0
Paraffin	21,6	21,4	8,5	5,1	5,4
Wood	23,0	20,5	12,5	9,8	8,0
Coal	3,6	2,8	0,7	0,6	0,3
Animal dung	1,2	1,0	0,3	0,1	0,1
Solar	-	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1
Other	0,0	0,2	0,2	0,6	0,1
None	-	-	0,2	0,1	0,3
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100	100

Figure 7.18: The distribution of households by energy source for cooking: [Census 1996-CS 2016]




Figure 7.18 shows that households using electricity as the main energy source for cooking increased since 1996. Currently, about 82,7% of households are using electricity to cook as compared to only 47,4% in 1996. However, the use of other energy sources such as paraffin, wood and coal has declined over time as compared to their use in 1996 while the use of gas revolved around 3% since 1996.

Figure 7.19: The distribution of households with access to electricity for cooking by province: [Census 1996–CS 2016]



Figure 7.19 indicates that many households in South Africa are now resorting on using electricity as the main energy for cooking. The provincial variations for 2016 shows that over 90% of households in both Free State and Western Cape use electricity for cooking, making them the highest as compared to other provinces in the country. However Limpopo, Eastern Cape and Mpumalanga remain the lowest provinces that use electricity as the cooking source as compared to its use generally.

Table 7.21: Distribution of households by energy source for lighting: [Census 1996-CS 2016]

Energy for lighting	Census 1996	Census 2001	Census 2011	GHS 2014	CS 2016
Electricity	5 220 825	7 815 270	12 242 401	14 144 288	15 262 235
Gas	35 512	27 065	34 347	5 371	25 700
Paraffin	1 144 014	759 817	426 205	268 487	451 602
Candles	2 583 031	2 545 532	1 649 082	1 033 868	997 571
Solar	-	24 175	51 505	48 774	96 532
Other	800	33 845	-	67 117	23 784
None	-	-	46 621	10 031	35 498
Total	8 984 182	11 205 705	14 450 161	15 577 936	16 892 922
%					
Electricity	58,1	69,7	84,7	90,7	90,3
Gas	0,4	0,2	0,2	0,0	0,2
Paraffin	12,7	6,8	2,9	1,7	2,7
Candles	28,8	22,7	11,4	6,6	5,9
Solar	-	0,2	0,4	0,3	0,6
Other	0,0	0,3	-	0,4	0,1
None	-	-	0,3	0,1	0,2
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Figure 7.20: Percentage of households by energy source for lighting: [Census 1996–CS 2016]




Figure 7.20 shows trends of using various sources of energy for lighting by each household in South Africa since 1996. The results indicate higher percentages of households using electricity as the main source of energy for lighting over time. Moreover, there is decline in the percentages of those using paraffin and candles respectively despite their higher use in 1996. Therefore energy sources such as gas, solar and other remained below 1% across all years including households with no source of energy for lighting.

Figure 7.21: The distribution of households with access to electricity for lighting by province: [Census 1996–CS 2016]




Figure 7.21 shows the results relating to use of electricity as the main energy source for lighting by province. Nationwide, the use of electricity for lighting has increased by 32,2% since 1996 (i.e. from 58,1% in 1996 to 90,3% in 2016). Likewise, there has been significant increase across all provinces since 1996. In 2016, the provinces with high use of electricity for lighting are Western Cape, Free State, Limpopo and Mpumalanga with over 90% of their households using electricity as the main source of lighting. Finally, Eastern Cape remains the lowest with only 85,4% of households in the province using electricity for lighting.

Table 7.22: The distribution of households by use of energy sources

Energy source	Using		Not using		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Electricity	14 826 067	91,1	1 450 309	8,9	16 276 376	100
Paraffin	3 112 929	21,3	11 490 149	78,7	14 603 099	100
Gas	1 708 773	12,2	12 298 256	87,8	14 007 041	100
Candles	5 219 570	37,0	8 870 905	63,0	14 090 512	100
Coal	411 877	3,0	13 428 824	97,0	13 840 704	100
Firewood	3 503 204	24,5	10 771 809	75,5	14 275 038	100
Solar system	353 594	2,5	14 030 849	97,5	14 384 445	100
Car batteries	63 680	0,4	14 588 157	99,6	14 651 837	100
Other batteries	81 910	0,6	14 816 525	99,5	14 898 436	100
Generator (petrol/diesel)	170 911	1,1	14 903 447	98,9	15 074 359	100
Other	54 893	0,4	14 964 793	99,6	15 019 686	100

Table 7.22 shows the distribution of households in South Africa by use of various sources of energy. About 91,1% of households countrywide are using electricity in 2016. The use of candles remains the second dominant with 37,0% followed by 24,5% of those using firewood. Only 12,2% and 3% of households are using gas and coal respectively while those using solar system remains at 2,5%. Finally, less than 1% of households are using batteries and other energy sources.

