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<td>215</td>
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<td>215</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Toilet facilities, South African purposive sample, by locality</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.8</td>
<td>Handwashing facilities, South African purposive sample</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.9</td>
<td>Handwashing facilities, South African purposive sample, by gender</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.10</td>
<td>Access to toiletries, South African purposive sample</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
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<td>6.8.11</td>
<td>Access to toiletries, South African purposive sample, by locality</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Executive Summary

The Individual Deprivation Measure (IDM) is a new, gender-sensitive measure of multidimensional poverty, assessed across 15 dimensions at the individual level, making it possible to see who is poor, in what ways and to what extent.

This report presents the results of the initial analysis of the IDM South Africa Country Study. The South African study had two parts, the first being a national-level main sample, with a final sample size of 8,652 individuals (sixteen years and older). The second was a purposive sample of people with disabilities, which was implemented in Gauteng and Limpopo provinces. For the purposive sample, 826 individuals with disabilities were sampled, and they and other adult individuals (18 years and older) in their households were interviewed, achieving a final sample size of 2,311 individuals. The same survey instruments were used for both samples and data collection for both took place between February and June 2019.

Ultimately, the overall IDM Score—a composite index across all the dimensions measured—will be constructed. However, the analyses presented in this report are the results of index construction to the dimension level. Each dimension is constructed slightly differently, but follows the same principles. Questions from the individual and household surveys (the variables) are used, either singly or in combination, to construct indicators, which are then aggregated to the theme level. Themes can be constructed from just one indicator, or from as many as eight, with each theme describing a single concept or idea that fits within the relevant dimension. Finally, each dimension is constructed by aggregating one or more themes, as illustrated in Figure 1. Many indicators and themes included in the construction of the IDM and its constituent dimensions are rarely, if ever, included in other poverty analyses.

Figure 1  Schematic dimension construction, Individual Deprivation Measure
In the construction of the dimension-level results, aggregation is achieved by a simple addition of normalised indicator and theme scores (as appropriate). A higher score for an indicator, theme or dimension indicates less severe deprivation and a lower score more severe deprivation. Equal weighting is used in the aggregation process, at the indicator to theme, and theme to dimension levels, where there are two or more indicators or themes to be aggregated.

To be categorised as most deprived for a dimension, an individual must be categorised as most deprived on each theme within that dimension. This method treats indicators and themes as if they were compensable—a low score for an indicator or theme can be masked in the aggregation with other indicators or themes for which an individual has relatively high scores. Thus, alternative aggregation and weighting approaches for index construction will be tested in the future.

Unlike most other measures of poverty, which tend to be binary—dividing the population into ‘poor’ and ‘non-poor’—the IDM describes individuals’ depth of deprivation. The results presented are the proportion of the main and purposive samples that fall into each of the four categories of deprivation—least deprived, somewhat deprived, deprived, and most deprived—using quarters as the cut-off for each category. A fuller explanation for the interpretation of these results, including at the theme and indicator levels, can be found in the body of the report.

The novel combination of variables included in each dimension and the index construction approach, combined with measurement at an individual (not household) level, means that, even where variable-level data is very similar to data from other sources, the results presented in this report may differ in important ways from other poverty assessments in South Africa.

This summary starts with a very brief description of each of the dimensions included in the IDM (see Section 3 for comprehensive descriptions). The results of the initial analyses for the national sample (the main sample) are then summarised, followed by those for the purposive sample of people with disabilities.

For both of these samples, overall results are summarised, as are those of four subgroup analyses. The subgroup analyses compare gender (male/female), locality (rural/urban) and disability status (individuals with disabilities and those without). The age group comparisons differ slightly for the two samples: 16–24 years, 25–64 years and 65+ years for the main sample; and 18–24 years, 25–64 years and 65+ years for the purposive sample.

The differences reported in the comparative analyses are determined not only by statistical significance but also the size of these differences; that is, those of more than approximately 2% across two or more of the four deprivation categories. However, a complete set of results is available in Appendix A.2.
Food
The food dimension is measured using the Food and Agriculture Organisation’s Food Insecurity Experience Scale. The questions ask about an individual’s experience of compromising the quality and/or quantity of food eaten in the 30 days prior to the survey, due to a lack of financial or other resources.

Water
The first two themes of this dimension measure access to sufficient quantity and quality of drinking water and domestic water (i.e. for purposes such as washing, bathing and cooking). The third theme assesses whether individuals responsible for collecting water from outside the dwelling face threats or hazards while doing so.

Shelter
The shelter dimension has three themes covering a wider range of topics than many standard assessments. These themes are: habitability of the dwelling (its construction materials, condition and crowding); ownership of essential household items (cooking utensils, tableware, bedding, and water storage vessels for those who require the latter); security of tenure (eviction concern, recognition of ownership, whether formal or informal, and rent or mortgage stress).

Health
The health dimension of the IDM has two themes: health status (physical health status and psycho-social health status, i.e. anxiety and depression); and health care access and quality, which assesses the quality of general health care and (where relevant) prenatal health care.

Education
The IDM assesses two themes in the education dimension: education level; and functional literacy and numeracy.

Energy
The first three themes of the energy dimension determine the energy source for cooking, lighting and heating, and the reliability of supply for each of those sources. The fourth theme assesses whether individuals responsible for collecting energy from outside the dwelling face threats or hazards while doing so.

Sanitation
The sanitation dimension has three themes: toilet facilities (type of toilet facility, if any, and whether it is private, shared or public); washing facilities (access to handwashing facilities and to toiletries); and for menstruating women, a place to change in privacy during menstruation.

Relationships
This social dimension has two themes: dependence and support; and participation in community events. The first theme determines whether respondents are dependent on people not living with them to help provide basic needs (because they could not provide these for themselves), how often they have enough of this support, and whether they are able to reciprocate.

The second theme includes overall participation in community events and participation during menstruation. The latter assesses whether a menstruating woman missed any social activities, school or work because of a lack of sanitary products, or missed any events because of the stigma associated with menstruation.
Clothing and footwear
The IDM determines the level of deprivation in clothing and footwear using three themes: basic clothing and footwear; other clothing and footwear; and sanitary product use. The first theme has two indicators—basic clothing and footwear ownership and social acceptability and protection (e.g. from weather conditions).

The second theme assesses other types of clothing and footwear—whether the respondent has enough clothing and footwear to wear to school or work (if necessary), whether it is socially acceptable and provides protection, whether the respondent has enough formal clothing to meet their needs and whether it is socially acceptable.

The third theme, relevant only to menstruating women, is whether a woman has sufficient sanitary products to use during menstruation.

Violence
This dimension assesses the type of violence experienced, whether it was psychological, physical, aggravated physical and/or sexual violence, and the frequency of any violence experienced. Discussion with gender violence experts in South Africa led to the decision not to construct a dimension score for violence because with the current IDM sampling strategy and survey questions, it is not clear whether the same thing is being measured for men and women. For a more detailed discussion of this issue, see Section 3.10.

Family planning
This dimension consists of a single theme and single indicator: the unmet need for contraception of men and women. This assesses whether respondents want to use contraception to delay or avoid having children, and if so, whether they or their partner have access to modern contraceptive methods, are reliant on less effective traditional methods, or no method at all.

Environment
The environment dimension consists of three themes: exposure to environmental problems; natural resource utilisation; and safe environment. The second theme—natural resource utilisation—assesses whether users of wild resources and biomass fuel have enough to meet their needs. The third theme deals with the perceived safety of the respondent’s living environment, while walking alone in their neighbourhood and while at home alone.

Voice
The voice dimension consists of two themes: voice in the public domain; and personal control over decision-making. Voice in the public domain includes indicators relating to voting, participation in local decision-making and perception of raising concerns (locally).

Personal control over decision-making assesses whether the respondent is prevented by people living in the same dwelling from doing certain activities (e.g. seeking work, education or training, or socialising).
Time use
Time use is measured in one theme and one indicator: time burden, which measures both time burden and on-call time. Time burden includes time spent on work for pay, profit and production, unpaid and domestic care work, and other obligatory time commitments. It excludes time spent on leisure and social activities, personal care, resting and sleeping.

On-call time is the proportion of the time burden that the individual is also responsible for the care of a child (under 13 years) and/or someone who is sick, disabled and/or elderly.

Work
The work dimension covers topics that go beyond what many will typically associate with the title of the dimension, which have been included to improve understanding of the different types of work undertaken within and outside the home. This dimension has three themes that address: work for pay, profit or own production (i.e. it generates income, food or other goods or services); unpaid domestic and care work; and the double labour burden. The separation of unpaid work from paid and subsistence activities and the consideration of the double labour burden are particularly important to gender sensitivity. All results are presented for the whole sample, not just for working age respondents.

Summary of the results of the national-level main sample

Overall results for the national-level main sample
As noted above, these initial analyses have focused on constructing dimension-level scores and deprivation categorisation for the whole of the main sample (for the overall results, see Figure 2) and for the four comparative analyses (of gender, age, rural/urban locality and disability status). These results are ‘raw’; sampling weights have yet not been used to ensure national representativity. Section 5 of the report presents these results in detail.

The food and time use dimensions have the largest shares of the main sample categorised as most deprived—30.7% for food and 32.0% for time use. Themes with more than 10% of the main sample categorised as most deprived are: education level (12.7%); functional literacy and numeracy (12.6%); heating energy (12.3%); safe environment (13.6%); and voice in the public domain (32.0%).

Indicators within themes where more than 10% of the main sample are categorised as most deprived are: crowdedness (26.3% in habitability); psycho-social health status (13.6% in health status); handwashing facilities (15.1% in washing facilities); community event participation (15.3% in participation in community events); formal clothing (30.2% in other clothing and footwear); biomass utilisation (13.7% in natural resource utilisation); and job security (13.6% in work for pay, profit and production).
Figure 2  Overall results for IDM dimensions, South African main sample
Gender differences in the national-level main sample

The pattern of deprivation between men and women in the main survey is similar for several dimensions—water, shelter, education, energy, sanitation, clothing and footwear, voice and work. However, there are differences in the patterns of deprivation at the theme and/or indicator level within some of those dimensions. For example, men are slightly more deprived for almost all the indicators in the clothing and footwear dimension. The overall lack of difference at the theme level suggests that those experiencing deprivation in the various indicators are not the same individuals (i.e. a range of different individuals suffered deprivation in different indicators, rather than the same individuals suffering multiple deprivations).

Slightly more women than men are deprived in food, health, relationships and environment, and not only are more women deprived in time use, they are also more deeply deprived. In contrast, men appear more deprived than women in family planning. However, this seems to be being driven by a higher proportion of men than women refusing to answer questions about family planning (see Section 5.12).

Age differences in the national-level main sample

There are several dimensions for which there are no distinguishable differences in the deprivation patterns for the three age groups—water, shelter, sanitation and relationships. However, within each of these dimensions, there are differences at the theme and/or indicator level.

There are several dimensions for which the differences between age groups are important. For food, those between 25 and 64 years old (i.e. the middle age group) are the most deprived, with the oldest group (65+ years) slightly less deprived, and the youth group slightly less deprived again. However, between one-quarter and one-third of each of the groups are most deprived, experiencing severe food insecurity at the time of the survey.

This pattern of deprivation is repeated in the environment dimension. The youth are less deprived than the two older groups, more of the middle age group are more deeply deprived than the other two groups, and the oldest group falls in between. There are relatively higher levels of deprivation faced by both the middle and oldest groups in the natural resource utilisation theme, particularly relating to the utilisation of biomass fuels. The middle group is also exposed to more environmental problems than the other two age groups.

For both time use and work, the middle age group is, once again, the more deprived of the three, but the oldest group is less deprived and the youth falls in the middle. As time use measures time burden and on-call time, it might be expected that the middle age group would experience greater deprivations along with their increased likelihood of having paid work, unpaid domestic and care work, and specific caring responsibilities, whether for children, the sick or elderly.

For the work dimension, the oldest group is less deprived than the two younger groups, largely due to the high proportion of this group that was retired at the time of the survey. This deprivation pattern is replicated in the work for pay, profit and production theme. The middle group is most deeply deprived, while a high proportion of the youth are in full time education and training, and thus classified as somewhat deprived. The double labour burden theme also follows this pattern of deprivation, with the middle age group most likely to experience higher labour burdens (working for pay, profit and production and undertaking unpaid domestic and care work), sometimes more than 55 hours per week, on average.

In the education dimension, as may be expected, the youth experience the least deprivation, followed by the middle age group, and the older group more deeply deprived than the two younger groups.
This pattern of deprivation is replicated in the health dimension, where the oldest group is more deprived for most of the indicators comprising the health dimension, except for prenatal health care access and psycho-social health status.

For energy, the pattern of deprivation is also repeated. However, there are no significant differences at the indicator or theme level, and the differences at the dimension level are slight.

There are several dimensions for which the youth face the deepest deprivation, or are as deprived as another group. In clothing and footwear, the youth and middle age group experience approximately the same levels of deprivation, while the older age group is less deprived. The youth are more deprived in the other clothing and footwear theme than the two older groups, while the youth and middle age groups are equally deprived in the sanitary product use theme.

The family planning theme is most usefully analysed by the intersection of age and gender. On age alone, the oldest group seem more deprived than the two younger groups, but this appears to be because a higher proportion of the older group refused to answer these questions, rather than because they experienced an actual unmet need for contraception (see Section 5.12).

The dimension for which the youth are most deprived is voice, where they are both more likely to be deprived and more deeply deprived than the two older groups. The older group is less deprived and the middle group falls in between. This pattern holds for almost all the indicators and themes within the dimension; however, the differences are very small for the second theme, personal control over decision-making. The high levels of deprivation of the youth in this dimension indicates their disengagement or exclusion from voting and local decision-making processes.

Rural/urban differences in the national-level main sample

There are five dimensions for which there are no discernible differences between rural and urban residents—health, relationships, family planning, environment and work.

For eight of the remaining nine dimensions for which results are reported, rural residents are more deprived than their urban counterparts. This is true in the food dimension, where a higher proportion of rural residents experience some level of food insecurity. However, urban residents are more likely than their rural counterparts to be at either end of the spectrum, being either least deprived or most deprived.

Rural residents are more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived, than their urban counterparts in water and energy. This is also true for each theme within these dimensions. In the water dimension, it is largely driven by poor-quality water sources combined with poor reliability of supply in rural areas. In the energy dimension, rural residents are much more likely to have access to unclean fuels and have poor reliability of supplies for cooking, lighting and heating than their urban counterparts. Further, a much higher proportion of rural residents must collect water and energy from outside the home compared to urban residents, and the proportion of each group facing threats while doing so is slightly higher in rural compared to urban settings.

Rural residents are also slightly more deprived than urban residents in shelter, which seems to be driven by the higher proportion of rural residents who are multiply deprived within this dimension compared to urban residents.

For each indicator and theme, and for the education dimension overall, a higher proportion of rural than urban residents are deprived, and overall, they are more deeply deprived. This reflects not only the lower education levels of rural residents, but also lower levels of functional literacy and numeracy.

Rural residents are more deprived, and more deeply deprived, with respect to sanitation, for each indicator in the two themes of toilet facilities and washing
facilities, and for the whole dimension. Given the difficulties involved in accessing clean water and the poor reliability of supplies in rural areas, this is perhaps not a surprise. The theme for which there are no observable differences is having a private place to change during menstruation.

This pattern of greater deprivation in rural areas is also apparent for clothing and footwear, where rural residents are more deprived, and more deeply deprived than their urban counterparts. Rural residents face higher levels of deprivation in everyday or basic clothing and footwear, other clothing and footwear (both school and work clothes, as well as formal clothes), as well as sanitary product use.

The final dimension for which this pattern of deprivation holds is time use, where a slightly higher proportion of rural residents are deprived, and more deeply deprived, than urban residents. However, in both urban and rural areas, the largest proportion of residents are categorised as most deprived. These individuals spend between 10.5 and 13.3 hours per day on paid and unpaid work or obligatory activities, and more than two-thirds of that on call, or at least 13.3 hours per day on such activities, with any amount of on-call time.

Voice is the only dimension in which urban residents are slightly more likely to be deprived than their rural counterparts, as well as being slightly more deeply deprived. This result seems to be driven, at least in part, by the poor access that urban residents have to local decision-making processes, and the poor perceptions they have about being able to influence local decision-making processes.

Disability status differences in the national-level main sample

In the main sample, there are several dimensions for which no differences occur in the patterns of deprivation between individuals with disabilities and those without, including shelter, sanitation, voice, time use and work.

Individuals with disabilities in the main sample are more likely to be deprived in food, and more severely food insecure than those without disabilities. Only one-quarter of individuals with disabilities are least deprived (28.4%), compared to 40.5% of those without disabilities, and the figures for those who are most deprived (experiencing severe food insecurity) are 37.5% and 27.0%, respectively.

There are relatively smaller differences between the two groups in the water dimension, with individuals with disabilities more deprived than those without. However, there are no differences between the two groups in water collection threats.

People with disabilities are also considerably more deprived than others in education, with a third of them most deprived, which is three times the rate of those without disabilities.

Perhaps least surprising is that individuals with disabilities are more deprived across the health dimension than those without. This is true of the health status theme—physical and psycho-social health status—as well as for the health care access and quality theme (although the latter is to a lesser degree than for the former). The only indicator for which there was no difference between the two groups was prenatal health care access, and this is likely due to the small numbers that reported the need for prenatal health care access in the survey.

In the energy dimension, individuals with disabilities are worse off than those without, although both groups are equally likely to be most deprived. In general, individuals with disabilities are slightly less likely to have clean energy supplies, and/or have slightly worse reliability of supply for cooking, heating and lighting.

The greater deprivation of those with disabilities in the relationships dimension appears to be driven by the higher proportion of individuals with disabilities (than those without) who depend on others to help meet their basic needs, and the lower proportion who receive enough of this type of support to meet their needs.
In the clothing and footwear dimension, there are higher proportions of people with disabilities in each of the categories of somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived than of those without disabilities. Individuals with disabilities are more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived, in the basic clothing and footwear theme as well as the theme of other clothing and footwear.

Those without disabilities appear more deeply deprived in the family planning dimension, though the higher rate of refusal to answer these questions among those with disabilities may account (at least in part) for the apparently greater deprivation level.

In the environment dimension, individuals with disabilities are more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived, than those without; a pattern repeated in the exposure to environmental problems and safe environment themes.

**Summary of the results of the purposive sample of people with disabilities**

**Overall results for the purposive sample of people with disabilities**

An individual is categorised as a person with disabilities if they reported having ‘some’ or ‘a lot of’ difficulty in at least one domain of the Washington Group on Disability Statistics’ Short Set of Disability Questions, or if they reported being unable to function at all in at least one domain (see Section 5.1.1). Section 6 of this report presents the results of the analyses of the purposive sample in full.

As shown in Figure 3, the food, education and time use dimensions all have significant proportions of the purposive sample classified as most deprived (38.4%, 27.0% and 31.2%, respectively). In the food dimension, this means that close to four in ten respondents were severely food insecure at the time of the survey. With respect to education, just over one-quarter of respondents had received very little schooling (30.9% were most deprived on the education level theme) and were not functionally literate or numerate (31.9% most deprived on the functional literacy and numeracy theme).

In the time use dimension, close to one-third of respondents spent more than the median amount of time on non-leisure and non-personal activities and were likely to also have had a significant proportion of that time on call (i.e. responsible for care of a child under the age of 13 or a sick, disabled or elderly person).

There are eight dimensions that have themes with significant proportions of people classified as most deprived. These include the ownership of essential household items (14.4% in the shelter dimension), both themes in the education dimension—education level (30.9%) and functional literacy and numeracy (31.9%)—and the health status theme (12.1% in the health dimension). The latter includes both indicators (physical health status at 15.5% and psycho-social health status at 19.3%). In the theme of washing facilities in sanitation, 14.3% are classified as most deprived.

In the clothing and footwear dimension, 11.5% are most deprived in the basic clothing and footwear theme, with high proportions in that category for both indicators—basic clothing and footwear ownership (11.9%) and basic acceptability and protection (22.2%).

In the environment dimension, the theme of safe environment has 13.2% classified as most deprived, that is, individuals who feel very unsafe both when at home alone and walking alone in the neighbourhood, or very unsafe for either one and unsafe for the other.
Figure 3  Overall results for IDM dimensions, South African purposive sample
In the voice dimension, not only does the first theme of voice in the public domain have almost one-quarter classified as most deprived (22.0%), but all three indicators in the theme have significant proportions that are most deprived—voting (28.6%), participation in local decision-making (60.5%, the worst result of any indicator across this IDM study), and perception of raising concerns (27.1%).

The theme of work for pay, profit and production has almost one-quarter of respondents classified as most deprived (23.7%), due to the large proportion of respondents in the purposive sample who are not in the labour force because they are unable to work.

The two dimensions in which no individuals in the purposive sample are categorised as most deprived are shelter and environment. However, as noted from above, both of these dimensions have constituent themes and indicators with significant minorities that are most deprived.

Overall, there are fewer differences between subgroups at the dimension level in the purposive sample than there are in the main sample. This may indicate that households with one or more persons with disabilities may experience deeper deprivation levels within the household than is evident in the analysis of the main sample. Further analysis is required to understand this more comprehensively.

Disability status differences in the purposive sample of people with disabilities

There are several dimensions for which there is no difference in patterns of deprivation between individuals with disabilities and those without in the purposive sample, including the water, energy, clothing and footwear, family planning and environment dimensions. However, within these dimensions, there are indicators and/or themes where differences can be observed, as described in detail in Section 6.

There are six dimensions in which people with disabilities are more deprived than those without disabilities. These differences were relatively small in the sanitation, relationships and work dimensions. The differences between the groups at the dimension level for sanitation imply a proportion of the sample face multiple deprivations across the themes within this dimension.

In relationships, the differences between the two groups arise largely from the deeper deprivation experienced by those with disabilities in the dependence and support theme.

In the work dimension, the differences are driven by the work for pay, profit and production theme, in particular, by the high proportion of individuals with disabilities who are unable to work for pay, profit or production, and are therefore not in the labour force (38.2% compared to 6.4% of those without disabilities).

The differences between the two groups are more substantial for the food, health and education dimensions. In food, those with disabilities are more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived, than those without disabilities, even though a high proportion of both groups experienced severe food insecurity at the time of the survey (41.1% and 35.3% for those with and without disabilities, respectively).

In health, those with disabilities are more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived. These differences are particularly marked in the health status theme, which comprises both physical health status and psycho-social health status, although neither of these indicators were used to determine a respondent’s disability status (see Section 3.4).

This pattern of deprivation also holds for the education dimension—those with disabilities, on average, received less schooling and are far more likely to be functionally illiterate and innumerate than those without.

For the remaining dimensions, individuals without disabilities are more deprived than those with disabilities. This pattern of deprivation was evident in the shelter
dimension, where the difference between the two groups is relatively small. In the constituent themes and indicators, there are no substantial differences between the two groups, meaning that those without disabilities face a slightly higher rate of multiple deprivations within this dimension.

This pattern of deprivation also holds in the voice dimension, a result generated from the greater deprivation of those without disabilities in the voice in the public domain theme, where they are more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived, than those with disabilities.

The differences observed in the time use dimension arise because those without disabilities were more likely to have higher time burdens and were more likely to have on-call responsibilities, increasing their deprivation levels compared to those with disabilities.

**Gender differences in the purposive sample of people with disabilities**

There are several dimensions for which no differences between men and women are observable—water, shelter, education, energy, family planning and work. There are, however, differences in themes and/or indicators in these dimensions (except for food and family planning which are both constructed from just one indicator and theme).

Women are more deprived than men in several dimensions—relationships, clothing and footwear, environment and time use. In relationships, these differences are relatively small and derive mainly from women’s greater deprivation in the participation in community events theme, and in particular, in the participation during menstruation indicator, where a deprivation can only be faced by a menstruating woman (see Section 6.9 for more detail).

In clothing and footwear, the differences appear to be generated by those women experiencing multiple deprivations across the sanitary product use theme, the school and work clothing indicator, and/or the formal clothing indicator.

In the environment theme, women are slightly more deprived than men in the biomass fuel utilisation indicator (more women than men are responsible for collecting fuel and fewer feel there is enough available for collection to meet needs). Further, women are more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived, in the safe environment theme, feeling less safe than men while at home alone and walking alone in the neighbourhood.

The differences in the time use dimension reflect not only the greater amount of time spent by women on non-leisure and non-personal care activities, but also their far greater likelihood of having on-call responsibilities.

For the remaining dimensions, men are, on average, more deprived than women. In the food dimension, the difference is substantial, with 49.1% of men severely food insecure compared to 29.9% of women; however, the reason for this important difference is unclear.

The differences in the health dimension are generated largely by the differences apparent in the health status theme, with a higher proportion of men more deeply deprived than women (this holds for the two indicators of physical health status and psycho-social health status).

The differences between men and women are far smaller for the sanitation dimension, and are driven by greater deprivation of men with respect to the washing facilities theme (and in both the handwashing facilities indicator and access to toiletries indicator).

Finally, differences in the voice dimension are driven by the voice in the public domain theme, where men are slightly more deprived than women.
Age differences in the purposive sample of people with disabilities

There are no differences between the three age groups in the food, water, health, energy and sanitation dimensions. However, there are differences at the theme and/or indicator level within all but the food dimension (which is constructed from only a single indicator and theme).

There are three dimensions where the youth are most deprived, followed by the middle age group, with the oldest group being less deprived than the two younger groups. This pattern of deprivation holds for the shelter, relationships and voice dimensions. In the shelter dimension, differences are observed for only one of the three themes—ownership of essential household items. However, at the indicator level, the youth were the most fearful of eviction of the three age groups.

The differences in relationships are relatively small, with the youth slightly more likely to be deprived than the two older groups. This result seems to be driven by young people’s greater deprivation in participation in community events.

In the voice dimension, the youth are more deprived in the voice in the public domain theme, notably, in each of the indicators comprising this theme (voting, participation in local decision-making and perception of concern-raising).

In a further two dimensions—clothing and footwear, and time use—the overall pattern of deprivation is that the youth and middle age groups (i.e. 18–64 year olds) are equally deprived, and both are somewhat more deprived than the older age group. At this stage, it is not clear why this pattern of deprivation occurs in the clothing and footwear dimension.

In the time use dimension, the largest group of both the youth and middle age groups are classified as most deprived (34% and 32%, respectively), demonstrating their higher overall time burden and likely higher proportion of on-call responsibilities compared to the older group.

For the education, family planning and environment dimensions, the oldest group is the most deprived of the three, followed by the middle group, with the youth less deprived than the two older groups. Given the historical context of South Africa, this pattern of deprivation in education is not surprising.

For family planning, finding that the oldest group is the most deprived of the three is an unexpected result, as it is far more typical for younger people to have an unmet need for contraception (particularly younger women). However, the result is, in part, due to a higher proportion of older respondents refusing to answer these questions (see Section 6.12).

The differences in the environment dimension are seemingly driven by the higher rates of deprivation in the natural resource utilisation theme (in particular, in the biomass fuel utilisation indicator).

The final dimension is work, in which the middle age group is most deprived, followed by the older group, with the youth group less deprived. There are several factors influencing this. One is that for the work for pay, profit and production theme, around a quarter of both the middle and older age groups are most deprived, as a result of not being in the labour force because they are unable to work. Another is that the youth are less likely to be characterised in this way and a higher proportion of this group are still in fulltime education or training, and are therefore scored more highly. Finally, the middle group is most likely to be more deeply deprived in the double labour burden theme.
Rural/urban differences in the purposive sample of people with disabilities

In the family planning and work dimensions, very small differences between rural and urban residents are observed, although in work, there are indicators and themes where differences occur.

With respect to food, the differences in deprivation between rural and urban are unlike any other dimension. A higher proportion of rural residents face some level of food insecurity; however, the depth of deprivation is less extreme than for urban residents. Of the almost six in ten urban residents who are food insecure, the bulk of them are severely food insecure, with few being either mild or moderately food insecure.

For the dimensions of water, health, education, energy, sanitation and time use, rural residents are, on average, more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived, than their urban counterparts.

Rural residents are more likely than urban residents to have unclean sources of water, with poorer reliability of supplies for both drinking and domestic water. They are also more likely to have unclean sources of fuel for cooking, lighting and heating (or none, for the latter), as well as poor supply reliability for these energy sources. Rural residents are also more likely to have to collect water and energy sources from outside the dwelling, and to face threats while doing so.

This general pattern of deprivation is also repeated in the health dimension, driven, in particular, by the poorer outcomes for the health status theme, although urban residents are more deprived in health care access and quality.

Rural residents are more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived, in the education dimension, and in each of the themes and indicators within that dimension.

With respect to sanitation, rural residents are worse off than urban residents in both the toilet facility and washing facilities themes; however, there is no observable difference between residents in either locality in the theme measuring the availability of a private changing place during menstruation.

A higher proportion of rural residents are deprived, and more deeply deprived, in time use—that is, more of them faced higher time burdens, typically with more time spent on call.

The remaining dimensions follow patterns of deprivation going in the opposite direction—that is, urban residents are, on average, more deprived than rural residents in shelter, relationships, clothing and footwear, environment and voice. The differences in deprivation in the shelter dimension are relatively slight and driven by slightly greater deprivation of urban residents in the ownership of essential household items and security of tenure themes. Lower levels of participation in community events drive urban residents’ slightly deeper deprivation in the relationships theme.

In clothing and footwear, the greater deprivation of urban residents is demonstrated not only at the dimension level, but also in all three themes—basic clothing and footwear, other clothing and footwear, and sanitary product use.

With respect to the environment dimension, this pattern of deprivation may be counterintuitive. However, it is driven by the relatively high exposure of urban residents to pollution and waste-related issues. The inclusion of the safe environment theme in this dimension also drives this pattern, as urban residents feel significantly less safe alone at home and while walking alone in their neighbourhood than rural residents.

Finally, urban residents are slightly more deprived than their rural counterparts in voice, a result driven by their lower scores in the theme on voice in the public domain.
Structure of the main report

The full report provides an overview of the IDM and the South Africa Country Study (Section 1), and outlines the way deprivation is measured in the IDM (Section 2). Section 3 describes the current form of each of the dimensions of the IDM, and gives an overview of their evolution. Further details about the sampling strategies for the two samples are outlined in Section 4.

The results of the national-level main sample are provided in full in Section 5, while those for the purposive sample of people with disabilities appear in Section 6.

The report concludes with a brief overview and discussion of the results of these analyses, and provides an indication of some of the technical issues for the IDM raised by the South African study (Section 7). These issues include the need to revise parts of the survey and scoring procedures for some indicators, assessing alternative aggregation approaches, and the construction of the IDM composite index. This report does not include all of the many analyses that could be undertaken with the South African data, so the final section identifies some of the possible future analyses that would help to deepen understanding of the multidimensional poverty experienced by different social groups in South Africa.

The appendices describe the scoring procedures for each of the dimensions (see Appendix A.1), and the detailed tables of results for each of the indicators, themes and dimensions for both the main and purposive samples (see Appendix A.2).
The Individual Deprivation Measure
The Individual Deprivation Measure

The Individual Deprivation Measure (IDM) is a new, individual measure of multidimensional poverty, which has been under development since 2009. From the outset, the aim was to formulate a just and justifiable measure of poverty that was gender-sensitive and capable of revealing gender disparities. The measure would reflect and be grounded in the experiences and priorities of poor men and women, would have the individual as the unit of analysis and would measure things that are known to be important to gender equity (e.g. unpaid or ‘domestic’ work, and control over personal decision-making). The objective was that the measure would enable comparisons across contexts and be policy relevant, with respect to anti-poverty policy and programs (Wisor et al. 2014).

Since 2016, the Australian National University (ANU) has worked with the International Women’s Development Agency (IWDA) and the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade to ensure the measure is technically robust, test it in a number of countries, to refine it for global use. In 2019, ANU led an IDM study in South Africa, one of the two countries where the revised measure has been tested by ANU researchers in this phase of the research. The other study, in Indonesia, was undertaken in 2018.

The results of the initial analysis of the South African data are presented in this report for both the national-level study and for the purposive sample of people with disabilities. The report does not include all the many levels of analysis that could be undertaken with these rich data sets. It is hoped that further analysis can be conducted in future collaborations with South African researchers. This report reflects the first stage of analysis of the survey results, including comparisons by gender, age, locality and disability status. It does not yet include analysis of the intersections between these characteristics, or of other data collected, such as regarding individual asset ownership.

The report is structured as follows: this introductory section, Section 1, provides some background to the IDM and details of the South Africa Country Study; Section 2 discusses how deprivation is measured in the IDM; Section 3 outlines how the 15 dimensions that comprise the IDM measure are constructed; Section 4 describes the sampling strategy for the South Africa Country Study in detail; and Sections 5 and 6 report the findings from the national-level main sample and from the purposive sample of people with disabilities, respectively. The report concludes by summarising some of the key findings and lessons from the South Africa Country Study, as well as identifying several possible future analyses using this data (Section 7). Two appendices are available, the first describing the scoring procedures for each of the dimensions (see Appendix A.1), and the second providing the detailed tables of results for each of the indicators, themes and dimensions for both the main and purposive samples (see Appendix A.2).
1.1 The South Africa Country Study

The South Africa Country Study was designed with two parts: (i) a survey undertaken nationally (the main sample); and (ii) a geographically restricted purposive sample of people with disabilities (and their household members), conducted in the Gauteng and Limpopo provinces.

Several ethics approvals were gained in Australia and South Africa for this study prior to commencing fieldwork. In 2018, ikapadata Pty Ltd was contracted (following an open request for tenders) to conduct the data collection in South Africa. Data collection for both samples was undertaken between February and June 2019.

To complement the survey implementation in South Africa, two qualitative exercises were undertaken, as had occurred in Indonesia. The first was cognitive interviewing—to investigate and capture people’s thought processes and understanding in responding to (a select subset of) survey questions, and contribute to improvements in the clarity and phrasing of questions used in the IDM survey instruments. Cognitive interviewing was conducted in Indonesia and South Africa in 2018.

The second exercise was the follow-up study. This study had two main purposes: (i) to determine whether participating in the IDM survey resulted in negative impacts for individuals, particularly in relation to the voice and violence dimensions; and (ii) to help understand how any unintended (negative) consequences could be reduced or eliminated in future uses of the IDM—that is, to inform sampling design and plans for IDM survey implementation in the future. In Indonesia and South Africa, the fieldwork for the followup study commenced approximately one month after the main survey. The Gender and Health Research Unit of the South African Medical Research Council led the study in South Africa, between April and June 2019. Further information on the South African follow-up study can be found in Sikweyiya et al. (forthcoming).

1.2 The development of the Individual Deprivation Measure

As noted above, the initial aim of the IDM was to develop a just and justifiable measure of poverty that was gender-sensitive and capable of revealing gender disparities.

The first research project tasked with creating the IDM was funded by the Australian Research Council, between 2009 and 2013, led by ANU, with a number of national and international scholarly and practitioner partners, among them the IWDA, one of the partners in the current project (see Wisor et al. 2014 for more detailed information about this first project).

The methodology used in this first project was informed by feminist principles and theoretical perspectives relating to gender and development (in particular, around power hierarchies, division of labour, social values, etc.), as well as a human rights-based approach.

The field-based research in the first project was largely participatory, to ensure that the measure would reflect the experiences and priorities of those living in poverty. It was conducted in six countries—Angola, Fiji, Indonesia, Malawi, Mozambique and the Philippines. In each country, the participatory work was undertaken at three sites: a
rural site; an urban site; and a ‘marginalised’ site. At each site, work was undertaken (separately) with men and women across three age cohorts (youth and young adults, middle-aged and older people).

Two phases of work were undertaken at each site (although, not always with the same participants). The phases were designed to elicit a full range of dimensions of deprivation that were important to the participants, and then to rank the identified dimensions in order of importance. The final 15 dimensions of the IDM, as determined through this work, are illustrated in Figure 1.2.1.

The final activity of the first phase was to develop pilot survey instruments, and test them as a ‘proof of concept’ in the Philippines (Wisor et al. 2014). An IDM survey was subsequently conducted in Fiji by IWDA and the Fiji Bureau of Statistics, with funding from the Australian Government’s Pacific Women Shaping Pacific Development Program (Fisk et al. 2017). During this second implementation, the IDM survey instruments were modified slightly (see Chapter 5 in Hunt et al. 2017 for more details).

The current IDM project is a partnership between ANU, IWDA and the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. It began in 2016 and will run until mid-2020. The overlap of organisations (and individuals) involved has ensured that the learning gleaned from early trials of the IDM in the Pacific was incorporated into further development of the measure. The initial activities of this project have centred on survey revision (including international peer review), revising the index construction methods and undertaking several data collection exercises. IWDA led an IDM study in Nepal (2016) and is working towards a study in the Solomon Islands (2020), while ANU-led studies were undertaken in Indonesia in 2018 (Bexley et al. 2020) and South Africa in 2019.
2. Measuring deprivation

As noted above, the aim of the IDM was to develop a just and justifiable measure that demonstrates the depth of deprivation, and the profiles of deprivation of individuals within households and social groups (e.g. by gender, age, locality, disability status, etc.). It was not feasible to develop a measure based on existing data because of the lack of individual-level data and because of the lack of gender sensitivity of existing survey instruments (Wisor et al. 2014).

As part of the process of selecting the 15 dimensions to be included in the IDM, several criteria were used to select appropriate dimensions—conceptual plausibility, moral importance, ease and reliability of measurement, suitability for institutional responses, comprehensiveness, usefulness and purpose (Wisor et al. 2014). The dimensions have remained the same throughout the development and refinement of the IDM instruments and index construction methods.

Selection criteria for the indicators used to measure different aspects of each dimension were outlined in the first project, emphasising the measurement of access to, use and achievement of resources. Selected indicators were designed, as far as possible, to measure access, use or achievement as objectively as possible. However, there are several cases in which it is necessary to measure individuals’ perception of their status with respect to this access, use or achievement.

Indicator selection (and therefore, the questions asked in the survey instruments used to measure those indicators) was based on the need to cover the aspects of each dimension identified as important during the participatory phase of the IDM, as comprehensively and accurately as possible. Where possible, questions included in the initial survey instruments were drawn from existing surveys that had been validated.

During the current IDM program, a major survey revision took place (see Chapter 5 in Hunt et al. 2017) and the indicators measured using the IDM survey instruments were significantly improved, based on the original indicator selection criteria. This revised survey was used in Indonesia and has since been further refined for use in South Africa. This iterative process of revision and improvement continued after the South African data collection.

It is recognised that the multi-topic nature of the IDM survey instruments means that trade-offs must be made between the complete and thorough coverage of a particular dimension and the selection of essential themes to measure the extent of deprivation and its gendered nature, to highlight priorities for policy responses.

The survey instruments contain almost 300 questions split across the dwelling, household and individual instruments—however, this does not mean that each respondent has to answer all 300 questions. Virtually all questions in each of the three survey instruments use a comprehensive set of appropriately defined response categories to facilitate data analysis. For the vast majority of individuals, in both Indonesia and South Africa, the time taken to complete the individual survey was approximately one hour or less.

To achieve a scalar measurement of deprivation, the data collected using the IDM survey instruments have been transformed into an ordinal ranking of that information. In many cases, this transformation is non-controversial (e.g. having control over personal decisions is better than not having such control), although in some instances, some subjectivity remains in the final ordering. The original method of index construction and weighting is described in detail in Wisor et al. (2014). Methods have been refined during this second phase of the project, and detailed information regarding the South African scoring procedures for each of the dimensions is presented in Appendix A.1.
To achieve the measurement objectives of the IDM, data from survey questions (or variables) is used in the creation of an indicator; indicators are then used to create theme scores and subsequently, dimension scores.

Each indicator is created from one or more survey questions, and there are 53 indicators in total. Indicators are aggregated (following an equal weight arithmetic aggregation procedure) into 32 themes. Each theme consists of one or more indicators and each dimension may consist of one or more themes. A schematic of the dimension-level construction is shown in Figure 2.1.1, and a dimension-specific schematic is presented at the beginning of each section that reports results for that dimension (for both samples).

Normalised indicator scores are used to create theme scores and normalised theme scores to create dimension scores. A higher score (at any level) indicates less severe deprivation and a lower score more severe deprivation. Equal weighting in aggregation has been chosen as the initial approach to dimension construction, as it is one of the more common methods used (OECD 2008). At this stage, there is no justification for weighting any indicators and themes more heavily than others. Further analysis across several country studies may suggest a shift in this approach in the future.

The results presented below are grouped according to their depth of deprivation. There are four categories of deprivation—least deprived, somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived. The cut-offs for each deprivation category are quarters of the normalised indicator, theme or dimension score.

The top category is consciously named as least deprived because the IDM does not measure the full extent of achievement. Thus, if an individual scores highly on one or more of the indicators, themes or dimensions and is categorised as least deprived, there is no claim that these individuals are not deprived—in many cases, the least deprived category may indicate a relatively low level of attainment (e.g. for the basic clothing and footwear theme).

Ultimately, the overall IDM score will be calculated based on the 14 dimensions of the IDM for which data is being reported (see Section 3.10 for an explanation of why the violence dimension will not be included). However, the final choice of index construction methods has not yet been made, so the overall IDM score is not presented in this report. Each of the dimensions is described below, providing detail about the themes and indicators within each. The scoring procedures for each dimension are outlined in Appendix A.1.
3. The 15 dimensions of the IDM

In the initial development of the IDM, when participants ranked the importance of the final 15 dimensions to be included in the measure (see Figure 1.2.1), there was a surprising level of agreement—across field sites and across both gender and age cohorts—regarding the prioritisation and ranking of these dimensions. Gendered roles, however, often determined whether participants were likely to prioritise certain dimensions or aspects of those dimensions. Furthermore, gendered roles also influenced the reasons given for certain dimensions being identified as important; age was also relevant to these choices.

3.1 Food

To measure deprivation in food, the IDM adopted the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) developed by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) of the United Nations. The FIES focuses on food-related behaviours associated with difficulties in accessing food due to resource constraints (Ballard et al. 2014). The dimension is measured using one theme, constructed from a single indicator that is derived from eight variables. The eight variables are the questions in the FIES Survey Module (Ballard et al. 2014), which cover three of the four cross-cultural domains of uncertainty and worry, inadequate quality and insufficient quantity (Coates et al. 2006).

These questions ask about direct personal and individual experience of compromising the quality and/or quantity of food eaten in the 30 days prior to the survey, due to a lack of financial or other resources to obtain it. The initial questions assess issues of mild food insecurity (worry about obtaining food) and each subsequent variable is associated with an aspect indicating a higher level of food insecurity—mild, moderate or severe food insecurity—according to the theoretical construct of food insecurity underlying the scale (Ballard et al. 2014).

The food dimension was initially measured with only one indicator, created using the questions from the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) project (and one additional question about hunger over the last 12 months). Subsequently, FANTA was developed further by the FAO, contributing to the development of the FIES (Leroy et al. 2015), so the FIES Survey Module for individuals was adopted by the IDM in 2017.

3.2 Water

This dimension focuses on measuring access to water of sufficient quantity and quality for various uses. The three themes are: drinking water; domestic water; and water collection threats.

The first theme, drinking water, is constructed from four variables: drinking water source; drinking water sufficiency (i.e. whether supplies are sufficient to meet needs); whether drinking water is treated (to improve quality); and whether the treatment method is adequate.
The second theme deals with domestic water and refers to uses of water, including cooking, washing and bathing (i.e. for uses other than drinking). The theme is measured using one indicator constructed from two variables determining the domestic water source and the sufficiency of that source.

The third theme is a departure from conventional assessments of access to water, in that it assesses the hazards and threats associated with collecting water from outside the dwelling, where necessary. The theme has only one indicator constructed from two variables: responsibility for collecting water; and threats experienced while collecting water.

This dimension has been expanded beyond the two indicators initially measured, which were water source, distance and improvement (constructed from two survey questions); and water quantity (based on one survey question). Information about the water treatment methods used was collected but not originally included in the IDM index construction.

3.3 Shelter

The shelter dimension has three themes: habitability; ownership of essential household items; and security of tenure.

The first theme consists of five indicators, each constructed from a single variable. The first three indicators determine the main construction materials of the floor, roof and exterior walls of the dwelling. The fourth indicator assesses the overall condition of the house, and the fifth indicator considers whether the home is too crowded to live in comfortably.

The second theme—ownership of essential household items—is measured using one indicator. The indicator is constructed from variables determining ownership of: sufficient cooking utensils (e.g. pots, pans and knives to use for the preparation of a meal with more than one component or dish); sufficient tableware (e.g. plates, bowls, dishes and cups); water storage and/or carrying vessels (to store enough water for one day, for those who have to collect water from outside the dwelling); and bedding (blankets, mats and/or mattresses to sleep comfortably).

The security of tenure theme is constructed from three indicators. The first indicator—eviction concern—is derived from one variable related to respondents’ concern about whether they may be evicted from their dwelling. The second indicator—recognition of ownership—determines whether ownership of the residence is recognised, either by government or customary tenure, and is derived from a single variable. The third indicator—mortgage or rent stress—is constructed from two variables. The first determines whether the respondent must pay rent or a mortgage for their dwelling, and if they do, the second determines how frequently they have been able to make their payments on time.

The shelter dimension was initially measured using only two indicators: housing materials and condition of the dwelling (four questions); and homelessness (two questions).

3.4 Health

The health dimension of the IDM has two main themes: health status; and health care access and quality. The health status theme is constructed from two indicators, namely, physical health status and psycho-social health status. The three variables that combine to create the physical health status indicator are: recent illness or injury; long term illness or injury; and health problems caused by exposure to cooking fuel smoke or fumes. The psycho-social health status indicator is constructed from two variables assessing how frequently an individual experienced nervousness, worry or
anxiety and/or depression. The questions for this latter indicator are drawn from the Washington Group on Disability Statistics’ (the Washington Group) questions on psycho-social distress (WGDS 2011).

The second theme is health care access and quality. Information for this theme is drawn from two indicators—general health care access and prenatal health care access. The first indicator is an aggregation of nine questions relating to any (non-pregnancy related) health care facilities accessed by the respondents in the 12 months prior to the survey. Aspects of quality that are assessed include the skills and knowledge of the health care practitioner, the cleanliness and location of the health care facility, whether a respondent was treated with respect by the medical staff, and issues around communication with the health practitioner. For those who did not access health care, the reasons for not doing so are also captured. The second indicator of the theme captures prenatal health care received by female respondents who were pregnant at the time of the survey or who had given birth in the 12 months prior. The prenatal health care access indicator mirrors the questions asked about general health care access, but with specific regard to any prenatal care received by the mother.

The health dimension was initially measured using three indicators: health status (three questions); health care access (two questions); and health care quality (seven questions). Additional data was collected, but not used in index construction, relating to why a respondent did not seek health care. Women who were pregnant (or had been so in the last three years) were also asked about prenatal care, which substituted for health care access for these women.

The Washington Group on Disability Statistics’ Short Set of Disability Questions (the Washington Group Short Set) were added to the survey in Fiji, to identify people with a disability across six core functional domains (Madans and Loeb 2013). Questions on psycho-social distress were added to the survey—the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale, or K10 (Kessler et al. 2002) was used in the Nepal country study in 2016. The K10 was replaced with the Washington Group questions on anxiety and depression during the survey revision process in 2017 (see WGDS 2011).

The need to understand health status and to identify people with disabilities complicates matters; it is not possible to use the same measures of health status for both purposes, since it would give rise to issues of circularity in comparisons between the subgroup of people with disabilities and the total sample respondents. Therefore, the Washington Group Short Set is included in the IDM survey instrument to identify people with disabilities among sampled respondents, but these data are not included in the dimension scoring for health.

3.5 Education

The IDM assesses two themes in the education dimension—education level and functional literacy and numeracy. Education level is measured using one indicator, derived from one variable—the highest level of education completed. The second theme—functional literacy and numeracy—contains two indicators. The functional literacy indicator comprises two variables measuring competency in reading and writing. Similarly, the functional numeracy indicator comprises two variables, assessing competency in addition/subtraction and in multiplication/division. These indicators have remained unchanged since the initial survey development. The focus on functional literacy and numeracy align with the focus of the Sustainable Development Goals on literacy, numeracy and skills proficiency (UNESCO 2016).
3.6 Energy

The energy dimension consists of four themes: cooking energy; lighting energy; heating energy; and energy collection threats. The structure of the first three themes is identical, with each comprising one indicator constructed from two variables—the source of energy and its sufficiency—for cooking, lighting and heating, respectively. The fourth theme also comprises a single indicator constructed from two variables. These variables determine whether the respondent is responsible for collecting energy or fuel sources from outside the home, and if they do, whether they experienced any threats or hazards when doing so. (This theme mirrors the water collection threats theme in the water dimension.) The questions about heating energy were included in the survey instruments in South Africa for the first time.

The dimension was initially measured using only the two indicators of cooking fuel/smoke exposure (five questions) and access to electricity (two questions). Data was collected regarding the reliability of electricity access but not included in the index construction. Data about exposure to fuel smoke is now included in the survey module and analyses of the health dimension.

3.7 Sanitation

This dimension examines sanitation and issues of personal hygiene, focusing on the sanitation facilities used when the respondent is at home (i.e. not those used when away from the dwelling). The dimension has three themes: toilet facilities; washing facilities; and a place to change in privacy during menstruation.

The first theme is constructed using two indicators: the type of toilet facility; and ownership status of that facility. The first indicator classifies types of toilet facilities and combines this, for flush and flush–pour type toilets, with a variable assessing whether there is enough water to flush the toilet. Toilet ownership is constructed using information from two hierarchal variables assessing whether the facility is private, shared with other households, or available for use by any member of the public.

The second theme—washing facilities—is constructed from two indicators. The first indicator assesses the availability of handwashing facilities in the dwelling, and combines information from three variables. The first determines whether the respondent has a place in their house or yard to wash their hands (at any time). Those with a handwashing place are then asked if they usually have enough water for handwashing and about the use of soap or soap substitutes for handwashing. The second indicator asks respondents how often they have access to sufficient toiletries. This latter indicator was introduced for the first time in South Africa following the review of the participatory fieldwork data from the original project, as part of the survey review process.

The third theme is relevant for menstruating women and examines available sanitation infrastructure. The theme considers whether menstruating women have a private place to wash and change at home, during menstruation, and contributes to improving the gender sensitivity of this dimension.

This dimension has changed substantially from the original two indicators that measured the type of primary toilet used (one question) and secondary toilet used (two questions).
3.8 Relationships

This social dimension has two themes: dependence and support; and participation in community events. The first theme is measured using one indicator, which is created from four variables. The first two determine whether the respondent depends on people not living with them to provide or pay for basic needs such as drinking water, food and shelter, because a lack of resources means they cannot provide for themselves. The third variable measures how often the respondent has enough of this support, and the fourth determines the (hypothetical) ability of the respondent to reciprocate.

The second theme—participation in community events—has two indicators. The first, namely overall community event participation, is constructed using four variables, the first two being whether the respondent attended community events, and if they did not, their reasons for not attending. The third and fourth variables examine the respondent’s contributions to community events and their reasons for not contributing (where relevant). The second indicator in this theme—participation during menstruation—is constructed from two variables: whether a menstruating woman missed any social activities, school or work because she did not have sanitary products; and whether she missed any events because of stigma associated with menstruation.

The dimension was substantially revised during the 2017 survey revision process. It originally focused on decision-making and personal support, measured by two indicators: control over personal decision-making (six questions); and personal support (one question). Data analysis revealed that the two original indicators were pulling in opposite directions, so the questions on control over personal decision-making were retained in the IDM but are now included in the voice dimension (see Section 3.13). Questions around the extent of an individual’s reliance/dependence on others have been refined, with iterations being cognitively tested in Indonesia and South Africa.

3.9 Clothing and footwear

The IDM determines the level of deprivation in clothing and footwear using three themes: basic clothing and footwear; other clothing and footwear; and sanitary product use.

The first theme is constructed from two indicators, each comprising two variables. The first indicator is basic clothing and footwear ownership, assessing ownership of at least two complete sets of clothing and two pairs of footwear. The second indicator—basic acceptability and protection—determines whether the individual’s everyday clothing is socially acceptable as well as the level of protection it provides against all weathers and environmental hazards.

The second theme assesses other clothing and footwear; specifically, it deals with school or work clothing and footwear (for those who require it) and clothing for formal occasions. The indicator addressing school and work clothing is constructed from three variables assessing whether the respondent has enough of the right types of clothing to wear to school/work each week, whether these are socially acceptable and the level of protection they provide from the weather and environmental hazards. The second indicator refers to formal clothing (e.g. for occasions such as funerals, weddings or other celebrations) and determines whether an individual has enough formal clothing (i.e. to meet needs) and whether this clothing is socially acceptable.
The final theme of the clothing dimension is measured by one theme and one indicator, derived from two variables determining whether the respondent menstruated in the six months prior to the survey, and if they did, how often they had sufficient sanitary products, such as sanitary pads, tampons or cloths to use. This is only relevant to menstruating women.

This dimension measures from a very low base, adopted from the minimum standards determined for appropriate responses in humanitarian emergencies (Sphere Project 2015), one of the few circumstances where clothing and footwear have been routinely considered. Thus, a relatively high score for the first theme, in particular, cannot be interpreted as an individual being not deprived—those in the least deprived category are so classified because they own two complete sets of clothing and two pairs of footwear.

This dimension has been expanded from the indicators originally included, which were protection from the elements (one question) and personal care/presentation in public (one question). This expansion and iterative development of the variables and the relevant survey questions has relied heavily on the results of the cognitive interviewing in Indonesia and South Africa, but it should be further developed.

3.10 Violence

This dimension assesses the type of violence experienced and whether it was psychological, physical, aggravated physical and/or sexual violence. It also assessed the frequency of any violence experienced over the 12 months prior to the survey.

The IDM initially measured this dimension with one indicator: freedom from violence. In Nepal, specific, additional, informed consent was introduced into the survey at the beginning of the questions about violence. Questions were reordered and rephrased, and questions regarding the frequency of each type of violence experienced were introduced. A Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) system was used for data collection for the first time in Nepal, and for the violence module only, these survey questions were selfadministered, using the enumerators’ device. However, respondents who were not familiar with touch screens (particularly older respondents) had difficulties with the self-administration process. The novelty of tablets in many locations often drew the attention of bystanders, including children, which was less than ideal, particularly during the administration of such sensitive questions. CAPI systems were used in the Indonesia and South Africa country studies; however, this module was administered by enumerators in both countries, as were all other survey modules.

As noted in Hunt et al. (2017), from a gender and policy perspective, this dimension would ideally distinguish between public violence and intimate partner or family violence. However, because the IDM sampling strategy involves interviewing all eligible and consenting dwelling members, it is not possible to ask about the perpetrator (i.e. their gender or relationship to the victim) or the location of the violence, due to the risk to participants who may be experiencing intimate partner violence. Advice from violence experts guided us in this; however, support remained for us to trial this sampling approach with violence questions included in the survey.

In South Africa, the Gender and Health Research Unit at the South African Medical Research Council were also commissioned to conduct a carefully designed follow-up study of respondents who had reported some experience of violence, to ensure that there had been no detrimental effects caused by asking them about violence. A similar followup study was also undertaken in Indonesia. From the study undertaken in South Africa, the respondents spoken to as part of the follow-up study had not suffered negative consequences as a result of answering questions about violence, even though multiple individuals in a household had been sampled and interviewed as part of the survey implementation (Sikweyiya et al. forthcoming).
In terms of constructing the dimension index, the intention had been to construct the violence dimension by identifying one theme with five indicators. Instances of violence reported by men and women during IDM data collection would have been scored equally, which assumes a similar incident of violence occurred. As the level of violence increased with each indicator (i.e. from psychological violence through to sexual violence), the indicator would have been assigned a greater weight, but would not distinguish between male or female respondents. However, as was made clear in the early stages of the IDM:

If a man is hit in a public fight, this scores the same as if a woman is hit by her partner. Arguably, in some instances, the woman’s deprivation could be considered as more severe because her exposure to violence is in the home (with implications for her ability to avoid it), because it is more likely to occur again (and fear of this may be ever-present), and because it is likely to affect many other aspects of her life. If the man’s public fight is not likely to have these similar features (possible future occurrence, affecting many aspects of life), perhaps it should not count equally (Wisor et al. 2014, p.62).

Following the completion of data collection and a preliminary data analysis, discussion with gender violence experts in South Africa led to the decision not to construct a dimension score for violence. The reason for this decision is that, in line with the concerns described above, we do not believe that the same thing is being measured for men and women; men are more likely to have experienced public violence, while women are more likely to experience gender-based, or family violence. Thus, a dimension measurement score that equates these quite different types of violence in a single, comparable score cannot be validly constructed. Further work on this dimension will be required to determine if an appropriate scoring procedure exists. Until such a procedure is finalised, the data and analysis for the violence dimension will not be released.

3.11 Family planning

This is one of the more gender-sensitive dimensions of the IDM, and consists of a single theme and single indicator: unmet need for contraception (i.e. individuals who are sexually active and want to delay or avoid having children but who do not use contraception, or use only less effective traditional methods). The indicator is constructed from five variables, determining first whether the respondent or their partner uses any methods to delay or avoid pregnancy, and then which method is used (i.e. modern or traditional). If no methods of contraception are used, the reasons for not doing so are also investigated.

Unmet need for contraception is typically measured for married women aged between 15 and 49 years. However, the IDM determines the unmet need of all women and men irrespective of their marital status and age. This recognises that fertility rates can extend beyond the defined age group for women, as well as the role of men in family planning, and does not assume that unmarried men and women are not sexually active.

The dimension was initially measured using two indicators: access to contraception (two questions) and use of contraception (two questions). Additional questions were added in Nepal to improve the assessment of use, access and need, and to distinguish use by the respondent or a sexual partner.
3.12 Environment

The environment dimension consists of three themes: exposure to environmental problems; natural resource utilisation; and a safe environment.

The first theme—exposure to environmental problems—is measured by one indicator, constructed from eight variables asked in the household survey, and each individual in a household is assumed to be affected by these problems in the same way.

The second theme relates to natural resource utilisation, which is constructed from two indicators. The first indicator—wild resource utilisation—is developed with the information regarding the collection of wild or non-cultivated resources, and whether these resources are enough to meet needs. The second indicator—biomass fuel utilisation—assesses the utilisation and availability of biomass fuel (for cooking and/or heating).

The third theme deals with the perceived safety of the respondent’s environment and is constructed with the two variables determining their feelings of safety while walking alone in their neighbourhood and while at home alone. The two latter themes were incorporated into the survey during the revision process in 2017, and were first captured in the Indonesian data collection in 2018.

3.13 Voice

The voice dimension consists of two themes: voice in the public domain and personal control over decision-making. Voice in the public domain is constructed from three indicators: voting; participation in local decision-making; and perception of raising concerns (locally). The voting indicator is based on three variables: whether the respondent voted in the most recent election at any level; for those who voted, whether they were free to choose whom to vote for; and, for those who did not vote, whether it was because they were too young to vote.

The second indicator—local participation in decision-making—is constructed from three variables. These determine whether the respondent participated in any local decision-making processes in the 12 months prior to the survey. For those who did participate, respondents were asked how much influence they felt they had in that process, and if they did not participate, their main reason for not doing so. This indicator was revised following the Indonesian data collection, based on the cognitive interviewing in both Indonesia and South Africa.

The third indicator consists of two variables assessing (hypothetical) perceptions of how easy or difficult it is to raise concerns with local leaders, organisations or influential people, and how seriously concerns are taken if they are raised. This indicator is included to understand the perspectives of those individuals who may not have had an opportunity to participate in any local decision-making.

The second theme—personal control over decision-making—has only one indicator, which is constructed from six variables. These determine whether people living in the same dwelling have prevented the respondent from doing certain activities or from making any personal decisions, such as seeking education or training, seeking work for income, or seeing family and friends.

This dimension was initially named ‘voice in the community’ and was measured with two indicators: ability to participate in community decision-making (one question) and ability to change your community (one question). It was supplemented by the theme of personal control over decision-making, as discussed in Section 3.8.
3.14 **Time use**

This dimension focuses on time use deprivation faced by the individual during the most recent working day (i.e. Monday to Friday) prior to the survey. The dimension is measured using one theme: time burden. This theme is a combination of time burden and on-call time. Time burden is measured by calculating the time spent on work for pay, profit and production, on unpaid domestic and care work, and on obligatory activities (i.e. time spent on non-leisure and non-personal care activities). On-call time is the proportion of time the respondent is simultaneously undertaking their primary activity while being responsible for caring for a child under the age of 13, or responsible for someone who was sick, disabled or elderly.

The method of data collection for this dimension has changed during the course of this phase of research, and the categories of time use have been clarified based on cognitive interviewing and, at the same time, have been aligned more closely with international activity classification. Data was collected in the Philippines and Fiji using a 24-hour time diary, broken into 30-minute blocks, for 20 different activities (and concurrent secondary activities). In Nepal, the survey questions were reframed into a more narrative-based method, using 22 different time use categories (and collecting data on secondary and tertiary activities). Since the survey revision, data have been collected using an interactive approach during the survey enumeration to determine the proportion of time people spent on 14 key activities on the most recent working day prior to the survey (11 key activities were defined in the Indonesian survey).

The 14 categories used in South Africa were aligned with the 2016 ‘International classification of activities for time-use statistics’ (UNSD 2017), and data on multitasking was replaced with additional detail about on-call time, asking about care of a child under 13 years of age, and of people who may be sick, elderly or disabled.

3.15 **Work**

The work dimension aims to broaden the understanding of work, to increase the visibility of work inside the home and to see how the burden of work, so defined, differs between men and women. Therefore, the dimension has three themes: work for pay, profit or own production (i.e. it generates income, food or other goods or services); unpaid domestic and care work; and the double labour burden. The separation of unpaid work from paid and subsistence activities and the consideration of the double labour burden is particularly important for gender sensitivity.

The first theme—work for pay, profit and production—is constructed from four indicators. The first indicator is employment status, which is created from five variables that determine whether the respondent is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labour force. The second indicator—job security—is constructed from three variables including the number of jobs held over the six months prior to the survey, whether their employment status changed based on the decision of an employer, and a proxy for whether their employment could be considered in the formal sector.

The hazards in work for pay, profit and production indicator is constructed from three variables relating to whether the respondent’s workplace was in a confined space, whether workers were exposed to dangerous materials as a result of their work, or whether they were required to operate dangerous machinery or do heavy physical labour. The final indicator in this theme is respect and autonomy in work for pay, profit and production. It is constructed from four variables that relate to whether the respondent experienced sexual harassment, physical abuse or humiliation at work, or feels the work that they do is humiliating, and whether they were able to take breaks to eat, drink or go to the toilet during working hours.
The second theme relates to unpaid domestic and care activities. The first indicator—hazardous unpaid domestic and care work—is constructed from three variables that determine whether the respondent experienced any injury, illness or mental harm as a result of their unpaid domestic and care work, and if so, whether the effects were temporary or permanent. The respect in unpaid domestic and care work indicator is constructed from two variables relating to whether the respondent is free from humiliating treatment while doing their unpaid domestic and care work, and if this work is valued by other household members.

The third theme assesses the double labour burden of paid and unpaid work and is constructed from information about average hours per week spent on both work for pay, profit and production and unpaid domestic and care work.

This dimension has expanded substantially from the four indicators originally used, which were risks related to paid and unpaid work (three questions), and status of paid and unpaid work (two questions).

### 3.16 Additional data collected

In addition to these 15 dimensions, data is collected at the individual level about several non-dimension topics, to provide additional context for data analysis. These nondimension topics cover personal characteristics, quality of life, asset ownership and control, and vulnerability.

The personal characteristics module gathers basic demographic information about the respondent such as age, gender, population group, whether the respondent is a social grant recipient (e.g. receives an old age grant, disability grant or other form of assistance from the government), or whether he or she has a formal/legal identity document. This will improve understanding of the demographic distribution of the sample, and understanding about the individual. Additional information is collected at the dwelling and household level, which can be used to understand the household and dwelling demographic structure.
4. The South African Country Study sampling approaches

The IDM has adopted an approach to sampling that is unlike most multi-topic household surveys, which tend to interview only one person per household. In the data collection exercises in the Philippines, Fiji and Nepal, the approach taken was to attempt to survey all adult household members within the sampled households. This strategy was initially chosen to enable the evaluation of intra-household deprivation levels (Wisor et al. 2014). Adult household members were initially defined as those 18 years of age and older. There may have been some non-randomness in those adult household members who were not interviewed (e.g. due to their absence from the home despite call-backs), which could introduce some bias into the overall representativeness of the sample.

The selection of respondents to be surveyed has varied somewhat according to the location of the study. The age of eligible respondents was reduced to 16 years and older in Indonesia. A further departure from the earlier sampling approach was to sample at the dwelling level, rather than the (socially-constructed) household level, to maximise the chance that all individuals living within a dwelling would be interviewed, not just the members of the ‘principal’ household (e.g. to ensure coverage of domestic staff, resident labourers, etc.). In South Africa, two approaches were taken to sampling to best suit the needs of the main and purposive samples, as described below.

In all cases, the dwelling, household and individual surveys were undertaken in the preferred language of the respondent; i.e. any of the 11 official languages of South Africa.

4.1 The South African national-level main sample

To select respondents for the main sample of the South Africa Country Study, enumeration areas (EAs) were randomly selected across all nine provinces of the country, stratified by rural/urban\(^2\) locality. A sampling frame of dwellings was created by remote sensing roofs from satellite imagery of the sampled EAs, and the GPS point of each was listed, randomly ordered and sequentially numbered. Fieldwork teams followed the sequence of randomly ordered dwellings until they had completed a minimum of 24 individual interviews in each EA (determined to achieve a minimum provincial sample size of 800 individuals).

At the dwelling level, attempts were made to interview each eligible individual in each household living in that dwelling. Eligible individuals for the main sample were all dwelling residents 16 years and older, who were able to communicate for themselves and who were competent to give informed and ongoing consent during the interview.

---

\(^2\) There may be issues with the classification of surveyed localities into urban and rural, which are likely to be the result of changes in how an area is classified (as a result of demographic and land use changes). This is because the enumeration area classifications used were from the most recent census (2011) and the data collection for this study was undertaken in 2019.
The cut-off age was set at 16 for several reasons. Firstly, from this age many young people are already starting to lead adult lives with adult responsibilities. Further, there are ethical issues associated with working with younger and more vulnerable people and it was not certain that the 15 dimensions in the IDM would be the most relevant for people younger than 16.

More than 24 individual interviews were conducted in some selected EAs, as once a dwelling had been sampled, interviews of all eligible individuals in those sampled dwellings were required to be completed. Technical detail about the remote sensing process, EA replacement and other sampling issues can be found in ikapadata (2019). Table 4.1.1 shows the breakdown of the main sample by province.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1.1</th>
<th>Summary of the main sample, by province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu Natal</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is quite a resource intensive sampling strategy, so the data will be used to simulate whether it would be more efficient to roll out a different sampling strategy.

4.2 The South African purposive sample of people with disabilities

The purposive sample was intended to identify and interview individuals with disabilities (and their household members), to ensure that we had a sample of sufficient size to allow comparisons between individuals with disabilities and those without. As such, the sampling frame for the purposive sample was created separately from the frame for the main sample, given the lack of any available sampling frame that could be used and/or adapted. Due to resource constraints, this purposive sample was limited to Gauteng and Limpopo provinces, selected to capture rural and urban localities, and based on advice received from disability advocates in South Africa.

The sampling frame for the purposive sample was created using two different methods. The first was to have ikapadata fieldworkers ask key informants in communities to identify potential eligible respondents (i.e. adults with a disability), using a set of questions adapted from the Australian Bureau of Statistics Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers (ABS 2015) and the Washington Group Short Set (WGDS ud) (see Box 1). The second was to contact disabled people’s organisations (DPOs) in both provinces and, with the DPOs’ consent, access contact details of their (adult) members.
The purpose of using both methods to identify potential respondents was to reduce sampling bias that may have arisen from only contacting those individuals with disabilities who had formal or informal associations with DPOs.

**Box 1 Questions used in key informant interviews to identify potential respondents for the purposive sample**

Do you know anyone who lives in this community who is over 18 years of age and who:
- Has difficulty seeing, or a loss of sight?
- Has difficulty hearing, or a loss of hearing?
- Has difficulty speaking, or a loss of speech?
- Has difficulty walking or climbing steps or hills?
- Is restricted in their daily activities because of memory problems or confusion?
- Has incomplete use of their arms or legs?
- Has skin that is extremely sensitive to the sun?
- Is restricted in their daily activities because of nervous or emotional condition(s)?
- Is restricted in their daily activities because of chronic or recurrent pain?
- Is restricted in their daily activities because of difficulty breathing?
- Has a long-term head injury or brain damage?
- Has a disfigurement or deformity?
- Has blackouts, seizures or loss of consciousness (but that is not the result of substance abuse, whether alcohol or drugs)?

Source: Adapted from ABS (2015) and WGDS (ud).

The resultant sampling frame was by no means a complete list of all people with disabilities in both provinces, but was used to purposively select individuals residing within the districts in each province, approximately proportional to the size of the total population of each district.

Potential participants were asked if they were interested in participating in the study by telephone, and if so, a time and date for a visit to conduct the interview was arranged. During that visit, interviews with their household members were also conducted and/or scheduled.

Eligible respondents for this sample were the purposively selected individuals with a disability and their household members, all of whom had to be 18 years of age and older, able to communicate for themselves and competent to give informed and ongoing consent during the interview. The age of eligibility was raised to 18 years for the purposive sample because of the multiple vulnerabilities that individuals might face due to the combination of youth and disability, and to reduce risks associated with these multiple vulnerabilities. The breakdown of the purposive sample is shown in Table 4.2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gauteng</th>
<th>Limpopo</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>2,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Results from the national-level main sample

The analysis presented below focuses on constructing dimension-level scores and deprivation categorisation for the national-level main sample, with deprivation categories determined by cut-offs at quarters of the indicator, theme or dimension score. The overall results for the main sample are presented, as are the results of four comparative analyses: (i) between male and female; (ii) between three age groups—youth (16–24), middle/rest of the working age population (25–64), and older/those past the legal retirement age (65+); (iii) between localities classified as rural and urban;3 and (iv) between individuals in the main sample identified as living with a disability and those who are not. (This is a separate analysis from that of the purposive sample, the results of which are presented in Section 6).

This section presents the overall results of these analyses of the South African main sample, and summarises the more important differences identified by the comparative analyses. These differences are determined not only by statistically significant differences between subgroups, but also the size of these differences—that is, those of more than approximately 2% across two or more of the four deprivation categories of least deprived, somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived. The complete tables of results—for each indicator, theme and dimension—for each of these comparative analyses are provided in Appendix A.2.

As noted in Section 2, indicators are aggregated using an equally weighted arithmetic aggregation (where appropriate) to construct themes. The same method is used for the aggregation of themes into dimensions. Equal weighting has been chosen as the initial approach to dimension construction, as it is one of the most common weighting methods used in the construction of composite indices (OECD 2008). Alternative methods of aggregation and weighting for the construction of themes and dimensions should be tested in the future. In terms of the representativeness of the results, sampling weights can be calculated and used in analysis to correct any over- or underrepresentation of certain groups due to sampling. The report presents ‘raw’ results at this stage; sampling weights have not yet been used, so the analysis presented below has not been adjusted for national representativity.

5.1 Summary of the national-level main sample

The main demographic characteristics of the main sample respondents are shown in Table 5.1.1. Other characteristics, such as education and employment status, can be found in the results presented in this section, as these variables are used in the construction of the dimension score and deprivation categorisation (where appropriate).

The average household size for the main sample was 5.2 people, with a median of 5, and a range of 1–29 individuals. Additional information about the number of dwellings, households and individuals by province can be found in Section 4; provincial-level analyses should be undertaken in the future.

3 As noted earlier in the report, the issues with the classification of these localities into urban and rural are recognised, as are the changes over time (i.e. between the 2011 census and 2019) in how an area is classified, as a result of demographic and land-use changes.
### Table 5.1.1  Demographic characteristics, South African main sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16–24</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–64</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language spoken most commonly at home</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiNdebele</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiXhosa</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiZulu</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiSwati</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TshiVenda</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xitsonga</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race group</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian or Asian</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability status</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With disabilities</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without disabilities</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total respondents</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>4,914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1.1 Functioning difficulties and disability status classification

An individual is categorised as having disabilities if they reported having ‘some’ or ‘a lot of’ difficulty in one of the six domains assessed in the Washington Group Short Set, or if they are unable to function at all in at least one domain (WGDS ud).

Stricter criteria can be used: categorising only those who have ‘a lot of’ difficulty or who cannot function at all in one or more domains. When this strict approach is taken, 43.0% of the individuals who were purposively sampled because they have a disability (in the purposive sample) are categorised as ‘without disabilities’, while using the more relaxed criteria results in only 9.0% of these purposively sampled individuals being classified the same way. The Washington Group Short Set is recognised as not always identifying people with the characteristics of interest (Madans et al. 2004) and not covering all domains across which individuals may have difficulties functioning. Table 5.1.2 illustrates the differences in classification for the main and purposive samples using the two different criteria.
Table 5.1.2  Prevalence rate of functioning difficulties based on the Washington Group Short Set, main and purposive samples, by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Strict criteria (%)</th>
<th>Relaxed criteria (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disabilities</td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-64</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purposive sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Strict criteria (%)</th>
<th>Relaxed criteria (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With disabilities</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-64</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of functioning difficulties experienced by respondents categorised as ‘with disabilities’ using the relaxed criteria in the main sample is presented in Table 5.1.3. Of this group, 51.7% experience one functioning difficulty, 26.2% experience two difficulties, 13.0% experience three difficulties, and the remaining 9.1% experience four, five or six functioning difficulties.

Table 5.1.3  Functioning difficulties by domain, main sample respondents classified as with disabilities (n=3,306) (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Some difficulty</th>
<th>A lot of difficulty</th>
<th>Cannot do at all</th>
<th>% of those with functioning difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeing</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/climbing steps</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering/concentrating</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-care</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those experiencing functioning difficulties in the main sample—2.5% stated that these difficulties were first experienced at birth, 15.7% first experienced difficulties in childhood, 16.7% first experienced them in early adulthood (approximately 18-29 years), and the remaining 64.8% first experienced their functioning difficulties when they were 30 years or older. This may help to explain the correlation between age and disability.

Of those with functioning difficulties, 37.8% identified an individual within their household who was responsible for taking care of them—46.7% of men and 33.6% of women identified a carer.
5.2 Food

5.2.1 Food dimension results

Figure 5.2.1 Indicators and themes of the food dimension

Food insecurity

5.2.2 Food dimension, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who are experiencing no food insecurity
Somewhat deprived: Individuals who are experiencing mild food insecurity
Deprived: Individuals who are experiencing moderate food insecurity
Most deprived: Individuals who are experiencing severe food insecurity

Those experiencing current mild food insecurity may have: been worried about not having enough food to eat; been unable to eat healthy and nutritious food; and/or may have eaten only a few kinds of foods. Those experiencing moderate food insecurity may have: had to skip a meal; and/or eaten less than they thought they should; and/or run out of food. Severe food insecurity refers to individuals who: had been hungry but did not eat; and/or went without eating for a whole day. The relevant period is the 30 days prior to the survey, and the reason for failing to obtain food must be because of a lack of money or other resources (i.e. excluding religious, health or dieting reasons).
Overall, 30.7% of respondents are classified as most deprived and were experiencing severe food insecurity when they were surveyed (Figure 5.2.2). A further 18.5% are deprived, experiencing moderate food insecurity at that time, and 14.6% were experiencing mild food insecurity and are categorised as somewhat deprived. The remaining 36.2% were experiencing no food insecurity, and are categorised as least deprived.

More than half of the respondents stated that they ate only a few kinds of foods, and were unable to eat healthy and nutritious food, while just under half worried about not having enough food (the three questions determining mild food security). More than a third had to skip a meal, eat less than they thought they needed, or ran out of food (the two questions determining moderate food insecurity). Almost 30.0% said they had been hungry but had not eaten, and 20.0% had gone a whole day without eating in the 30 days prior to the survey (the questions determining severe food insecurity).

A smaller proportion of women are categorised as least deprived (34.2% compared to 38.8% of men), and a higher proportion of women than men are somewhat deprived (16.3% and 12.3%, respectively). However, at the variable level, women were considerably more likely than men to say that they worried about not having enough food, ate few kinds of foods, and were unable to eat healthy and nutritious food.

The youth are slightly less food insecure than the two older age groups, while the middle age group is more food insecure than other two groups, with 33.0% of them most deprived (26.2% for the youth and 27.6% for the older group).

Urban residents are more likely to be least deprived (38.7% compared to 31.5% of rural residents) and most deprived (31.9% compared to 28.5% of rural residents), with smaller proportions of urban respondents in the middle categories compared to rural residents.

The most noticeable variation from the overall pattern of deprivation is in relation to people living with disabilities (see Figure 5.2.3). A smaller proportion of people with disabilities are least deprived (28.4%) compared to those without disabilities (40.5%). People with disabilities were also more severely food insecure, being considerably more likely than those without disabilities to be deprived or most deprived (57.9% combined compared to 44.4%).

Figure 5.2.3  Food dimension, South African main sample, by disability status
5.3 Water

Figure 5.3.1 Indicators and themes of the water dimension

5.3.1 Theme 1: Drinking water

Figure 5.3.2 Drinking water, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who:

- always have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
- or have enough to meet needs most of the time, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

OR Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or public tap, who always have enough to meet needs, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.
**Somewhat deprived:** Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who:

- have enough to meet needs most of the time, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
- OR have enough to meet needs sometimes, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
- OR never have enough to meet needs, but treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

OR Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or public tap, who:

- always have enough to meet needs, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
- OR have enough to meet needs most of the time, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
- OR have enough to meet needs sometimes, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who:

- always have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
- OR have enough to meet needs most of the time, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, who always have enough to meet needs, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

**Deprived:** Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who never have enough to meet needs, do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods.

OR Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or a public tap, who:

- have enough to meet needs sometimes, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
- OR never have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used.

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who:

- have enough to meet needs most of the time, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
- have enough to meet needs sometimes, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
- OR never have enough to meet needs, but treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, who:

- always have enough to meet needs, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
- OR have enough to meet needs most of the time, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
- OR have enough to meet needs sometimes, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

OR Individuals who have unimproved water sources, who:
· Always have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
· OR have enough to meet needs most of the time, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

**Most deprived:** Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who never have enough to meet needs, and do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, who:
· have enough to meet needs sometimes, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
· OR never have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used.

OR Individuals who have unimproved water sources, who have enough to meet needs most of the time, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods

OR Individuals who have unimproved water sources, who sometimes or never have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used

Of the main sample respondents, 36.0% are categorised as least deprived with respect to drinking water, with a further 38.4% somewhat deprived (see Figure 5.3.2). A total of 25.6% are either deprived (17.8%) or most deprived (7.8%), categories that largely represent those with poor water quality and/or poor reliability of supply. Results for all three age groups follow this overall pattern of deprivation.

The differences between men and women are small, with slightly fewer men categorised as least deprived (33.9%) and slightly more as most deprived (8.7%) compared to women (37.6% and 7.1%, respectively).

A stark divergence from this pattern is evident with respect to locality. In rural areas, only 11.0% are least deprived compared to 49.3% in urban areas (see Figure 5.3.3).

**Figure 5.3.3** Drinking water, South African main sample, by locality
Some 49.2% of urban dwellers are either somewhat deprived or deprived, and 1.4% are most deprived compared to just over 69.2% of rural dwellers who are in the somewhat deprived or deprived categories and 19.7% who are most deprived.