Table 7.23: Distribution of households by overall use of electricity per province

Province	Using electricity		Not using electricity		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Western Cape	1 810 141	97,0	55 478	3,0	1 865 619	100
Eastern Cape	1 472 143	86,8	224 813	13,3	1 696 956	100
Northern Cape	305 599	89,4	36 082	10,6	341 681	100
Free State	860 694	94,2	52 991	5,8	913 685	100
KwaZulu-Natal	2 468 719	89,3	295 152	10,7	2 763 870	100
North West	1 082 291	89,9	121 320	10,1	1 203 610	100
Gauteng	4 295 892	90,4	456 569	9,6	4 752 461	100
Mpumalanga	1 087 402	91,0	107 533	9,0	1 194 935	100
Limpopo	1 443 186	93,5	100 373	6,5	1 543 559	100
South Africa	14 826 067	91,1	1 450 309	8,9	16 276 376	100

Figure 7.22: The distribution of households by overall use of electricity per province




Figure 7.22 shows the distribution of households using electricity by province. Generally, the overall use of electricity by households in South Africa is 91,1%. The top three leading provinces in terms of overall electricity usage are Western Cape (97,0%), Free State (94,2%) and Limpopo (93,5%). Eastern Cape has only 86,8% of households using electricity – which is the lowest as compared to other provinces. Although Gauteng province is known to be the economic hub of the country, surprisingly the use of electricity by households dropped slightly by 0,7% as compared to the national average.


7.4.4 Household goods

Table 7.24: Distribution of households by ownership of household goods

Household Goods	Census 2011 (N)			CS 2016 (%)		
	Owning	Not owning	Total	Owning	Not owning	Total
Fridge	9 886 238	4 563 924	14 450 162	13 084 170	2 916 610	16 000 780
Electric stove	11 129 857	3 320 305	14 450 162	13 608 882	2 517 504	16 126 386
Vacuum cleaner	2 521 249	11 928 912	14 450 161	2 681 929	12 706 218	15 388 147
Washing Machine	4 556 455	9 893 707	14 450 162	6 307 589	9 203 872	15 511 461
Tablet/ Phablet	-	-	-	3 363 207	12 226 405	15 589 612
Computer	3 092 543	11 357 618	14 450 161	3 884 348	11 973 379	15 857 727
DSTV	3 721 067	10 729 095	14 450 162	6 692 558	9 482 424	16 174 982
Motor vehicle	4 266 081	10 184 080	14 450 161	5 292 194	11 013 686	16 305 880
TV	10 761 949	3 688 212	14 450 161	13 850 708	2 766 644	16 617 352
Radio	9 749 897	4 700 264	14 450 161	11 276 289	5 322 155	16 598 444
DVD player	8 575 219	5 874 943	14 450 162	8 860 933	7 598 365	16 459 298
Home theatre	-	-	-	4 032 652	12 281 341	16 313 993
Landline	2 088 147	12 362 015	14 450 162	1 866 384	14 382 949	16 249 333
Cellphone	12 850 874	1 599 288	14 450 162	15 584 615	1 026 427	16 611 042
Microwave	-	-	-	9 128 279	7 202 499	16 330 778
Geyser	-	-	-	4 707 210	11 357 270	16 064 480
Air conditioner	-	-	-	1 254 469	14 392 411	15 646 880

*Unspecified not included in the analysis

Figure 7.23: The distribution of households by ownership of household goods



Ownership of household's goods is crucially important in measuring the standard of living for the household. Figure 7.23 shows the results relating to ownership of households' goods in which comparison is made between Census 2011 and Community Survey 2016 (i.e. CS 2016). The ownership of some household goods such as cellphone, electric stove, TV, fridge, washing machine, DSTV, motor vehicle as well as computer have seen significant increases in 2016 as compared to in 2011. However the household ownership of radio and vacuum cleaner remained intact between Census 2011 and CS 2016. The current ownership of DVD player and landline has declined by 5,5% and 3% respectively since 2011.


7.5 Household Involvement in agricultural activities

Table 7.25: Number of agricultural households by province, Census 2011 and CS 2016

Province	Agricultural households				
	Census 2011	CS 2016	% Change	Difference	% Contribution
Western Cape	84 574	69 152	-18,2	-15 422	-0,5
Eastern Cape	596 573	495 042	-17,0	-101 531	-3,5
Northern Cape	55 150	48 798	-11,5	-6 352	-0,2
Free State	201 286	157 510	-21,7	-43 776	-1,5
KwaZulu-Natal	717 006	536 225	-25,2	-180 781	-6,3
North West	214 049	167 780	-21,6	-46 269	-1,6
Gauteng	279 110	242 594	-13,1	-36 516	-1,3
Mpumalanga	263 391	225 282	-14,5	-38 109	-1,3
Limpopo	468 494	386 660	-17,5	-81 834	-2,8
South Africa	2 879 638	2 329 043	-19,1	-550 595	-19,1

The number of agricultural households in the country decreased by 19,1% (550 595) from 2 879 638 in Census 2011 to 2 329 043 in Community Survey 2016 (see Table 7.25). The major contributing provinces to the decrease are KwaZulu-Natal (-6,3% or 180 781 agricultural households), Eastern Cape (-3,5% or 101 531) and Limpopo (-2,8% or 81 834).