Urban residents have much better access to clean water sources—a majority have access to treated drinking water, piped to their dwelling or yard, a neighbour or a public tap (only a very small proportion, 1.7%, reported using bottled water). Over 90.0% of urban residents access clean water compared to 48.1% of rural residents. The reliability of supply is also much better for urban residents. Some 61.0% of urban dwellers always have sufficient water compared to only 32.0% of rural respondents.

Only 9.8% of rural and 12.6% of urban groups treat their drinking water, which is perhaps surprising, particularly given the unclean sources used by many rural residents. However, 98.3% of all respondents who treat their water use adequate treatment methods (WHO and UNICEF 2006), which is encouraging. While most urban residents and over half of rural residents boil their water, some 38.0% of those in rural areas who treat their water do so by adding iodine, chlorine, bleach or other mineral treatments.

People with disabilities are slightly worse off than those without disabilities—they are less likely to be in the least deprived category (32.3% compared to 38.1%), and more likely to be deprived or most deprived (29.3% compared to 23.5%), experiencing poor water quality and poor reliability of supply.

The current method used to score this indicator, and the cut-offs between categories, will likely be simplified in the future, to reduce the overlap of improved and unimproved water sources between deprivation categories.

5.3.2 Theme 2: Domestic water

Figure 5.3.4 Domestic water, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, and have enough to meet needs always or most of the time
OR Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or public tap, and always have enough to meet needs
**Somewhat deprived:** Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, but who sometimes or never have enough to meet needs

OR Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or public tap and have enough to meet needs some or most of the time

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, and have enough to meet needs, always or most of the time

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, and always have enough to meet needs

**Deprived:** Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or public tap, but never have enough to meet needs

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) sources piped to their dwelling, but sometimes or never have enough to meet needs

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, and have enough to meet needs some or most of the time

OR Individuals who have unimproved water sources, and have enough to meet needs always or most of the time

**Most deprived:** Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, but never have enough to meet needs

OR Individuals who have unimproved water sources, and have enough to meet needs some of the time or never

Domestic water refers to non-drinking uses such as washing, cooking, bathing. Overall, 57.6% of respondents are least deprived in relation to domestic water. A little over a quarter (27.1%) are somewhat deprived, 12.6% are deprived and only 2.7% most deprived (Figure 5.3.4). For those individuals for whom scores are lower, it is because of the combination of unimproved water supplies and the relatively poor reliability of that supply. Men and women follow the same pattern of deprivation for domestic water, as do the three age groups.

Once again, the starkest difference is between rural and urban areas (see Figure 5.3.5), with almost three-quarters (74.1%) least deprived, but just over a quarter of rural dwellers (26.5%) categorised similarly. Thus, more than 70.0% of rural residents are classified as somewhat deprived or worse compared to less than onequarter of their urban counterparts. A combination of poor quality water sources and poor reliability of supplies drive these differences.
Individuals with disabilities are worse off than those without—with 10.0% fewer in the least deprived category, and more classified as deprived or most deprived (a total of 17.2% compared to 14.3%).

5.3.3 Theme 3: Water collection threats

**Figure 5.3.6** Water collection threats, South African main sample

*Least deprived:* Individuals who do not have any responsibility for collecting water from outside the dwelling
Somewhat deprived: not applicable

Deprived: Individuals who are responsible for collecting water from outside the dwelling, but who do not face any threats or hazards when doing so

Most deprived: Individuals who are responsible for collecting water from outside the dwelling, and who do face threats or hazards when doing so

Overall, 59.0% of individuals surveyed did not have to collect water from outside of their dwelling, and are therefore categorised as least deprived (Figure 5.3.6). Some 38.8% collected water from outside their dwelling but faced no threats when doing so, and are therefore categorised as deprived. Further, 2.2% are categorised as most deprived—those individuals who faced threats while collecting water—and this is 5.4% of those who were responsible for collecting water outside the home. This overall pattern of deprivation with respect to facing water collection threats is consistent for men and women, and individuals with and without disabilities.

Patterns of deprivation for the youth and middle age groups are close to the overall trend. However, for the older group, a much higher proportion reported not collecting water from outside the household and accordingly, 71.6% are classified as being least deprived and fewer are deprived or most deprived (a total of 28.4%).

The differences between urban and rural residents are substantial (see Figure 5.3.7), largely driven by the much higher proportion of rural residents needing to collect water from outside the house. Approximately 60.2% of rural residents compared to only 30.8% of those living in urban areas, are therefore categorised as deprived or most deprived. Small proportions of urban and rural residents reported experiencing threats when they were out collecting water (1.8% and 3.0%, respectively), and are therefore categorised as most deprived.

Figure 5.3.7 Water collection threats, South African main sample, by locality
5.3.4 Water dimension results

Figure 5.3.8 Water dimension, South African main sample

Overall, 53.4% of respondents are least deprived and 35.4% are somewhat deprived, while some 11.2% are deprived or very deprived in the water dimension (Figure 5.3.8). There are no differences in the patterns of deprivation of men and women, or of any of the three age groups.

As would be expected from the three themes described above, the most striking variation is between urban and rural respondents (see Figure 5.3.9). Almost 70.0% of urban respondents are least deprived at the dimension level compared to only 22.9% of rural dwellers, while 26.6% of rural respondents are deprived or most deprived compared to 2.9% of urban ones.
A smaller proportion of people living with disabilities are least deprived, compared with those without disabilities (49.6% and 55.5%, respectively), with a larger proportion in the somewhat deprived category (38.6% and 33.6%).

5.4 Shelter

Figure 5.4.1  Indicators and themes of the shelter dimension
5.4.1  Theme 1: Habitability

Indicator 1: Flooring material

Figure 5.4.2  Flooring material, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have floors of finished materials
Somewhat deprived: not applicable
Deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have floors of rudimentary materials
Most deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have floors of natural materials

The majority of the main sample (94.3%) live in dwellings with floors made of finished materials and are categorised as least deprived (Figure 5.4.2). In contrast, 1.8% are categorised as deprived (e.g. have floorings of rudimentary materials), and 3.8% are categorised as most deprived (i.e. dwellings with earth or dung floors). This deprivation distribution holds true across each of the subgroup comparisons.
Indicator 2: Roofing material

Figure 5.4.3  Roofing material, South African main sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th>Most deprived</th>
<th>Deprived</th>
<th>Somewhat deprived</th>
<th>Least deprived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Least deprived:** Individuals whose dwellings have roofs of finished materials  
**Somewhat deprived:** Individuals whose dwellings have roofs of rudimentary materials  
**Deprived:** Individuals whose dwellings have roofs of natural materials  
**Most deprived:** Individuals whose dwellings have no roof

Nearly all individuals are categorised as least deprived (98.0%), meaning they live in dwellings with roofs made from finished materials (mostly metal/zinc or ceramic tiles, see Figure 5.4.3). Just 0.1% (11 individuals) lived in dwellings without a roof. There were no substantial deviations from this pattern within the subgroup analyses.
Indicator 3: Exterior wall material

Figure 5.4.4  Exterior wall material, South African main sample

Of the sample, 88.6% are least deprived in this indicator, with 2.7% somewhat deprived and 7.9% categorised as deprived (Figure 5.4.4). Just 0.8% are categorised as most deprived (71 individuals living in dwellings with no exterior walls). This distribution of deprivation holds true for men and women, all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

Urban residents are slightly more deprived than rural residents. Rural residents are slightly more likely than urban residents to be categorised as least deprived and somewhat deprived (a total of 95.4% compared to 89.1%), while urban residents are more likely to be deprived than rural residents (10.2% compared to 3.7%). They are equally likely to be most deprived (0.9% for rural residents and 0.8% for urban residents).

Least deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have exterior walls of finished materials
Somewhat deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have exterior walls of rudimentary materials
Deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have exterior walls of natural materials
Most deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have no exterior walls
Indicator 4: Housing condition

Figure 5.4.5  Housing condition, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have no housing problems or one relatively minor problem

Somewhat deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have two relatively minor problems

Deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have three relatively minor problems

OR Individuals whose dwellings have an unsafe housing structure

OR Individuals whose dwellings have an unsafe housing structure and one relatively minor problem

Most deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have an unsafe housing structure, and two or three relatively minor problems

Of the sample, 89.4% are categorised as least deprived with respect to housing condition, indicating either no problems with the condition, or only one comparatively minor problem (e.g. a leaky roof or holes in the wall, see Figure 5.4.5). Further, 5.6% are categorised as somewhat deprived, another 5.0% as deprived and most deprived (where the housing problems pose a threat to the physical safety and comfort of these individuals). This overall pattern holds true for each of the subgroups.

The scoring may be revised in the future to distinguish more clearly between those for whom the indicator is relevant (i.e. those who experience problems with their housing condition) and those for whom it is not (i.e. those who have no problems).
Indicator 5: Crowdedness

Figure 5.4.6  Crowdedness, South African main sample

**Least deprived:** Individuals who do not feel they share their dwelling with too many people

**Somewhat deprived:** not applicable

**Deprived:** Individuals who refused to answer

**Most deprived:** Individuals who feel they share their dwelling with too many people

This indicator has the highest proportion of respondents in the most deprived category of any indicators in the habitability theme—26.3% reported that they lived in a dwelling with too many people (Figure 5.4.6). The pattern holds true for rural and urban residents and those with and without disabilities.

Women are slightly more likely than men to be in the most deprived category (29.0% compared to 22.8%), while those in the older group are least likely to be in the most deprived category (21.5%, compared to 27.0% and 26.9% for the youth and middle age groups).
Theme 1 results: Habitability

Figure 5.4.7  Habitability, South African main sample

The classification of this theme into deprivation categories is illustrated in Figure 5.4.7. Overall, for the habitability theme, 91.0% of the respondents are categorised as least deprived, 7.8% are somewhat deprived and 1.3% are deprived, largely driven by those respondents who feel that their housing is too crowded. No individuals are categorised as most deprived; that is, there are none categorised as most deprived in all five indicators comprising this theme. There are no differences in the pattern of deprivation for any of the four subgroups analysed.
5.4.2 Theme 2: Ownership of essential household items

Figure 5.4.8 Ownership of essential household items, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who own all four household item categories
Somewhat deprived: Individuals who own any three household item categories
Deprived: Individuals who own any two household item categories
Most deprived: Individuals who own any single household item category
OR Individuals who own none of the household item categories

The categories of essential household items are: cooking utensils (e.g. pots, pans and knives to use for the preparation of a meal with more than one component or dish); tableware (e.g. enough plates, bowls, dishes and cups for each household member); water storage and/or carrying vessels (to store enough water for one day); and, bedding (enough blankets, mats and/or mattresses to sleep comfortably).

Of the respondents, 60.8% are categorised as least deprived (owning all four essential household items) and 21.2% somewhat deprived (owning three of the four categories, see Figure 5.4.8). Moreover, 8.8% are categorised as deprived and a further 9.2% as most deprived (owning either none or only one of the four categories). Both men and women and all three age groups follow this pattern of deprivation.

There are substantial differences in ownership of these essential items between rural and urban residents (see Figure 5.4.9). Urban residents are more likely than rural residents to be categorised as least deprived (66.4% and 50.4%, respectively) and less likely to be categorised as deprived or most deprived (a total of 14.2% compared to 24.8%).
There are also some differences between those with and without disabilities. Those with disabilities are likely to own fewer categories of essential items, and accordingly, to be more deprived than those without disabilities (44.2% classified as somewhat deprived or worse, compared to 36.4%).

5.4.3 Theme 3: Security of tenure

Indicator 1: Eviction concern

5.4.10 Eviction concern, South African main sample
Least deprived: Individuals who have not been worried (in the six months prior to the survey) that they would be evicted or forced to leave their home

Somewhat deprived: not applicable

Deprived: Individuals who refused to answer

Most deprived: Individuals who have been worried (in the six months prior to the survey) that they would be evicted or forced to leave their home

Close to one in ten individuals are most deprived—reporting that in the six months prior to the survey, they felt worried that they may be evicted or forced to leave their home (9.8%, see Figure 5.4.10). The remaining 90.0% are categorised as least deprived, with just 0.1% refusing to answer. This pattern is followed by men and women and by those with and without disabilities.

There are differences between the age groups—broadly, the younger and middle age groups followed the overall pattern (9.2% and 11.0%, respectively, in the most deprived category), but only 4.5% of those in the older age group are categorised this way.

Almost twice the proportion of urban residents feared eviction compared to rural residents—11.5% of them are classified as most deprived compared to 6.7% of their rural counterparts.

**Indicator 2: Recognition of ownership**

**Figure 5.4.11** Recognition of ownership, South African main sample

Least deprived: Ownership of the dwelling that individuals live in is recognised (either by government or under customary tenure)

Somewhat deprived: not applicable

Deprived: Individuals who refused to answer

Most deprived: Ownership of the dwelling that individuals live in is not recognised (by government or customary tenure)
Overall, the vast majority of respondents are categorised as least deprived (97.8%), with just 2.0% living in dwellings for which ownership is not recognised, either by government or under customary tenure arrangements (Figure 5.4.11). This small proportion of respondents categorised as most deprived pattern holds true for all subgroups.

It is unclear if this question about recognition of ownership, either by government or by customary authorities, is an effective measure of tenure security as intended, and so this question and its scoring will be revised in the future.

**Indicator 3: Mortgage/rent stress**

**Figure 5.4.12  Mortgage/rent stress, South African main sample**

Of those sampled, 91.2% reported not experiencing mortgage or rent stress and are categorised as least deprived (Figure 5.4.12). The remaining 8.8% reported having difficulty paying on time—3.7% are somewhat deprived, 3.0% are deprived, and 2.1% are most deprived (the latter category indicates individuals were not able to pay their rent or mortgage on time at all over the 12 months prior to the survey). This overall pattern holds true for men and women, across all three age groups and for those with and without disabilities.
Mortgage/rent stress is more problematic in urban areas than in rural areas (see Figure 5.4.13). Of urban residents, 12.8% are categorised as somewhat deprived or worse compared to only 1.3% of rural residents.

**Figure 5.4.13**  Mortgage/rent stress, South African main sample, by locality

The scoring may be revised in the future to distinguish more clearly between those for whom the indicator is relevant (i.e. those who experience mortgage or rent stress), and those for whom it is not (i.e. those who do not have to pay rent or a mortgage).

**Theme 3 results: Security of tenure**

**Figure 5.4.14**  Security of tenure, South African main sample
Overall, in this third theme—security of tenure—87.0% are categorised as least deprived, consistent with the pattern of relatively low levels of deprivation for each of the three indicators (Figure 5.4.14). Further, 11.5% are somewhat deprived and 1.6% deprived. No individuals are categorised as most deprived for this theme, meaning none are categorised as most deprived for each of the three indicators. This pattern of deprivation holds true for men and women and those with and without disabilities.

Small differences are apparent between the three age groups. Those in the older age group are more likely to be least deprived compared to the two younger groups, both of which follow the overall pattern—92.3% of the oldest age group are least deprived, compared to 88.3% for the youth and 88.5% for the middle age group.

Rural residents have slightly higher levels of tenure security than their urban counterparts (see Figure 5.4.15). Of rural residents, 91.7% are categorised as least deprived compared to 84.4% of urban residents. Urban residents are somewhat more likely to be categorised as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived than urban residents (although the last category represents only four individuals).

**Figure 5.4.15  Security of tenure, South African main sample, by locality**
Overall, across the shelter dimension, results follow the pattern of large majorities categorised as least deprived (85.5% for the dimension), with much smaller (and diminishing proportions) in each of the worse categories (Figure 5.4.16). No one is categorised as most deprived in the shelter dimension. This overall dimension-level pattern of deprivation is followed by men and women, by all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

There are small differences between rural and urban residents (see Figure 5.4.17), with urban residents being slightly more likely than rural residents to be categorised as least deprived (86.9% compared to 82.8%) and slightly less likely to be somewhat deprived (12.4% compared to 16.5%).
5.5 Health

Figure 5.5.1  Indicators and themes of the health dimension
5.5.1 Theme 1: Health status

Indicator 1: Physical health status

Figure 5.5.2 Physical health status, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who experience no health problems of any kind
OR Individuals who experience (only) a recent health condition
Somewhat deprived: Individuals who experience (only) a smoke-related health problem
OR Individuals who experience (only) a long-term health condition
Deprived: Individuals who experience a recent health condition and a smoke-related health problem
OR Individuals who experience a recent health condition and a long-term health condition
Most deprived: Individuals who experience a long-term condition and a smoke-related health problem
OR Individuals who experience all three health conditions

For the main sample in South Africa, just over two-thirds of respondents are categorised as least deprived in physical health status (65.8%), with close to a quarter being somewhat deprived (23.9%), experiencing either a smoke-related or long-term health condition (Figure 5.5.2). The deprived and most deprived categories had 5.1% of the main sample respondents in each—a relatively small proportion, but with significant health issues.
In the comparison between men and women, broadly, this pattern is repeated. However, men are more likely than women to be least deprived (70.0% and 62.7%, respectively), and less likely to be somewhat deprived (20.3% and 26.7%, respectively), indicating men’s slightly better physical health status.

The differences between age groups are significant. The youth are most likely to be least deprived—with the fewest and least severe health problems—and least likely to be in any of the remaining categories (73.6% compared to 65.2% for the middle group and just 52.6% for the oldest group). The oldest group is most likely to be classified as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived, indicating generally higher levels of ill health than the two younger groups—almost half of the oldest group, compared to one-third for the middle group and approximately one-quarter for the youth.

Rural residents are less likely than urban residents to be in the least deprived category (59.9% compared to 69.0%), and more likely to be in each of the remaining categories, indicating their poorer physical health outcomes.

Of all the subgroup comparisons, the largest difference is between those with and without disabilities, with the latter having significantly better physical health outcomes. As shown in Figure 5.5.3, almost twice the proportion of individuals with disabilities are classified as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived, compared to those without disabilities.

**Figure 5.5.3**  
Physical health status, South African main sample, by disability status

The scoring may be revised in the future to distinguish more clearly between those for whom the indicator is relevant (i.e. those who have health conditions), and those for whom it is not (i.e. those with no health conditions).
Indicator 2: Psycho-social health status

Figure 5.5.4  Psycho-social health status, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who never feel anxious or depressed
OR Individuals who feel anxious a few times a year and never depressed, or feel depressed a few times a year but never anxious

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who feel both anxious and depressed a few times a year
OR Individuals who feel anxious monthly and depressed a few times a year, or feel anxious a few times a year and depressed monthly
OR Individuals who feel anxious weekly and never depressed, or never feel anxious but feel depressed weekly

Deprived: Individuals who feel anxious daily and never depressed, or never anxious but depressed daily
OR Individuals who feel anxious weekly and depressed a few times a year, or feel anxious a few times a year and depressed weekly
OR Individuals who feel both anxious and depressed monthly
OR Individuals who feel anxious daily and depressed a few times a year, or feel anxious a few times a year and depressed daily
OR Individuals who feel anxious weekly and depressed monthly, or feel anxious monthly and depressed weekly

Most deprived: Individuals who feel anxious daily and depressed monthly, or depressed daily and anxious monthly
OR Individuals who feel anxious and depressed weekly
OR Individuals who feel anxious daily and depressed weekly, or feel anxious weekly and depressed daily
Or Individuals who feel anxious and depressed daily
Deprivation in psycho-social health is much more evenly spread across the four categories than is the case for general physical health (Figure 5.5.4). Close to one-third of respondents are in the least deprived and somewhat deprived categories (31.7% and 34.9%, respectively), with 19.8% categorised as deprived and the remaining 13.6% categorised as most deprived.

The overall pattern holds for women, while men have slightly worse psycho-social health outcomes. Men are slightly less likely than women to be classified as least deprived (28.4% compared to 34.2%), equally likely to be somewhat deprived (34.8% compared to 35.0%) and are more likely than women to be in the remaining two categories (22.0%, compared to 18.1% in the deprived category, and 14.8% compared to 12.7% in the most deprived category).

The youth are most likely to be categorised as least deprived (38.5%, compared to 28.7% and 34.1% for the two older groups), and the least likely to be in any of the remaining categories, demonstrating generally better psycho-social health. The older group is most likely to be somewhat deprived (36.5%, compared to 32.9% for the youth, and 35.4% for the middle group). The middle group is most likely to be categorised as both deprived (20.8%, compared to 17.9% for the youth, and 18.0% for the older group) and most deprived (15.1%, compared to 10.8% for the youth, and 11.4% for the older group), having worse psycho-social health outcomes than both the youth and older groups.

Overall, urban residents have higher levels of deprivation in psycho-social health status than their rural counterparts. Rural residents are more likely than urban residents to be categorised as least deprived (35.5% compared to 29.7%), and less likely to be somewhat deprived (36.6% compared to 34.2%), deprived (17.6% compared to 20.9%) or most deprived (10.6% compared to 15.2%).

Individuals without disabilities have slightly better outcomes for this indicator than the overall pattern (see Figure 5.5.5). In contrast, those with disabilities have worse psycho-social health outcomes, being more likely to be categorised as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived (74.2% compared to 65.0% for those without disabilities).

![Figure 5.5.5](image-url) Psycho-social health status, South African main sample, by disability status
It is likely that in the future, the scoring and cut-offs between categories for this indicator may be revisited, to simplify the meaning of each of the categories of deprivation.

**Theme 1 results: Health status**

**Figure 5.5.6  Health status, South African main sample**

The effect of relatively poor psycho-social health can be observed in the results for the health status theme in Figure 5.5.6, with under half of all respondents in the main sample categorised as least deprived (49.8%). More than a third are categorised as somewhat deprived (34.7%), 12.8% are categorised as deprived, and 2.7% as most deprived. This last category represents individuals who are most deprived in both general health status and psycho-social health status. This overall pattern holds for men and women and rural and urban residents.

In terms of age group differences, the youth are most likely to be least deprived (and least likely to be in each subsequent category), the oldest group is most likely to be categorised in the somewhat deprived, deprived and deprived categories, and the middle group falls in between the youth and older group.

Individuals with disabilities are much more likely to be deprived in the health status theme than those without disabilities (see Figure 5.5.7), as is the case for both indicators.
5.5.2 Theme 2: Health care access and quality

Indicator 1: General health care access

Figure 5.5.8 General health care access, South African main sample
Least deprived: Individuals who did not need or want health care (so did not access it)
OR Individuals who accessed health care, and reported no problems or only one problem related to health care quality

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who accessed health care, and reported two or three problems related to health care quality

Deprived: Individuals who accessed health care, and reported four or five problems related to health care quality

Most deprived: Individuals who accessed health care, and reported six or seven problems related to health care quality
OR Individuals who did not access health care facilities due to personal and health care facility factors

The aspects of health care quality assessed were: the skills and knowledge of the health care practitioner; the cleanliness and location of the health care facility; whether the respondent was treated with respect by the medical staff; issues of communication with the health care practitioner; and, waiting times. Those respondents who had been unable to access health care for personal or health care facility factors—because they were excluded in some way, such as if there were no health care facilities to access, or a practitioner refused to treat them—are most deprived.

In general, the overall pattern indicates that a large majority of respondents are least deprived (84.2%), with a further 10% classified as somewhat deprived (Figure 5.5.8). Of the respondents, 3.6% and 2.2% are categorised as deprived and most deprived, respectively, indicating poor health care quality or an inability to access health care at all. Rural and urban residents follow this pattern of deprivation in health care quality.

In the comparison between men and women, both groups follow this overall pattern closely. However, a slightly lower proportion of men than women are classified as somewhat deprived (7% and 12.2%, respectively) and deprived (2.4% and 4.6%)—indicating that men experienced slightly better health care quality than women.

The older age group is more likely than the other two groups to be categorised in the three more severe levels of deprivation (see Figure 5.5.9)—experiencing the worst health care quality of the three age groups. The youth are more likely to be least deprived than the other two groups (as far smaller proportions of this group accessed health care), and the middle group sits in between the youth and the older group, reflecting the overall pattern of deprivation in this indicator.
Broadly, the levels of deprivation for individuals without disabilities follow the overall pattern of deprivation. However, those with disabilities are more likely than those without to be categorised as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived (23.6% for all three categories compared to 11.5% for those without disabilities), reporting more problems with their health care.

The scoring may be revised in the future to distinguish more clearly between those for whom the indicator is relevant (i.e. those who have problems with health care access and quality), and those for whom it is not (i.e. those who did not need or want health care).
**Indicator 2: Prenatal health care access**

**Figure 5.5.10**  Prenatal health care access, South African main sample

- **Least deprived:** Individuals who did not need or want prenatal health care (including all men and non-pregnant women)
- OR Women who accessed prenatal health care, and reported no problems or only one problem related to health care quality

- **Somewhat deprived:** Women who accessed prenatal health care, and reported two or three problems related to health care quality

- **Deprived:** Women who accessed prenatal health care, and reported four or five problems related to health care quality

- **Most deprived:** Women who accessed prenatal health care, and reported six or seven problems related to health care quality
- OR Women who did not access prenatal health care facilities due to personal and health care facility factors

The score received by women for this indicator is for the most recent event—reflecting their experience during either their current pregnancy or a birth in the 12 months prior to the survey (i.e. no women are given a score for both, even if they experienced both). The health care quality problems assessed in this indicator are the same as for those in general health care access, but relate specifically to any prenatal care received.

Levels of deprivation for this indicator are very low, with 97.9% of respondents categorised as least deprived, 1.0% as somewhat deprived, another 1.0% as deprived and just 0.1% categorised as most deprived (Figure 5.5.10). This overall pattern is followed in each of the subgroup analyses (by gender, age, locality and disability status).
However, when examining only those women who had either given birth in the 12 months prior to the survey or were pregnant at the time of the survey (459 individuals), 28.1% of those respondents are in the somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived categories. At best, this means that these women faced at least two of the possible seven health care quality problems asked about, and at worst, they faced all seven of these problems while receiving prenatal care or were unable to access any prenatal care.

The scoring may be revised in the future to distinguish more clearly between those for whom the indicator is relevant (i.e. those who have problems with prenatal health care access and quality), and those for whom it is not (i.e. those who did not need or want prenatal health care).

**Theme 2 results: Health care access and quality**

**Figure 5.5.11  Health care access and quality, South African main sample**

Figure 5.5.11 shows the results for the health care access and quality theme for the South African main sample. The relatively low levels of deprivation in this theme are being driven largely by the apparently low levels of deprivation in the prenatal health care access indicator—all male and most female respondents are least deprived in this indicator. In terms of the groupings within the deprivation categories, 92.9% are least deprived, 5.2% somewhat deprived and the remaining 1.8% deprived. No individuals are classified as most deprived in both indicators, and accordingly, there are no individuals categorised as most deprived for the theme. All three age groups follow this overall pattern of deprivation.

There are small differences apparent in the male/female comparison, between rural and urban residents, and between those with and without disabilities. Women are slightly more deprived than men for this theme (see Figure 5.5.12), urban residents are slightly more deprived than rural residents, and those with disabilities are a little more deprived than those without disabilities.
5.5.3 Health dimension results

Figure 5.5.12 Health care access and quality, South African main sample, by gender

Figure 5.5.13 Health dimension, South African main sample
For the overall health dimension, more than three-quarters are classified as least deprived (77.8%), 20.5% as somewhat deprived and 1.6% as deprived (Figure 5.5.13). There are no individuals classified as most deprived (which would require them to be most deprived in each of the two themes). Neither rural nor urban residents deviated from this overall pattern of deprivation.

Differences between men and women are small, with men more likely to be least deprived than women (79.7% compared to 76.4%), and less likely to be somewhat deprived (18.4% compared to 22.1%). Women are fractionally more deprived in health than men. Note here, that while it is masked by the aggregation across themes, almost one-third of women who required prenatal care over the 12 months prior to the survey experienced problems with the quality of this care.

In the comparison between age groups, the middle group follows the overall pattern described above, while the youth are, overall, the most likely to be least deprived in health and the oldest group less likely to be least deprived in health than the other two groups.

The most significant differences in the health dimension are apparent between those with disabilities and those without (see Figure 5.5.14). Those with disabilities are substantially less likely to be least deprived in health than those without—driven largely by their poorer health status.

**Figure 5.5.14**  Health dimension, South African main sample, by disability status
5.6 Education

Figure 5.6.1  Indicators and themes of the education dimension

Educational completion  EDUCATION LEVEL

Functional literacy  FUNCTIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY

5.6.1 Theme 1: Education level

Figure 5.6.2  Education level, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who have completed at least some tertiary education
OR Individuals who have completed secondary/high school (i.e. matriculation)

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who have completed only some secondary/high school
(i.e. not matriculated)

Deprived: Individuals who have completed primary school

Most deprived: Individuals who have completed only some primary school
OR Individuals who have received no schooling
Of respondents in the main sample, 41.0% are least deprived, having completed at least secondary school (matriculation). Just over one-third are somewhat deprived (37.7%), having completed some secondary schooling (Figure 5.6.2). A further 8.5% are deprived, having completed primary school. The remaining 12.7% are most deprived—these individuals have completed only some primary schooling or received no schooling at all. This overall pattern of deprivation in education levels applies to both men and women.

The comparison between age groups demonstrates stark differences, as can be seen in Figure 5.6.3. Of the youth group, 94.7% are least deprived or somewhat deprived, while the middle group has 80.6% in these two categories—the latter group closely follows the overall pattern. However, only 33.4% of the older group fall in these two categories, indicating the completion of at least some secondary or high school. A further 19.3% of this older age group are deprived, and close to half (47.4%) are in the most deprived category.

Urban residents are less deprived than their rural counterparts, having received more schooling. Urban residents are more likely than rural residents to be least deprived, having at least completed secondary school. Rural residents are, in contrast, more likely to be somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived (17.5% compared to 10.2% in this last category).

Individuals with disabilities are more likely to be deprived and have lower levels of schooling. Of those with disabilities, 28.6% are categorised as least deprived compared to 47.9% of those without disabilities, while 23.4% of those with disabilities are most deprived compared to 6.9% of those without.
5.6.2 Theme 2: Functional literacy and numeracy

Indicator 1: Functional literacy

Figure 5.6.4 Functional literacy, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who are able to read and write adequately
Somewhat deprived: Individuals who are able to read adequately, but write poorly
OR Individuals who are able to read poorly, but write adequately
Deprived: Individuals who are able to read and write poorly
OR Individuals who are able to read adequately, but not able to write
OR Individuals who are not able to read, but are able to write adequately
Most deprived: Individuals who are able to read poorly, but not able to write
OR Individuals not able to read, but able to write poorly
OR Individuals who are not able to read or to write
Of the main sample, 68.1% are categorised as least deprived in the functional literacy indicator (see Figure 5.6.4), being able to read and write adequately (bearing in mind the simplicity of the tasks set). Of the respondents, 12.0% are categorised as somewhat deprived and 7.8% as deprived. Moreover, 12.1% are categorised as most deprived—they can read or write poorly or not at all.

Both men and women follow this overall pattern quite closely, however, women are slightly more likely than men to be either least deprived or most deprived (i.e. their abilities are at the two extremes).

Once again, the differences between age groups are stark (see Figure 5.6.5), and follow the same patterns as for the first theme—the middle group closely follow the overall pattern, while the youth are less deprived than the two older groups, and the older group is far more likely to be most deprived (44.6%, compared to 2.5% for the youth and 10.2% for the middle group).

![Figure 5.6.5  Functional literacy, South African main sample, by age](image)

Rural residents are more deprived than urban residents, with 24.6% of rural residents categorised as deprived or most deprived (compared to 17.4% of urban residents), indicating significant difficulties with functional literacy.

Individuals without disabilities are considerably less deprived in this indicator, with only 12.6% categorised as deprived or most deprived, compared to one-third of individuals with disabilities (33.2%).
Indicator 2: Functional numeracy

Figure 5.6.6  Functional numeracy, South African main sample

| Least deprived: | Individuals who were able to answer both calculations correctly |
| Somewhat deprived: | not applicable |
| Deprived: | Individuals who were able to answer one calculation correctly, but unable to answer the second correctly |
| Most deprived: | Individuals who were unable to answer either calculation correctly OR Individuals who answered one calculation incorrectly, and refused to answer the other |

Just over half of respondents in the main sample are categorised as least deprived for functional numeracy (57.8%), and were able to answer both calculations correctly (Figure 5.6.6). However, 20.1% are deprived and a further 22.0% most deprived—the latter group largely being unable to answer either calculation correctly. Both men and women follow this overall pattern.

Across the three age groups, there are significant differences in functional numeracy, as can be seen in Figure 5.6.7, with far greater deprivation in the older group compared to the two younger groups.
In the comparison between rural and urban, rural residents are slightly more likely than their urban counterparts to be categorised as deprived (21.0% and 19.6%, respectively) and most deprived (26.7% and 19.7%).

There are significant differences between those with and without disabilities. Just over one-third of those without disabilities are classified as deprived or most deprived (34.4%) compared to 56.3% for those with disabilities.

Theme 2 results: Functional literacy and numeracy
As can be seen in Figure 5.6.8, more than half of all respondents in the main sample are classified as least deprived in the functional literacy and numeracy theme (55.9%), one-fifth as somewhat deprived (19.3%), and close to a quarter in the deprived and most deprived categories (12.2% and 12.6%, respectively). The deprivation patterns for both men and women follow this overall trend.

As for each of the indicators, the differences between age groups are significant (see Figure 5.6.9)—the youth are the most likely to be least deprived in functional literacy and numeracy (67.4%), with the middle group tracking the overall pattern, and the older group by far the most likely to be most deprived (46.2%).

Urban respondents are slightly less deprived than the average for this theme. Rural residents are more likely to be most deprived (17.4% compared to 10.0%), no doubt a reflection of the low levels of schooling of rural residents described in Section 5.6.1 (as is the case with other groups with high levels of deprivation in this theme).

For this theme, those with disabilities are far more likely than those without disabilities to be most deprived (24.1% and 6.2%, respectively), indicating a lack of functional literacy and numeracy among this group.
5.6.3 Education dimension results

For the education dimension, 55.1% of the main sample are categorised as least deprived, one-quarter as somewhat deprived (25.3%), with 10.0% categorised as deprived, and 9.4% as most deprived (Figure 5.6.10). Both men and women follow this overall pattern for the dimension.

As is reflected in each of the themes, there are substantial differences in the levels of deprivation across age groups (see Figure 5.6.11). The middle age group follows the overall pattern very closely, while the youth are less deprived than the two older groups, and the older group are substantially more deprived than the two younger groups. Only 1.0% of the youth are categorised as most deprived, 7.6% of the middle age group, and 37.7% of the older group.
Urban residents are less deprived than rural residents (59.1% categorised as least deprived and 47.7%, respectively). For each category indicating a deeper level of deprivation, there is a higher proportion of rural residents than urban, reflecting the lower levels of educational completion and the lower levels of functional literacy and numeracy.

The deprivation levels of individuals with disabilities are more extreme than for those without—while 11.8% of those without disabilities are categorised as deprived or most deprived, the figure for individuals with disabilities is 33.6%.
5.7 Energy

Figure 5.7.1  Indicators and themes of the energy dimension

5.7.1 Theme 1: Cooking energy

Figure 5.7.2  Cooking energy, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who use clean cooking energy sources, and always, or most of the time, have enough to meet needs
OR Individuals who do not cook/prepare their own food at home, or are not responsible for cooking at home

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who use clean cooking energy sources, but the availability of energy is either never enough, or only sometimes enough, to meet needs
OR Individuals who use unclean/polluting cooking energy sources, and always have enough to meet needs

**Deprived:** Individuals who have access to unclean/polluting cooking energy sources, and most of the time, or some of the time, have enough to meet needs

**Most deprived:** Individuals who have unclean/polluting cooking energy sources, and never have enough to meet needs

OR Individuals who do not have any cooking energy source, even if they need it

For the three themes of cooking, lighting and heating energy, clean energy sources are scored more highly than unclean or polluting sources due to the negative health effects of breathing in smoke and particulates.

Overall, a very small proportion (1.4%) are in the most deprived category, followed by 11.4% in the deprived category (Figure 5.7.2). On a positive note, 65.9% of the sample are least deprived, with access to clean energy for cooking. The remaining 21.2% are somewhat deprived. This pattern of deprivation holds true for men and women, and all three age groups, with such minor differences between them as to be practically unimportant.

The largest difference in the subgroup analyses is between urban and rural (see Figure 5.7.3). Three-quarters of urban respondents (75.7%) are least deprived—they had sufficient access to clean energy—compared with only 47.4% of rural respondents. Rural respondents are more likely to be categorised as somewhat deprived or deprived, because of the combination of unclean energy that they have access to, and the inadequate supplies of those energy sources.

**Figure 5.7.3  Cooking energy, South African main sample, by locality**

People with disabilities are somewhat more deprived than with those without—with 58.3% in the least deprived category compared to 70.0% for those without disabilities. Individuals with disabilities are more likely to be in the somewhat deprived category (29.7% compared to 16.6%), largely because of the poor reliability of their cooking energy sources.
Further revision of the construction of this theme (and indeed, the lighting and heating energy themes) may be required to determine whether it is appropriate to retain the existing overlaps in some categories, between those with access to clean fuels but with poor reliability of those supplies, and those with access to polluting fuels with good reliability of supplies.

5.7.2 Theme 2: Lighting energy

Figure 5.7.4 Lighting energy, South African main sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who have clean lighting energy sources, and always, or most of the time, have enough to meet needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who have clean lighting energy sources, but the availability of energy is either never enough, or only sometimes enough, to meet needs OR Individuals who use unclean/polluting lighting energy sources, and there is always enough to meet needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who use unclean/polluting lighting energy sources, and most of the time, or some of the time, have enough to meet needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who use unclean lighting energy sources, and never have enough to meet needs OR Individuals who have no energy for lighting at all, even if they need it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three-quarters of the sample are classified as least deprived (75.6%)—they have clean energy for lighting and generally have enough to meet their needs (Figure 5.7.4). A further 20.0% are somewhat deprived—individuals who are typically using clean energy (indeed, 94.0% of respondents report the use of electricity for lighting) but without having enough to meet needs. Just 3.5% and 0.9% are in the deprived and most deprived categories, respectively. This pattern holds for both men and women and across all three age groups.

Although generally following the overall trend, there are disparities in the comparison between rural and urban, and between those with and without
disabilities, particularly in the least deprived and somewhat deprived categories. Rural residents are less likely to be in the least deprived category than urban residents (71.5% compared with 77.7%).

People with disabilities are less likely to be least deprived and more likely to be somewhat deprived than those without disabilities (see Figure 5.7.5).

**Figure 5.7.5** Lighting energy, South African main sample, by disability status

![Figure 5.7.5 Lighting energy, South African main sample, by disability status](image)

5.7.3 **Theme 3: Heating energy**

**Figure 5.7.6** Heating energy, South African main sample

![Figure 5.7.6 Heating energy, South African main sample](image)
Least deprived: Individuals who use clean heating energy sources, and always, or most of the time, have enough to meet needs
OR Individuals who do not need heating (because of the mild climate)

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who use clean heating energy sources, but never have enough, or only sometimes enough, to meet needs
OR Individuals who use unclean/polluting heating energy sources, and always have enough to meet needs

Deprived: Individuals who use unclean/polluting heating energy sources, and most of the time, or some of the time, have enough to meet needs

Most deprived: Individuals who use unclean/polluting heating energy sources, and never have enough to meet needs
OR Individuals who have no energy for heating at all, even if they need it

Only around half of the main sample is categorised as least deprived with respect to heating (51.2%), including 15.0% who reported living in sufficiently warm climates to not need heating, while 20.1% are somewhat deprived, 16.3% deprived and 12.3% are classified as most deprived (Figure 5.7.6). This most deprived category consists of almost 10.0% who did not have heating energy, even if they needed it, and 2.3% who had access only to unclean heating energy sources and never had enough to meet their needs. This is the largest proportion in the most deprived category of the three themes dealing with cooking, lighting and heating energy. Any differences between men and women are extremely small and do not deviate from this overall pattern. This overall pattern also holds for all three age groups.

Once again, the largest difference within groups occurs between urban and rural areas (see Figure 5.7.7). Only 39.6% of rural residents are least deprived compared to 57.4% of their urban counterparts, and they are more likely than urban residents to be somewhat deprived and deprived (a total of 49.1% and 29.7%, respectively), which is driven by a higher proportion of urban residents having access to clean fuel and more reliable supplies.

Figure 5.7.7 Heating energy, South African main sample, by locality
People with disabilities are less likely than those without to be in the least deprived category (46.3% compared to 53.9%) and thus, more likely to be in each of the more deprived categories.

The scoring may be revised in the future to distinguish more clearly between those for whom the indicator is relevant (i.e. those who require heating energy), and those for whom it is not (i.e. those who live in a sufficiently mild climate and do not require heating energy).

5.7.4 Theme 4: Energy collection threats

Figure 5.7.8 Energy collection threats, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who do not have any responsibility for collecting energy supplies from outside the dwelling

Somewhat deprived: not applicable

Deprived: Individuals who are responsible for collecting energy supplies from outside the dwelling, but who do not face any threats or hazards when doing so

Most deprived: Individuals who are responsible for collecting energy sources from outside the dwelling, and who face threats or hazards when doing so

This theme mirrors the water collection threats in the water dimension (and indeed, the results show similar patterns to those in the water collection threat theme), although the focus in this dimension is on threats faced while collecting energy supplies outside the home.

Over two-thirds of respondents are classified as least deprived (68.4%), reflecting the relatively high proportion of respondents who are not responsible for collecting energy outside the home—higher than is the case for water collection responsibilities (Figure 5.7.8). Meanwhile, 28.5% are deprived (those individuals responsible for collecting energy sources outside the house, but not subject to threats while doing so), and 3.1% are most deprived (facing threats when collecting energy sources outside the home), representing almost one in ten of those who are responsible for collecting energy sources (9.9%).
The overall pattern holds true for both men and women, however, a slightly higher proportion of men than women who are responsible for collecting energy sources reported facing threats while doing so (10.9% compared to 8.8%).

There are pronounced differences between age groups (see Figure 5.7.9). Of the youth, 82.8% are least deprived, compared to only 63.4% of the middle age group and 66.1% of the oldest age group. Correspondingly, the youth are therefore less likely to be categorised as deprived or most deprived (a total of 17.2% compared to 36.6% and 33.9%, respectively). However, 11.0% of all youth who are responsible for collecting energy face threats, as do 10.4% of the middle age group, compared to 5.9% of the oldest group.

Figure 5.7.9  Energy collection threats, South African main sample, by age

There are also important differences between urban and rural respondents for this theme. Of rural respondents, 40.0% are deprived and somewhat deprived, compared to 27.1% of their urban counterparts. The proportion of those responsible for collecting energy and who face threats is 11.8% and 8.5%, respectively.

There are also differences between those with and without disabilities. People with disabilities are less likely than those without to be in the least deprived category (63.9% compared to 70.9%), and more likely to be in both the deprived and most deprived categories. Very similar proportions of those responsible for collecting energy face threats while doing so—10.0% and 9.7%, respectively for those without disabilities and with disabilities.
8 Results from the national-level main sample

5.7.5 Energy dimension results

Figure 5.7.10 Energy dimension, South African main sample

Across the energy dimension (see Figure 5.7.10), 62.9% of respondents are categorised as least deprived, which is driven by the relatively high proportion of respondents with access to clean fuels and reasonable reliability (for cooking, lighting and heating). Almost one-third (30.6%) are somewhat deprived, while 6.0% are deprived and just 0.4% are categorised as most deprived. This distribution of deprivation holds true for both men and women.

There are small differences between the three age groups. The middle age group follows the overall pattern almost exactly, while the youth are most likely to be least deprived and the older group least likely to be categorised as least deprived.

Consistent with what was found at the theme level, rural residents are more likely, compared with urban residents, to be in the more deprived categories and less likely to be in the least deprived category (see Figure 5.7.11). Of rural respondents, 47.7% are in the least deprived category, versus 71.0% of urban respondents.
Those with disabilities are more deprived, compared to those without disabilities—of people with disabilities, 35.0% are somewhat deprived, compared with 28.3% of people without disabilities. However, the proportions in the deprived and most deprived categories are very similar—6.2% for those without disabilities and 7.0% for those with disabilities.

5.8 Sanitation

Figure 5.8.1 Indicators and themes of the sanitation dimension
5.8.1 Theme 1: Toilet facilities

Indicator 1: Toilet type

Figure 5.8.2 Toilet type, South African main sample

A majority of respondents are either least deprived (52.1%) or somewhat deprived (39.4%), meaning that their households or dwellings have improved toilet facilities (Figure 5.8.2). Encouragingly, very few have flush toilets that are piped to open drainage systems, exposing waste to the environment. Fewer than 1.0% are deprived. However, 8.4% are most deprived—they either use a flush toilet piped to open drainage systems and without enough water (3.6%), use a bucket or hanging toilet (3.0%), or they have no facility at all (1.8%). This broad pattern holds true for both men and women and those with and without disabilities.
There are small differences between age groups. The youth and middle group follow a broadly similar pattern, with decreasing proportions in least deprived, somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived categories. However, the older age group has approximately equal proportions categorised as least deprived and somewhat deprived (47.3% and 46.7%, respectively). The older group also has a smaller proportion in the most deprived category, compared to the youth and middle group (5.9% compared to 8.2% and 9.0%, respectively).

There is a remarkable difference between urban and rural respondents (see Figure 5.8.3). Of urban residents, 75.4% are in the least deprived category, compared with only 8.3% of their rural counterparts. This is one of the largest gaps observed across all the IDM indicators. There is an opposite pattern in the somewhat deprived category—with 79.8% of rural residents and only 17.9% of urban residents in that category—while rural residents are more likely to be in the most deprived category (11.8% compared to 6.7%).

Figure 5.8.3  Toilet type, South African main sample, by locality

The scoring of this indicator may be revisited in the future to determine whether it is appropriate to retain the three different toilet types in the most deprived category, or whether those with access to a facility (however poor), should be separated from those with no access to any toilet facility.
Overall, 59.1% are least deprived, as they can use a private toilet in their dwelling (Figure 5.8.4). A further 21.6% are somewhat deprived, those who share their toilet with other households. Of the main sample, 17.5% are deprived—they report using a public toilet while at home—and 1.8% are most deprived, and do not have any toilet to use at home.

There are minor differences between women and men—women are slightly more likely than men to be least deprived (61.1% compared to 56.5%) and deprived (18.1% compared to 16.6%), but slightly less likely to be somewhat deprived (19.1% compared to 24.9%).

The youth are most deprived compared with the two older age groups. Of this group, 56.2% are least deprived, compared to 59% of the middle age group and 66.2% of the oldest age group. They are more likely than the other two groups to be somewhat deprived (24.8%, compared to 20.9% and 19%). The youth and middle age group are equally likely to be deprived and somewhat deprived (19.0% and 20.1%, respectively), with the oldest group least likely to be in these categories (14.8%).

There is a relatively large difference between urban and rural residents. Urban residents are generally less deprived than those in rural localities—62.9% have a private toilet, compared to 52.0% of rural residents. Higher proportions of rural residents are in each of the remaining three categories.

The difference between people with and without disabilities is also large. People with disabilities are more likely to be least deprived (have a private toilet) than those without disabilities (67.2% compared to 54.7%). Higher proportions of those without disabilities fall into each of the three progressively more deprived categories.
Overall, 91.7% of the main sample are least deprived or somewhat deprived in this theme (Figure 5.8.5), with 6.5% in the deprived category and 1.8% who are most deprived. This pattern holds true for subgroup comparisons of gender and age.

Urban residents are less deprived than their rural counterparts (see Figure 5.8.6). Of rural residents, 50.9% are least deprived, compared to 77.6% of urban and more than double the proportion of rural people, compared to urban respondents, are in the somewhat deprived (35.9% and 16.8%, respectively) and deprived categories (11.2% and 3.9%).
The differences between those with and without disabilities are found mainly in the least deprived and somewhat deprived categories. Of those without disabilities, 66.0% are least deprived, compared to 72.6% of those with disabilities, while for the somewhat deprived categories, the figures are 24.9% and 20.7%, respectively. The proportion of respondents falling in the two more deprived categories are similar.

5.8.2 Theme 2: Washing facilities
Indicator 1: Handwashing facilities

Figure 5.8.7 Handwashing facilities, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who have a place to wash their hands at home, with sufficient water and soap
Somewhat deprived: Individuals who have a place to wash their hands at home, with sufficient water and soap substitutes
OR Individuals who have a place to wash their hands at home, with sufficient water but no soap or soap substitutes
Deprived: Individuals who have a place to wash their hands at home, but do not have sufficient water (and no soap or substitutes)
Most deprived: Individuals who do not have a place to wash their hands at home

Almost two-thirds of respondents are least deprived (57%), with 23.0% in the somewhat deprived category (Figure 5.8.7). A relatively high proportion (15.1%) are in the most deprived category, with no place to wash their hands at home, and another 4.9% in the deprived category, with a place to wash, but not enough water and no soap or substitutes. This broad pattern holds true for the subgroup comparisons of gender, age and disability status.

The biggest disparity is observed between rural and urban respondents (see Figure 5.8.8). While two-thirds of urban respondents are least deprived, this is true for only 39.7% of rural residents. Of rural respondents, 26.8% are most deprived—they do not have a place to wash their hands—and another 6.6% are deprived—they have a place to wash their hands...
to wash their hands, but have only water to do so. Just 8.9% and 4.0% of urban residents are in these two categories, respectively.

**Figure 5.8.8** Handwashing facilities, South African main sample, by locality

![Graph showing handwashing facilities by locality](image)

**Indicator 2: Access to toiletries**

**Figure 5.8.9** Access to toiletries, South African main sample

![Graph showing access to toiletries by deprivation level](image)

**Least deprived**: Individuals who always have sufficient toiletries (such as toothpaste, shampoo and soap)
Almost half of the main sample are least deprived, and always have sufficient toiletries, with a further 29.8% categorised as somewhat deprived, having toiletries most of the time (Figure 5.8.9). However, around one-fifth are deprived, only having sufficient toiletries some of the time (19.5%), while a small proportion (1.7%) are most deprived, never having enough toiletries, such as toothpaste or shampoo and soap to wash themselves. The distribution holds true across all three age groups.

Men are more deprived than women in this indicator; only 41.0% of men are least deprived compared to 54.9% of women. Consequently, men comprise a higher proportion in each of the more deprived categories than women, having enough toiletries less frequently.

Rural residents are more deprived than their urban counterparts, with only 38.6% being in the least deprived category, compared with 54.4% of urban residents. Higher proportions of rural residents also fall into each of the somewhat deprived and deprived categories, although urban and rural residents are equally likely to be most deprived.

People with disabilities are slightly more deprived than those without disabilities and are less likely to always have enough toiletries. Of people with disabilities, 45.9% are least deprived and 26.5% are deprived. The figures are 50.6% in the least deprived category and 15.7% in the deprived category for those without disabilities.

**Theme 2 results: Washing facilities**

**Figure 5.8.10  Washing facilities, South African main sample**
Overall, more than half of the main sample are least deprived for this theme (57.3%) and similar proportions are in the somewhat deprived and deprived categories (18.1% and 18.2%, respectively), leaving 6.4% in the most deprived category (Figure 5.8.10). Those in the most deprived category are individuals who are most deprived in both indicators. This pattern of deprivation is followed by all three age groups and by those with and without disabilities.

For this theme, men are more likely to be deprived than women—they are less likely to be in the least deprived category (51.9% versus 61.4%), and represent higher proportions of each of the subsequent categories of deprivation. This is likely to be driven by the greater deprivation of men in access to toiletries.

Rural residents are almost three times more likely than urban residents to be in the most deprived category (see Figure 5.8.11). While only 41.4% of rural respondents are in the least deprived category, 66.0% of urban respondents are in this category.

**Figure 5.8.11**  Washing facilities, South African main sample, by locality
5.8.3 Theme 3: Private changing place (during menstruation)

Figure 5.8.12 Private changing place during menstruation, South African main sample

Least deprived: Men and non-menstruating women
OR Menstruating women who have a private place to wash and change at home during menstruation

Somewhat deprived: not applicable

Deprived: Menstruating women who refused to answer

Most deprived: Menstruating women who do not have a private place to wash and change at home during menstruation

This third theme in sanitation is particularly important to menstruating women and is a gender-sensitive theme. This theme measures whether a menstruating woman has a place to change and wash in privacy at home.

Men (3,379 respondents) and non-menstruating women (2,272 respondents) are classified as least deprived in this theme. Women who had menstruated in the six months prior to the survey and had a private place to wash and change during menstruation are also least deprived (2,416 respondents). These three groups comprise 97.4% of the sample (Figure 5.8.12).

Of the menstruating women surveyed, 1.3% are classified as deprived, because they refused to answer. Their score is set midway between the highest and lowest possible scores, as the reason why women refused to answer this question is unknown. The remaining 1.3% of the overall sample are most deprived, representing menstruating women who do not have a place to wash and change in private at home.
This overall pattern generally holds true for all age groups (even though there were no individuals in the oldest group classified as most deprived), rural and urban localities, and for those with and without disabilities (although more of the former refused to answer).

When considering women of all ages, 95.4% are least deprived (of whom 51.5% menstruated and had a place to wash in privacy) and the remainder did not menstruate. Of the respondents who menstruated, 2.3% were deprived and 2.3% were most deprived. That is, of the 2,538 women who menstruated, 4.6% did not have a place to wash and change in privacy while at home.

The scoring may be revised in the future to distinguish more clearly between those for whom the indicator is not relevant (i.e. men and non-menstruating women) and for whom it is relevant (i.e. menstruating women).

### 5.8.4 Sanitation dimension results

**Figure 5.8.13** Sanitation dimension, South African main sample

As can be seen in Figure 5.8.13, 78.2% of the main sample are least deprived and another 19.5% are somewhat deprived for the sanitation dimension. The remaining 2.2% and 0.1% are deprived and most deprived. The pattern of distribution holds true across the gender, age and disability status subgroup analyses.

The difference between rural and urban residents is pronounced (see Figure 5.8.14), consistent with the patterns found in the constituent themes and indicators. Rural residents are more deprived, with more than one-third categorised as somewhat deprived or worse (a total of 37.4%, compared with 13.5% of urban residents).
Figure 5.8.14  Sanitation dimension, South African main sample, by locality

![Sanitation dimension graph]

5.9 Relationships

Figure 5.9.1  Indicators and themes of the relationships dimension

- Dependence and support
- Community event participation
- Participation during menstruation
5.9.1 Theme 1: Dependence and support

Figure 5.9.2 Dependence and support, South African main sample

Of the main sample, 78.9% are least deprived—either not dependent on others who do not live with them, or dependent on others but with enough support, and who are able to reciprocate or return favours (Figure 5.9.2). Of the respondents, 4.7% are somewhat deprived and 11.2% deprived. The 5.2% that fall in the most deprived
category require support but do not receive enough support, and can generally not reciprocate. This pattern of deprivation holds true across each of the three age groups.

Although men and women are equally likely to be categorised as most deprived (5.3% and 5.2%, respectively), women are more likely than men to be deprived or somewhat deprived (a total of 18.5% and 12.4%), highlighting their slightly greater deprivation in this indicator.

Urban residents are slightly less deprived than rural residents for this indicator. Only 4.0% of urban respondents are most deprived, compared with 7.6% of rural residents, while the figures for those categorised as deprived are 10.3% and 12.9%, respectively. Both categories represent having insufficient levels of assistance, and (often) difficulties with reciprocation.

The largest of the subgroup differences is between those with and without disabilities (see Figure 5.9.3). Individuals with disabilities are more deeply deprived than those without, with a total of 23.7% categorised as deprived or most deprived, compared to 12.5% of those without disabilities.

**Figure 5.9.3**  Dependence and support, South African main sample, by disability status

![Diagram showing the percentage of respondents in different deprivation categories for individuals with and without disabilities](image)

The scoring of this indicator will have to be revisited in the future, to ensure that the degree to which an individual can reciprocate is reflected across the four deprivation categories.
5.9.2 Theme 2: Participation in community events

Indicator 1: Community event participation

Figure 5.9.4 Community event participation, South African main sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivation Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Least deprived</strong></td>
<td>Individuals who did not want to attend community events OR individuals who were always able to attend community events, regardless of whether they were able to make a contribution if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat deprived</strong></td>
<td>Individuals who were only able to attend community events some of the time, regardless of whether they were able to make a contribution if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deprived</strong></td>
<td>Individuals who were only able to attend community events rarely, regardless of whether they were able to make a contribution if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most deprived</strong></td>
<td>Individuals who were never able to attend community events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a relatively even distribution of respondents across the four categories of deprivation for this indicator (Figure 5.9.4). Approximately one-quarter each are in the least deprived and deprived categories (24.7% and 26.4%, respectively), one-third are somewhat deprived (33.6%) and 15.3% are most deprived. The latter category represents those who were never able to attend community events that they wanted to attend. This overall pattern holds for those with and without disabilities.

In the comparison between women and men, women are more likely to be at the extremes compared to men. That is, women were more likely to be able to go to all of the events they wish to, or to choose to go to none (least deprived), or were never be able to attend events they wished to (most deprived). Of women compared to men, 27.2% and 21.4%, respectively, are least deprived, with 16.5% and 13.8% in the most deprived category, respectively.

Both the middle and older age groups follow the overall pattern very closely, while the youth are very slightly more likely to be categorised as most deprived (unable to go to any events that they wished to).
The differences between rural and urban are the largest for this indicator, with urban residents more deprived than their rural counterparts. Figure 5.9.5 illustrates that rural residents are more likely to be categorised as least deprived and somewhat deprived, while urban residents are more likely to be deprived or most deprived.

**Figure 5.9.5** Community event participation, South African main sample, by locality

The current method used to score this indicator will need to be revised in the future. At present, when individuals are grouped into the four deprivation categories, all information regarding whether a contribution was made or not, and the reasons for not making a contribution are masked. In the future, the different circumstances reflected by differing abilities to make contributions should be more fully reflected across the four deprivation categories.
Indicator 2: Participation during menstruation

Figure 5.9.6  Participation during menstruation, South African main sample

Least deprived: Men and non-menstruating women
OR Menstruating women who always have sufficient sanitary products, and never miss activities due to stigma associated with menstruation
OR Menstruating women who always have sufficient sanitary products, but who sometimes miss activities due to stigma associated with menstruation

Somewhat deprived: Menstruating women who do not have sufficient sanitary products, but who never miss social activities, school or work because of such lack, nor miss any activities because of stigma associated with menstruation

Deprived: Menstruating women who do not have sufficient sanitary products, but who never miss social activities, school or work because of such lack, and who only sometimes miss activities because of stigma associated with menstruation

Most deprived: Menstruating women who do not have sufficient sanitary products, who miss social activities, school or work at least some of the time because of such lack, and sometimes miss activities because of stigma associated with menstruation
OR Menstruating women who do not have sufficient sanitary products, who miss social activities, school or work at least some of the time because of such lack, and always miss activities because of stigma associated with menstruation

Of the main sample, 89.9% are least deprived in this indicator (a group which includes all men and non-menstruating women), 4.4% are somewhat deprived, 2.0% deprived and 3.7% most deprived (Figure 5.9.6). The women in these latter categories do not have sufficient sanitary products to meet their needs, miss social activities, school or work because of this shortage, and typically miss activities because of stigma associated with menstruation. This overall pattern holds for those with and without disabilities and for rural and urban residents.
Although it appears to be a positive result that only one in ten people are disadvantaged in this indicator, because these categories include men and non-menstruating women, it fails to reflect the true level of deprivation that menstruating women face. When examining only the 2,538 women who reported that they menstruated in the six months prior to the survey, 30.0% reported not having access to sufficient sanitary products and 25.0% reported that they missed activities due to stigma associated with menstruation.

Of the 772 women who lack sanitary products despite needing them, 44.0% missed social activities, school or work as a result of this shortage. Table 5.9.1 shows the deprivation categories by age, for female respondents only.

| Table 5.9.1 Participation during menstruation, South African purposive sample, women only, by age |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Least deprived                      | 16-24 | 24-64 | 65+ |
| Somewhat deprived                   | 75.7  | 81.7  | 95.5|
| Deprived                            | 11.1  | 8.1   | 0.0 |
| Most deprived                       | 2.9   | 3.6   | 4.5 |
|                                     | 10.3  | 6.6   | 0.0 |

The current method used to score this indicator is likely to require revision in the future. The current scoring method masks the extent of the effect of missing activities because of the shame or stigma associated with menstruation. In future scoring, the extent of these effects should be more fully reflected in the allocation of individuals across the four deprivation categories.

Theme 2 results: Participation in community events

Figure 5.9.7 Participation in community events, South African main sample
Just over half of the main sample are least deprived in this theme (53.6%), with more than one-third somewhat deprived (38.9%), while 5.6% are deprived and 1.9% are most deprived (Figure 5.9.7). This pattern holds for those with and without disabilities.

Women are slightly more deprived than men in this theme—they are less likely to be least deprived (49.1% and 59.6%, respectively), and more likely to be deprived than men (8.8% and 1.3%), and while the numbers are small, there are no men in the most deprived category compared to 3.3% of women (164 women).

The middle age group follows the overall pattern of deprivation. The youth are slightly more deprived than the older two groups, being more likely to be in the deprived and most deprived categories. The oldest group is somewhat less deprived in this theme than the two younger groups.

Similar proportions of rural and urban residents are categorised as deprived and most deprived. However, rural residents are more likely to be least deprived than their urban counterparts (58.7% and 50.9%, respectively) and less likely to be somewhat deprived (33.1% and 42.0%)—implying that, overall, they are a little less deprived than urban residents.

5.9.3 Relationships dimension results

Figure 5.9.8 Relationships dimension, South African main sample

Two-thirds of the main sample are least deprived in the relationships dimension (67.0%), with another quarter somewhat deprived (24.0%, see Figure 5.9.8). Of the respondents, 8.4% are deprived, and just 0.6% are in the most deprived category. This overall pattern holds true for all three age groups and the comparison between rural and urban residents.

There are some marked differences between men and women (see Figure 5.9.9), although these are mainly in the categories indicating relatively less deprivation—men are more likely than women to be least deprived (74.2% and 61.5%, respectively) and less likely to be somewhat deprived (19.6% and 27.4%).
Higher proportions of people with disabilities are in more deprived categories compared to those without, and conversely, lower proportions are in less deprived categories—a total of 40.8% of people with disabilities are somewhat deprived, deprived or most deprived, compared to 28.7% of those without disabilities.

5.10 Clothing and footwear

Figure 5.10.1 Indicators and themes of the clothing and footwear dimension
5.10.1 **Theme 1: Basic clothing and footwear**

**Indicator 1: Basic clothing and footwear ownership**

**Figure 5.10.2** Basic clothing and footwear ownership, South African main sample

A large majority of the main sample are least deprived (84.7%), owning both two sets of clothing and two pairs of footwear (Figure 5.10.2). Despite this theme setting an extremely low standard of only two sets of clothing and two pairs of footwear, 15.4% of the main sample do not meet this standard—7.2% are somewhat deprived (having two sets of clothing but not two pairs of footwear), 2.6% are deprived (having two pairs of footwear but not two sets of clothing) and 5.6% are most deprived (having neither two sets of clothing nor two pairs of footwear). This overall pattern of deprivation holds for all three age groups and rural–urban comparisons.

Men are slightly more deprived than women on this indicator. Although lower proportions of men than women are least deprived, there are higher proportions of men in each of the remaining three categories—a total of 19.2% of men, compared to 12.4% of women.

The largest difference is in the comparison between those with and without disabilities (see Figure 5.10.3). Of individuals without disabilities, 12.5% do not meet the criteria of ownership of two sets of clothing and two pairs of shoes, compared to 20.5% of individuals with disabilities (i.e. they are in the somewhat deprived, deprived or most deprived categories).
Figure 5.10.3  Basic clothing and footwear ownership, South African main sample, by disability status

Indicator 2: Basic acceptability and protection

Figure 5.10.4  Basic acceptability and protection, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals whose everyday clothing is acceptable always or most of the time, and provides good or excellent protection from weather conditions and hazards
Somewhat deprived: Individuals whose everyday clothing and footwear is acceptable always or most of the time, but provides no or poor protection from weather conditions and hazards

Deprived: Individuals whose everyday clothing and footwear is only acceptable some of the time or never, but provides good or excellent protection from weather conditions and hazards

Most deprived: Individuals whose everyday clothing and footwear is only acceptable some of the time or never, and provides no or poor protection from weather conditions and hazards

Overall, just over two-thirds of the main sample are least deprived in this indicator—68.5% had everyday clothing and footwear that was (socially) acceptable, at least most of the time, that provided good protection (Figure 5.10.4). Of this sample, 13.6% are somewhat deprived, with their clothing and footwear providing less protection against the weather and hazards than those in the least deprived category. Of the main sample, 5.7% are deprived—their clothing is only acceptable some of the time, but it provides reasonable protection. More than one in ten respondents are most deprived (12.2%), having clothing and footwear that is only acceptable some of the time or never and that provides little or no protection. Each of the three age groups follows this pattern of deprivation, as do those living in rural and urban areas.

Men are slightly more deprived in this indicator than women. For the first indicator of the theme, lower proportions of men than women are least deprived, and men represent higher proportions in each of the remaining three categories (a total of 34.9% of men, compared to 29.0% of women).

As was the case for the previous indicator, the largest difference is in the comparison between those with and without disabilities (see Figure 5.10.5). Of individuals without disabilities, 73.0% are least deprived, compared to 60.2% of individuals with disabilities, and there are larger proportions of people with disabilities in each of the subsequent categories.
For the theme of basic clothing and footwear, three-quarters of the main sample are least deprived (77.6%), with 6.8% somewhat deprived and 10.5% deprived (Figure 5.10.6). Of this sample, 5.1% are most deprived, being most deprived in both indicators of the theme, despite the very low thresholds required to be categorised as least deprived (particularly for the first indicator). Both men and women and all three age groups follow this pattern of deprivation.

While the overall pattern of deprivation is followed by both rural and urban residents, urban residents are slightly less deprived than their rural counterparts. A slightly higher proportion of rural than urban residents are represented in each of the somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived categories (a total of 26.5% compared to 20.3%).

As was the case for each of the previous indicators, the largest difference is between those with disabilities and those without (see Figure 5.10.7). Close to double the proportion of those with disabilities are deprived and most deprived (a total of 21.2% and 12.6%, respectively), compared to those without. This means that one in five people with disabilities do not have minimally adequate basic clothing and footwear.
Figure 5.10.7  Basic clothing and footwear, South African main sample, by disability status

Figure 5.10.8  School or work clothing, South African main sample

5.10.2  Theme 2: Other clothing and footwear

Indicator 1: School or work clothing

Least deprived: Individuals who do not need school/work clothing and footwear
OR Individuals who have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable at least most of the time, that provides good or excellent protection
OR Individuals who have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable at least most of the time, but provides poor or no protection

OR Individuals who have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable only some of the time or never, but provides good or excellent protection

**Somewhat deprived:** Individuals who have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable only some of the time or never, but it provides poor or no protection

**Deprived:** Individuals who do not have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable at least most of the time, but it provides good or excellent protection

**Most deprived:** Individuals who do not have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable at least most of the time, but it provides poor or no protection

OR Individuals who do not have enough school/work clothing and footwear, it is acceptable only some of the time or never, but provides good or excellent protection

OR Individuals who do not have enough school/work clothing and footwear, it is acceptable only some of the time or never, and provides poor or no protection

Of the main sample, 89.6% are least deprived (Figure 5.10.8). This group consists of those who did not require school or work clothes (because they did not work or attend school), and those who reported that they had enough school or work clothing and footwear that conformed to community standards and provided excellent or good protection. Of those categorised as least deprived, 65.0% did not require school or work clothes, and the remaining 35.0% did. Very small proportions are classified as somewhat deprived and deprived (1.7% and 1.4%, respectively). Nonetheless, there remain 7.3% who are most deprived, because they did not have enough, and the quality of their school or work clothing and footwear was poor. This overall pattern of deprivation is followed by those with and without disabilities.

This overall pattern applies to both men and women. However, men are somewhat more deeply deprived in this indicator than women, with 10.0% of men most deprived, compared to 5.2% of women.

Across the age groups, again, the middle group follows the overall pattern very closely, while both the youth and oldest group are somewhat less deprived than the middle group, and the oldest group less deprived than the youth.

Rural and urban residents also follow this general pattern. However, rural residents are almost twice as likely to be most deprived as urban residents—10.5% compared to 5.6% of urban residents (an almost identical pattern to that found in the subgroup analysis of gender).

The method used to score this indicator is likely to require revision in the future. The current method of scoring masks the effect of the protection provided by the school/work clothing and footwear. In the future, the extent of such protection (or the lack of it) should be more fully reflected in the allocation of individuals across the four deprivation categories.
Indicator 2: Formal clothing

Figure 5.10.9  Formal clothing, South African main sample

![Bar chart showing the distribution of respondents across deprivation levels for formal clothing.]

**Least deprived:** Individuals who have enough formal clothing and footwear that is acceptable at least most of the time

**Somewhat deprived:** Individuals who have enough formal clothing and footwear that is acceptable some of the time

**Deprived:** Individuals who have enough formal clothing and footwear, but it is never socially acceptable

OR Individuals who do not have enough formal clothing and footwear, but it is acceptable at least most of the time

**Most deprived:** Individuals who do not have enough formal clothing and footwear, and it is acceptable only some of the time or never

Just over half of the main sample (55.8%) are least deprived—having enough clothing and footwear for formal occasions that is socially acceptable either most of the time or always (Figure 5.10.9). Relatively small proportions are somewhat deprived (8.4%) and deprived (5.6%), but close to one-third of individuals are most deprived in this indicator (30.2%)—they do not have enough clothing and footwear for formal occasions, and it is often not socially acceptable.

In this indicator, women are slightly less deprived than men, with 58.0% least deprived, compared to 52.9% of men in this category. Men have higher proportions, compared to women, in each of the subsequent categories of deprivation.

Across the age groups, the middle age group follows the overall pattern, while the youth are somewhat more deprived than the two older groups, and the oldest group is somewhat less deprived than the two younger groups. There are 33.4% of the youth in the most deprived category, compared to 30.1% of the middle age group and 24.1% of the oldest group.
Urban residents are more likely to be least deprived than their rural counterparts in this indicator (58.7% compared to 50.4%), with similar proportions of both in the somewhat deprived and deprived categories. Conversely, there are 34.7% of rural residents in the most deprived category, compared to 27.8% of urban residents.

As can be seen in Figure 5.10.10, those with disabilities are more likely to be in the most deprived category than individuals without disabilities.

**Figure 5.10.10  Formal clothing, South African main sample, by disability status**

**Figure 5.10.11  Other clothing and footwear, South African main sample**
In the results of this theme, less than two-thirds of the main sample are least deprived (60.3%), with one-fifth somewhat deprived (20.7%). Of the respondents, 13.9% are deprived and 5.2% most deprived—which, for the latter category, means that these individuals are most deprived in both the two indicators in the theme (Figure 5.10.11).

Women are somewhat less deprived than men in this theme. They are more likely than men to be least deprived (63.0% compared to 56.7%) and less likely to be in any of the subsequent three categories.

The youth are more likely to be deprived than the two older groups (although the gap with the middle group is smaller than with the oldest group). Conversely, the oldest group is less deprived than the younger two groups. The proportion of the youth in the deprived and most deprived categories is a total of 20.8%, while for the middle group, it is 19.7% and for the oldest group, 11.7%.

Rural residents are slightly more deprived than their urban counterparts. They are less likely to be least deprived (54.2% compared to 63.5%). Almost half of this difference is found in the somewhat deprived category (23.5% of rural residents, compared to 19.2% urban), with the remainder spread between the deprived and most deprived categories.

The differences between those with and without disabilities are shown in Figure 5.10.12. Higher proportions of individuals with disabilities, compared to those without, fall in the categories of somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived (a total of 45.2% compared to 36.8%).

**Figure 5.10.12  Other clothing and footwear, South African main sample, by disability status**

![Graph showing the distribution of respondents by disability status and deprivation level.](image-url)
5.10.3 Theme 3: Sanitary product use

Figure 5.10.13 Sanitary product use, South African main sample

For this theme (and indicator), men and non-menstruating women are considered least deprived, because individuals are only deprived if they need sanitary products but do not have them. Of the main sample, 90.0% are least deprived, 5.1% are somewhat deprived, 4.6% are deprived, and only 0.4% are most deprived (Figure 5.10.13). This pattern of deprivation also holds for those with and without disabilities.

Looking more closely at eligible women only, of the 2,538 women who menstruated in the six months prior to the survey, 70.0% reported always having enough sanitary products. 17.0% reported that they have sufficient sanitary products most of the time, 12.0% that they had them only some of the time, while 1.0% reported that they never had enough sanitary products to use. Further analysis of the intersection of eligible women by age, locality and disability status would be valuable in the future.

Returning to the whole sample, the oldest age group is least deprived in this, given the cut-off age is 65 years and above; those categorised as deprived (2.7%) are categorised this way because they refused to answer this question. The patterns of deprivation between the youth and the middle age group are very similar, and mirror those of the overall pattern described above.
The differences between rural and urban are very small, but urban residents are slightly less deprived than their rural counterparts. Of urban residents, 91.3% are least deprived compared to 87.7% of rural residents.

The scoring may be revised in the future to distinguish more clearly between those for whom the indicator is not relevant (i.e. men and non-menstruating women) and those for whom it is relevant (i.e. menstruating women).

5.10.4 Clothing and footwear dimension results

Overall, three-quarters of the main sample are least deprived in the clothing and footwear dimension (76.4%, see Figure 5.10.14). Almost one-fifth are somewhat deprived (18.6%), 4.6% deprived and 0.3% most deprived. Overall, men and women both follow this dimension-level pattern of deprivation.

Both the youth and the middle age group follow this overall pattern very closely. However, the oldest group is somewhat less deprived than the younger two groups, with a higher proportion being least deprived and none in this age group classified as most deprived.

As has been the case with many of the indicators comprising this dimension, rural residents are slightly more deprived than their urban counterparts. A total of 28.4% of rural residents are classified as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived, compared to 21.0% of urban residents.

The largest difference in subgroup analyses is between those with and without disabilities (see Figure 5.10.15), with higher proportions of those with disabilities in each of the categories of somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived.
5.11 Violence

As explained in Section 3.10, the data from the violence dimension is not presented in this report.

5.12 Family planning

Figure 5.12.1 Indicators and themes of the family planning dimension
5.12.1 Family planning dimension results

Figure 5.12.2 Family planning dimension, South African main sample

Overall, 79.1% of the main sample are least deprived in family planning—either the individual had no need for contraception, or they personally used a modern method (Figure 5.12.2). Of the respondents, 3.3% are somewhat deprived (they did not use a method themselves, but their partner used a modern method), 13.3% are deprived and 4.3% are most deprived. Of those respondents categorised as deprived, 90.0% refused to answer questions about their use of contraception to delay or avoid having children. The remaining 10.0% used a traditional method (i.e. approximately 1.3% of the whole sample either personally used a traditional method, or their female
partner did). This was the only series of questions across the survey that had a high proportion of refusals to answer (a combined rate across the series of questions of 10.7%). Both rural and urban residents follow this overall pattern of deprivation.

There are several distinctions between men and women (see Figure 5.12.3), even though similar proportions are least deprived. There are no men in the somewhat deprived category (they do not personally use, but their female partner uses a modern method), but 5.8% of women are somewhat deprived (they do not personally use, but their male partner uses a modern method). In contrast, a higher proportion of men than women are in the deprived category (17.4% compared to 10.2%) driven by the relatively higher proportion of men who refused to answer questions about this topic. The implications of this unmet need for contraception—of up to around one-fifth of respondents—should not be minimised, particularly for women who may be left to deal with unwanted and unplanned pregnancies alone.

There are also differences between age groups, with the oldest age group appearing to be more deprived. However, these differences also appear to be driven by the relatively high proportion of those in the oldest age group who refused to answer questions about the use of contraceptives (and older women, who may not have a need for them). In practice, the differences between the two younger age groups are likely more important. The youth are less likely to be in the deprived category than the middle group (8.4% compared to 13.0%), but a little more likely to be most deprived (5.7% compared to 3.8%). This represents an important unmet need for contraception in both groups. Further analysis of the intersections between age and gender for this dimension will be necessary to better understand the unmet need for contraception, particularly for women in the two younger age groups.

The difference between those with and without disabilities also seems to be driven largely by a higher proportion of those with disabilities refusing to answer this series of questions, as the largest difference is in the deprived category (17.1% of those with disabilities and 11.2% of those without). There is a higher proportion of those without disabilities than those with disabilities in both the somewhat deprived category (3.5% and 2.8%, respectively) and the most deprived category (4.5% and 3.9%).
The scoring may be revised in the future to distinguish more clearly between those for whom the indicator is not relevant (i.e. those who have no unmet need for contraception) and those for whom it is relevant (i.e. individuals with an unmet need).

5.13 Environment

Figure 5.13.1 Indicators and themes of the environment dimension

5.13.1 Theme 1: Exposure to environmental problems

Figure 5.13.2 Exposure to environmental problems, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who face no environmental problems, or only one
Somewhat deprived: Individuals who face any two or three environmental problems
Deprived: Individuals who face any four or five environmental problems
Most deprived: Individuals who face any six or seven environmental problems, or all eight
This theme asked respondents if they were exposed to common environmental problems around their homes, such as if they lived close to hazardous waste or waste disposal sites, whether open drains or areas with disease-carrying insects were a problem, or whether they were exposed to air, water and/or noise pollution (or any other significant environmental issue).

Around two-thirds are least deprived (66.3%), facing at most, one of these environmental problems (Figure 5.13.2). A further one-fifth are somewhat deprived, facing two or three of the eight environmental problems asked about. More than 10.0% of the main sample fall into the bottom two categories (Figure 5.13.2). This overall pattern is followed by both men and women.

The pattern of exposure to environmental problems is similar for the two younger age groups (and in line with the overall pattern), although the older age group report facing fewer environmental problems, with 75.6% of that age group being least deprived.

The most significant difference in the subgroup analyses is between rural and urban residents, with higher proportions of urban residents facing each environmental problem than their rural counterparts (see Figure 5.13.3), and facing more environmental problems. Between two and three times the proportion of urban residents were exposed to waste disposal, open drains and sewage, air pollution and noise pollution, compared to rural residents.

**Figure 5.13.3  Exposure to environmental problems, South African main sample, by locality**

Those with disabilities are somewhat more deprived than those without disabilities. A lower proportion of individuals with disabilities than those without are classified as least deprived (61.5% and 68.0%, respectively), and those with disabilities have higher representation in each of the remaining categories than those without.

The scoring may be revised in the future to distinguish more clearly between those for whom the indicator is not relevant (i.e. those who are not exposed to environmental problems) and for whom it is relevant (i.e. individuals who are exposed).
5.13.2  Theme 2: Natural resource utilisation

Indicator 1: Wild resource utilisation

Figure 5.13.4  Wild resource utilisation, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who do not utilise wild natural resources (i.e. non-cultivated resources)

Somewhat deprived: not applicable

Deprived: Individuals who utilise at least one wild natural resource, and there is enough of the resource to meet needs

Most deprived: Individuals who utilise at least one wild natural resource, and there is not enough of the resource to meet needs

Of the main sample, 93.4% are least deprived for this indicator, with a further 3.9% deprived and 2.7% most deprived (Figure 5.13.4). This overall pattern is followed by men and women, all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

However, there were differences between rural and urban residents (see Figure 5.13.5). Rural residents are somewhat more deprived in this indicator—7.7% of rural residents are deprived compared to 1.9% of urban residents, and a further 5.0% most deprived, compared to 1.4% of their urban counterparts.
Only 6.6% of all the respondents collected or harvested wild natural resources—12.7% of rural residents compared to only 3.3% of urban residents, and 8.1% of men compared to 5.5% of women. The most important resource harvested was wild plants for food or medicine (46.3% of female harvesters and 25.4% of male harvesters). The next most important resource for women was thatching grass (10.0% of female harvesters), and for men was wild animals/game (12.9%) and fish (12.5%). Of respondents who utilised a natural resource, 59.5% reported that there was enough, while 40.5% reported that there was not enough of the resource to meet their needs.
Indicator 2: Biomass fuel utilisation

Figure 5.13.6  Biomass fuel utilisation, South African main sample

Just over two-thirds of the main sample are least deprived for this indicator (68.4%), and 17.9% are deprived (i.e. they are responsible for collecting biomass fuel, but there is enough available to meet needs, see Figure 5.13.6). Of this sample, 13.7% are most deprived, meaning that they are responsible for collecting biomass fuel sources, but there is not enough available to meet needs. In total, for 43.0% of those who are responsible for collecting, there was not enough available to meet needs. This overall pattern is followed by both men and women.