Figure 7.24: Percentage distribution of agricultural households by province, 2011 and 2016



The proportion of agricultural households decreased from 19,9% in 2011 to 13,8% in 2016. However, the highest proportion of agricultural households are still in Eastern Cape (27,9%), Limpopo (24,1%) and KwaZulu-Natal (18,6%).

Table 7.26(a): Number of agricultural and non-agricultural households by province

Province	Agricultural household	Non-agricultural household	Total number of households
Western Cape	69 152	1 864 724	1 933 876
Eastern Cape	495 042	1 278 352	1 773 395
Northern Cape	48 798	304 910	353 709
Free State	157 510	789 128	946 638
KwaZulu-Natal	536 225	2 339 618	2 875 843
North West	167 780	1 080 986	1 248 766
Gauteng	242 594	4 708 543	4 951 137
Mpumalanga	225 282	1 013 579	1 238 861
Limpopo	386 660	1 214 423	1 601 083
South Africa	2 329 043	14 594 266	16 923 309

Table 7.26(b): Number of agricultural and non-agricultural households by population group of household head

Population group	Agricultural household	Non-agricultural household	Total number of households
Black African	2 116 281	11 526 641	13 642 922
White	143 361	1 524 069	1 667 430
Coloured	56 686	1 164 813	1 221 498
Indian/Asian	12 716	378 744	391 459
Total	2 329 043	14 594 266	16 923 309

Table 7.27(a): Number of agricultural households involved in a specific activity by province

Province	Livestock production	Poultry production	Grain and food crops	Industrial crops	Fruit production	Vegetable production	Other
Western Cape	12 373	17 120	5 068	394	12 399	37 417	4 808
Eastern Cape	323 763	318 621	178 939	2 200	53 242	157 732	5 183
Northern Cape	28 000	26 319	2 047	118	5 681	7 722	580
Free State	40 874	47 296	21 524	633	43 982	86 097	2 793
KwaZulu-Natal	256 045	310 458	143 477	2 358	55 920	188 442	8 449
North West	78 555	92 222	14 674	426	19 508	35 414	1 344
Gauteng	23 277	48 979	29 646	858	39 470	159 326	8 366
Mpumalanga	76 307	104 713	62 125	1 417	41 399	97 330	7 284
Limpopo	151 018	154 503	117 183	2 553	127 550	103 874	6 111
South Africa	990 210	1 120 233	574 684	10 956	399 151	873 355	44 917

Table 7.27(b): Number of agricultural households involved in a specific activity by population group of household head

Population group	Livestock production	Poultry production	Grain and food crops	Industrial crops	Fruit production	Vegetable production	Other
Black African	919 086	1 058 970	547 849	8 844	365 148	772 307	32 712
White	56 639	38 306	22 048	1 922	24 452	68 135	9 856
Coloured	13 559	21 169	3 332	124	7 866	24 058	1 636
Indian/Asian	926	1 787	1 455	66	1 685	8 855	712
Total	990 210	1 120 233	574 684	10 956	399 151	873 355	44 917

Table 7.28(a): Distribution of agricultural households by main place of agricultural activities and province

Province	Back yard	Farm land	Communal land	School, church or other organisational land	Other	Total
Western Cape	80.9	15.2	0.9	0.4	2.6	100.0
Eastern Cape	80.8	6.8	9.5	1.1	1.8	100.0
Northern Cape	61.9	24.0	11.1	0.7	2.3	100.0
Free State	84.2	11.4	2.1	0.9	1.4	100.0
KwaZulu-Natal	84.0	8.1	5.8	0.8	1.4	100.0
North West	78.9	13.9	3.9	0.6	2.7	100.0
Gauteng	89.5	6.7	1.1	1.1	1.6	100.0
Mpumalanga	86.1	8.6	2.9	1.2	1.2	100.0
Limpopo	86.7	7.2	4.5	0.5	1.0	100.0
South Africa	83.8	8.7	5.0	0.9	1.6	100.0

Note: The figures above represent the proportions of all households who responded to the question of main place of agricultural activities

Table 7.28(b): Distribution of agricultural households by main place of agricultural activities and population group of the household head

Population group	Back yard	Farm land	Communal land	School, church or other organisational land	Other	Total
Black African	85.8	6.4	5.5	0.9	1.5	100.0
White	58.7	37.9	0.5	0.6	2.3	100.0
Coloured	85.5	9.0	1.8	1.0	2.7	100.0
Indian/Asian	90.3	6.7	0.7	0.2	2.2	100.0
Total	83.8	8.7	5.0	0.9	1.6	100.0

Note: The figures above represent the proportions of all households who responded to the question of main place of agricultural activities

Table 7.29(a): Distribution of agricultural households by main purpose of involvement in agricultural activities and province