With respect to the three age groups, the youth are least deprived, having the smallest proportion responsible for collecting fuel (17.2%, compared to 36.6% of the middle group, and 33.8% of the older group). The middle and older groups follow a similar pattern of deprivation, both being more deprived than the youth.

As may be expected, rural residents are more deprived than their urban counterparts. Of urban residents, 72.9% are least deprived, compared to 60.0% of rural residents. Higher proportions of rural residents than urban residents are in both the deprived and most deprived categories (see Figure 5.13.7).
Those with disabilities are more likely to be deprived than those without, with higher proportions in both the deprived and most deprived categories—17.6% of those with disabilities are most deprived (i.e. the individual was responsible for collecting biomass fuel, and there was not enough available), compared to 11.6% for those without disabilities.

**Theme 2 results: Natural resource utilisation**

**Figure 5.13.7** Biomass fuel utilisation, South African main sample, by locality

**Figure 5.13.8** Natural resource utilisation, South African main sample
Almost two-thirds of respondents (65.4%) fall into the least deprived category for this theme, with approximately one-third classified in the middle two categories, while 2.2% are classified as most deprived—individuals who are most deprived in both wild resource utilisation and biomass fuel utilisation (Figure 5.13.8). This pattern of deprivation is broadly followed by both men and women and those with and without disabilities.

With respect to age, the youth are most likely to be categorised as least deprived (79.5%), and while the largest proportion of the two older groups were also least deprived, large minorities were categorised as somewhat deprived or deprived (a total of 36.7% for both the middle and older age groups).

The largest differences at the subgroup level were observed in the comparison between rural and urban residents, as was the case for each of the indicators, with rural residents being, broadly, more deprived than their urban counterparts (see Figure 5.13.9).

**Figure 5.13.9  Natural resource utilisation, South African main sample, by locality**
5.13.3 **Theme 3: Safe environment**

**Figure 5.13.10** Safe environment, South African main sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivation Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Least deprived:** | Individuals who feel very safe when at home alone and while walking alone in the neighbourhood  
OR Individuals who feel very safe for either one of these settings and feel safe for the other |
| **Somewhat deprived:** | Individuals who feel safe when at home alone and while walking alone in the neighbourhood  
OR Individuals who feel very safe for either one of these settings and feel unsafe for the other |
| **Deprived:** | Individuals who feel unsafe when at home alone and while walking alone in the neighbourhood  
OR Individuals who feel safe for either one of these settings, and feel very unsafe for the other  
OR Individuals who feel safe for either one of these settings, and feel unsafe for the other  
OR Individuals who feel very safe for either one of these settings, and feel unsafe for the other |
| **Most deprived:** | Individuals who feel very unsafe when at home alone and while walking alone in the neighbourhood  
OR Individuals who feel very unsafe for either one of these settings, and unsafe for the other |
This theme has a distribution of deprivation that is unlike most other indicators and themes, as it has a very low proportion of respondents in the least deprived category (Figure 5.13.10). Just 12.7% of the main sample are least deprived—feeling safe or very safe when at home alone and while walking alone in the neighbourhood. Almost one-quarter are somewhat deprived (23.7%), with exactly half classified as deprived, and the remaining 13.6% most deprived. This pattern of deprivation holds for all three age groups, and rural and urban residents.

The differences between men and women for this indicator are stark, as can be seen in Figure 5.13.11, with women more likely to be deprived than men. Women are far less likely than men to be categorised as least deprived (6.9% compared to 20.4%). They are also more deeply deprived, with higher proportions of women than men in the deprived and most deprived categories.

Individuals with disabilities are more deprived in this theme than their counterparts. A total of 40.1% of those without disabilities are either least deprived or somewhat deprived, while the figure for those with disabilities is 29.6%. Further, while 11.1% of people without disabilities are classified as most deprived, the figure for those with disabilities is 18.1%.

The scoring of this indicator is likely to be revised in the future, to narrow the range of possible response combinations within each category of deprivation—with a particular focus on reducing the overlap between feelings of safety and the lack of safety within the deprived category.
5.13.4 Environment dimension results

For the dimension as a whole, almost half of the main sample are classified as least deprived (47.0%), and 45.8% are somewhat deprived (Figure 5.13.12). Another 7.0% are classified as deprived and just 0.2% as most deprived. Given the diversity of issues within the themes, it is perhaps not surprising that few respondents are classified as most deprived across all of them. This overall pattern of deprivation is followed by rural and urban residents.

Women are slightly more deprived than men in this dimension. Women are less likely than men to be least deprived (42.1% versus 53.5%), and more likely than men to be in each of the subsequent three categories, particularly in somewhat deprived (49.9% compared to 40.4%). This seems to arise from the substantial differences observed in the safe environment theme.

Of the three age groups, the middle group is the more deprived—it is least likely to be least deprived (43.4% compared to 56.3% for the youth and 47.7% for the oldest group), and the most likely to be in the three categories indicating progressively worse deprivation. The youth are less deprived than the two older age groups, and the oldest group falls in between the youth and the middle group (with respect to levels of deprivation), but closer to the middle group than the youth.

The most substantial differences in this dimension are between individuals with disabilities and those without, as can be seen in Figure 5.13.13. Those with disabilities are slightly more deprived than those without, following on from their greater deprivation in the exposure to environmental problems and the safe environment themes.
Figure 5.13.13  Environment dimension, South African main sample, by disability status

![Bar chart showing the environment dimension for South African main sample by disability status.]

5.14 Voice

Figure 5.14.1  Indicators and themes of the voice dimension

- Voting
- Participation in local decision making
- Perception of raising concerns
- Personal control over decision making
5.14.1 Theme 1: Voice in the public domain

Indicator 1: Voting

Figure 5.14.2 Voting, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who voted in the most recent election, and were free to choose whom to vote for

Somewhat deprived: not applicable

Deprived: Individuals who were too young to vote

OR Individuals who refused to answer

Most deprived: Individuals who did not vote for any reason other than being too young

OR Individuals who voted, but were not free to choose whom to vote for

Overall, 55.9% of the main sample are least deprived—they voted and were free to choose whom to vote for in the most recent election (88.1% of those who voted, see Figure 5.14.2). Of this sample, 5.1% are deprived (largely individuals who were too young to vote) and almost four in ten respondents are in the most deprived group (39%). This overall pattern holds for both rural and urban residents.

Men are more deprived in this indicator than women; they are less likely than women to be least deprived (49.6% compared to 60.7%), and more likely to be most deprived (45.6% and 33.9%, respectively).

Across age groups, the differences are stark, as can be seen in Figure 5.14.3. The oldest age group is the least deprived, followed by the middle group, with the youth considerably more deprived than the two older groups. Examining the distinctions within the most deprived category, it was abstaining from voting, rather than not being free to vote that largely determined this categorisation. While 61.0% of the youth did not vote, the figures for the middle and oldest group are 25.0% and 8.0%, respectively.
Individuals without disabilities are more deprived than those with disabilities on this indicator. Those without disabilities are far less likely to be least deprived (51.5% compared to 64.0%), a little more likely to be deprived (6.5% and 2.5%, respectively), and much more likely to be most deprived (42.0% and 33.5%).

**Indicator 2: Participation in local decision-making**

**Figure 5.14.3** Voting, South African main sample, by age

**Figure 5.14.4** Participation in local decision-making processes, South African main sample
Least deprived: Individuals who participated in local decision-making processes, and felt they had a lot of influence

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who participated in local decision-making processes, and felt they had an intermediate level of influence

Deprived: Individuals who participated in local decision-making processes, but felt they had little influence

OR Individuals who did not participate in any decision-making processes because there were none to participate in

Most deprived: Individuals who did not participate in any decision-making processes because they were, or felt, excluded or were too busy to do so

Figure 5.14.4 shows that more than half of the main sample did not participate in any decision-making processes and are categorised as most deprived (59.4%). Their reasons for not participating were because they were excluded, felt that it was not appropriate for them to participate, or they were too busy to do so, not because there were no decision-making processes to participate in. Only 9.2% of the main sample participated in local decision-making and felt that they had a lot of influence and were therefore categorised as least deprived. This pattern of deprivation is followed by both men and women.

There are also substantial differences between the three age groups (see Figure 5.14.5). The youth is substantially more deprived than the two older groups, who experience broadly the same level of deprivation. For example, 77.1% of the youth are categorised as most deprived, compared to 53.7% and 53.6% for the middle and oldest group, respectively.

Urban residents are more deprived, with 61.4% categorised as most deprived, compared with 55.5% of their rural counterparts.
Those with disabilities are less deprived than those without disabilities. Those without disabilities are more likely to be deprived and most deprived (a total of 83.7% compared to 77.2% of those with disabilities), and consequently, less likely to be least deprived and somewhat deprived. Thus, those with disabilities are more likely to have participated in local decision-making processes and to feel that they had influence over the decisionmaking processes when they did so.

**Indicator 3: Perception of capacity to raise concerns**

**Figure 5.14.6 Perception of capacity to raise concerns, South African main sample**

- **Least deprived**: Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very easy, and they have a lot of influence
  - OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very easy, and they have an intermediate level of influence
  - OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is easy, and they have a lot of influence

- **Somewhat deprived**: Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very easy, but they have only a little influence
  - OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is easy, and they have an intermediate level of influence
  - OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is difficult, but they have a lot of influence

- **Deprived**: Individuals who believe that raising concerns is easy, but they have only a little influence
  - OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is difficult, but they have an intermediate level of influence
  - OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very difficult, but they have a lot of influence

- **Most deprived**: Individuals who believe that raising concerns is difficult, and they have only a little influence
OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very difficult, but they have an intermediate level of influence

OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very difficult, and they have only a little influence

Overall, the distribution of deprivation on this indicator is skewed towards greater deprivation (Figure 5.14.6). Only 14.5% are least deprived, and 18.6% somewhat deprived, while 39.7% are deprived and more than one-third are most deprived (37.3%). Both men and women follow this overall pattern of deprivation, as do individuals with and without disabilities.

The most substantial differences in the subgroup analyses for this indicator are between the three age groups. As can be seen in Figure 5.14.7, the youth are more deprived than the other two groups—only 8.8% of the youth are in the least deprived category, compared with 15.9% of the middle group and 18.5% of the oldest age group.

Figure 5.14.7 Perception of capacity to raise concerns, South African main sample, by age

Urban residents are slightly more deprived than their rural counterparts in this indicator. They are less likely to be categorised as least deprived or somewhat deprived, and equally likely to be categorised as deprived. However, 40.1% of urban residents are most deprived compared to 32.0% of rural residents.

The scoring of this indicator is likely to be revised in the future, to narrow the range of situations within each category of deprivation.
For this theme on voice in the public domain, close to two-thirds of the main sample are in the most deprived and deprived categories (64.1%, equally split between the categories), with a further one-quarter somewhat deprived (25.5%, see Figure 5.14.8). Only 10.4% of the main sample are least deprived. These results are unlike those for any of the other themes or dimensions in the IDM—the main sample are more deprived in voice in the public domain than in other aspects measured. This overall pattern is followed by those living in rural and urban localities, and by people with and without disabilities.

Men are more deeply deprived than women in this theme—they are more likely than women to be most deprived (36.4% versus 28.7%), and less likely to be deprived (28.0% versus 35.2%).

There is a marked difference between different age groups (see Figure 5.14.9) with the youngest group the more deprived of the three groups. Only 12.0% of the older age group are most deprived, which is half the proportion of the middle age group (25.2%), and around one-fifth the proportion of the youth (59.4%). Consequently, the youth are under-represented in other categories—only 2.2% of the youth are least deprived, compared to 12.5% of the middle age group and 15.6% of the older group.
Figure 5.14.9  Voice in the public domain, South African main sample, by age

Figure 5.14.10  Personal control over decision-making, South African main sample

5.14.2  Theme 2: Personal control over decision-making

Least deprived: Individuals who lived alone
OR Individuals who were not prevented from making any personal decisions
OR Individuals who were prevented from making one personal decision

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who were prevented from making two personal decisions
**Deprived:** Individuals who were prevented from making three or four personal decisions

**Most deprived:** Individuals who were prevented from making five or six personal decisions

Of respondents in the main sample, 90.9% are categorised as least deprived, meaning that the majority control their personal decisions over the issues they were asked about, or only lacked control over a single issue (Figure 5.14.10). Further, 1.7% are somewhat deprived (are not free to make personal decisions about two issues), while 7.0% are deprived and 0.4% are most deprived.

Of the six issues asked about, 6.0% of people responded that they had to ask for permission to spend money on household expenditure (the highest response, with other issues of control indicated by only 1-2% of respondents). This pattern of deprivation is followed by both urban and rural residents, and those with and without disabilities.

While both men and women are equally likely to be in the most deprived group (0.4% for both), women are less likely than men to be in the deprived category (6.2% and 8.2%, respectively) and slightly more likely to be in the least deprived category (91.9% and 89.5%, respectively).

Although still relatively small, the largest differences occurred between the three age groups (see Figure 5.14.11). It is apparent that the youth are somewhat more deprived than the two older groups, which closely follow the overall pattern of deprivation.

**Figure 5.14.11  Personal control over decision-making, South African main sample, by age**

Given the low response rates to these questions and the lack of nuance in the data helping to tease out the level of deprivation in terms of control over personal decision-making (including in Indonesia), these survey questions, as well as the scoring and indicator construction, should be revisited in the future.
5.14.3 Voice dimension results

Overall, almost one-third of the main sample are least deprived (Figure 5.14.12) across the voice dimension (32.6%), and over half are somewhat deprived (54.8%). Of this sample, 11.9% are deprived and 0.7% most deprived. This pattern is followed by both men and women, and those with and without disabilities.

Among the three age groups (see Figure 5.14.13), the youth are substantially more deprived than the two older groups. The middle group follows the overall pattern of deprivation closely, and the older group is less deprive than the two younger groups. Of the oldest and middle age groups, 47.6% and 38.6% are classified as least deprived (respectively), compared to 9.9% of the youth. Consequently, the youth are also over-represented in other categories, reflecting the greater deprivation of the youth in both themes of the voice dimension.
Driven largely by the results from the first theme, urban residents are slightly more deprived across the voice dimension, as well as being slightly more deeply deprived than their rural counterparts.

5.15 Time use

Figure 5.15.1 Indicators and themes of the time use dimension
5.15.1  Time use dimension results

Figure 5.15.2  Time use dimension, South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals with a first-quartile time burden (less than 7.5 hours per day), and not more than two-thirds of that time on call

Somewhat deprived: Individuals with a first-quartile time burden (less than 7.5 hours per day), and more than two-thirds of that time on call
OR Individuals with a second-quartile time burden (between 7.5 and 10.4 hours per day), and not more than two-thirds of that time on call

Deprived: Individuals with a second-quartile time burden (between 7.5 and 10.4 hours per day), and more than two-thirds of that time on call
OR Individuals with a third-quartile time burden (between 10.5 and 13.2 hours per day), and not more than two-thirds of that time on call

Most deprived: Individuals with a fourth-quartile time burden (of 13.3 hours per day or more), and with any amount of on-call time, or with a third-quartile time burden and in excess of two-thirds of that time on call

Time burden refers to the time spent on work for pay, profit and production, on unpaid domestic and care work and on obligatory activities—that is, time spent on non-leisure and non-personal care activities. On-call time is time when the respondent is undertaking their primary activity while simultaneously responsible for caring for a child under the age of 13, or responsible for someone who is sick, disabled or elderly. The time burden referred to in this dimension is measured by the quartiles determined from the South African data, which are shown in Table 5.15.1.
**Table 5.15.1**  
Quartile time burden cut-offs and no on-call responsibilities, South Africa main sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quartile No.</th>
<th>Hours spent in a day</th>
<th>‘Quartile respondents’ with no on-call responsibilities (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;7.5 hours</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5–10.4 hours</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.5–13.2 hours</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 hours or more</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals in this dimension are more evenly spread across the four categories than for many other dimensions. This is as a result of the method of dividing time spent into quartiles. However, it is apparent, as can be seen in 2, that the largest group falls into the most deprived category (32.0%). The skew toward deprivation indicates the relatively high time burden, which is combined with relatively higher on-call responsibilities as time burden increases (Table 5.15.1). This pattern of deprivation is followed by those with and without disabilities.

The most substantial difference is between men and women (see Figure 5.15.3), with the largest proportion of men categorised as least deprived (27.0%), while the largest proportion of women are categorised as most deprived (36.8%). The skew that can be observed in Figure 5.15.3 is, in part, caused by the higher levels of on-call responsibility women have compared to men. Approximately 35.0% of women spend more than two-thirds of their time on call, compared to 10.8% of men (74.8% men report no on-call time compared to 44.7% of women).

**Figure 5.15.3**  
Time use dimension, South African main sample, by gender

While the youth are evenly distributed across the four categories, the middle age group is most likely to be in the most deprived category (35.8%), and the older age group is most likely to be categorised as least deprived (39.8%). Thus, the older age group is the least deprived of the three, followed by the youth. The middle group is the more deprived of the three age groups.
Overall, a slightly higher proportion of rural than urban residents are deprived, and also more deeply deprived. Even though in both rural and urban areas the largest proportion of residents are categorised as most deprived, in rural areas this is 37.2% compared to 29.2% of urban residents.

5.16 Work

Figure 5.16.1 Indicators and themes of the work dimension

This final dimension, as measured in the IDM, is very broad. It covers several issues that go beyond what many will typically associate with the title of the dimension—work—which tends to be confined to concepts of employment, unemployment (i.e. labour market participation), and income generation. The inclusion of the themes addressing unpaid and domestic care work and the double labour burden, are designed to improve understanding of the different types of work undertaken within and outside the home, and how these may differ between different social groups.

For the first indicator in Theme 1, all respondents are allocated a score based on their employment status—employed, unemployed or not in the labour force (see Appendix A.1). For respondents who are not economically active, the score for this indicator is their theme score because if they are not in the labour force, issues such as job security, hazardous work etc., are of no relevance to them. For those respondents who are economically active, their theme score is an aggregation of all four indicators described within this theme. Therefore, information on Indicators 2, 3 and 4 is presented only for the 40.7% of the main sample who were employed or unemployed.

Similarly, in Theme 2, respondents who did not undertake any unpaid domestic and care work are allocated the highest possible score for this theme (14.1% of respondents in the main sample). For those who reported doing unpaid and domestic care work, their theme score is an aggregation of the two indicators described, which is reported for the 85.8% of respondents who reported doing unpaid domestic and care work.
5.16.1 Theme 1: Work for pay, profit and production

Indicator 1: Employment status

Figure 5.16.2 Employment status, South African main sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most deprived</th>
<th>Deprived</th>
<th>Somewhat deprived</th>
<th>Least deprived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived: Individuals who were employed</td>
<td>OR Individuals who were not in the labour force because they had retired or did not need to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who were unemployed and waiting to start a new job | OR Individuals who were in full-time education or training |

Deprived: Individuals who were unemployed (except those waiting to start a new job) | OR Individuals who were not in the labour force (except for those who were retired, did not need to work, or were unable to work) |

Most deprived: Individuals who were not in the labour force because they were unable to work (e.g. an illness, injury or condition prevented them from working), or were not allowed to work |

Note that these figures are for the whole sample, including those aged 65 and above, which means these results diverge from typical labour statistics (e.g. those released by Statistics South Africa), which are restricted to the working age population (those aged between 15 and 64).
Overall, 46.9% of the main sample is least deprived—either employed, or not in the labour force because they had retired or did not need to work (Figure 5.16.2). A further 16.2% are somewhat deprived (in full-time education or training or unemployed but waiting to start a new job), 32.3% are deprived (the rest of the unemployed and those not in the labour force) and 4.6% most deprived (those who are not in the labour force because they are unable to work). This pattern was followed very closely by men and women, and rural and urban residents.

For the whole of the main sample, 59.4% of respondents reported not being in the labour force (for any reason), while 33.2% of respondents reported that they were employed, and 7.5% that they were unemployed. Table 5.16.1 describes the different levels of deprivation of those who were economically active (i.e. employed or unemployed), and those who were not in the labour force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.16.1 Employment status and deprivation category, South African main sample</th>
<th>Economically active (employed and unemployed) (%)</th>
<th>Not in the labour force (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deprived</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>5,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most significant differences occur between the three age groups (see Figure 5.16.3). The youth are more deprived in this indicator than the two older groups. However, a key driver of this is the large number of youth who are classified as somewhat deprived (51.4%) because they are still in full-time education or training (which should boost their employment prospects in the future). The older group is least deprived in this indicator, due to the high number of over 65-year-olds who have retired (and who would not typically be included in reported labour statistics).
While there are more individuals with disabilities than without in the least deprived category (53.6% compared to 43.3%), there are fewer in the somewhat deprived and deprived categories (37.0% compared to 54.7%). There is a higher proportion of those with disabilities than those without who are most deprived (9.3% compared to 2.0%)—which includes all respondents who are not in the labour force because they are not able to work.

All the remaining indicators in this theme are reported ONLY for the 3,516 economically active respondents (i.e. 40.7% of respondents, corresponding to the labour force participation rate).

**Indicator 2: Job security**

**Figure 5.16.4 Job security (economically active respondents, n=3,516), South African main sample**

- **Least deprived:** Individuals who had between one and four jobs (including self-employment), very rarely had to change employment because of an employer’s decision, and received social security
- **Somewhat deprived:** Individuals who had any number of jobs, typically did not have to change jobs because of an employer’s decision (or not often), and broadly did not receive social security benefits
- **Deprived:** Individuals who had any number of jobs, did or did not have to change jobs because of an employer’s decision, and received no social security benefits
- **Most deprived:** Individuals who had five or more jobs, had to change jobs very often, often, or not often because of an employer’s decision, and received no social security benefits

A very small proportion (0.8%) of economically active respondents are categorised as most deprived in Figure 5.16.4, with a further 13.6% in the deprived category. The majority of those who are economically active are categorised as least deprived (51.4%), indicating relatively low levels of job insecurity as measured here. The distribution of deprivation for men and women follows this pattern very closely.
With respect to the comparisons between age groups (see Figure 5.16.5), the middle age group is more likely to be least deprived (54.3%)—experiencing less job insecurity—than the youth and the older group (38.1% and 30.2%, respectively). The older age group was most likely to be somewhat deprived (56.0%) compared to the two younger groups (38.9% and 32.6%, respectively). The youth are more likely than the middle or older groups to be deprived (20.6%, compared to 12.6% and 12.9%, respectively) and most deprived (2.4%, compared to 0.6% and 0.9%). Note, however, that in this group of economically active respondents, there are only 457 individuals aged 16–24 and 116 individuals who are 65 years or older.

Levels of job insecurity are more severe in rural than urban areas, with economically active urban residents more likely to be least deprived (58.4%, compared to 36.1% of economically active rural respondents). Rural residents are more likely than their urban counterparts to fall into the somewhat deprived (42.3% and 30.4%, respectively) and deprived categories (20.8% and 10.3%). Very few rural or urban residents are categorised as most deprived (1.0% for both groups).

In the comparison between economically active people with disabilities and those without, there is no difference in the proportions categorised as most deprived (1.0%) and deprived (14.0%). However, those without disabilities are far more likely to be categorised as least deprived (54.1% compared to 44.0%), and those with disabilities more likely to be somewhat deprived (41.6% compared to 31.5%).

It is likely that this indicator will be revised in the future, to improve the overall clarity of measurement of issues associated with job security—this activity is likely to require a reconsideration of the variables measured, as well as the cut-offs between different deprivation categories.
Indicator 3: Hazards in work for pay, profit and production

Figure 5.16.6 Hazards in work for pay, profit and production (economically active respondents, n=3,516), South African main sample

Almost two-thirds of economically active respondents (62.0%) are categorised as least deprived, indicating that they do not work in dangerous or hazardous conditions, with a further 21.1% categorised as somewhat deprived—experiencing some level of hazard at work (Figure 5.16.6). However, 16.9% are classified as deprived or most deprived, indicating relatively hazardous workplaces for those employees. Overall, 5.7% work in confined spaces, 14.9% work with dangerous materials, and 19.5% work with dangerous machinery. All three age groups, and those with and without disabilities follow this overall pattern of deprivation.

Economically active women are far more likely to be categorised as least deprived than economically active men (73.0% compared to 51.1%), indicating comparatively safer work and workplaces for those women (see Figure 5.16.7). Men are more likely than women to be categorised as somewhat deprived (28.9% and 13.2%, respectively), deprived (16.6% and 13.3%) and most deprived (3.4% and 0.5%), facing more hazards in their workplaces.

Least deprived: Individuals who do not work in a confined space, with dangerous materials, or with dangerous machinery

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who face one of these three hazardous conditions at work

Deprived: Individuals who face two of these three hazardous conditions at work

Most deprived: Individuals who face all three hazardous conditions at work (working in a confined space, with dangerous materials and with dangerous machinery)
Economically active urban residents are much more likely than their economically active rural counterparts to be categorised as least deprived (66.8% and 51.5%, respectively), and equally likely to be most deprived (2.2% and 1.4%)—with very small proportions in the latter category. In contrast, a total of 47.1% of rural residents are categorised as somewhat deprived or deprived, compared to just 31.0% of urban residents.
Indicator 4: Autonomy and harassment in work for pay, profit and production

Figure 5.16.8  Autonomy and harassment in work for pay, profit and production (economically active respondents, n=3,516), South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who are able to take breaks for eating, drinking and going to the toilet, do not face any sexual harassment or physical abuse, and do not feel their work is humiliating

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who face one of these four types of harassment, or lack of autonomy at work

Deprived: Individuals who face two of these four types of harassment, or lack of autonomy at work

Most deprived: Individuals who face any three, or all four types of lack of autonomy and harassment at work

Overall, three-quarters of economically active respondents (74.9%) are categorised as least deprived, indicating reasonable levels of autonomy and an absence of abuse or harassment at work (Figure 5.16.8). Another 14.5% are classified as somewhat deprived and 10.2% as deprived, with 0.4% experiencing the worst levels of harassment, abuse and lack of autonomy in the most deprived category. This overall pattern of deprivation is followed by both men and women who are economically active.

The experience varies between age groups. All three age groups are equally likely to be classified as most deprived (less than 0.5% for all groups) and somewhat deprived (14-15% for all groups). However, the youth are more likely than the two older groups to be classified as deprived (16.8%, compared to 9.0% and 13.8%), while the middle age group is more likely to be classified as least deprived (76.2%), compared to the youth and older group (67.8% and 71.6%, respectively).
Almost four-fifths of economically active urban residents (78.1%) are categorised as least deprived, compared to 68.1% for economically active rural residents (see Figure 5.16.9). Further, more than double the proportion of rural residents are categorised as deprived compared to their urban counterparts (16.9% and 7.1%, respectively).

Figure 5.16.9  Autonomy and harassment in work for pay, profit and production (economically active respondents, n=3,516), South African main sample, by locality

The pattern for economically active individuals with and without disabilities follows the overall pattern. However, a slightly larger proportion of those without disabilities are classified as least deprived compared to those with disabilities (76.6% and 70.4%, respectively), while a smaller proportion are classified as somewhat deprived (18.9% and 12.9%). Respondents from both groups are equally likely to be categorised as deprived (10.2% for both groups) and most deprived (0.3% and 0.5%).
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Theme 1 results: Work for pay, profit and production

Figure 5.16.10  Work for pay, profit and production, South African main sample

The results for this theme include those who are economically active (employed or unemployed), those who are not in the labour force, and all three age groups (including those over 65, who are typically excluded from discussions of employment, labour force participation, etc.). As noted above, the employment status indicator score is also the theme score for those individuals not in the labour force. The theme score for individuals who are economically active is the aggregate of the four indicator scores.

Overall, fewer than half of respondents are least deprived (45.9%), with 19.3% somewhat deprived (Figure 5.16.10). Close to one-third are categorised as deprived (30.3%), and the remaining 4.6% are categorised as most deprived (all of whom are not in the labour force because they are unable to work). This general pattern is also broadly followed by rural and urban respondents.

Roughly equal proportions of men and women are least deprived (44.9% and 46.6%, respectively). While a higher proportion of men than women are categorised as somewhat deprived (25.1% compared to 14.9%), smaller proportions of men than women are categorised as both deprived (26.6% and 33.1%, respectively) and most deprived (3.5% and 5.4%), indicating women’s deeper deprivation in this theme.

The three age groups experience significantly different levels of deprivation in work for pay, profit and production (see Figure 5.16.11). Those in the older age group are almost entirely least deprived (88.0%), with very small proportions in the three categories indicating progressively more severe deprivation. These relatively low levels of deprivation are driven by the high proportion of retired people in this age group. For the youth, few are least deprived (26.8%), and more than half are somewhat deprived (53.3%), a result driven by those in this age group who were in full-time education or training. Of this group, 28.5% are categorised as deprived and 1.3% as most deprived.
Individuals with disabilities are more likely than those without to be either least deprived (52.6% and 42.2%, respectively) or most deprived (9.3% and 2.0%), with all those in the latter category being unable to work or not being allowed to work. Those with disabilities are less likely than those without to be categorised as somewhat deprived (23.0% and 12.6%, respectively) and deprived (32.9% and 25.4%). This is driven, in part, by the higher proportions of people without disabilities who are economically active.

As discussed above, those who are not in employment are currently allocated a theme score based on their reason for not being in the labour force (e.g. an individual who is unable to work is categorised as most deprived, while someone who reported not needing to work is categorised least deprived. See Appendix A.1 for details). In contrast, the theme score for individuals who are economically active is an aggregation of the four indicator scores. This way of scoring and assigning deprivation categories is demonstrative of the subjectivity implicit in index construction—there is subjectivity involved in the assumption that having some employment, albeit bad, is better than having no employment. Further consideration of this theme is necessary, to ensure not only that the relevant scoring and aggregation methods are being used, but also that the most appropriate conceptual design of the theme—in particular, including both groups who are economically active and those who are not in the labour force—is determined.

5.16.2 Theme 2: Unpaid domestic and care work

As noted above, respondents who did not undertake any unpaid domestic and care work are allocated the highest possible score for this theme (0.2% refused to answer). The results presented for the two indicators below are only for the 85.8% of respondents (7,420) who reported doing unpaid and domestic care work.

Compared to 9.4% of women, 20.3% of men reported not doing any unpaid domestic and care work. Just 10.5% of the youth, 12.8% of the middle age group and 29.8% of the older group did none of this type of work. Urban residents were slightly more likely than rural residents not to do any unpaid domestic and care work (15.7%
compared to 11.0%). A smaller proportion of those without disabilities did not do unpaid domestic and care work compared to those with disabilities (12.9% compared to 16.2%).

**Indicator 1: Hazards in unpaid domestic and care work**

As can be seen in Figure 5.16.12, of those individuals undertaking unpaid domestic and care work, very few individuals experienced an illness or injury relating to this work (96.5% did not, and are therefore least deprived). Moreover, 1.6% are deprived (experiencing an illness or injury with no permanent effect), and a further 1.8% are most deprived (experiencing an illness or injury with permanent effects). Both men and women follow this pattern, as do those living in urban and rural localities.

While all three age groups follow this broad pattern, there are some very slight differences between them. The youth are most likely to be least deprived (97.2%), and the oldest group is most likely to be deprived (2.0%) or most deprived (4.5%) compared to the two other age groups. The middle age group follows the overall pattern of deprivation.

The overall pattern of deprivation is followed by individuals with and without disabilities. However, respondents with disabilities are slightly more likely than those without to be categorised as deprived (2.7% and 1.1%, respectively) or most deprived (3.7% and 0.8%).
Indicator 2: Respect in unpaid and domestic care work

Figure 5.16.13  Respect in unpaid domestic and care work (n=7,520), South African main sample

Least deprived: Individuals who are not subject to humiliating treatment/disrespect while doing unpaid domestic and care work, and this work is valued by other household members

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who refused to answer one of the two questions, and are either subject to humiliating treatment/disrespect, or this work is not valued

Deprived: Individuals who are subject to humiliating treatment/disrespect while doing unpaid domestic and care work, or this work is not valued

Most deprived: Individuals who are subject to humiliating treatment/disrespect while doing unpaid domestic and care work, and this work is not valued

Of those respondents who undertook unpaid domestic and care work, 84.3% are least deprived, meaning they are not subject to humiliating treatment and their contribution is valued (Figure 5.16.13). Those categorised as somewhat deprived (0.6%) were subject to one type of disrespect, and refused to answer one of the two questions. Further, 14.3% are deprived, which for most of them, is because they do not feel their work is valued by other household members (88.0% of this category). Finally, 0.8% are most deprived of respect in unpaid domestic and care work—their work is not valued by other household members and they are subject to humiliating treatment while they do this work. All the subgroup analyses follow this broad pattern.
Theme 2 results: Unpaid domestic and care work

Overall, the vast majority of respondents in the whole of the main sample (84.5%) are least deprived in unpaid domestic and care work, a further 13.0% are somewhat deprived, with just 2.2% deprived and 0.3% most deprived (Figure 5.16.14). This pattern was replicated across each of the four subgroup analyses.

Theme 3: Double labour burden

Overall, the vast majority of respondents in the whole of the main sample (84.5%) are least deprived in unpaid domestic and care work, a further 13.0% are somewhat deprived, with just 2.2% deprived and 0.3% most deprived (Figure 5.16.14). This pattern was replicated across each of the four subgroup analyses.
**Least deprived:** Individuals whose double labour burden (the combination of hours spent on work for pay, profit and production and the hours spent on unpaid domestic and care work) is, on average, between 0 and 35 hours per week

**Somewhat deprived:** not applicable

**Deprived:** Individuals whose double labour burden is, on average, between 36 and 55 hours per week

**Most deprived:** Individuals whose double labour burden is, on average, 56 hours per week or more

Overall, 71.9% of respondents in the main sample are categorised as least deprived—their double labour burden is less than 35 hours per week, on average (Figure 5.16.15). This is driven largely by the high proportion of respondents who are not in the labour force, and therefore do not work for pay, profit and production (and to a lesser extent, by those who are not in the labour force and do not do any unpaid domestic or care work, which is approximately 11% of the respondents in this category). Of the respondents, 20.9% have a double labour burden of between 36 and 54 hours per week, and are categorised as deprived. The remaining 7.5% are categorised as most deprived—those individuals with a double labour burden of, on average, more than 55 hours per week.

A larger proportion of women than men are categorised as least deprived (74.7% and 68.2%, respectively), driven largely by the higher proportion of women who did not report spending any time on work for pay, profit or production (69.6% compared to 59.8% of men). Women are less likely than men to be categorised as deprived (17.4% and 24.8%, respectively), but equally likely to be categorised as most deprived (7.0% and 7.9%).

There are substantial differences between age groups (see Figure 5.16.16), driven, in part, by the high proportions of those in the youngest group in full-time education and training and those in the older group who are retired and as a result, not spending any time on work for pay, profit or production. The middle group is least likely to be categorised as least deprived, compared to the youth and older group (62.0%, compared to 88.2% and 93.8%, respectively). However, the middle group is more likely to be categorised as deprived (28.0%, compared to 8.2% and 4.7%, respectively) and most deprived (10.0%, compared to 3.6% and 1.6%, respectively).
Higher proportions of urban than rural residents also report spending time on work for pay, profit or own production (37.8% compared to 28.9%). This is likely to be driving the higher proportion of rural than urban residents categorised as least deprived in this theme (79.6% compared to 67.8%), and the lower proportions categorised as deprived (15.2% compared to 23.5%) and most deprived (5.2% compared to 8.7%).

Of the respondents with disabilities, 79.1% are categorised as least deprived, compared to 67.8% of respondents without disabilities. Those with disabilities are therefore less likely to be categorised as deprived (23.9% compared to 14.5%) and most deprived (8.1% compared to 6.4%). As in the other subgroup analyses, this is largely driven by the proportions of respondents in each group who reported spending no time (on average) on work for pay, profit or production (i.e. 73.6% of respondents with disabilities, compared to 60.8% of respondents without).
5.16.3 Work dimension results

Overall, the pattern for the work dimension, incorporating all three themes, is skewed toward less deprivation—78.1% are least deprived, 20.7% are somewhat deprived and just 1.2% are deprived (Figure 5.16.17). No respondents are categorised as most deprived—that is, no individuals are categorised as most deprived in all three dimensions. Both men and women follow this overall pattern of deprivation, as do individuals living in rural and urban areas, and people with and without disabilities.

However, there are substantial differences between the age groups (see Figure 5.16.18). The oldest group is most likely to be least deprived compared to the two younger groups, while the middle group is more likely to be somewhat deprived than the youth and the oldest group. This is likely driven by the higher proportion of the middle group in the workforce, who are therefore subject to higher levels of deprivation in work and double labour burden.
When interpreting the results for the work dimension—particularly at the dimension level—it is important to note that the dimensions include indicators and themes that go far beyond those relating to labour force participation and economic activity. As noted above, the inclusion of second and third themes (on unpaid and domestic care work and the double labour burden) in particular, are designed to raise the visibility of work that is done both within and outside the home.
6. Results of the purposive sample of people with disabilities

This section presents the results of the analysis of the purposive sample of people with disabilities, which includes the 826 purposively selected individuals and their adult household members. This analysis has focused on constructing dimension-level scores and deprivation categorisation for the overall sample, as well as four comparative analyses between: (i) male and female; (ii) three different age groups—youth (18–24), middle/rest of the working age population (25–64), and older/those past the legal retirement age (65+); (iii) rural and urban localities; and, (iv) individuals with disabilities and those without. This fourth comparison combines those individuals in the purposive sample who were selected because they had been identified as having a disability, and their household members who are categorised as having a disability based on the Washington Group Short Set (WGDS ud).

The results for the sample as whole and for the subgroup comparisons are presented below, summarising the most important differences—that is, those differences that are statistically significant and larger than approximately 2% across two or more of the four deprivation categories. The full set of tables of results for each of these analyses is provided in Appendix A.2.

The initial method of dimension construction used is simple arithmetic aggregation, using equal weights, for the aggregation of indicators to themes (where necessary), and of themes to dimensions (see Sections 2 and 5 for more detail). However, alternative methods will be tested in the future. Proposed future revisions, with respect to indicator construction, scoring and cut-offs, as described throughout the main sample results (Section 5), also apply here, but have not been repeated to avoid undue repetition.

6.1 Characteristics of the purposive sample respondents

6.1.1 Individual characteristics

The overall aim of undertaking the purposive sample of people with disabilities was to ensure that the South African dataset would have a sufficiently large sample size of people with disabilities to enable comparisons between individuals with disabilities and those without, in order to assess the relationship between deprivation and disability. However, it is recognised that the IDM was not specifically designed as a measure of multidimensional poverty for people with disabilities, and certain dimensions of specific importance to people with disabilities are missing (as confirmed in a series of workshops with disabled people’s organisations).