Province	Main source of household food	Main source of household income	Extra source of household income	Extra source of household food	For leisure/hobby	Other	Total
Western Cape	25.4	8.9	4.6	31.8	26.9	2.4	100.0
Eastern Cape	52.7	4.2	5.2	33.7	3.1	1.2	100.0
Northern Cape	29.9	18.4	12.1	25.0	11.0	3.6	100.0
Free State	45.2	7.4	5.1	36.3	5.0	1.1	100.0
KwaZulu-Natal	40.8	4.1	3.6	44.0	6.1	1.4	100.0
North West	44.1	13.5	8.5	26.5	5.3	2.1	100.0
Gauteng	43.5	3.6	3.4	36.6	11.0	1.9	100.0
Mpumalanga	48.0	5.2	4.0	36.1	4.8	1.9	100.0
Limpopo	38.6	5.4	4.5	43.2	6.8	1.5	100.0
South Africa	43.7	5.7	4.7	37.5	6.8	1.6	100.0

Note: The figures above represent the proportions of all households who responded to the question of main purpose of involvement in agricultural activities.

Table 7.29(b): Distribution of agricultural households by main purpose of involvement in agricultural activities and population group of household head

Population group	Main source of household food	Main source of household income	Extra source of household income	Extra source of household food	For leisure/hobby	Other	Total
Black African	46.1	4.4	4.4	38.6	5.1	1.4	100.0
White	19.4	22.2	8.4	25.1	21.7	3.1	100.0
Coloured	35.2	4.0	5.8	33.9	18.5	2.7	100.0
Indian/Asian	28.5	4.5	2.8	36.5	25.7	2.1	100.0
Total	43.7	5.7	4.7	37.5	6.8	1.6	100.0

Note: The figures above represent the proportions of all households who responded to the question of main purpose of involvement in agricultural activities.

Table 7.30(a): Numbers of agricultural households by farming practice and province

Province	Irrigation	Dry land	Both irrigation and dry land
Western Cape	13 264	18 754	11 944
Eastern Cape	62 904	108 118	96 440
Northern Cape	3 243	5 573	3 229
Free State	39 300	33 963	27 549
KwaZulu-Natal	65 953	103 635	104 644
North West	14 702	21 746	16 630
Gauteng	47 205	74 686	59 370
Mpumalanga	31 998	46 543	53 559
Limpopo	51 433	94 729	67 643
South Africa	330 002	507 748	441 009

Table 7.30(b): Number of agricultural households by farming practice and population group of household head

Population group	Irrigation	Dry land	Both irrigation and dry land
Black African	290 787	461 476	402 993
White	30 215	27 452	27 753
Coloured	5 948	14 643	7 665
Indian/Asian	3 052	4 176	2 598
Total	330 002	507 748	441 009

Table 7.31(a): Number of livestock and poultry by type at household level and province as on 07 March 2016

Province	Cattle	Sheep	Goats	Pigs	Chickens	Other poultry
Western Cape	692 495	2 282 396	182 669	104 979	295 507	185 187
Eastern Cape	2 819 086	7 605 248	3 221 829	536 108	3 841 174	291 982
Northern Cape	591 607	4 279 133	554 254	13 099	314 007	120 833
Free State	1 869 583	2 509 463	131 532	148 470	1 056 509	184 417
KwaZulu-Natal	2 498 209	549 943	1 930 175	201 826	6 406 289	324 296
North West	2 207 342	840 180	538 991	127 078	2 128 239	113 828
Gauteng	581 169	217 406	202 091	141 650	1 911 589	129 978
Mpumalanga	1 508 508	945 118	337 217	194 238	1 938 282	143 835
Limpopo	1 237 493	250 279	731 888	135 369	4 056 632	232 481
South Africa	14 005 490	19 479 166	7 830 644	1 602 816	21 948 229	1 726 836

Table 7.31(b): Number of livestock and poultry by type at household level and population group of the household head as on 07 March 2016

Population group	Cattle	Sheep	Goats	Pigs	Chickens	Other poultry
Black African	7 033 048	6 296 510	5 739 508	916 539	16 019 481	816 454
White	6 661 513	11 491 565	1 817 389	648 196	5 316 692	765 962
Coloured	282 591	1 674 056	265 411	37 452	517 941	138 736
Indian/Asian	28 338	17 035	8 336	630	94 115	5 684
Total	14 005 490	19 479 166	7 830 644	1 602 816	21 948 229	1 726 836

7.6 Food security

According to the World Food Summit, food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe, nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active life (FAO, 1996). Food security was prioritised by the South African government in 2010 and is closely linked to source of income, household structure, health, access to water and education (Du Toit, 2011). The CS 2016 asked households to indicate whether and how often their households ran out of money to buy food or skipped a meal.

Table 7.32: Distribution of households who ran out of money to buy food in past 12 months by province, CS 2016

Province	Ran out of money to buy Food in past 12 months		
	Yes	No	Total
Western Cape	255 163	1 671 601	1 926 764
Eastern Cape	464 838	1 303 800	1 768 638
Northern Cape	97 169	255 514	352 683
Free State	220 863	723 575	944 438
KwaZulu-Natal	667 625	2 202 001	2 869 626
North West	312 324	931 612	1 243 936
Gauteng	771 725	4 150 248	4 921 973
Mpumalanga	273 886	958 542	1 232 428
Limpopo	288 963	1 305 479	1 594 441
South Africa	3 352 555	13 502 372	16 854 927

Source: Statistics South Africa, CS 2016

Less than one-fifth (19,9%) of households in the country reported that they had run out of money to buy food in the past 12 months. The Northern Cape (27,6%), Eastern Cape (26,3%), Free State (23,4%), North West (25,1%) and Mpumalanga (22,2%) all had more than 20% of households that reported that they had run out of money to buy food. The Western Cape (13,2%) and Gauteng (15,7%) had the lowest percentage of households that had experienced running out of money to buy food.

Table 7.33: Households who skipped a meal in the past 12 months, GHS 2015, CS 2016

Skip meal	GHS 2015		CS 2016	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	2 693 893	16,7	2 247 501	13,3
No	13 428 096	83,3	14 616 694	86,7
Total	16 121 989	100,0	16 864 195	100,0

Table 7.33 shows the number of households who skipped a meal in the past twelve months prior to the survey. The overwhelming majority of households (86,7%) reported that they did not skip a meal in the twelve months prior to the CS 2016 survey. The number of households that reported that they had skipped a meal in the past year decreased from 2,6 million in 2015 to 2,2 million in 2016.

Table 7.34: Households who skipped a meal in the past 12 months by household head sex, CS 2016

Sex of household head	Skipped meal in the past 12 months				Total
	Yes		No		
	N	%	N	%	
Male	1 224 245	12,4	8 671 284	87,6	9 895 529
Female	1 023 256	14,7	5 945 410	85,3	6 968 666
Total	2 247 501	13,3	14 616 694	86,7	16 864 195

2 247 501 (13,3%) of South African households that has skipped meal in the past twelve months preceding CS 2016 of which 14,7% are female headed households and 12,4% are male headed households.

Table 7.35: Households who skipped a meal in the past 12 months by household head sex and province, CS 2016

Province	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Western Cape	90 710	56,1	70 983	43,9	161 692
Eastern Cape	156 448	50,3	154 815	49,7	311 263
Northern Cape	35 640	57,7	26 170	42,3	61 810
Free State	83 229	56,0	65 468	44,0	148 697
KwaZulu-Natal	203 383	47,8	222 277	52,2	425 660
North West	130 334	60,3	85 754	39,7	216 088
Gauteng	322 151	60,3	212 189	39,7	534 340
Mpumalanga	101 633	55,7	80 885	44,3	182 519
Limpopo	100 716	49,0	104 716	51,0	205 432
South Africa	1 224 245	54,5	1 023 256	45,5	2 247 501

In general, there are more male headed households than female-headed households that had skipped a meal in the past twelve months. In almost all the provinces, male headed household are the ones that had highest number of households who skipped a meal compared to female head household, except in KZN and Limpopo province where female headed household are the highest.

Table 7.36: Households who skipped a meal in the past 12 months by province, GHS 2015, CS 2016

Province	GHS 2015					CS 2016				
	Yes		No		Total	Yes		No		Total
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
Western Cape	311 654	17,6	1 462 911	82,4	1 774 565	161 692	8,4	1 766 632	91,6	1 928 324
Eastern Cape	296 773	17,2	1 430 424	82,8	1 727 197	311 263	17,6	1 457 967	82,4	1 769 230
Northern Cape	87 752	27,4	232 273	72,6	320 025	61 810	17,5	291 105	82,5	352 915
Free State	171 226	18,9	734 394	81,1	905 620	148 697	15,7	796 251	84,3	944 948
KwaZulu-Natal	529 493	19,3	2 217 008	80,7	2 746 500	425 660	14,8	2 444 362	85,2	2 870 022
North West	370 897	30,5	844 484	69,5	1 215 382	216 088	17,4	1 028 223	82,6	1 244 311
Gauteng	587 939	12,5	4 101 566	87,5	4 689 506	534 340	10,8	4 392 339	89,2	4 926 679
Mpumalanga	256 300	21,2	954 525	78,8	1 210 825	182 519	14,8	1 049 961	85,2	1 232 480
Limpopo	81 858	5,3	1 450 512	94,7	1 532 371	205 432	12,9	1 389 854	87,1	1 595 286
South Africa	2 693 893	16,7	13 428 096	83,3	16 121 989	2 247 501	13,3	14 616 694	86,7	16 864 195

Table 7.36 above shows the provincial distribution of households who skipped a meal in the 12 months prior to the survey in 2015 and 2016. In 2015, North West had the highest proportion of households who skipped a meal, 30,5% of households, almost double the national proportion of 16,7% reported to have skipped a meal. This proportion reduced significantly in 2016 to 17,4%. In all provinces, with the exception of Limpopo and Eastern Cape, the number of households who had skipped a meal decreased. Limpopo reported the highest number of households in 2016 who has skipped a meal (12,9%), with a significant increase from the 5,3% in 2015. Gauteng (10,8%) and Western Cape (8,4%) had the lowest proportions of those who did not skip a meal in the past 12 months.