4 As noted earlier in the report, there may be issues with the classification of surveyed localities into urban and rural, given their basis in the 2011 census classifications and the likelihood that in many areas, there will have been demographic and land use changes between 2011 and 2019, which is when the data for this survey was collected.
In order to undertake this testing, a purposive sample of people with disabilities was run parallel to the main survey, but with a narrower geographic focus—the Gauteng and Limpopo provinces. Thus, 826 individuals identified as having a disability were purposively selected for this sample. They and their (individually consenting) adult household members were interviewed, to gain a total sample size of 2,311 individuals. The sampling strategy for the purposive sample is described in detail in Section 4.2.

Eligible respondents in the purposive sample were aged 18 years or older (compared to 16 years and older in the main sample). The age of eligibility was raised for the purposive sample to reduce risks associated with the multiple vulnerabilities that individuals might face due to the combination of youth and disability. Eligible respondents also had to be able to communicate for themselves, and be competent to give informed and ongoing consent during the interview.

The Washington Group Short Set was used to identify any individuals within the purposive sample with functioning difficulties—not only those who were purposively selected to participate (WGDS ud). Thus, any individual who reported that they had ‘some’ difficulty, ‘a lot of’ difficulty, or were unable to function at all in at least one of the six domains covered in the Washington Group Short Set, is included in the ‘with disabilities’ category in the analysis below (see Section 5.1.1 for additional detail).

Table 6.2.1 shows that when using these criteria, the majority of purposively selected individuals are classified as ‘with disabilities’, in addition to one-third of their household members. Consequently, all analyses presented below compare those identified as ‘with disabilities’ according to these criteria, regardless of whether they were purposively selected to be in the sample or not. Of individuals in the purposive sample, 1,254 are classified as ‘with disabilities’ in the following analyses.

Table 6.1.1  Purposively selected individuals and household members classified as with and without disabilities, South African purposive sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposively selected individual</th>
<th>Household member of purposively selected individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without disabilities (%)</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disabilities (%)</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main demographic characteristics of respondents in the purposive sample can be found in Table 6.2.2. For this sample, the mean household size was 5.7 (a median of 5), with a range of 1–19. It is hoped that further analysis at the provincial level for Gauteng and Limpopo will be possible, but all results presented below are for the whole sample, including all respondents from both provinces.

Table 6.1.2  Demographic characteristics, South African purposive sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Without disabilities (%)</th>
<th>With disabilities (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Without disabilities (%)</th>
<th>With disabilities (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
65+ | Male (%) | Female (%) | Without disabilities (%) | With disabilities (%) |
---|---|---|---|---|
65+ | 13.1 | 17.6 | 6.5 | 23.3 |

Language spoken most commonly at home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Without disabilities (%)</th>
<th>With disabilities (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiNdebele</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiXhosa</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiZulu</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiSwati</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshivenda</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xitsonga</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race group</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Without disabilities (%)</th>
<th>With disabilities (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian or Asian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total respondents | 1,029 | 1,282 | 1,057 | 1,254 |

### 6.1.2 Functioning difficulties for people with disabilities

Information about the specific types of functioning difficulties experienced by individuals with disabilities is presented in Table 6.2.3. Of this group, 50.1% experience one functioning difficulty, 32.8% experience two functioning difficulties, 10.9% experience three, and the remaining 5.6% experience four, five or six functioning difficulties.

#### Table 6.1.3 Functioning difficulties by domain, purposive sample respondents classified as with disabilities (n=1,254) (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Some difficulty</th>
<th>A lot of difficulty</th>
<th>Cannot do at all</th>
<th>% of those who have difficulty functioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeing</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/climbing steps</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering/concentrating</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-care</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For those experiencing functioning difficulties, 16.8% stated that these difficulties were first experienced at birth, 18.2% first experienced difficulties in childhood, 17.3% first experienced them in early adulthood (approximately 18-29 years old), and the remaining 45.5% first experienced their functioning difficulties when they were 30 years or older. This demonstrates a much earlier onset of functioning difficulties than that experienced by those in the main sample, where there is a stronger correlation between older age and functioning difficulties, as discussed in Section 5.1.1.

Only 35.7% of those with functioning difficulties identified an individual within their household who was responsible for taking care of them, with 32.0% of men and 38.8% of women identifying a carer. Across the age groups, 46.7% of the youth with disabilities identified a carer within the home, compared to 35.4% for the middle age group and 32.5% for the older group.

6.2 Food

Figure 6.2.1  Indicators and themes of the food dimension

6.2.1 Food dimension results

Figure 6.2.2  Food dimension, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who are experiencing no food insecurity
Those experiencing current mild food insecurity may have been: worried about not having enough food to eat; been unable to eat healthy and nutritious food; and/or eaten only a few kinds of foods because of a lack of money or resources (to obtain food) in the 30 days prior to the survey. Moderate food insecurity means: having had to skip a meal; and/or eating less than they thought they should; and/or having run out of food because of a lack of money or resources in the 30 days prior to the survey. Severe food insecurity refers to individuals who: had been hungry but did not eat; and/or went without eating for a whole day because of a lack of money or resources in the 30 days prior to the survey.

Overall, 31.5% of individuals in the purposive sample are least deprived (i.e. they were food secure at the time of the survey), 12.6% are somewhat deprived (experiencing mild food insecurity) and 17.5% are deprived (experiencing moderate food insecurity, see Figure 6.2.2). The largest proportion, 38.4%, is most deprived and these respondents were experiencing severe food insecurity at the time of the survey. This pattern is followed by all three age groups.

Individuals with disabilities are more likely to be most deprived (41.1%) and less likely to be least deprived (26.1%), compared to those without disabilities (35.3% most deprived and 37.8% least deprived). Thus, individuals with disabilities are more deprived, and more severely deprived than those without disabilities.

Food insecurity is worse for men than women, with almost half of all men categorised as most deprived (49.1%), compared to 29.9% of women, while lower proportions of men than women are somewhat deprived and least deprived (a total of 33.0% compared to 53.0%).

There are some very clear differences between rural and urban respondents (see Figure 6.2.3). A higher proportion of urban than rural residents are least deprived (42.6% compared to 28.4%), but the deprivation amongst urban residents occurs at the extremes. Some 47.2% of urban individuals are in the most deprived category, compared to 36.0% of rural residents. A total of 10.2% of urban dwellers are classified as somewhat deprived and deprived categories, compared to 35.6% of rural residents.
6.3 Water

Figure 6.3.1  Indicators and themes of the water dimension

- **Drinking water source, reliability and treatment**
- **Domestic water source and reliability**
- **Water collection threats**

Figure 6.2.3  Food dimension, South African purposive sample, by locality

- **Rural**
- **Urban**
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6.3.1 Theme 1: Drinking water

Figure 6.3.2 Drinking water, South African purposive sample

**Least deprived:** Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who:

- always have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
- OR have enough to meet needs most of the time, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

OR Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or public tap, who always have enough to meet needs, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

**Somewhat deprived:** Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who:

- have enough to meet needs most of the time, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
- OR have enough to meet needs sometimes, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
- OR never have enough to meet needs, but treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

OR Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or public tap, who:

- always have enough to meet needs, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
- OR have enough to meet needs most of the time, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
- OR have enough to meet needs sometimes, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.
OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who:
  · always have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
  · OR have enough to meet needs most of the time, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, who always have enough to meet needs, treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

Deprived: Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who never have enough to meet needs, do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods

OR Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or a public tap, who:
  · have enough to meet needs sometimes, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
  · OR never have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used.

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who:
  · have enough to meet needs most of the time, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
  · have enough to meet needs sometimes, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used;
  · OR never have enough to meet needs, but treat their drinking water and use adequate methods.

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, who:
  · always have enough to meet needs, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
  · OR have enough to meet needs most of the time, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used.

Most deprived: Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, who never have enough to meet needs, and do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods

OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, who:
  · have enough to meet needs sometimes, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods;
  · OR never have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used.

OR Individuals who have unimproved water sources, who have enough to meet needs most of the time, but do not treat their drinking water or use inadequate methods

OR Individuals who have unimproved water sources, who sometimes or never have enough to meet needs, regardless of whether water is treated at home and the treatment method used.
In relation to drinking water, 23.3% of the purposive sample are least deprived, 34.6% are somewhat deprived and 32.6% deprived, with almost one in ten classified as most deprived (9.5%)—indicating both poor water quality and insufficient supplies to meet needs (Figure 6.3.2).

A smaller proportion of those with disabilities are least deprived (21.1% compared to 25.9% for those without disabilities) and a higher proportion classified as somewhat deprived (38.0% compared to 30.6%). However, a slightly higher proportion of people without disabilities are categorised as deprived or most deprived (a total of 43.5% compared to 40.9% for those with disabilities).

A slightly higher proportion of women are least deprived compared to men (24.7% and 21.6%, respectively), and a smaller proportion of women than men are somewhat deprived (30.4% and 39.7%). However, women are twice as likely to be most deprived (12.2% compared to 6.2% for men).

Far smaller proportions of the oldest age group are least deprived compared to the younger age groups (12.7% compared to around 25% for each of the younger groups). A higher proportion of the oldest group is somewhat deprived (40.4%), compared with the two younger groups (34.8% for the youth and 33.1% for the middle age group). The proportion classified as most deprived increases with age, from 6.8% for the youngest group, to 9.5% for 25–64-year-olds, and 13.0% for the oldest group.

A stark divergence from the overall distribution is evident with respect to locality (see Figure 6.3.3). In rural areas, only 7.0% are least deprived compared to 82.3% in urban areas—indicating a vast difference in drinking water quality and in access to supplies that are sufficient to meet needs. The majority of respondents in urban areas have access to clean water sources, and good reliability of supply. A small percentage of urban dwellers (14.1%) are somewhat deprived, and a total of 3.6% are either deprived or most deprived. Most rural dwellers are categorised as somewhat deprived (40.2%) or deprived (40.9%), while 11.9% are most deprived.

Figure 6.3.3  Drinking water, South African purposive sample, by locality
6.3.2 Theme 2: Domestic water

Figure 6.3.4 Domestic water, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, and have enough to meet needs always or most of the time
OR Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or public tap, and always have enough to meet needs

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, but who sometimes or never have enough to meet needs
OR Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/neighbour or public tap and have enough to meet needs some or most of the time
OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources piped to their dwelling, and have enough to meet needs, always or most of the time
OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, and always have enough to meet needs

Deprived: Individuals who have treated (improved) water sources piped to their yard/ neighbour or public tap, but never have enough to meet needs
OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) sources piped to their dwelling, but sometimes or never have enough to meet needs
OR Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, and have enough to meet needs some or most of the time
OR Individuals who have unimproved water sources, and have enough to meet needs always or most of the time

Most deprived: Individuals who have untreated (improved) water sources, but never have enough to meet needs
OR Individuals who have unimproved water sources, and have enough to meet needs some of the time or never
Domestic water refers to water for uses such as washing, cooking, bathing, etc., that is, water for non-drinking purposes. Overall, a high proportion of respondents are least deprived in relation to domestic water, with 37.3% in that category and nearly half (46.8%) categorised as somewhat deprived (Figure 6.3.4). Of the remainder, 12.8% are deprived, and only 3.2% most deprived. This overall pattern holds for men and women and those with and without disabilities.

Both the two younger age groups follow the overall pattern. However, the older age group is less likely to be least deprived, compared to the other two age groups (28.5%, versus 39.3% for the youth, and 38.8% for the middle group). The older age group is, therefore, slightly more likely to be somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived (a total of 71.4%, compared to 60.7% and 61.2% for the younger and middle age groups respectively).

The most stark differences between the subgroups are again between rural and urban areas (see Figure 6.3.5), with more than nine in ten urban residents least deprived (92.8%), but fewer than a quarter of rural dwellers similarly categorised (21.9%). Unclean water sources and poor reliability are driving this deprivation in rural areas.

**Figure 6.3.5** Domestic water, South African purposive sample, by locality
### 6.3.3 Theme 3: Water collection threats

**Figure 6.3.6** Water collection threats, South African purposive sample

- **Least deprived**: Individuals who do not have any responsibility for collecting water from outside the dwelling
- **Somewhat deprived**: not applicable
- **Deprived**: Individuals who are responsible for collecting water from outside the dwelling, but who do not face any threats or hazards when doing so
- **Most deprived**: Individuals who are responsible for collecting water from outside the dwelling, and who do face threats or hazards when doing so

Overall, 51.4% of individuals in the purposive sample did not have to collect water from outside the dwelling, and are therefore categorised as least deprived (Figure 6.3.6). Some 46.7% collected water but faced no threats doing so and are categorised as deprived. Only 1.9% of people faced threats while collecting water and are therefore categorised as most deprived (this is equivalent to 3.8% of all those responsible for collecting water from outside the dwelling).

A slightly higher proportion of those without disabilities was responsible for collecting water outside the home, and are thus categorised as deprived and most deprived compared to those with disabilities (a total of 52.5% compared to 45.5%). However, the same proportion of both groups are classified as most deprived.

A slightly higher proportion of women than men were responsible for collecting water and are classified as deprived and most deprived (a total of 51.1% compared to 45.4%). However, there is a difference among those who collected water but who did not face threats while doing so—49.1% of women and 43.7% of men are classified as deprived. For both men and women, 2.0% or less faced threats while collecting water, and are classified as most deprived.
Both the youth and middle age groups follow the overall pattern of deprivation closely. However, a much higher proportion of the older age group was not responsible for collecting water from outside the household—65.1% of this group are least deprived (compared to 51.8% of the youth and 48.0% of the middle age group) and thus, fewer are deprived or most deprived.

The differences between urban and rural residents can be observed in Figure 6.3.7. A much higher proportion of rural residents collect water from outside the dwelling—54.1% of rural residents compared to only 20.1% for those living in urban areas. Small proportions of both urban (0.6%) and rural (2.2%) residents experienced threats when collecting water.

**Figure 6.3.7**  Water collection threats, South African purposive sample, by locality
6.3.4 Water dimension results

Over all, 38.9% of respondents are least deprived for the water dimension, while almost half are somewhat deprived (48.2%, see Figure 6.3.8). Another 12.8% are deprived and only 0.2% most deprived in the water dimension—just four people are categorised as most deprived in each of the three themes in the dimension. This overall pattern of deprivation at the dimension level is followed by women and men, all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

As is true for each of the three themes, the most striking variation is between urban and rural respondents (see Figure 6.3.9), where a total of 16.5% of rural residents are deprived or most deprived compared to a 0.4% of urban residents.
6.4 Shelter

Figure 6.4.1 Indicators and themes of the shelter dimension

- Flooring material
- Roofing material
- Exterior wall material
- Housing condition
- Crowdedness
- Ownership of essential household items
- Eviction concern
- Recognition of ownership
- Mortgage/rent stress

Habitability
Ownership of essential household items
Security of tenure
6.4.1 **Theme 1: Habitability**

**Indicator 1: Flooring material**

Figure 6.4.2  Flooring material, South African purposive sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivation Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived</td>
<td>Individuals whose dwellings have floors of finished materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deprived</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>Individuals whose dwellings have floors of rudimentary materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td>Individuals whose dwellings have floors of natural materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of the purposive sample respondents are least deprived (95.4%), with floors made of finished materials (Figure 6.4.2). Just 0.4% are deprived, with floors of rudimentary materials, and the remaining 4.2% are most deprived, living in dwellings with dirt or sand flooring. This pattern of deprivation holds true for all subgroups.
**Indicator 2: Roofing material**

**Figure 6.4.3  Roofing material, South African purposive sample**

- **Least deprived:** Individuals whose dwellings have roofs of finished materials
- **Somewhat deprived:** Individuals whose dwellings have roofs of rudimentary materials
- **Deprived:** Individuals whose dwellings have roofs of natural materials
- **Most deprived:** Individuals whose dwellings have no roof

Of the purposive sample, 98.7% are least deprived—they lived in a dwelling with a roof made of finished materials (Figure 6.4.3). Just 0.3% are somewhat deprived (their dwelling roof was made of rudimentary materials), 1.0% are deprived (their dwelling roof was made of natural materials), and just 0.1% are most deprived (their dwelling had no roof). This overall pattern of deprivation holds true for all subgroups.
Indicator 3: Exterior wall material

Figure 6.4.4 Exerior wall material, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have exterior walls of finished materials
Somewhat deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have exterior walls of rudimentary materials
Deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have exterior walls of natural materials
Most deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have no exterior walls

Of the purposive sample, 83.5% are least deprived (their dwelling had exterior walls made of finished materials), with 0.9% somewhat deprived and 3.0% deprived (Figure 6.4.4). However, 12.6% are most deprived—living in dwellings without external walls. This deprivation pattern holds true for men and women and those with and without disabilities.

The youth are most likely to be least deprived (87.3%, compared to 83.3% for the middle group and 79.8% for the older group). In contrast, the older group is most likely to be most deprived (16.1%, compared to 8.4% for the youth and 12.8% for the middle group), meaning these individuals were all living in structures with no external walls.

The pattern in rural and urban areas is shown in Figure 6.4.5, with rural residents more deprived than their urban counterparts.
Figure 6.4.5  Exterior wall material, South African purposive sample, by locality

Indicator 4: Housing condition

Figure 6.4.6  Housing condition, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have no housing problems or one relatively minor problem

Somewhat deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have two relatively minor problems
Deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have three relatively minor problems
OR Individuals whose dwellings have an unsafe housing structure
OR Individuals whose dwellings have an unsafe housing structure and one relatively minor problem

Most deprived: Individuals whose dwellings have an unsafe housing structure, and two or three relatively minor problems

Of the purposive sample, 88% are least deprived in the housing condition indicator. A further 3.3% are somewhat deprived (their dwelling had two relatively minor problems), and 5.8% are deprived (their dwelling had three relatively minor problems or an unsafe housing structure, see Figure 6.4.6). Additionally, 2.8% are most deprived, meaning they lived in dwellings that had serious structural problems and with multiple minor issues. This pattern holds true for men and women, all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

In contrast to other indicators in the habitability theme, for this indicator, rural residents are less deprived than urban residents (see Figure 6.4.7). While only 1.0% of rural residents are most deprived, the figure for urban residents is 9.4%.

As described above, while dwellings in urban areas were largely constructed from materials classified as ‘finished’, they also had important structural problems, or multiple other problems. The classification of the materials used for construction does not necessarily reflect either the quality of those materials, or the quality of construction.

Figure 6.4.7 Housing condition, South African purposive sample, by locality
Three-quarters of the purposive sample are least deprived (74.6%) and did not think there were too many people living in their dwelling, and just 0.3% are deprived (those who refused to answer, see Figure 6.4.8). However, this leaves 25.1% classified as most deprived—those who felt that they shared their dwelling with too many people. This pattern holds true for rural and urban residents and those with and without disabilities.

Men are slightly more deprived than women in this indicator—a slightly higher proportion of men are most deprived compared to women (28.5% and 22.4%, respectively) and thus, a smaller proportion of men than women are least deprived (71.0% and 77.5%).

While the middle age group follows the overall pattern, the youth are slightly more deprived than the two older groups, and the oldest group is slightly less deprived than the two younger groups. The youth are more likely to be most deprived (27.5% compared to 25.4% for the middle group and 20.8% of those in the oldest age group).
The vast majority of the sample is least deprived in this theme (90.0%), with 8.8% somewhat deprived, 1.3% deprived and none in the most deprived category (Figure 6.4.9). Thus, no one is most deprived across all five indicators included in this theme. This pattern of deprivation holds across all subgroups.

6.4.2 Theme 2: Ownership of essential household items

The vast majority of the sample is least deprived in this theme (90.0%), with 8.8% somewhat deprived, 1.3% deprived and none in the most deprived category (Figure 6.4.9). Thus, no one is most deprived across all five indicators included in this theme. This pattern of deprivation holds across all subgroups.
Least deprived: Individuals who own all four household item categories
Somewhat deprived: Individuals who own any three household item categories
Deprived: Individuals who own any two household item categories
Most deprived: Individuals who own any single household item category
OR Individuals who own none of the household item categories

The categories of essential household items are: cooking utensils (i.e. pots, pans and knives to use for the preparation of a meal with more than one component or dish); tableware (i.e. enough plates, bowls, dishes and cups for each household member); water storage and/or carrying vessels (to store enough water for one day); and, bedding (enough blankets, mats and/or mattresses to sleep comfortably).

Overall, just over half (50.5%) of the purposive sample are least deprived in this theme, owning all four types of essential household items (Figure 6.4.10). Almost one-quarter are somewhat deprived (23.0%), 12.3% deprived and 14.4% most deprived—the latter category owning only one, or none of the essential household item types. This pattern is followed by all three age groups, and those with and without disabilities.

Women are slightly more deprived than men in this theme, being less likely to be least deprived (45.1% compared to 57.2%) and more likely to be somewhat deprived (28.0% compared to 16.8%).

The largest difference is between rural and urban residents, with urban residents being more deprived than their rural counterparts (see Figure 6.4.11).

Figure 6.4.11 Ownership of essential household items, South African purposive sample, by locality
6.4.3  Theme 3: Security of tenure

Indicator 1: Eviction concern

Figure 6.4.12  Eviction concern, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who have not been worried (in the six months prior to the survey) that they would be evicted or forced to leave their home

Somewhat deprived: not applicable

Deprived: Individuals who refused to answer

Most deprived: Individuals who have been worried (in the six months prior to the survey) that they would be evicted or forced to leave their home

Of the purposive sample, 89.9% are least deprived, meaning they had not been worried that they would be evicted, and just 0.1% are deprived (individuals who refused to answer this question, see Figure 6.4.12). However, this leaves one in ten individuals (10.0%) who are categorised as most deprived—those who had concerns about being evicted or forced to leave their home in the six months prior to the survey. This distribution of deprivation holds true for men and women, and those with and without disabilities.

There are differences between the three age groups (see Figure 6.4.13), with the youth twice as likely than those in the oldest age group to be most deprived—13.4% of the youth feared eviction, compared to 9.9% for the middle group and 6.4% for the oldest group.
Urban residents are more deprived than rural residents in this indicator. Of urban residents, 13.1% are most deprived—fearing eviction—compared to 9.2% of rural residents.

**Indicator 2: Recognition of ownership**

**Least deprived:** Ownership of the dwelling that individuals live in is recognised (either by government or under customary tenure)
Almost all respondents in the purposive sample (97.0%) are least deprived, leaving just 2.9% classified as most deprived (Figure 6.4.14). This latter group are individuals who lived in dwellings that did not have ownership recognition, whether by government or under customary land tenure. This pattern of deprivation holds for men and women, rural and urban residents and those with and without disabilities.

There are small differences between the three age groups. The middle group follows the overall pattern of deprivation, and the youth are less deprived than the two older groups. The oldest group is more deprived than the two younger groups—5.8% of those aged 65 years and over are most deprived, compared with 0.2% of the youth and 3.0% of the middle age group.

**Indicator 3: Mortgage/rent stress**

Figure 6.4.15  Mortgage/rent stress, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who do not have to pay rent/mortgage
OR Individuals who do not know if they must pay rent/mortgage
OR Individuals who must pay rent/mortgage and were able to always pay on time (in the 12 months prior to the survey)

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who were able to pay their rent/mortgage on time most of the time

Deprived: Individuals who were able to pay their rent/mortgage on time some of the time

Most deprived: Individuals who were never able to pay their rent/mortgage on time
A majority of the sample (89.1%) are least deprived and did not suffer from mortgage or rent stress (Figure 6.4.15). A further 4.5% are somewhat deprived (they were able to pay their mortgage/rent on time most of the time), and 5.1% are deprived (they were able to pay their mortgage/rent on time only some of the time). The remaining 1.3% are most deprived, and were never able to pay their rent or mortgage on time. This overall pattern holds true for men and women, the three age groups, and those with and without disabilities.

Although mortgage and rent stress might be expected to be higher in urban areas, the differences between the urban and rural respondents are surprisingly stark (see Figure 6.4.16), with 40.0% of urban residents experiencing some certain level of mortgage stress, compared to just 3.0% of rural residents.

Figure 6.4.16  Mortgage/rent stress, South African purposive sample, by locality
For this theme—examining security of tenure—86.2% are least deprived, and 12.6% somewhat deprived (Figure 6.4.17). Only 1.2% are deprived, and no one is categorised as most deprived—that is, there are no individuals who are most deprived for all three indicators in this theme. This overall pattern holds true for men and women, the three age groups, and those with and without disabilities.

There are small differences between the rural and urban groups, with urban residents a little more deprived than their rural counterparts (see Figure 6.4.18).
Overall, for the shelter dimension, almost four in every five are least deprived (79.8%), with 19.3% somewhat deprived (Figure 6.4.19). Just 0.8% are deprived, and no individuals are in the most deprived category. This overall distribution holds true for men and women.

Those without disabilities are slightly more deprived than those with disabilities—they are less likely than those without disabilities to be in the least deprived category (76.4% compared to 82.7%) and more likely to be somewhat deprived (22.7% compared to 16.5%).

There are also small differences between the three age groups. While the middle age group follows the overall pattern, the youth are slightly more likely to be more deprived (e.g. 22.5% were somewhat deprived, compared to 19.2% and 16.1% for the two older groups), and the oldest group is less deprived than the two younger groups.

The largest differences in the shelter dimension occurred between urban and rural respondents, as can be seen in Figure 6.4.20. Of urban residents, 28.7% are somewhat deprived compared with 16.5% of their rural counterparts.
6.5 Health

Figure 6.5.1 Themes and indicators of the health dimension
6.5.1 Theme 1: Health status

Indicator 1: Physical health status

Figure 6.5.2 Physical health status, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who experience no health problems of any kind
OR Individuals who experience (only) a recent health condition

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who experience (only) a smoke-related health problem
OR Individuals who experience (only) a long-term health condition

Deprived: Individuals who experience a recent health condition and a smoke-related health problem
OR Individuals who experience a recent health condition and a long-term health condition

Most deprived: Individuals who experience a long-term condition and a smoke-related health problem
OR Individuals who experience all three health conditions

Just over half of the purposive sample (56.4%) are least deprived in physical health status, with a further 22.9% somewhat deprived, 5.2% deprived, and 15.5% most deprived (Figure 6.5.2). That is, around one in five individuals in the sample—those in the deprived and most deprived categories—experience at least two of the three health conditions assessed in this indicator.

Respondents without disabilities in the purposive sample experienced significantly less deprivation in physical health status, compared to those with disabilities, as can be seen in Figure 6.5.3. Approximately 30.0% of those without disabilities fall into categories below least deprived, compared to around 55.0% of those with disabilities—individuals with disabilities are more likely to experience long-term conditions, and more likely to experience multiple conditions.
Women broadly follow the overall pattern of deprivation, and while men and women are equally likely to be categorised as least deprived (58.3% and 54.8%, respectively), men are far less likely than women to be somewhat deprived (12.6% and 31.2%), and far more likely than women to be most deprived (24.8% and 8.0%).

The youth are most likely to be least deprived (62.3%, compared to 57.3% of the middle group and 45.4% of the oldest group). The older group is more likely to be in each of the subsequent three deprivation categories. The middle group follows the overall pattern described above, falling in between the youth and the older group. The older group is therefore more likely to experience more health conditions than the other two groups, and more likely to experience long-term conditions.

Rural residents are far less likely to be least deprived than urban residents (51.3% compared to 74.4%), and therefore considerably more likely (at each level) to experience greater levels of deprivation, particularly in the most deprived category—18.9%, compared with just 3.4% for urban residents.
**Indicator 2: Psycho-social health status**

**Figure 6.5.4  Psycho-social health status, South African purposive sample**

- **Least deprived**: Individuals who never feel anxious or depressed
  OR Individuals who feel anxious a few times a year and never depressed, or feel depressed a few times a year but never anxious

- **Somewhat deprived**: Individuals who feel both anxious and depressed a few times a year
  OR Individuals who feel anxious monthly and depressed a few times a year, or feel anxious a few times a year and depressed monthly
  OR Individuals who feel anxious weekly and never depressed, or never feel anxious but feel depressed weekly

- **Deprived**: Individuals who feel anxious daily and never depressed, or never anxious but depressed daily
  OR Individuals who feel anxious weekly and depressed a few times a year, or feel anxious a few times a year and depressed weekly
  OR Individuals who feel both anxious and depressed monthly
  OR Individuals who feel anxious daily and depressed a few times a year, or feel anxious a few times a year and depressed daily
  OR Individuals who feel anxious weekly and depressed monthly, or feel anxious monthly and depressed weekly

- **Most deprived**: Individuals who feel anxious daily and depressed monthly, or depressed daily and anxious monthly
  OR Individuals who feel anxious and depressed weekly
  OR Individuals who feel anxious daily and depressed weekly, or feel anxious weekly and depressed daily
  Or Individuals who feel anxious and depressed daily
The distribution of respondents across the four deprivation categories for the psycho-social health indicator is much more evenly spread than for most other indicators in the IDM. Just 43.1% of the purposive sample are categorised as least deprived, with more than half of respondents feeling anxious and/or depressed at least a few times in a year (Figure 6.5.4). One-quarter of respondents are somewhat deprived, with 12.6% deprived, and 19.3% most deprived. This latter group feel anxious and/or depressed at least monthly. All three age groups follow this overall pattern of deprivation.

Individuals without disabilities reflect the overall pattern quite closely, but are slightly less deprived in this indicator. However, individuals with disabilities have worse psycho-social outcomes than those without disabilities, as can be seen in Figure 6.5.5. More than double the proportion of respondents with disabilities are categorised as most deprived, compared to those without.

**Figure 6.5.5  Psycho-social health status, South African purposive sample, by disability status**

The differences between men and women with respect to psycho-social health are stark. Women are slightly less deprived than the overall purposive sample, while men are significantly more deprived. Of the men, 33.0% are most deprived, compared to 8.0% of women—experiencing anxiety and depression on at least a monthly basis. However, these results conflict with World Health Organisation evidence that suggests that women are more likely to experience poor psycho-social health outcomes than men.\(^5\)

Residents in rural areas are more likely than those in urban areas to be least deprived (44.5% compared to 37.8%), and less likely to be somewhat deprived (23.4% compared to 30.9%) and deprived (11.6% compared to 16.3%). However, they are more likely than their urban counterparts to be experiencing the most extreme forms of psycho-social ill health, with 20.5% categorised as most deprived (compared to 14.9% for urban residents).

---

Theme 1 results: Health status

Only half of respondents are least deprived in the health status theme for the purposive sample (51.3%). A quarter are somewhat deprived (25.5%), 11.0% deprived and 12.1% most deprived (Figure 6.5.6). The latter category refers to individuals who are most deprived in both physical health and psycho-social health status.

As for both indicators, those without disabilities are generally less deprived than those with disabilities—with a total of 13.5% classified as deprived and most deprived, compared to 31.3% of individuals with disabilities. Those with disabilities are more likely to experience more severe health conditions, and more likely to experience multiple physical and psycho-social conditions.

Men and women differ significantly in their pattern of deprivation for this theme, as can be seen in Figure 6.5.7. While similar proportions are least deprived, men are much more likely to experience greater levels of deprivation than women, and a far greater proportion of men are classified as most deprived at the theme level.
Among the age groups, the middle group mirrors the pattern of the overall purposive sample in this theme. The youth are generally better off than average (i.e. they are more likely to be least deprived, yet approximately equally likely to be most deprived). In contrast, the oldest age group is slightly more deprived in health status than the younger two groups—experiencing more severe physical and psycho-social conditions, and more of them in combination.

Rural residents are, overall, more deprived than their urban counterparts in the health status theme. Only half are categorised as least deprived (49.5% compared to 57.8% in urban areas), with similar proportions classified as somewhat deprived and deprived. However, rural residents are much more likely than urban residents to be most deprived in both physical and psycho-social health (15.0% classified as most deprived in the health status theme, compared to 1.8% for urban residents).
6.5.2 Theme 2: Health care access and quality

Indicator 1: General health care access

Figure 6.5.8 General health care access, South African purposive sample

The aspects of health care quality assessed were: the skills and knowledge of the health care practitioner; the cleanliness and location of the health care facility; whether respondents were treated with respect by the medical staff; issues of communication with the health practitioner; and, waiting times. Respondents who had been unable to access health care because they were excluded in some way—such as if there were no health care facilities to access, or a practitioner refused to treat them—are most deprived.

Overall, the majority of the purposive sample are least deprived with respect to general health care access (86.0%), with around 14.0% experiencing some problems with general health care quality, or an inability to access health care, as can be seen in Figure 6.5.8. Overall, if individuals experience problems with health care quality, they tend to experience fewer problems rather than more. Each of the three age groups matched the overall distribution of deprivation for this indicator.
The comparison between those with and without disabilities shows both groups follow the overall pattern, although those with disabilities are more likely to be more deprived than those without. Of those without disabilities, a total of 12.1% are categorised as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived compared to 15.7% of those with disabilities. However, those without disabilities are more likely to be most deprived (4.1% compared to 2.5%).

The comparison between women and men also shows that broadly, both groups follow the overall pattern, although a slightly lower proportion of women than men are least deprived (87.8% compared to 83.8%).

The differences between rural and urban residents are slight for this indicator. A smaller proportion of rural residents than urban residents are least deprived (85.4% rural and 88.2% urban), yet they are also slightly less likely to be most deprived (2.2% versus 6.8%). Thus, a higher proportion of urban residents experienced the most severe problems with general health care quality.

**Indicator 2: Prenatal health care access**

Figure 6.5.9  Prenatal health care access, South African purposive sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived:</td>
<td>Individuals who did not need or want prenatal health care (including all men and non-pregnant women) OR Women who accessed prenatal health care, and reported no problems or only one problem related to health care quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deprived:</td>
<td>Women who accessed prenatal health care, and reported two or three problems related to health care quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived:</td>
<td>Women who accessed prenatal health care, and reported four or five problems related to health care quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived:</td>
<td>Women who accessed prenatal health care, and reported six or seven problems related to health care quality OR Women who did not access prenatal health care facilities due to personal and health care facility factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The health care quality problems assessed in this indicator are the same as for those in general health care access, but relate specifically to any prenatal care received. The score received by women for this indicator is for the most recent event—reflecting their experience during either their current pregnancy or a birth in the 12 months prior to the survey (i.e. no women are given a score for both, even if they experienced both).

The vast majority of respondents in the purposive sample had not given birth in the 12 months prior to the survey and were not pregnant at the time of the survey, so almost all of the sample are categorised as least deprived in this indicator (98.9%), with less than 1.0% categorised as somewhat deprived and deprived (Figure 6.5.9). Obviously, all those categorised as deprived or deprived were women. There were no significant differences in any of the subgroup analyses; all subgroups followed the overall pattern of deprivation.

The nature of this indicator means that the differences in subgroup analyses, at least for gender and age, are driven by its relevance only to women, and primarily to younger women (see Table 6.5.1). All men, and all respondents in the oldest age group, were least deprived for this indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18–24</th>
<th>25–64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deprived</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cases</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When examining only those women for whom this was relevant (i.e. those women who had either given birth in the 12 months prior to the survey, or were pregnant at the time of the survey—70 women altogether), a total of 22.9% of respondents are in the somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived categories. Thus, close to a quarter of women who required prenatal care experienced problems with the quality of that care.
The aggregation method used means the low levels of deprivation in prenatal health care access contribute strongly to the relatively low levels of deprivation seen in this theme (Figure 6.5.10), with 94.0% being categorised as least deprived, and none as most deprived. This overall pattern of deprivation is followed by all three age groups, and those with and without disabilities.

In the comparison between men and women, women are slightly more deprived—they are less likely to be categorised as least deprived and more likely to be categorised as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived (see Figure 6.5.11). Women are more likely to experience problems with health care quality, and by the nature of the theme, more likely to experience health care quality issues with different health care types.
Rural residents are less deprived than their urban counterparts in this theme, although the differences are small.

6.5.3 Health dimension results

Figure 6.5.12 Health dimension, South African purposive sample
Across the health dimension, nearly three-quarters of the sample are categorised as least deprived (71.4%), with a further quarter (24.7%) classified as somewhat deprived (Figure 6.5.12). Less than a total of 5.0% are classified as deprived or most deprived, but they are severely deprived across multiple indicators. In general, there were no differences between age groups.

The differences in the results for the health dimension between those with and without disabilities are stark, as can be seen in Figure 6.5.13. These differences arise from higher levels of deprivation for those with disabilities, both in terms of health status and health care access and quality.

**Figure 6.5.13 Health dimension, South African purposive sample, by disability status**

Across the health dimension, men are more deprived than women. A smaller proportion of men than women are categorised as least deprived (62.7% compared to 78.5%), and men are more likely to be somewhat deprived (30.2% compared to 20.3%) and deprived (7.1% compared to 1.1%), which is driven primarily by men’s greater deprivation in the health status theme.

There are small differences between rural and urban residents overall, with rural residents slightly more likely to be deprived (and more deeply deprived) than urban residents.

**6.5.4 Use of assistive devices by those with disabilities**

Questions regarding the use of assistive devices were asked of those respondents who answered that they experienced a functioning difficulty (only those devices relevant to that functioning difficulty were asked about). The use of assistive devices for each functioning difficulty is described in Table 6.5.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% with relevant functioning difficulty and using assistive device(s)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those with difficulties seeing and who are using assistive devices (n=629)</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasses</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braille</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with difficulties hearing and who are using assistive devices (n=204)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing aids</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplifiers</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with difficulties walking/climbing steps and who are using assistive devices (n=664)</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking sticks/canes</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking frames/walkers</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual wheelchair</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric wheelchair</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with difficulties remembering/ concentrating and who are using assistive devices (n=417)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with difficulties with self-care and who are using assistive devices (n=153)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown device</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with difficulties communicating and who are using assistive devices (n=106)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice output communication devices</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Individuals may use more than device, so the figures within functioning categories may not be exactly equal to the proportion of relevant users.

Without knowing specific details about the functioning difficulties faced by each individual, it is not known whether increased use of assistive devices would be desirable or necessary, although in any case, the table illustrates very low levels of use of assistive devices. The most commonly used device is a walking stick—also the lowest technology device—followed by glasses (spectacles).

---

6 Further analysis of assistive device use, disaggregated by the degree of difficulty faced, would likely provide some indication, which is an analysis that could be undertaken in the future.
6.6 Education

Figure 6.6.1 Themes and indicators of the education dimension

6.6.1 Theme 1: Education level

Figure 6.6.2 Education level, South African purposive sample

**Least deprived:** Individuals who have completed at least some tertiary education
OR Individuals who have completed secondary/high school (i.e. matriculation)

**Somewhat deprived:** Individuals who have completed only some secondary/high school (i.e. not matriculated)

**Deprived:** Individuals who have completed primary school

**Most deprived:** Individuals who have completed only some primary school
OR Individuals who have received no schooling
Only just over one-quarter of the purposive sample are least deprived (26.9%), having completed high school and perhaps some tertiary education (Figure 6.6.2). One-third are somewhat deprived (33.6%), representing those who completed some secondary or high school. A further 8.6% are deprived (those who completed primary school) and almost another third are most deprived (30.9%)—those who have either had no schooling, or who did not finish primary school.

Those with disabilities are far more likely to be more deprived than those without—being much more likely to have received no schooling or only primary schooling. Of those with disabilities, 54.8% are categorised as most deprived and deprived, compared to 21.3% of those without disabilities.

There are important differences between men and women, with women more likely than men to be least deprived (28.9% compared to 24.4%) and most deprived (33.1% compared to 28.1%). Correspondingly, women are less likely than men to be somewhat deprived (30.7% and 37.3%, respectively) and deprived (7.3% and 10.2%).

The differences in education level across the three age groups are enormous, as can be seen in Figure 6.6.3. While the middle age group follows the overall pattern, the youth are less deprived than the two older groups, and the oldest group is substantially more deprived than the two younger groups.