7.7 Crime statistics

7.7.1 Introduction

According to the National Development Plan, in 2030, people living in South Africa “feel safe at home, at school and at work, and they enjoy a community life free of fear. Women walk freely in the streets and children play safely outside. The police service is well-resourced and professional, staffed by highly skilled officers who value their work, serve the community, safeguard lives and property without discrimination, protect the peaceful against violence, and respect the rights to equality and justice” (NDP 2030). Outcome three of the Medium-Term Strategic Framework (MTSF: 2014-2016) also outlines the importance of ensuring that all people in South Africa ‘are’, and feel ‘safe’. In order to achieve that, the main priority is to ensure a reduction in the overall levels of serious crimes, in particular contact and trio crimes.

Even though the SAPS provides annual reports on reported crime, household surveys are needed to get an idea of the magnitude of crime which includes unreported crimes from a household perspective. To date Statistics South Africa has only measured feelings of safety and experiences of victimisation through the annual Victims of Crime Survey. However, the sample size of this survey only allows for statistical reliable reporting at Provincial and National level, whereas the SAPS and local municipalities also need information at lower levels of disaggregation. The inclusion of crime and safety related questions in the Community Survey 2016 will therefore enable entities involved in the fight against crime to better identify the municipalities where South African households feel most insecure and develop appropriate measures to alleviate those.

7.7.2 Households’ experience of crime

Table 7.37 shows the percentage of households who experienced crime by province. Overall, 7,5% of households in the country experienced crime in the 12 months prior to the Community Survey 2016. Percentages within each province show that over 9 per cent of households in Western Cape (9,7%) and Gauteng (9,1%) experienced crime within the 12 months prior to the survey, which are higher than the national average of 7,5%.

Table 7.37: Number and percentage of households who experienced crime by province, Community Survey 2016

Experienced crime	Statistics	Province									RSA
		WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	
Yes	Number ('000)	188	109	24	57	197	94	448	91	67	1 276
	Percent	9,7	6,2	6,8	6,0	6,9	7,6	9,1	7,4	4,2	7,5
No	Number ('000)	1 793	1 659	329	887	2 669	1 150	4 472	1 141	1 526	15 572
	Percent	90,0	93,6	93,1	93,7	92,8	92,1	90,4	92,2	95,4	92,1
Don't know	Number ('000)	6	4	*	3	9	4	28	6	6	66
	Percent	0,3	*	0,2	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,6	0,5	0,4	0,4

*Numbers below 10 000 are too small to provide accurate estimates. Sensitive cells are indicated by an asterisk. Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.

The percentage of households that experienced crime by population group is shown in Table 7.38. Overall, amongst households who were victims of crime in the 12 months preceding the survey, all population groups, with the exception of black Africans, had percentages higher than the national average. Approximately one in ten households headed by whites experienced crime, followed by Indian/Asians (8,4%) while about 7,1% of those headed by black Africans were victimised. It is important to note that the analysis conducted here looked within each population group.

Table 7.38: Percentage of households that experienced crime by population group of the household head, Community Survey 2016

Households that had been victims of crime	Statistics	Population group of the head of the household				Total households
		Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	
Yes	Number ('000)	969	94	33	180	1 276
	Percent	7,1	7,7	8,4	10,8	7,5
No	Number ('000)	12 613	1 124	356	1 479	15 572
	Percent	92,5	92,0	91,1	88,7	92,1
Don't know	Number ('000)	54	3	2	8	66
	Percent	0,4	0,2	0,5	0,5	0,4

Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.

Table 7.39 shows the percentage of households who experienced crime by sex of the household head. Eight per cent of households headed by males experienced crime. The percentage for households headed by females was lower at 6,9%.

Table 7.39: Percentage of households who experienced crime by sex of the household head, Community Survey 2016

Households who had been victims of crime	Statistics	Sex of the household head		Total households
		Male	Female	
Yes	Number ('000)	794	482	1 276
	Percent	8,0	6,9	7,5
No	Number ('000)	9 092	6 480	15 572
	Percent	91,6	92,7	92,1
Don't know	Number ('000)	40	27	66
	Percent	0,4	0,4	0,4

Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.

7.7.3 Households' feelings of safety when walking alone

Table 7.40 summarises the percentage distribution of households' feelings of safety when walking alone by province in 2016. The majority (79,4%) of households in South Africa indicated that they felt safe during the day. Households living in Limpopo (89,3%) and Northern Cape (87,2%) were the most likely to feel safe. Nationally, only about 34,3% of households indicated that they felt safe when it is dark. Northern Cape (47,8%) and Limpopo (40,3%) also had the highest percentage households who felt safe at night.

Table 7.40: Households' feelings of safety by province, Community Survey 2016

Households' feelings of safety	Statistics	Province									RSA
		WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	
Safety during the day	Number ('000)	1 366	1 397	308	785	2 236	1 006	3 895	1 007	1 429	13 429
	Percent	70,7	78,8	87,2	83,0	77,8	80,6	78,7	81,3	89,3	79,4
Safety when it is dark	Number ('000)	659	541	169	294	1 066	382	1 622	420	644	5 797
	Percent	34,1	30,5	47,8	31,1	37,1	30,6	32,8	33,9	40,3	34,3

Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.

Table 7.41 shows households' feelings of safety by population group of the household head. When asked about their feelings of safety during the day, over 83% of households headed by white household heads felt safe during the day followed by 79,4% of households headed by black Africans. Within the white population group, a little less than half of the households felt safe when it is dark (49,2%), while approximately a third of households headed by black Africans felt safe when it is dark (31,9%).

Table 7.41: Households’ feelings of safety by population group of the household head, Community Survey 2016

Household level of safety	Statistics	Population group of the head of the household				Total households
		Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	
Safety during the day	Number ('000)	10 827	944	276	1 382	13 429
	Percent	79,41	77,33	70,54	82,98	79,4
Safety when it dark	Number ('000)	4 344	493	141	819	5 797
	Percent	31,85	40,41	35,93	49,17	34,27

Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.

Households’ feelings of safety by the sex of the household head is shown in Table 7.42. About 80% of male headed households felt safe during the day. Whereas 78,7% of households headed by females felt safe during the day. More male headed households felt safe when it is dark (35,4%) than those headed by females (32,7%).

Table 7.42: Households’ feelings of safety by sex of the household head, Community Survey 2016

Household level of safety	Statistics	Sex of the household head		Total households
		Male	Female	
Safety during the day	Number ('000)	7 929	5 500	13 429
	Percent	79,9	78,7	79,4
Safety when it is dark	Number ('000)	3 511	2 287	5 797
	Percent	35,4	32,7	34,3

Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.

7.7.4 Types of crime experienced by households

Households who responded that they were victims of crime in the 12 months prior to the survey were asked to elaborate on the type of crime that they experienced. Table 7.43 shows results for households who experienced crime by the types of crime that they experienced and province. Nationally, the most frequently experienced crime type was housebreaking/burglary (3,6%). Gauteng (4,4%), Western Cape (4,1%) and Mpumalanga (4,1%) had a higher percentage of households who experienced housebreaking/burglary. A similar trend was exhibited for households’ experiences of home robbery (Gauteng (2,3%) and Western Cape (2,2%)). In terms of households who experienced robbery, 3,6% of those in Western Cape and 2,9% in Gauteng were victimised. There was generally a 0,1–0,3 percentage point difference between provinces in their experience of murder, theft of livestock, poultry and other animals, theft of motor vehicle/motorcycle and other crimes.

Table 7.43: Crime experienced by households by province, Community Survey 2016

Crime experienced	Statistics	Province									RSA
		WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	
Murder	Number ('000)	4	3	*	*	5	2	7	2	2	25
	Percent	0,2	0,2	*	*	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,2
Home robbery	Number ('000)	42	26	5	14	45	21	111	23	17	303
	Percent	2,2	1,5	1,3	1,4	1,6	1,7	2,3	1,9	1,1	1,8
Housebreaking	Number ('000)	78	46	11	26	95	45	213	50	35	599
	Percent	4,1	2,6	3,1	2,8	3,3	3,6	4,4	4,1	2,2	3,6
Robbery	Number ('000)	69	36	5	14	55	22	140	23	13	377
	Percent	3,6	2,1	1,5	1,4	1,9	1,8	2,9	1,9	0,8	2,3
Theft of livestock, poultry and other animals	Number ('000)	2	6	*	2	11	5	8	3	3	40
	Percent	0,1	0,3	*	0,2	0,4	0,4	0,2	0,3	0,2	0,2
Theft of motor vehicle/motorcycle	Number ('000)	12	4	*	2	9	4	29	3	2	66
	Percent	0,6	0,2	*	0,2	0,3	0,3	0,6	0,3	0,1	0,4
Other Crime	Number ('000)	16	7	3	4	9	7	26	4	4	81
	Percent	0,9	0,4	0,7	0,5	0,3	0,6	0,5	0,3	0,3	0,5

*Numbers below 10 000 are too small to provide accurate estimates. Sensitive cells are indicated by an asterisk. Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.

A distribution of the crimes experienced by households disaggregated by population group is shown in Table 7.44. Generally, households headed by whites and Indian/Asians were more likely to be affected by crime than other population groups. They had higher percentages of households who experienced housebreaking/burglary (whites (5,0%), Indian/Asians (4,0%)), home robbery (whites (3,1%), Indian/Asians (2,6%)), robbery (whites (3,0%), Indian/Asians (2,7%)), theft of motor vehicle/motorcycle (whites (1,3%), Indian/Asians (0,9%)).