There are also substantial differences between rural and urban residents, with the former more deprived than the latter. Of rural residents, 43.5% are categorised as most deprived or deprived, compared to 25.1% of their urban counterparts.
6.6.2 Theme 2: Functional literacy and numeracy

Indicator 1: Functional literacy

Figure 6.6.4 Functional literacy, South African purposive sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivation Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who are able to read and write adequately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who are able to read adequately, but write poorly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR Individuals who are able to read poorly, but write adequately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who are able to read and write poorly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR Individuals who are able to read adequately, but not able to write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR Individuals who are not able to read, but are able to write adequately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who are able to read poorly, but not able to write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR Individuals not able to read, but able to write poorly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR Individuals who are not able to read or write</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the purposive sample, 44.4% are least deprived (were able to read and write adequately), with 15.7% somewhat deprived (able to either read or write adequately, but rated poorly on the other skill) and 8.8% deprived (Figure 6.6.4). Almost one-third are most deprived (31.1%), being able to read and write either very poorly or not at all. This pattern of deprivation was followed by men and women.

Those with disabilities are substantially more deprived than those without—just 28.9% of the former are least deprived, compared to 62.9% of the latter. Further, those with disabilities are far more likely to be most deprived—45.6% compared to 13.9%.

The most substantial differences in the subgroup analyses are between the three age groups (see Figure 6.6.5), where the youth are less deprived than the older two groups, and the oldest group is substantially more deprived than the younger two groups.
Rural residents are far more deprived than urban residents. A total of 60.3% of rural residents are somewhat deprived, deprived or most deprived, compared to 38.6% for urban residents.

**Indicator 2: Functional numeracy**

**Figure 6.6.6 Functional numeracy, South African purposive sample**

*Least deprived:* Individuals who were able to answer both calculations correctly
Almost half of the purposive sample are least deprived—those who were able to correctly complete both calculations (48%, see Figure 6.6). A further 14.0% are deprived (broadly, those who were able to correctly complete one of the calculations). More than one-third of the sample are most deprived (38.0%)—those who were unable to correctly complete the two calculations. This deprivation pattern is followed by men and women.

There are again substantial differences between those with disabilities and those without—51.4% of the former are most deprived (unable to complete either calculation), compared to 22.1% of those without disabilities. Just 33.0% of those with disabilities are least deprived compared to 65.8% for those without disabilities—individuals who were able to correctly complete both calculations.

Once again, the most substantial differences are between age groups (see Figure 6.6.7), with the youth least deprived, the middle age group slightly more deprived than the youth, and the oldest age group substantially more deprived than both.

**Figure 6.6.7  Functional numeracy, South African purposive sample, by age**

There are differences between rural and urban residents, although they are smaller than the differences for functional literacy. While 43.0% of rural residents were unable to complete both calculations correctly (and were therefore categorised as most deprived), this was only true of 20.1% of urban residents.
Overall, 44.0% of the purposive sample are least deprived in the functional literacy and numeracy theme (Figure 6.6.8). A further 14.1% are somewhat deprived, 9.9% deprived and close to one-third are most deprived (31.9%), meaning they are most deprived in both functional literacy and numeracy. This pattern of deprivation holds for both men and women.

As for each of the indicators, those with disabilities are more deprived than those without—only 27.7% of those with disabilities are categorised as least deprived, compared to 63.4% of those without. While both groups have similar proportions in the somewhat deprived and deprived categories, 46.6% of those with disabilities are most deprived, compared to 14.6% of those without disabilities.

The differences between the three age groups are substantial (see Figure 6.6.9), with the youth less deprived, the oldest group much more likely to be deprived, and the middle age group falling in between the two (although closer to the youth than the oldest group).
Rural residents are more deprived across the theme than urban residents—a total of 60.7% of rural residents are somewhat deprived, deprived or most deprived, compared to 39.0% for urban residents—figures almost identical to those for functional literacy.

### 6.6.3 Education dimension results

#### Figure 6.6.10  Education dimension, South African purposive sample

![Bar chart showing education dimension results for South African purposive sample.](chart)

The bar chart shows the distribution of respondents across different levels of deprivation for the education dimension. The chart indicates the percentage of respondents in each deprivation category for the age groups 18-24 years, 25-64 years, and 65+ years. The data is organized into four categories: Most deprived, Deprived, Somewhat deprived, and Least deprived. The chart illustrates the proportion of respondents falling into each category for each age group, demonstrating the variation in deprivation levels among different age groups.
The distribution of deprivation in the education dimension is slightly more even across the four categories than for previous dimensions (Figure 6.6.10). Of the sample, 38.4% are least deprived and 22.5% are somewhat deprived. Another 12.1% are deprived, and more than onequarter are most deprived (27.0%)—those who have received very little schooling and who could not be considered functionally literate and numerate. This pattern of deprivation holds for both men and women.

As for each of the indicators and themes, there is a substantial difference between those with and without disabilities, with the former being more deprived. A total of 78.9% of those with disabilities are categorised as somewhat deprived, deprived or most deprived, compared to 41.1% of those without disabilities.

The most substantial differences at the dimension level are between the three age groups (see Figure 6.6.11). Furthermore, the differences between them mirror those for each of the indicators and themes—the youth have the best outcomes, the middle group are slightly more deprived than the youth, and the older group are more deeply deprived than the two younger groups.

Figure 6.6.11  Education dimension, South African purposive sample, by age

Rural residents are more deprived across the education dimension than their urban counterparts—being far less likely to be least deprived (34.1% compared to 54.0%) and far more likely to be most deprived (31.5% compared to 11.0%).
6.7 Energy

Figure 6.7.1 Themes and indicators of the energy dimension

6.7.1 Theme 1: Cooking energy

Figure 6.7.2 Cooking energy, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who use clean cooking energy sources, and always, or most of the time, have enough to meet needs

OR Individuals who do not cook/prepare their own food at home, or are not responsible for cooking at home

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who use clean cooking energy sources, but the availability of energy is either never enough, or only sometimes enough, to meet needs
OR Individuals who use unclean/polluting cooking energy sources, and always have enough to meet needs

**Deprived:** Individuals who have access to unclean/polluting cooking energy sources, and most of the time, or some of the time, have enough to meet needs

**Most deprived:** Individuals who have unclean/polluting cooking energy sources, and never have enough to meet needs

OR Individuals who do not have any cooking energy source, even if they need it

Of the purposive sample, 44.0% are least deprived in cooking energy (those who have clean energy sources, and always or most of the time have enough to meet their needs, or those who were not responsible for cooking at home, see Figure 6.7.2). A further quarter are somewhat deprived (24.5%)—either those with clean energy sources but not enough to meet needs, or those who rely on unclean fuel sources, but generally have enough to meet needs. Close to one-third are deprived (30.3%) and just 1.2% most deprived (reliant on unclean sources and with never enough to meet needs, or those who did not have any energy source at all). This overall pattern of deprivation holds true across all three age groups and for those with and without disabilities.

A smaller proportion of women than men are least deprived (41.7% compared to 46.9%), and most deprived (28.2% compared to 32.9%), but a higher proportion are somewhat deprived (29.1% compared to 18.8%). Further analysis of household structure and demographics and intersectional analysis of gender and locality may help to increase the understanding of this pattern.

The largest difference in the subgroup analyses was between rural and urban residents. As can be seen clearly in Figure 6.7.3, rural residents are substantially more deprived with respect to cooking energy sources and reliability than urban residents—a result of the access to unclean fuels and the frequency with which those sources fail to meet needs.

**Figure 6.7.3** Cooking energy, South African purposive sample, by locality

![Cooking energy, South African purposive sample, by locality](image)
6.7.2 Theme 2: Lighting energy

Figure 6.7.4 Lighting energy, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who have clean lighting energy sources, and always, or most of the time, have enough to meet needs.

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who have clean lighting energy sources, but the availability of energy is either never enough, or only sometimes enough, to meet needs or individuals who use unclean/polluting lighting energy sources, and there is always enough to meet needs.

Deprived: Individuals who use unclean/polluting lighting energy sources, and most of the time, or some of the time, have enough to meet needs.

Most deprived: Individuals who use unclean lighting energy sources, and never have enough to meet needs or individuals who have no energy for lighting at all, even if they need it.

More than two-thirds of the purposive sample are least deprived in lighting energy—these individuals have access to clean energy, and generally, have good reliability of supply to meet their needs (67.4%, see Figure 6.7.4). A further 27.0% are somewhat deprived, 4.3% deprived and 1.3% most deprived. The latter category, despite being small, represents those individuals who either reported having no access to lighting energy at all, or access only to unclean sources and never enough to meet their needs. This pattern of deprivation holds for all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

Women are slightly more deprived than men, with a smaller proportion of women than men being least deprived (64.5% compared to 71.0%) and a higher proportion somewhat deprived (30.1% compared to 23.0%), typically representing supplies that less frequently meet needs.
The most substantial subgroup differences are between rural and urban residents (see Figure 6.7.5), where rural residents are, again, more deprived than their urban counterparts (although by a smaller margin than for cooking energy).

**Figure 6.7.5** Lighting energy, South African purposive sample, by locality

![Graph showing lighting energy by locality](image)

6.7.3 **Theme 3: Heating energy**

**Figure 6.7.6** Heating energy, South African purposive sample

![Graph showing heating energy by deprivation level](image)
Least deprived: Individuals who use clean heating energy sources, and always, or most of the time, have enough to meet needs
OR Individuals who do not need heating (because of the mild climate)

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who use clean heating energy sources, but never have enough, or only sometimes enough, to meet needs
OR Individuals who use unclean/polluting heating energy sources, and always have enough to meet needs

Deprived: Individuals who use unclean/polluting heating energy sources, and most of the time, or some of the time, have enough to meet needs

Most deprived: Individuals who use unclean/polluting heating energy sources, and never have enough to meet needs
OR Individuals who have no energy for heating at all, even if they need it

Almost half of the purposive sample are least deprived with respect to heating energy (47.7%, see Figure 6.7.6), including 5.4% who, because of the mild climate in which they live, do not need heating. Around one-quarter are somewhat deprived (23.4%), and one-fifth (20.9%) are deprived—individuals who had access only to unclean energy for heating, and who often did not have enough to meet needs. 8.0% are most deprived—individuals with access to unclean energy and never enough to meet needs, or those with no energy for heating even though they needed it (87.5% of that category). This pattern of deprivation holds true for those with and without disabilities.

There are differences between men and women, with women being slightly less likely than men to be least deprived (46.7% compared to 49.0%), and deprived (15.8% compared to 28.2%), but more likely to be somewhat deprived (28.8% compared to 16.7%).

The middle age group follows the overall pattern of deprivation, and the youth are slightly less likely to be somewhat deprived, and slightly more likely to be deprived than the middle group. The oldest group is slightly more likely than the middle group to be both somewhat deprived and deprived, but less likely to be most deprived.

The most substantial differences across the subgroups are, again, between rural and urban residents. As can be seen in Figure 6.7.7, rural residents are far more deprived with respect to heating energy than their urban counterparts.
**6.7.4 Theme 4: Energy collection threats**

**Figure 6.7.8** Energy collection threats, South African purposive sample

*Least deprived:* Individuals who do not have any responsibility for collecting energy supplies from outside the dwelling

*Somewhat deprived:* not applicable
Almost two-thirds of the purposive sample are least deprived in this theme (62.4%), meaning they were not responsible for collecting energy sources from outside the dwelling, while just over one-third are deprived (34.4%), being responsible for collecting energy from outside the dwelling, but not facing threats while doing so (Figure 6.7.8). Of the overall sample, 3.2% are most deprived—they faced threats and hazards while collecting energy from outside the dwelling (equivalent to 8.0% of those responsible for collecting energy from outside the dwelling). This pattern holds true for women and men (although, 10.9% of women who collect fuel from outside the dwelling reported facing threats, compared to only 5.8% of men).

Those with disabilities are more likely than those without disabilities to be deprived (37.2% compared to 31.0%) and most deprived (4.0% compared to 2.4%).

The largest difference between subgroups is between the three age groups (see Figure 6.7.9), with the youth most likely to be least deprived (84.5%), compared with the two older groups (57.9% and 54.0%, respectively). The two older groups follow similar patterns; nevertheless, the oldest group is more likely than the middle group to be to be deprived (43.5%, compared to 38.0% for the middle group and only 14.3% for the youth).

A higher proportion of urban residents are least deprived compared to their rural counterparts—not having to collect energy from outside the dwelling (75.1% compared to 58.9%). Conversely, higher proportions of rural residents than urban are both deprived (37.4% and 23.5%, respectively) and most deprived (3.8% and 1.4%). While 5.6% of urban residents faced threats while collecting fuel outside the dwelling, the figure for rural residents is 9.1%.
6.7.5 Energy dimension results

Around half of the purposive sample are least deprived in the energy dimension (51.0%), with a further 39.5% somewhat deprived (Figure 6.7.10). Another 9.1% are deprived, and 0.3% most deprived (the latter category being those who are most deprived across all four themes). This overall pattern of deprivation holds for men and women, across the three age groups and for those with and without disabilities.

Following on from the substantial differences in each of the four themes, the largest differences at the dimension level are, once again, between rural and urban residents, as can be seen in Figure 6.7.11. This is driven largely by urban residents’ access to cleaner fuels and more reliable supplies for cooking, lighting and heating.
6.8 Sanitation

Figure 6.8.1 Themes and indicators of the sanitation dimension

- Toilet type
- Toilet ownership
- Handwashing facilities
- Access to toiletries
- Private changing place (during menstruation)
6.8.1 Theme 1: Toilet facilities

Indicator 1: Toilet type

Figure 6.8.2 Toilet type, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who use flush toilets when at home, and have enough water to flush (toilets are piped to covered systems)

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who use flush toilets, but do not have enough water to flush (toilets are piped to covered systems)

OR Individuals who use ventilated improved pit latrines, pit latrines with a slab, or composting toilets

Deprived: Individuals who use flush toilets, and have enough water to flush (toilets are piped to open drainage systems)

Most deprived: Individuals who use flush toilets, and do not have enough water to flush (toilets are piped to open drainage systems)

OR Individuals who use a bucket toilet or hanging toilet

OR Individuals who do not have any facility to use at home

Only 24.2% of the purposive sample are least deprived in toilet type, with the vast majority being somewhat deprived (69.5%, see Figure 6.8.2). This latter category uses either improved toilet facilities, or flush toilets, but without enough water to flush them. Just 0.2% are deprived and 6.1% most deprived (of whom, 32.0% do not have any toilet facility, which is equivalent to 1.9% of the overall sample). This pattern holds for men and women and those with and without disabilities.

For those with disabilities, 54.0% reported that the toilet facilities they used had been modified to accommodate their physical needs, and 12.0% reported that it had been partly modified. For 33.0% of respondents, the toilet facility that they used had not been modified at all to accommodate their physical needs.
Both the youth and the middle age group follow the overall pattern of deprivation. However, the oldest age group are more deprived—they are much less likely to be in the least deprived category than the two younger groups (14.7%, compared to 25.3% of the youth and 25.8% of the middle group)—and much more likely to be somewhat deprived (87.1%, compared to 67.5% for both of the younger groups).

The greater deprivation that rural residents face compared to their urban counterparts can be seen in Figure 6.8.3.

**Figure 6.8.3**  Toilet type, South African purposive sample, by locality
Indicator 2: Toilet ownership

Figure 6.8.4  Toilet ownership, South African purposive sample

Of the purposive sample, 46.0% are least deprived, meaning they have access to a private toilet at their dwelling (Figure 6.8.4). A further 14.3% are somewhat deprived (they have access to a shared toilet facility), while 37.7% are deprived, having access to a public toilet. Another 1.9% are most deprived, representing those individuals with access to no toilet facility at all. This pattern holds for all three age groups, and for those with and without disabilities.

Women are slightly more deprived than men. A smaller proportion of women than men are least deprived, using a private toilet when at home (41.5% compared to 51.7%), and a higher proportion are classified as deprived (41.6% compared to 32.8%), with access to a public toilet. The proportion categorised as most deprived, with no access to any type of facility, is 2.8% for women and 0.9% for men (or 36 women and 9 men).

Rural residents are slightly less deprived with respect to toilet ownership. As shown in Figure 6.8.5, a higher proportion of rural than urban residents are least deprived, and a lower proportion somewhat deprived. An important minority of both groups are deprived, with access only to a public toilet.
**Figure 6.8.5** Toilet ownership, South African purposive sample, by locality

**Theme 1 results: Toilet facilities**

**Figure 6.8.6** Toilet facilities, South African purposive sample
Half of the purposive sample are least deprived with respect to toilet facilities (50.4%), with almost one-fifth somewhat deprived (18.3%, see Figure 6.8.6). Almost one-third are deprived, and the 1.9% categorised as most deprived are those individuals who have no access to any type of toilet. This overall pattern holds true for all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

Women are slightly more deprived in this theme than men. A smaller proportion of women than men are least deprived (44.1% compared to 58.2%), and a larger proportion are somewhat deprived (22.9% compared to 12.4%). This is largely driven by the greater deprivation women face in toilet ownership compared to men.

Rural residents are more deprived than their urban counterparts, as can be seen in Figure 6.8.7, driven in large part by the greater deprivation faced in toilet type (as opposed to ownership).

Figure 6.8.7  Toilet facilities, South African purposive sample, by locality
6.8.2 Theme 2: Washing facilities

Indicator 1: Handwashing facilities

Figure 6.8.8 Handwashing facilities, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who have a place to wash their hands at home, with sufficient water and soap

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who have a place to wash their hands at home, with sufficient water and soap substitutes

OR Individuals who have a place to wash their hands at home, with sufficient water but no soap or soap substitutes

Deprived: Individuals who have a place to wash their hands at home, but do not have sufficient water (and no soap or substitutes)

Most deprived: Individuals who do not have a place to wash their hands at home

Just one-third of the purposive sample are least deprived (34.7%)—those who had a place to wash their hands and with sufficient water and soap (Figure 6.8.8). One-quarter are somewhat deprived (25.2%)—individuals who had a place to wash their hands, with sufficient water, but using soap substitutes. Only 2.5% are deprived—they had a place to wash, but did not have sufficient water, and no soap or soap substitutes. However, more than one-third are most deprived (37.6%)—individuals who had no place to wash their hands at home. This overall pattern of deprivation is followed by all three age groups, and those with and without disabilities.

The most substantial difference at the subgroup level is between men and women. As can be seen in Figure 6.8.9, men are considerably more deprived than women. In order to understand this fully, further analysis of household structure and demographics will be necessary.
Figure 6.8.9  Handwashing facilities, South African purposive sample, by gender

Rural residents are substantially more deprived than urban residents. Of rural residents, 44.8% are most deprived—with no place to wash their hands at home—compared to just 11.8% of urban residents.

Indicator 2: Access to toiletries

Figure 6.8.10  Access to toiletries, South African purposive sample

**Least deprived**: Individuals who always have sufficient toiletries (such as toothpaste, shampoo and soap)
Close to one-third of the purposive sample fall into the least deprived (34.4%), deprived (33.9%) and deprived (29.1%) categories (Figure 6.8.10). While all these respondents have access to toiletries, only those who are least deprived reported having enough all of the time. The remaining 2.6% are most deprived, meaning they never had sufficient toiletries. This pattern holds true for all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

Men are slightly more deprived than women, with lower proportions of men categorised as least deprived (23.9% compared to 42.8%), and higher proportions categorised as somewhat deprived (43.4% compared to 26.3%).

While the pattern of deprivation of rural residents follows the overall pattern, urban residents are more likely to be both least deprived and most deprived, reflecting some inequality in this group (see Figure 6.8.11).
Theme 2 results: Washing facilities

Figure 6.8.12  Washing facilities, South African purposive sample

Around one-third of the purposive sample respondents are categorised as least deprived (34.2%) and another third as deprived (33.1%), with 18.3% somewhat deprived and 14.3% most deprived (Figure 6.8.12). This last category represents the proportion of the sample that is most deprived in both the handwashing facility and access to toiletries indicators. This pattern of deprivation is followed by those with and without disabilities.

Men are more deprived in this theme than women, with a total of 77.1% of men categorised as somewhat deprived, deprived and deprived (compared to 56.7% of women), and 20.6% of men categorised as most deprived (compared to 9.3% of women).

With respect to the three age groups, all three are equally likely to be most deprived. However, while the largest proportion of the youth and the older group are categorised as deprived in this theme (37.3% and 41.6%, respectively), the largest proportion of those aged between 25 and 64 are classified as least deprived (35.9%).

As can be seen in Figure 6.8.13, rural residents are substantially more deprived than urban residents, with higher proportions categorised as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived.
6.8.3 Theme 3: Private changing place (during menstruation)

**Figure 6.8.13** Washing facilities, South African purposive sample, by locality

![Bar chart showing washing facilities by locality and deprivation level.](chart)

**Figure 6.8.14** Private changing place during menstruation, South African purposive sample

![Bar chart showing private changing place during menstruation.](chart)

**Least deprived:** Men and non-menstruating women

OR Menstruating women who have a private place to wash and change at home during menstruation
Somewhat deprived: not applicable
Deprived: Menstruating women who refused to answer
Most deprived: Menstruating women who do not have a private place to wash and change at home during menstruation

The nature of this dimension—assigning a score to men and non-menstruating women for an indicator measuring whether a menstruating woman has access to a private place to wash and change during menstruation—means that 98.5% of the purposive sample are least deprived (Figure 6.8.14). This category includes men and non-menstruating women, as well as women who menstruated in the six months prior to the survey and who had a private place to wash and change at home during menstruation. Another 0.7% are deprived (women who refused to answer this question), and 0.8% are most deprived—women who did not have somewhere to wash and change in private at home during menstruation. This overall pattern is followed by all three age groups (although a higher proportion of the older group refused to answer these questions), to rural and urban residents, as well as to those with and without disabilities.

Examining only women, 97.3% are least deprived, 1.3% deprived and 1.4% most deprived. Of the 1,247 women who are categorised as least deprived, 51.5% (642) had not menstruated in the six months prior to the survey. Further, of those women who had menstruated (624), 2.9% did not have a private place to wash and change at home during menstruation.

6.8.4 Sanitation dimension results

Figure 6.8.15  Sanitation dimension, South African purposive sample

Just over half of the purposive sample are least deprived in the sanitation dimension (51%, see Figure 6.8.15). A further 45.9% are classified as somewhat deprived, with 3.0% deprived and just 0.1% most deprived. This overall pattern holds for all three age groups.
Those with disabilities are slightly more deprived than those without disabilities in the sanitation dimension. A smaller proportion of those with disabilities than those without are classified as least deprived (46.9% compared to 55.9%), and larger proportion as somewhat deprived (50.2% compared to 40.8%).

For the sanitation dimension, men are slightly more deprived than women—they are less likely than women to be least deprived (42.6% compared to 57.8%) and more likely to be somewhat deprived (54.9% compared to 38.6%).

Rural residents are more deprived than their urban counterparts, as can be seen in Figure 6.8.16. Of rural residents, a total of 57.9% are classified as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived, compared to just 16.9% of urban residents.

**Figure 6.8.16**  Sanitation dimension, South African purposive sample, by locality

![Sanitation dimension, South African purposive sample, by locality](image)

**6.9**  Relationships

**Figure 6.9.1**  Themes and indicators of the relationships dimension

![Themes and indicators of the relationships dimension](image)
6.9.1 Theme 1: Dependence and support

Figure 6.9.2 Dependence and support, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who do not need to depend on others not living with them, regardless of whether they can reciprocate

OR Individuals who depend on others not living with them (because they cannot provide for themselves), who always have enough support, and can always reciprocate

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who depend on others not living with them (because they cannot provide for themselves), who always have enough support, but are not always, or are never, able to reciprocate

OR Individuals who depend on others not living with them (because they cannot provide for themselves), who receive enough support most of the time, and are able to reciprocate always or most of the time

Deprived: Individuals who depend on others not living with them (because they cannot provide for themselves), who receive enough support most of the time, but are only able to reciprocate some of the time or never

OR Individuals who depend on others not living with them (because they cannot provide for themselves), who receive enough support only some of the time, and can reciprocate at least sometimes

Most deprived: Individuals who depend on others not living with them (because they cannot provide for themselves), who receive enough support only some of the time, but can never reciprocate

OR Individuals who depend on others not living with them (because they cannot provide for themselves), but who never receive enough support, regardless of whether they can reciprocate always, sometimes, or never

Around two-thirds of the purposive sample are least deprived (64.4%)—individuals who did not need to depend on others who do not live with them, or those who depended on others, but who always received enough support (Figure 6.9.2). That leaves around one-third of the purposive sample who depended on people living...
outside their dwelling for help to meet basic needs, but did not always receive enough of that support—13.3% are somewhat deprived, 18.1% are deprived, and 4.2% are most deprived. This pattern of deprivation holds true for men and women and the three different age groups.

People with disabilities are both more deprived, and more deeply deprived, than people without disabilities (see Figure 6.9.3). A total of 43.9% of those with disabilities are somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived, compared to 25.7% for those without disabilities, combined with a higher proportion of those with disabilities in each of the three categories.

**Figure 6.9.3**  Dependence and support, South African purposive sample, by disability status

Rural residents are slightly more deprived than urban residents. While there are no differences in the proportions categorised as most deprived and deprived, 16.6% of the rural residents are somewhat deprived compared with 1.4% of the urban residents. Conversely, while 61.0% of rural residents are least deprived, 77.3% of urban residents are.
6.9.2 Theme 2: Participation in community events

Indicator 1: Community event participation

Figure 6.9.4 Community event participation, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who did not want to attend community events
OR Individuals who were always able to attend community events, regardless of whether they were able to make a contribution if required

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who were only able to attend community events some of the time, regardless of whether they were able to make a contribution if required

Deprived: Individuals who were only able to attend community events rarely, regardless of whether they were able to make a contribution if required

Most deprived: Individuals who were never able to attend community events

Approximately equal proportions of the purposive sample are categorised as least deprived and somewhat deprived (a total of 34.5% and 33.1%, respectively, see Figure 6.9.4). Equal proportions of the remaining sample are classified as deprived and most deprived (a total of 16.4% and 16.1%). This pattern of deprivation is followed by all three age groups, and those with and without disabilities.

Men are slightly more deprived than women in this indicator. Men are less likely than women to be least deprived (23.8% compared to 43.1%) and more likely to be somewhat deprived (40.6% compared with 27.1%)

The largest differences occur in the comparison between rural and urban residents (see Figure 6.9.5). There is a higher proportion of urban than rural residents that are deprived (a total of 81.5%, compared to 61.1% in the somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived categories), and a higher proportion of urban than rural residents in both the deprived and most deprived categories.
Figure 6.9.5  Community event participation, South African purposive sample, by locality

![Bar chart showing community event participation by locality and deprivation level.]

Indicator 2: Participation during menstruation

Figure 6.9.6  Participation during menstruation, South African purposive sample

![Bar chart showing participation during menstruation by locality and deprivation level.]

**Least deprived:** Men and non-menstruating women

OR Menstruating women who always have sufficient sanitary products, and never miss activities due to stigma associated with menstruation
Results of the purposive sample of people with disabilities

OR Menstruating women who always have sufficient sanitary products, but who sometimes miss activities due to stigma associated with menstruation

**Somewhat deprived:** Menstruating women who do not have sufficient sanitary products, but who never miss social activities, school or work because of such lack, nor miss any activities because of stigma associated with menstruation

**Deprived:** Menstruating women who do not have sufficient sanitary products, but who never miss social activities, school or work because of such lack, and who only sometimes miss activities because of stigma associated with menstruation

**Most deprived:** Menstruating women who do not have sufficient sanitary products, who miss social activities, school or work at least some of the time because of such lack, and sometimes miss activities because of stigma associated with menstruation

OR Menstruating women who do not have sufficient sanitary products, who miss social activities, school or work at least some of the time because of such lack, and always miss activities because of stigma associated with menstruation

Of the purposive sample, 86.0% are least deprived, a group which includes all men and all non-menstruating women (Figure 6.9.6). This category also includes menstruating women who always had enough sanitary products but may have sometimes missed activities due to stigma associated with menstruation. Further, 5.9% are somewhat deprived, 1.4% deprived and 6.6% of the purposive sample are most deprived—menstruating women who may have missed social activities, work or school due to their lack of access to sanitary products, and who also missed activities because of stigma associated with menstruation. This pattern of deprivation holds true for people with and without disabilities and for those in rural and urban localities.

Looking only at women for this indicator, 10.7% are somewhat deprived (menstruating women who did not have access to enough sanitary products, but did not miss social activities, school or work, nor miss activities due to menstruation-related stigma) and 2.6% are deprived. Finally, 11.9% are in the most deprived category, meaning that these women did not have sufficient sanitary products to use during menstruation and therefore, missed social activities, school or work, as well as missing some activities because of menstruation-related stigma.

Further, if considering only the 624 women who had menstruated in the six months prior to the survey, half reported that they did not always have sufficient sanitary products to use (48.7%), and 39.0% reported that they had to abstain from activities due to stigma associated with menstruation. Indeed, 5.0% reported that they were never able to participate in any activities (during their last menstrual period) due to stigma associated with menstruation.

Of those women who did not always have enough sanitary products to use, 47.7% reported that this prevented them from attending social activities, or from school or work (at least sometimes). These statistics all highlight that a large proportion of menstruating women suffered high levels of deprivation associated with menstruation.

There is also a marked disparity between age groups, as illustrated in Table 6.9.1. The youngest women are considerably more deprived, and more severely deprived, than both the middle age group and the oldest group. While less deprived than the youngest women, slightly more than one-quarter of women aged between 25 and 64 are classified as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived.
Table 6.9.1  Participation during menstruation, South African purposive sample, women only, by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18–24</th>
<th>24–64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deprived</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of women in the least deprived category, 23.5% of the youngest women and 16.1% of women in the middle age group always had sufficient sanitary products (and did not miss social activities, school or work as a result), but did sometimes miss activities due to stigma associated with menstruation.

**Theme 2 results: Participation in community events**

Figure 6.9.7  Participation in community events, South African purposive sample

The majority of the purposive sample are least deprived (59.6%), or somewhat deprived (30.8%). In this theme, 8.2% are deprived and only 1.4% are most deprived (Figure 6.9.7). This overall pattern of deprivation holds for those with and without disabilities.

Women are more deprived, and more deeply deprived, than men in this theme; driven in part by their deprivation in the participation during menstruation indicator. Furthermore, 64.4% of men and 56.0% of women are least deprived, while a total of only 1.8% of men are in the deprived and most deprived categories, compared to 15.8% of women.

Those in the middle age group follow the overall pattern of deprivation, while the youth are slightly more deprived than the middle group; a total of 48.8% of the youth are somewhat deprived, deprived, and most deprived, compared to 39.4% of the middle age group and 35.4% of the oldest group. The oldest group is marginally less deprived than the middle group, and less deprived than the youth.

As can be seen in Figure 6.9.8, urban residents are more deprived, and more deeply deprived, than their rural counterparts.
Figure 6.9.8  Participation in community events, South African purposive sample, by locality

6.9.3  Relationships dimension results

Figure 6.9.9  Relationships dimension, South African purposive sample
Overall, 55.0% of the purposive sample are least deprived in the relationships dimension, and more than one-third are somewhat deprived (35.6%, see Figure 6.9.9). Additionally, 8.9% are deprived and just 0.6% are most deprived.

Those without disabilities follow the overall pattern of deprivation closely. However, people with disabilities are slightly less likely to be least deprived, and more likely to be in the somewhat deprived, deprived, and most deprived categories (a total of 47.7%, compared to 41.8% of those without disabilities).

Women are slightly more deprived than men in the relationships dimension. Women are less likely than men to be least deprived and somewhat deprived (a total of 85.7% compared to 96.6%), and more likely to be deprived (13.4% compared to 3.4%).

Among different age groups, the youth are slightly more deprived than the two older groups, and the oldest group is slightly less deprived than the two younger groups (see Figure 6.9.10).

Urban residents are more deeply deprived than rural residents for this dimension. This is largely driven by the greater deprivation of urban residents with respect to the participation in community events theme.
6.10 Clothing and footwear

Figure 6.10.1 Indicators and themes of the clothing and footwear dimension

6.10.1 Theme 1: Basic clothing and footwear

Indicator 1: Basic clothing and footwear ownership

Figure 6.10.2 Basic clothing and footwear ownership, South African purposive sample

**Least deprived:** Individuals who own two sets of clothing and two pairs of footwear

**Somewhat deprived:** Individuals who own two sets of clothing, but do not have two pairs of footwear
Deprived: Individuals who do not own two sets of clothing, but do have two pairs of footwear

Most deprived: Individuals who do not own either two sets of clothing or two pairs of footwear

For this indicator, measuring the ownership of the most basic quantity of clothing and footwear, 79.2% are least deprived, 7.0% are somewhat deprived (individuals who reported owning two sets of clothing, but not two pairs of footwear), and 1.9% are deprived (individuals who did not own two sets of clothing, but had two pairs of footwear, see Figure 6.10.2). More than one in ten are most deprived (11.9%), meaning they owned neither two sets of clothing, nor two pairs of footwear. This overall pattern of deprivation is followed by all three age groups, and those with and without disabilities.

Men are slightly more deprived than women, as can be seen in Figure 6.10.3, with slightly higher proportions of men than women in all categories, except least deprived.

Urban residents are more deprived than rural residents in this indicator—a total of one-quarter are classified as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived, compared to one-fifth of rural residents (26.7% and 19.1%, respectively), with 21.3% of urban residents classified in the most deprived category, compared to 9.3% of rural residents.
Indicator 2: Basic acceptability and protection

Figure 6.10.4  Basic acceptability and protection, South African purposive sample

Less deprived: Individuals whose everyday clothing is acceptable always or most of the time, and provides good or excellent protection from weather conditions and hazards

Somewhat deprived: Individuals whose everyday clothing and footwear is acceptable always or most of the time, but provides no or poor protection from weather conditions and hazards

Deprived: Individuals whose everyday clothing and footwear is only acceptable some of the time or never, but provides good or excellent protection from weather conditions and hazards

Most deprived: Individuals whose everyday clothing and footwear is only acceptable some of the time or never, and provides no or poor protection from weather conditions and hazards

Of the purposive sample, 60.2% are least deprived (individuals who owned socially acceptable clothing and footwear that provided good protection from the weather and hazards, see Figure 6.10.4). Another 5.1% are somewhat deprived, and 12.5% deprived. More than one-fifth are most deprived (22.2%), comprising individuals who had basic clothing and footwear that was never acceptable (or only some of the time), and that provided no or poor protection. This pattern holds for men and women, all three age groups, and those with and without disabilities.

As can be seen in Figure 6.10.5, urban residents are slightly more deprived than rural residents with respect to the basic acceptability and protection of their basic clothing and footwear.
Figure 6.10.5  Basic acceptability and protection, South African purposive sample, by locality

![Bar chart showing basic acceptability and protection by locality in South Africa. The chart displays the percentage of respondents in different deprivation categories (Most deprived, Deprived, Somewhat deprived, Least deprived) for rural and urban areas.](image)

**Theme 1 results: Basic clothing and footwear**

Figure 6.10.6  Basic clothing and footwear, South African purposive sample

![Bar chart showing basic clothing and footwear by deprivation category in South Africa.](image)
For the theme of basic clothing and footwear, almost two-thirds of the purposive sample are least deprived (62.5%), 11.6% are somewhat deprived, 14.4% deprived, and 11.5% are most deprived (Figure 6.10.6). The latter category indicates that more than one in ten of the sample are most deprived in both the indicators comprising the theme. This overall pattern of deprivation holds for men and women, all three age groups, and those with and without disabilities.

In accordance with the patterns of deprivation for both indicators comprising this theme, the most substantial subgroup difference was between rural and urban residents (see Figure 6.10.7), with urban residents being more severely deprived than their rural counterparts.

Figure 6.10.7  Basic clothing and footwear, South African purposive sample, by locality
6.10.2 Theme 2: Other clothing and footwear

Indicator 1: School or work clothing

Figure 6.10.8 School or work clothing, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who do not need school/work clothing and footwear
OR Individuals who have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable at least most of the time, that provides good or excellent protection
OR Individuals who have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable at least most of the time, but provides poor or no protection
OR Individuals who have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable only some of the time or never, but provides good or excellent protection

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable only some of the time or never, but it provides poor or no protection

Deprived: Individuals who do not have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable at least most of the time, but it provides good or excellent protection

Most deprived: Individuals who do not have enough school/work clothing and footwear that is acceptable at least most of the time, but it provides poor or no protection
OR Individuals who do not have enough school/work clothing and footwear, it is acceptable only some of the time or never, but provides good or excellent protection
OR Individuals who do not have enough school/work clothing and footwear, it is acceptable only some of the time or never, and provides poor or no protection
A vast majority of the purposive sample (90.4%) are least deprived—either they did not require them, or had enough school and work clothing and footwear that conformed to community standards, and provided them with excellent or good protection (Figure 6.10.8). The proportions classified as somewhat deprived and deprived are 1.1% and 1.2%, respectively. Nonetheless, the remaining 7.4% are most deprived—they did not have enough clothing and footwear for school or work and the quality of this clothing and footwear was poor. This pattern of deprivation is followed by rural and urban residents, and those with and without disabilities.

The most substantial differences in this theme occur between men and women (see Figure 6.10.9), with greater levels of deprivation amongst men, who are less likely than women to be least deprived, and more likely to be most deprived (11.0% compared to 4.4%).

Figure 6.10.9  School or work clothing, South African purposive sample, by gender

Those in the middle age group follow the overall pattern of distribution for this indicator closely. The youth and the oldest age group follow approximately the same patterns of deprivation, with both groups being less deprived than the middle group.
**Indicator 2: Formal clothing**

**Figure 6.10.10  Formal clothing, South African purposive sample**

- **Least deprived**: Individuals who have enough formal clothing and footwear that is acceptable at least most of the time.
- **Somewhat deprived**: Individuals who have enough formal clothing and footwear that is acceptable some of the time.
- **Deprived**: Individuals who have enough formal clothing and footwear, but it is never socially acceptable.
  
  OR Individuals who do not have enough formal clothing and footwear, but it is acceptable at least most of the time.
- **Most deprived**: Individuals who do not have enough formal clothing and footwear, and it is acceptable only some of the time, or never.

Just over half of the purposive sample (52.4%) are least deprived in clothing and footwear for formal occasions, with 10.0% classified as somewhat deprived (those who had enough formal clothing and footwear, which was acceptable some of the time, see Figure 6.10.10). A further 6.5% are deprived, and almost one-third are most deprived (31.0%). This latter category represents individuals who did not have enough formal clothing and footwear and it was acceptable only some of the time, or never.

Those with disabilities are slightly more deprived than those without in this indicator—they are less likely to be least deprived (48.6% compared to 57.0%), and the same or higher proportions of those with disabilities are represented in each of the remaining three categories.

Women are less likely to be in the deprived category than men (10.2% compared to 3.6%), but are more likely to be most deprived (32.5% compared to 29.2%), and are therefore more deeply deprived than men.

Both the youth and the middle age group follow the overall pattern of deprivation, while the oldest group is a little less deprived than the two younger groups.
The differences between rural and urban residents can be seen in Figure 6.10.11. While similar proportions of both groups are least deprived, urban residents are more deeply deprived. Rural residents are more likely than urban residents to be in the somewhat deprived and deprived categories, and less likely to be in the most deprived category.

**Figure 6.10.11**  Formal clothing, South African purposive sample, by locality

![Bar chart showing formal clothing distribution by locality](image)

**Theme 2 results: Other clothing and footwear**

**Figure 6.10.12**  Other clothing and footwear, South African purposive sample

![Bar chart showing other clothing and footwear distribution by deprivation level](image)
For the theme of other clothing and footwear, over half of respondents are classified as least deprived (58.6%), with more than a quarter somewhat deprived (27.7%, see Figure 6.10.12). Another 8.5% are deprived, and 5.2% are most deprived. Not having adequate and acceptable clothing and footwear for different purposes is likely to impact negatively on individuals’ dignity, their ability to move about in public without shame and attend social events. This overall pattern of deprivation is followed by both men and women, and broadly by all three age groups.

People with disabilities are slightly more deprived than those without disabilities. Those with disabilities are slightly less likely than those without to be in the least deprived category (55% compared to 62.8%), and slightly more likely to be somewhat deprived (30.7% compared to 24.2%).