Table 7.44: Crime experienced by households by population group of the household head, Community Survey 2016

Crime experienced	Statistics	Population group of the head of the household				Total households
		Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	
Murder	Number ('000)	21	2	*	2	25
	Percent	0,2	0,2	*	0,1	0,2
Home robbery	Number ('000)	220	22	10	51	303
	Percent	1,6	1,8	2,6	3,1	1,8
House breaking	Number ('000)	463	38	15	82	599
	Percent	3,4	3,2	4,0	5,0	3,6
Robbery	Number ('000)	287	30	10	50	377
	Percent	2,1	2,5	2,7	3,0	2,3
Theft of livestock, poultry and other animals	Number ('000)	30	*	*	8	40
	Percent	0,2	*	*	0,5	0,2
Theft of motor vehicle/motorcycle	Number ('000)	35	6	3	21	66
	Percent	0,3	0,5	0,9	1,3	0,4
Other crime	Number ('000)	49	10	2	20	81
	Percent	0,4	0,8	0,6	1,2	0,5

*Numbers below 10 000 are too small to provide accurate estimates. Sensitive cells are indicated by an asterisk. Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.

Table 7.45 shows crime experienced households in 2015 by sex of the household head. Overall, there were minimal differences between male and female headed households across crime types as column percentages within the genders show similar levels of victimisation. The most notable differences between male and female headed households was about 0,6 percentage points for housebreaking/burglary.

Table 7.45: Crime experienced by households in 2015 by sex of the household head, Community Survey 2016

Crime experienced	Statistics	Sex of the household head		Total households
		Male	Female	
Murder	Number ('000)	14	11	25
	Percent	0,2	0,2	0,2
Home robbery	Number ('000)	187	116	303
	Percent	1,9	1,7	1,8
House breaking	Number ('000)	376	223	599
	Percent	3,8	3,2	3,6
Robbery	Number ('000)	234	143	377
	Percent	2,4	2,1	2,25
Theft of livestock, poultry and other animals	Number ('000)	25	15	40
	Percent	0,3	0,2	0,2
Theft of motor vehicle/motorcycle	Number ('000)	45	20	66
	Percent	0,5	0,3	0,4
Other crime	Number ('000)	51	30	81
	Percent	0,5	0,4	0,5

*Numbers below 10 000 are too small to provide accurate estimates. Sensitive cells are indicated by an asterisk. Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.

7.8 Conclusion

The total number of households in South Africa has increased from 9 million households in 1996 to 16,9 million households in 2016. The average household size has decreased from 4,5 in 1996 to 3,3 in 2016. The overall proportion of households living in formal dwellings increased from 68,5% in 2001, to 77,6% in 2011 and to 79,2% in 2016. Regarding household services and access to facilities: the findings indicate that the households that own and have fully paid off their dwellings in 2016 had increased to 54,7% as compared to 41,3% in 2011. The proportion of households whose main source of water for drinking is piped water inside the yard has almost doubled from 16,6% in 1996 to 30% in 2016. 60,6% of households in 2016 have access to flush toilets connected to sewerage system as compared to 57% in 2011. There has been a continued growth in the percentage of households that use electricity for cooking, heating and lighting. On household goods, the findings indicate an increase in the percentage of households with a cellphone, electric stove, television, refrigerator, washing machine, DSTV, motor vehicle and computer in working order between 2011 and 2016.

The number of agricultural households in the country decreased from 2 879 638 in 2011 to 2 329 043 in 2016. Eastern Cape and Limpopo had the highest proportions of agricultural households, the majority of which are located in their backyard. Most households involved in agricultural activities stated that the purpose of the agricultural activity was as a main source of food or as an extra source of food for the household.

Households were asked what they perceived as their main challenge or difficulty in their municipality to be - lack of a safe and reliable water supply, lack of or inadequate employment opportunities, the cost of electricity, inadequate housing and violence and crime were cited as the main challenges that they presently faced in their municipalities.

Findings of the CS 2016 show that about 7,5% of all households in South Africa experienced crime in the 12 months prior to the survey. The majority (79,4%) of households in South Africa indicated that they felt safe during the day, however disparities existed between provinces, population groups and sex. Housebreaking/burglary was the most widely experienced crime type in South Africa, predominantly affected households in Gauteng, Western Cape and Mpumalanga.

REFERENCES

du Toit, D. C. (2011) *Food Security. Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries*. March 2011. Accessed from <http://www.nda.agric.za/docs/genreports/foodsecurity.pdf> on 20 June 2016

Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), 1996. *Rome Declaration on World Food Security and World Food Summit Plan of Action*. World Food Summit 13-17 November 1996. Rome. Accessed from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/005/y4671e/y4671e06.htm#fn30> on 20 June 2016

Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses Revision 2, United Nations
Statistics on International Migration: A Practical Guide for Countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia. UN 2011.

Statistics South Africa, 2015. *Census 2011: A profile of education enrolment, attainment and progression in South Africa*, Pretoria, South Africa: Statistics South Africa Available at <http://www.statssa.gov.za>.