There are also small differences that can be observed between rural and urban residents, as seen in Figure 6.10.13, with urban residents slightly more deprived than those living in rural areas.

Figure 6.10.13  Other clothing and footwear, South African purposive sample, by locality
6.10.3 Theme 3: Sanitary product use

Figure 6.10.14 Sanitary product use, South African purposive sample

![Sanitary product use graph]

Least deprived: Men and non-menstruating women
OR Menstruating women who always have enough sanitary products

Somewhat deprived: Menstruating women who have enough sanitary products most of the time

Deprived: Menstruating women who have enough sanitary products some of the time

Most deprived: Menstruating women who never have enough sanitary products

Of the sample, 86.2% are least deprived in this theme, a category that includes all men and non-menstruating women, as well as menstruating women who always have enough sanitary products (Figure 6.10.14). Further, 6.4% are somewhat deprived (menstruating women who have access to enough sanitary products most of the time), 7.0% deprived (menstruating women who only have access to enough sanitary products some of the time), and 0.4% most deprived (menstruating women who never have enough sanitary products). This pattern was followed closely by both those with and without disabilities.

Of the 624 women who menstruated in the six months prior to the survey, 51.0% always had enough sanitary products (least deprived), and 24.0% had enough sanitary products most of the time (somewhat deprived). Another 23.6% only had enough sanitary products some of the time (deprived), and the remaining 1.8% never ever had enough sanitary products.

The middle age group follows the same pattern of deprivation as the overall sample, while the youth are slightly more deprived than the middle group, and the oldest group is slightly less deprived than either of the two younger groups.
Urban residents are more likely to be deprived than rural residents in this indicator. Urban residents are less likely to be least deprived (82.1% compared to 87.3%), and therefore, are more likely to be somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived (a total of 17.9% compared to 12.7%).

6.10.4 Clothing and footwear dimension results

For the clothing and footwear dimension, just over two-thirds are least deprived (67.9%), with another quarter of the purposive sample being somewhat deprived (24.5%, see Figure 6.10.15). Additionally, 7.4% are deprived and 0.1% most deprived. This overall pattern of deprivation holds for those with and without disabilities.

There are small differences across other subgroups—women are slightly more deprived than men in clothing and footwear and the two younger age groups mirror the overall pattern of deprivation, while the oldest group is slightly less deprived than the younger two age groups. Finally, urban residents are slightly more deprived than their rural counterparts.

6.11 Violence

As explained in Section 3.10, the data from the violence dimension is not presented in this report.
6.12 Family planning

Figure 6.12.1 Themes and indicators of the family planning dimension

Figure 6.12.2 Family planning dimension, South African purposive sample

**Least deprived**: Individuals who have no need for contraception (e.g. female partner is pregnant, do not have a partner, etc.)

OR Individuals who personally use a modern method of contraception

OR (Male) Individuals who do not personally use, but whose female partner uses, a modern method

**Somewhat deprived**: (Female) Individuals who do not personally use, but whose male partner uses, a modern method

**Deprived**: Individuals who personally use a traditional method

OR (Male) Individuals who do not personally use, but whose female partner uses, a traditional method
OR Individuals who refused to answer questions about the use of contraception to delay or avoid having children

**Most deprived:** (Female) Individuals who do not personally use, but whose male partner uses, a traditional method

OR Individuals who do not personally use, and do not know if their partner uses, any method

OR Individuals who are unable to use or access contraception (for any reason)

For the whole of the purposive sample, 83.2% are classified as least deprived in family planning: individuals who either had no need for contraception to delay or avoid childbirth; individuals who personally used a modern method of contraception; and, (male) individuals whose female partner used a modern contraceptive method (Figure 6.12.2). Further, 3.7% are somewhat deprived (modern contraception methods were used by the respondents’ partner), 7.4% are deprived (traditional methods were personally used, or by their male partner, or the respondent refused to answer these questions). The remaining 5.7% are most deprived, meaning either they did not personally use any method, but their male partner used a traditional method, or they did not use a method themselves and did not know if their partner used any method, or they had no access to any contraceptive methods. This overall pattern is followed by men and women, rural and urban residents, and those with and without disabilities.

The most substantial subgroup difference in this dimension is between age groups. While both the youth and the middle age group follow the overall pattern, the oldest group appear slightly more deprived; in part due to higher rates of refusal to answer among the oldest group (other driving factors are unclear).

### 6.13 Environment

**Figure 6.13.1** Themes and indicators of the environment dimension

---

7 With respect to the latter, there was a combined refusal to answer rate of 10.7% across this series of questions, by far the highest for any section of the survey.
6.13.1 Theme 1: Exposure to environmental problems

Figure 6.13.2  Exposure to environmental problems, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who face no environmental problems, or only one
Somewhat deprived: Individuals who face any two or three environmental problems
Deprived: Individuals who face any four or five environmental problems
Most deprived: Individuals who face any six or seven environmental problems, or all eight

This theme assessed whether respondents were exposed to common environmental problems around their homes, such as living close to hazardous waste or waste disposal sites, whether open drains or areas with disease-carrying insects were a problem, or whether they were exposed to air, water and/or noise pollution (or any other significant environmental issue).

The vast majority of the purposive sample are categorised as least deprived with respect to exposure to environmental problems (86.5%), with less than 1.0% in the most deprived category (Figure 6.13.2). Of the subgroups analysed, both men and women follow this overall pattern, as do all three age groups, and those with and without disabilities.

Significant differences are observed between rural and urban residents. Rural residents reported less exposure to environmental problems than urban residents—90.8% of rural residents are in the least deprived category, compared to 71.1% of urban—as can be seen in Figure 6.13.3.
6.13.2 Theme 2: Natural resource utilisation

Indicator 1: Wild resource utilisation

Figure 6.13.4  Wild resource utilisation, South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who do not utilise wild natural resources (i.e. non-cultivated resources)
As can be seen in Figure 6.13.4, the vast majority of the purposive sample are least deprived, with just 2.3% deprived and less than 1.0% most deprived. This is because only 3.0% (69 individuals) of the purposive sample utilised wild—i.e. non-cultivated—natural resources, with the most commonly used resources (41.0%) being wild plants for food or medicine. Of those individuals who utilised wild resources, approximately three-quarters reported that resource availability was sufficient to meet needs. However, the remaining one-quarter reported that there was not enough of the resource available to meet needs.

Because of the small numbers utilising wild resources, there are no substantial differences between the subgroups. However, there is a slightly higher proportion of rural than urban residents who utilised wild resources, who are therefore classified as deprived (2.8% compared to 0.4%), and most deprived (0.9% compared to 0.0%).

**Indicator 2: Biomass fuel utilisation**

**Figure 6.13.5**  Biomass fuel utilisation South African purposive sample
Almost two-thirds of the purposive sample respondents are not responsible for collecting biomass fuel from outside the dwelling, and therefore, are least deprived (Figure 6.13.5). A further 22.0% are deprived, and 15.6% most deprived. That is, 37.6% of the purposive sample are responsible for collecting biomass fuel sources from outside the dwelling, and of those, 41.0% report that there was not enough of these resources available to meet needs (most deprived).

Those with disabilities are slightly more deprived, and slightly more deeply deprived, than those without disabilities.

The pattern for the comparison between men and women follows the overall pattern closely; nevertheless, a higher proportion of women are classified as most deprived compared to men (13.4% and 17.3%, respectively).

The two older groups are much more likely to be responsible for collecting biomass energy than the youth, and the oldest group is slightly more deeply deprived than the middle age group.

A higher proportion of rural than urban residents are responsible for collecting biomass energy sources, and are more likely to be more deeply deprived than their urban counterparts (18.0% of rural residents are most deprived, compared to 6.8% of urban residents).

**Theme 2 results: Natural resource utilisation**

![Natural resource utilisation, South African purposive sample](image-url)
Overall, almost two-thirds of the purposive sample are categorised as least deprived with respect to natural resource utilisation (61.4%), with progressively smaller proportions categorised in each of the more severe levels of deprivation (Figure 6.13.6). Of the respondents, 1.1% are most deprived in the natural resource utilisation theme—indicating a severe level of deprivation for both natural resource and biomass fuel utilisation. More severe levels of deprivation in this theme are driven by the higher proportion of respondents facing deprivation with respect to biomass utilisation, compared to natural resource utilisation. The overall pattern of deprivation is followed by women and men and individuals with and without disabilities.

Both the middle and older age groups are more deprived and more deeply deprived than the youth, with the middle age group slightly less deeply deprived than the oldest group. In contrast, 83.2% of youth are classified as least deprived compared to 57.0% for the middle group and 53.7% for the oldest group.

Rural residents are much more likely to be deprived than urban residents in this theme (57.7% are least deprived compared to 74.9%), and more deeply deprived (see Figure 6.13.7), driven largely by the deprivation faced in the biomass fuel utilisation indicator.
6.13.3  Theme 3: Safe environment

Figure 6.13.8  Safe environment, South African purposive sample

**Least deprived:** Individuals who feel very safe when at home alone and while walking alone in the neighbourhood

OR Individuals who feel very safe for either one of these settings and feel safe for the other

**Somewhat deprived:** Individuals who feel safe when at home alone and while walking alone in the neighbourhood

OR Individuals who feel very safe for either one of these settings and feel unsafe for the other

**Deprived:** Individuals who feel unsafe when at home alone and while walking alone in the neighbourhood

OR Individuals who feel safe for either one of these settings, and feel very unsafe for the other

OR Individuals who feel safe for either one of these settings, and feel unsafe for the other

**Most deprived:** Individuals who feel very unsafe when at home alone and while walking alone in the neighbourhood

OR Individuals who feel very unsafe for either one of these settings, and unsafe for the other
One-fifth of the purposive sample are least deprived in the safe environment theme (19.6%)—those who felt safe or very safe while at home alone, and while walking alone in the neighbourhood (Figure 6.13.8). Another 29.6% are somewhat deprived, 37.7% are deprived, and 13.2% most deprived. The latter category means that more than one in ten respondents felt unsafe or very unsafe while at home alone, and while walking around their neighbourhood alone. This pattern of deprivation holds for all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

The pattern for men and women is very different, as can be seen in Figure 6.13.9—women are substantially more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived, than men.

Figure 6.13.9  Safe environment, South African purposive sample, by gender

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents by gender and deprivation level.]

There are also significant differences between rural and urban residents. Urban residents are substantially more deprived, and more deeply deprived, than their rural counterparts. Indeed, a total of 82.7% of urban residents are deprived or somewhat deprived, compared to 42.1% of rural residents.
For the environment dimension, 59.8% are least deprived, with 37.2% somewhat deprived and 3.1% deprived (Figure 6.13.10). No individuals are most deprived—which is perhaps not surprising, given the range of different themes comprising the environment dimension, and that individuals would have to be classified as most deprived in each of them. This overall pattern of deprivation is followed by those with and without disabilities.

Women are more deprived than men in the environment dimension, with the bulk of the difference occurring in the least deprived and somewhat deprived categories—women are less likely than men to be least deprived (47.1% compared to 75.5%), and more likely to be somewhat deprived (48.5% compared to 23.0%).

With respect to age, the middle group follows the overall pattern of deprivation and the youth are less deprived than the two older groups—70.5% of youth are least deprived, compared to 57.9% and 42.9% for the older two groups. The oldest group is more likely to be somewhat deprived than the youth or the middle groups (42.9%, compared to 26.6% and 38.9% respectively).

The most substantial subgroup difference is between rural and urban. As can be seen in Figure 6.13.11, urban residents are more deprived than their rural counterparts in the environment dimension.
6.14 Voice

Figure 6.14.1 Themes and indicators of the voice dimension
6.14.1 Theme 1: Voice in the public domain

Indicator 1: Voting

Figure 6.14.2 Voting, South African purposive sample

![Bar chart showing voting status by deprivation level.]

- **Least deprived**: Individuals who voted in the most recent election, and were free to choose whom to vote for
- **Somewhat deprived**: not applicable
- **Deprived**: Individuals who were too young to vote
  OR Individuals who refused to answer
- **Most deprived**: Individuals who did not vote for any reason other than being too young
  OR Individuals who voted, but were not free to choose whom to vote for

Overall, 68.6% of the purposive sample are least deprived, as they voted and were free to choose who to vote for in the most recent election (prior to the survey implementation, see Figure 6.14.2). An additional 1.9% are deprived (largely youth who were too young to vote), and 28.6% are most deprived—those who did not vote (excluding those who were too young to do so), or those who voted but were not free to choose whom to vote for. This pattern of deprivation is followed by men and women.

Individuals without disabilities are more deprived in this indicator, with 37.3% in the most deprived category, compared to 23.0% of those with disabilities.

The most substantial differences occur across age groups (see Figure 6.14.3), with older individuals more likely to vote and to vote freely. Only 27.5% of the youth are least deprived, compared to 76.8% of the middle age group, and 84.2% of those aged 65+. The 8.6% of youth categorised as deprived were too young to vote at the most recent election.
Figure 6.14.3  Voting, South African purposive sample, by age

![Voting Graph]

A higher proportion of rural residents are most deprived (30.3%, compared to 26.7% for urban residents). There was a lower proportion of rural youth compared to urban youth who were too young to vote and, therefore, categorised as deprived (0.2% compared to 7.8%).

Indicator 2: Participation in local decision-making

Figure 6.14.4  Participation in local decision-making processes, South African purposive sample

![Participation Graph]
Least deprived: Individuals who participated in local decision-making processes, and felt they had a lot of influence

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who participated in local decision-making processes, and felt they had an intermediate level of influence

Deprived: Individuals who participated in local decision-making processes, but felt they had little influence

OR Individuals who did not participate in any decision-making processes because there were none to participate in

Most deprived: Individuals who did not participate in any decision-making processes because they were, or felt, excluded or were too busy to do so

Figure 6.14.4 shows high levels of deprivation with respect to participation in local decision-making—just 12.5% of the purposive sample are least deprived, 9.2% are somewhat deprived, and almost one in five are deprived (17.9%). Cumulatively, 39.7% of the purposive sample had participated in a local decision-making process, although with different levels of influence over it (the deprived group having very little influence over the process). However, 60.5% of the sample did not participate in any decision-making processes, and thus, are categorised as most deprived. This pattern holds for those with and without disabilities.

A larger proportion of men than women are least deprived (14.1% and 11.2%, respectively), and while there are larger proportions of women than men in the somewhat deprived and deprived categories (a total of 32.8% compared to 20.0%), men are more likely than women to be most deprived (65.9% versus 56.1%).

The youth are more deprived in this indicator than the two older groups (see Figure 6.14.5), which follow a similar pattern of deprivation to the overall pattern.

Figure 6.14.5  Participation in local decision-making processes, South African purposive sample, by age

There is also a marked difference between those living in rural and urban areas, with urban residents being more deeply deprived. While there is a higher proportion of rural residents in the deprived category (20.1% compared to 10.0%), there is a much lower
proportion who are most deprived (only 56.7% of rural residents, compared to 73.9% of urban residents). This demonstrates that a far higher proportion of urban residents are not involved in any local decision-making processes when compared with their rural counterparts.

**Indicator 3: Perception of capacity to raise concerns**

![Figure 6.14.6 Perception of capacity to raise concerns, South African purposive sample](image)

**Least deprived:** Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very easy, and they have a lot of influence
OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very easy, and they have an intermediate level of influence
OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is easy, and they have a lot of influence

**Somewhat deprived:** Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very easy, but they have only a little influence
OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is easy, and they have an intermediate level of influence
OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is difficult, but they have a lot of influence

**Deprived:** Individuals who believe that raising concerns is easy, but they have only a little influence
OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is difficult, but they have an intermediate level of influence
OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very difficult, but they have a lot of influence

**Most deprived:** Individuals who believe that raising concerns is difficult, and they have only a little influence
OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very difficult, but they have an intermediate level of influence
OR Individuals who believe that raising concerns is very difficult, and they have only a little influence
There is a relatively even distribution of the purposive sample across the different levels of deprivation for this indicator (see Figure 6.14.6), with close to one-quarter falling into each category. This clearly indicates that there is no single view about how easy or difficult it is to raise concerns with local leaders, nor about how much influence respondents could have over local decisions. This pattern of deprivation holds for people with and without disabilities.

Men are slightly more deprived than women. They are less likely than women to be in the least deprived category (20.3% compared to 32.4%), and more likely to be somewhat deprived (28.5% compared to 17.7%). However, similar proportions of men and women are in the deprived and most deprived categories.

The most substantial subgroup differences are, once again, between the three age groups (see Figure 6.14.7). The youth are more deprived than those in the two older age groups, with only 16.1% being least deprived, compared to 28.1% and 36.0% of the middle and oldest age groups, respectively.

**Figure 6.14.7**  Perception of capacity to raise concerns, South African purposive sample, by age

Urban residents are both more likely to be deprived, and more deeply deprived, than their rural counterparts. Only 11.8% of urban respondents are least deprived, while the proportion of rural respondents is 31.0%. Further, a total of 69.1% of urban residents are deprived and most deprived, compared to 45.1% of rural residents.
Just one in five of the purposive sample respondents are least deprived in the theme of voice in the public domain (18.0%), and almost one-third somewhat deprived (31.8%, see Figure 6.14.8). This leaves 50.1% as deprived and most deprived (28.1% and 22.0%, respectively). Thus, 22.0% of respondents are most deprived in each of the three indicators of this theme.

In this theme, individuals without disabilities are slightly more deprived than those with disabilities; in particular, there are higher proportions of those without disabilities in the most deprived category compared to those with disabilities (28.4% and 16.8%, respectively).

The overall pattern is followed closely by men and women, though men are slightly more deprived than women and also slightly more deeply deprived.

As for each of the constituent indicators, the most substantial differences are between the three age groups (see Figure 6.14.9). A total of 81.8% of the youth are deprived and most deprived, compared to 44.3% of the middle group, and 36.1% of the oldest age group.
Urban residents are more deprived than rural residents in this theme—a total of 66.9% of urban residents are deprived and most deprived, (compared to 45.5% of those in the rural areas), while just 9.0% are least deprived (compared to 20.6% of rural residents).

6.14.2 Theme 2: Personal control over decision-making
Least deprived: Individuals who lived alone
OR Individuals who were not prevented from making any personal decisions
OR Individuals who were prevented from making one personal decision

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who were prevented from making two personal decisions

Deprived: Individuals who were prevented from making three or four personal decisions

Most deprived: Individuals who were prevented from making five or six personal decisions

A vast majority of the purposive sample residents are least deprived in this theme (92.7%, see Figure 6.14.10). This means that most of the sample had not been prevented from making personal decisions (including those who lived alone), or had experienced a single type of controlling behaviour. Moreover, 1.5% are somewhat deprived, 5.5% deprived and 0.2% are in the most deprived category. This latter category represents individuals who had been prevented from making personal decisions five or six of the (six) topics asked about in this part of the survey. This pattern holds true for all the subgroups.

As noted in Section 5.14.2, low response rates to these questions, combined with the fact that the data collected lack nuance with respect to improving our understanding of control over personal decision-making, mean that it is likely that these questions will need to be revised in the future.

6.14.3 Voice dimension results

Figure 6.14.11  Voice dimension, South African purposive sample

The majority of the sample are either least deprived (45.1%) or somewhat deprived (48.2%) in the voice dimension, with 6.6% deprived and just 0.1% most deprived (Figure 6.14.11). The relatively high proportions of the sample falling into the categories representing less severe deprivation are largely driven by the low levels of deprivation in the second theme of personal control over decision-making.

Those without disabilities are slightly more deprived than those with disabilities in this theme, reflecting the pattern observed in voice in the public domain. A total of
60.7% of those without disabilities are somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived, compared to 50.0% for those with disabilities.

The differences between men and women are small overall. However, men are slightly more deprived than women in the voice dimension, also following the pattern of deprivation observed in voice in the public domain.

The most substantial difference is between the three age groups, as can be seen in Figure 6.14.12. A total of 83.9% of the youth are somewhat deprived and deprived, compared to 49.2% of the middle group, and 42.9% of the oldest group. There is virtually no one classified as most deprived, only three individuals in the middle age group.

**Figure 6.14.12  Voice dimension, South African purposive sample, by age**

Urban residents are more deprived than rural residents in the voice dimension—they are less likely to be least deprived than their rural counterparts (30.1% compared to 49.3%), and more likely to be somewhat deprived (62.5% compared to 44.2%).

## 6.15 Time use

**Figure 6.15.1  Themes and indicators of the time use dimension**
6.15.1 Time use dimension results

Figure 6.15.2 Time use dimension, South Africa purposive sample

- **Least deprived**: Individuals with a first-quartile time burden (less than 7.5 hours per day), and not more than two-thirds of that time on call.
- **Somewhat deprived**: Individuals with a first-quartile time burden (less than 7.5 hours per day), and more than two-thirds of that time on call.
- **Deprived**: Individuals with a second-quartile time burden (between 7.5 and 10.4 hours per day), and more than two-thirds of that time on call.
- **Most deprived**: Individuals with a fourth-quartile time burden (of 13.3 hours per day or more), and with any amount of on-call time, or with a third-quartile time burden and in excess of two-thirds of that time on call.

Time burden refers to the time spent on work for pay, profit and production, on unpaid domestic and care work, and on obligatory activities—that is, time spent on non-leisure and non-personal care activities. On-call time refers to the proportion of time spent by the respondent undertaking their primary activity while simultaneously being responsible for caring for a child under the age of 13, and/or for someone sick, disabled or elderly. The time burden referred to in this dimension is measured by the quartiles determined from the South African data, which are shown in Table 6.15.1, along with the proportion of respondents with on-call responsibilities in each quartile.

In Figure 6.15.2, it is apparent that the proportion of respondents allocated to deprivation categories increases from least deprived to most deprived, with the largest proportion of respondents (31.2%) in the most deprived category. This skewing indicates both the relatively high time burden on respondents, and that the proportion of on-call responsibilities also increases as time burden increases in the purposive sample.
Table 6.15.1  Quartile time burden cut-offs and no on-call responsibilities, South Africa purposive sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quartile no.</th>
<th>Hours spent in a day</th>
<th>Proportion of ‘quartile respondents’ with no on-call responsibilities (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 7.5 hours</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5–10.4 hours</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.5–13.2 hours</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 hours or more</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For respondents without disabilities, the proportion of respondents in each of the categories increases from least deprived to most deprived, with the largest group in the latter category (36.4%). For those with disabilities, the proportion of respondents in each category is much more evenly spread, and the largest proportion also falls in the most deprived category (26.8%). Of men with disabilities, 79.1% had no on-call responsibilities, compared to 57.5% of women with disabilities, while the figures for men and women without disabilities were 69.3% and 33.8%, respectively.

Women are far more likely than men to be categorised as most deprived (38.4% compared to 22.3%), and less likely than men to be in any other category. This is partially driven by women’s on-call responsibilities—44.8% of women spend more than two-thirds of their time on call, compared to 10.5% of men, while 74.7% of men reported no on-call responsibilities compared to 46.4% for women.

With respect to age, the largest proportion of both the youth and middle age group are classified as most deprived (34.3% and 32.4%, respectively), while for the oldest age group, the largest group is classified as least deprived (30.2%).

Urban residents are twice as likely as rural residents to be classified as least deprived (31.5% and 15.0%, respectively), with a much larger proportion of rural residents classified as most deprived (33.6%) when compared with urban residents (22.7%).

6.16  Work

Figure 6.16.1  Themes and indicators of the work dimension
This final dimension is very broad, covering issues beyond what is generally associated with the label 'work'. The first theme—work for pay, profit and production—deals with issues related to economic activity (i.e. employment status) and issues of the quality of work, as would be anticipated. However, the two themes addressing unpaid and domestic care work, and the double labour burden, have been included to improve understanding—and increase the visibility—of the different types of work undertaken within and outside the home, and how these may differ between different social groups. The inclusion of these themes also aims to improve the gender sensitivity of the dimension.

The scoring of the first and second themes in this dimension is a little different from others in the IDM (see also Section 5.16). In Theme 1, the score for employment status, for those who are not in the labour force, is also their theme score because if they are not in the labour force, issues such as job security, hazardous work etc. are not no relevant to them. The results for Indicators 2, 3 and 4 are therefore, presented only for the 30.3% of the purposive sample who were economically active (i.e. employed or unemployed).

In Theme 2, respondents who did not undertake any unpaid domestic and care work are allocated the highest possible score for this theme (24.4% of respondents). The results for Indicators 1 and 2 are presented for the 75.6% of respondents who reported doing unpaid domestic and care work.

6.16.1 Theme 1: Work for pay, profit and production

Indicator 1: Employment status

**Figure 6.16.2** Employment status, South African purposive sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deprived</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Least deprived:** Individuals who were employed

OR Individuals who were not in the labour force because they had retired or did not need to work
Somewhat deprived: Individuals who were unemployed and waiting to start a new job OR Individuals who were in full-time education or training

Deprived: Individuals who were unemployed (except those waiting to start a new job) OR Individuals who were not in the labour force (except for those who were retired, did not need to work, or were unable to work)

Most deprived: Individuals who were not in the labour force because they were unable to work (e.g. an illness, injury or condition prevented them from working), or were not allowed to work

Note that the figures reported throughout are for the whole sample, including those aged 65 and above, which means these results diverge from typical labour statistics (e.g. those released by Statistics South Africa), which are restricted to the working age population, those aged between 15 and 64.

Overall, almost four in ten respondents in the purposive sample are least deprived (39.9%), which means these individuals were either employed, or not in the labour force because they had retired or did not need to work (Figure 6.16.2). Another 12.2% are somewhat deprived—individuals in full-time education or training, or unemployed individuals waiting to start a new job. Almost half of the sample are either deprived (24.3%) or most deprived (23.7%). The former category comprises unemployed individuals and those not in the labour force because they had given up looking for work, they were too busy with domestic and care duties, or they did not want to work. The latter category consists of those not in the labour force because they are unable to work.

Across the purposive sample, 69.8% of respondents reported not being in the labour force (for any reason), while 24.8% of respondents reported that they were employed, and 5.5% that they were unemployed. The proportions of those considered economically active and those not in the labour force are shown in Table 6.16.1. Note that results are presented for all respondents, not only those who are of working age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivation category</th>
<th>Economically active</th>
<th>Not in the labour force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deprived</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number</strong></td>
<td><strong>699</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,612</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are important differences between those with and without disabilities. As can be seen in Figure 6.16.3—those with disabilities are more deprived, and more deeply deprived than those without disabilities. In particular, while only 6.4% of those without disabilities are most deprived (i.e. those who are not in the labour force because they are not able to work), the figure for those with disabilities is 38.2%.
Women are more deprived than men in this indicator; women are less likely than men to be least deprived (31.4% compared to 50.4%), and much more likely to be deprived and most deprived (a total of 56.9% compared to 36.7%).

Across the three age groups, the youth appear to be least deprived, with almost half somewhat deprived (49.1%)—largely due to the high numbers of this group who were still in full-time education and training. While broadly, the middle age group follows the overall pattern, they are slightly more likely to be deprived and most deprived (and less likely to be somewhat deprived). For the oldest age group, almost two-thirds are least deprived (64.3%), likely due to the high numbers of this age group who had retired. However, while they are least likely to be somewhat deprived and deprived, one-quarter are most deprived (27.4%), with those in this last category considering themselves unable to work, but, presumably, wishing to work.

Rural residents tend to follow the overall pattern of deprivation. Urban residents are more likely to be in the somewhat deprived and deprived categories than rural residents (a total of 45.4% compared to 34.0%), and less likely to be most deprived (17.3% compared to 25.5%). These results imply that rural residents were slightly more likely to not be in the labour force because they were unable to work, and urban residents are slightly more likely to be economically active, or not in the labour force for reasons other than being unable to work (e.g. having given up looking for work).

All remaining indicators in this theme are reported only for the 699 individuals (30.3% of respondents) who reported being economically active.
Indicator 2: Job security

Figure 6.16.4  Job security (for economically active respondents, n=699), South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who had between one and four jobs (including self-employment), very rarely had to change employment because of an employer’s decision, and received social security

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who had any number of jobs, typically did not have to change jobs because of an employer’s decision (or not often), and broadly did not receive social security benefits

Deprived: Individuals who had any number of jobs, did or did not have to change jobs because of an employer’s decision, and received no social security benefits

Most deprived: Individuals who had five or more jobs, had to change jobs very often, often, or not often because of an employer’s decision, and received no social security benefits

Very few respondents in the purposive sample are most deprived in this indicator (0.7%), with almost one-quarter deprived (22.6%), four in ten somewhat deprived (40.8%), and the remainder least deprived (35.9%, see Figure 6.16.4). The three categories—somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived—imply that the work being done was in the informal sector rather than the formal sector, as respondents did not receive any social security benefits. There was no deviation from this overall pattern of deprivation in any of the subgroups.
Indicator 3: Hazards in work for pay, profit and production

Figure 6.16.5 Hazards in work for pay, profit and production (for economically active respondents, n=699), South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who do not work in a confined space, with dangerous materials, or with dangerous machinery

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who face one of these three hazardous conditions at work

Deprived: Individuals who face two of these three hazardous conditions at work

Most deprived: Individuals who face all three hazardous conditions at work (working in a confined space, with dangerous materials and with dangerous machinery)

Of the economically active purposive sample respondents, 70.4% are least deprived, meaning that they did not work in confined spaces, with dangerous materials, or with dangerous machinery (Figure 6.16.5). However, the remaining 30.0% did face some hazards at work—15.0% are somewhat deprived, 14.3% deprived, and 0.3% most deprived (the latter group, representing two individuals, who faced all three hazardous conditions at work). This overall pattern held for all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

The most substantial difference in the subgroup analyses was between men and women. As can be seen in Figure 6.16.6, in general, women faced more hazards at work than men. Only men are most deprived (two individuals).
Figure 6.16.6 Hazards in work for pay, profit and production, South African purposive sample, by gender

Urban residents are slightly more deprived than their rural counterparts, with a total of 38.8% categorised as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived, compared to 26.8% of rural residents. The two individuals categorised as most deprived both live in urban areas.
Indicator 4: Autonomy and harassment in work for pay, profit and production

Figure 6.16.7 Autonomy and harassment in work for pay, profit and production (for economically active respondents, n=699), South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who are able to take breaks for eating, drinking and going to the toilet, do not face any sexual harassment or physical abuse, and do not feel their work is humiliating

Somewhat deprived: Individuals who face one of these four types of harassment, or lack of autonomy at work

Deprived: Individuals who face two of these four types of harassment, or lack of autonomy at work

Most deprived: Individuals who face any three, or all four types of lack of autonomy and harassment at work

Once again, only two individuals (0.3%) of the economically active purposive sample are categorised as most deprived (Figure 6.16.7). Overall, 13.0% are deprived, 17.2% somewhat deprived, and 69.5% are least deprived. It should be noted that a categorisation of least deprived in this indicator represents a very low level of autonomy and (lack of) harassment at work. This overall pattern of deprivation holds for all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

In the comparison between men and women, one man and one woman are each categorised as most deprived (see Figure 6.16.8). These individuals were unable to take breaks for eating drinking or going to the toilet, they faced sexual harassment and physical abuse, and felt that their work was humiliating. Equal proportions of women and men are least deprived, lower proportions of women than men are somewhat deprived (10.9% compared to 21.1%), and higher proportions of women are deprived (19.1% compared to 9.3%), indicating deeper deprivation amongst women.
Rural residents are more deprived than urban residents, with one-third being classified as somewhat deprived, deprived and most deprived (a total of 33.5% compared to 20.6%). However, while similar proportions are categorised as deprived (12.7% and 13.9%, respectively), a higher proportion of rural than urban residents are somewhat deprived (20.6% compared to 6.1%).

**Theme 1 results: Work for pay, profit and production**
For the whole purposive sample, around four in ten are least deprived (39.1%) in the work for pay, profit and production theme, and 14.6% are somewhat deprived (Figure 6.16.9). Another 22.6% are deprived, and 23.7% are most deprived—all of whom are not in the labour force because they are unable to work. There are deviations from this pattern amongst all four subgroups.

Those with disabilities are more deprived than those without in the theme of work for pay, profit and production (see Figure 6.16.10). This is largely driven by the high proportion of those with disabilities who are not in the labour force due to not being able to work—38.2% of those with disabilities are most deprived, compared to 6.4% of those without disabilities.

Figure 6.16.10  Work for pay, profit and production, South African purposive sample, by disability status

Women are more deprived in this theme than are men. While similar proportions are most deprived, a total of 44.3% women are categorised as deprived and somewhat deprived, compared to 28.4% of men (and a smaller proportion of women than men are least deprived—31.4% and 48.7%, respectively).

Within the youth age group, half are classified as somewhat deprived, representing many individuals who are still in full-time education and training. The middle age group is more deprived than both the youth and oldest groups, with a total of 53.5% in the deprived and most deprived categories, compared to 30.9% for the youth, and 34.9% for the oldest group.

A higher proportion of rural than urban residents are most deprived (25.4% compared to 17.3%). However, higher proportions of urban residents compared to rural, are in the somewhat deprived and deprived categories (a total of 46.6% compared to 34.7%).
6.16.2 Theme 2: Unpaid domestic and care work

As noted above, those individuals who did no unpaid domestic and care work are allocated the highest possible score for this theme. They are not included in the results for the two indicators below (only in the theme-level results), which provide information only on the 75.6% (1,748 individuals) who undertook unpaid domestic and care work (0.2% refused to answer).

There was little difference between the proportions of those without disabilities and those with disabilities doing unpaid domestic and care work (23.3% and 25.0%, respectively). Among the women, 22.3% did not do any unpaid domestic and care work, compared to 26.5% of men. Similar proportions of the youth and middle age group reported not doing unpaid domestic and care work (21.8% and 20.5%, respectively), with around double the proportion of the oldest age group not doing such work (42.7%). Of rural residents, 23.8% did no unpaid domestic and care work, with 25.7% of urban residents not doing it.

Indicator 1: Hazards in unpaid domestic and care work

Figure 6.16.11 Hazards in unpaid domestic and care work (n=1,748), South African purposive sample

Least deprived: Individuals who have experienced no injury or illness doing unpaid domestic and care work

Somewhat deprived: not applicable

Deprived: Individuals who have experienced an injury or illness doing unpaid domestic and care work, but with no permanent effect

Most deprived: Individuals who have experienced an injury or illness doing unpaid domestic and care work, which has had a permanent effect
For those in the purposive sample who undertook unpaid domestic and care work, 94.9% are least deprived, having suffered no injury or illness associated with these activities. A further 3.7% are deprived, and 1.4% most deprived (Figure 6.16.11). While those in the deprived and most deprived categories experienced an illness or injury doing unpaid domestic and care work, the effects on the former were temporary and permanent for the latter. This overall pattern of deprivation holds for both those with and without disabilities, and for rural and urban residents.

Broadly, the overall pattern is followed by men and women, yet women are more likely than men to be deprived—having suffered an illness or injury that did not have permanent effects (6.0% compared to 0.7%).

Across the three age groups, the youth are the most likely to be least deprived (98.5%, compared to 94.6% and 90.3% for the two older groups), while the oldest group was more likely to be deprived than the two younger groups (7.2%, compared to 1.2% for the youth and 3.8% for the middle group).

**Indicator 2: Respect in unpaid and domestic care work**

**Figure 6.16.12  Respect in unpaid domestic and care work (n=1,748), South African purposive sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who are not subject to humiliating treatment/disrespect while doing unpaid domestic and care work, and this work is valued by other household members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who refused to answer one of the two questions, and are either subject to humiliating treatment/disrespect, or this work is not valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who are subject to humiliating treatment/disrespect while doing unpaid domestic and care work, or this work is not valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td>Individuals who are subject to humiliating treatment/disrespect while doing unpaid domestic and care work, and this work is not valued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of those who undertook unpaid domestic and care work in the purposive sample, 81.3% are least deprived in this indicator (Figure 6.16.12). Another 0.5% are somewhat deprived, and 17.9% are deprived (meaning they were subject to humiliating treatment, or their work was not valued), with just 0.9% most deprived (experiencing humiliation and not having their contribution valued). This overall pattern of deprivation holds true for men and women, for all three age groups and those with and without disabilities.

The broad pattern is also followed by those in rural and urban localities. However, rural residents are slightly less likely to be least deprived (80.2% compared to 85.2%), and slightly more likely to be deprived (18.6% compared to 12.4%).

**Theme 2 results: Unpaid domestic and care work**

For all respondents in the purposive sample for the theme of unpaid domestic and care work, 83.0% are least deprived and 14.7% somewhat deprived (Figure 6.16.13). Just 1.8% and 0.5% are deprived and most deprived, respectively. There is no deviation from this pattern of deprivation in any of the four subgroups.
6.16.3 Theme 3: Double labour burden

Figure 6.16.14 Double labour burden, South African purposive sample

Of the respondents in the purposive sample, 84.7% are least deprived in this theme—on average, their combined hours of work for pay, profit and production and unpaid domestic and care work do not exceed 35 hours a week (Figure 6.16.14). This is driven, in particular, by the very high proportion of respondents who reported spending no time, on average, on work for pay, profit or production. Moreover, 13.2% are deprived (those individuals who had a double labour burden of 36–55 hours a week on average), and 2.1% were most deprived (those who had a double labour burden of more than 56 hours per week on average).

Slightly more than double the proportion of those without disabilities than those with disabilities are deprived and most deprived (a total of 22.0% and 9.7%, respectively).

Men are slightly more deprived than women in this theme (see Figure 6.16.15), with a total of 19.7% of men in the deprived and most deprived categories, compared to 11.7% of women. This is likely to be related to the proportion of men who reported one or more hours of work for pay, profit and production being double the proportion of women who did so (36.9% for men versus 14.9% for women).

**Least deprived:** Individuals whose double labour burden (the combination of hours spent on work for pay, profit and production and the hours spent on unpaid domestic and care work) is, on average, between 0 and 35 hours per week

**Somewhat deprived:** not applicable

**Deprived:** Individuals whose double labour burden is, on average, between 36 and 55 hours per week

**Most deprived:** Individuals whose double labour burden is, on average, 56 hours per week or more
The youth and the oldest age group follow the same pattern of deprivation, with 93.9% and 95.8%, respectively, categorised as least deprived compared to 79.3% for the middle age group. Conversely, the middle age group are far more likely than the other age groups to be deprived and most deprived (a total of 20.6%, compared to 6.1% for the youth and 4.2% of the oldest group).

Rural residents are slightly less deprived than their urban counterparts—a total of 19.9% of urban residents are deprived and most deprived, compared to 14.0% of rural residents.

6.16.4 Work dimension results
For the whole purposive sample, two-thirds are least deprived (66.3%) in the work dimension, with a further 32.5% somewhat deprived, and just 1.1% deprived (Figure 6.16.16). No individuals are categorised as most deprived for the whole dimension, which would require them to be categorised as most deprived across all three themes. This pattern was followed by both men and women, and those living in rural and urban areas.

Individuals with disabilities are more deprived than those without, being less likely to be least deprived (54.2% compared to 80.7%), and much more likely to be somewhat deprived (44.1% compared to 18.8%).

As can be seen in Figure 6.16.17, the pattern of deprivation differs substantially across the three age groups, with the middle age group substantially more deprived than the youth, and slightly more deprived than the oldest group.

**Figure 6.16.17  Work dimension, South African purposive sample, by age**

![Bar chart showing work dimension by age group](image)

It is important to remember that the results for the work dimension are an aggregate across all three themes—going far beyond topics relating only to labour force participation and economic activity. The dimension-level results must be interpreted with all three themes—of work for pay, profit and production, unpaid domestic and care work, and the double labour burden—in mind.
This report presents initial findings about the deprivation of the men and women—of different ages, in rural and urban localities, and with or without disabilities—sampled as part of the IDM South Africa Country Study. This is only the second country in which the revised IDM has been trialled as part of research efforts to refine it. This study has enabled aspects of the measure that still need improvement to be identified, while at the same time, providing a rich data set. The data demonstrate clearly that not only do different groups of people experience different depths of poverty, but also that the nature of their poverty differs.

This final section of the report provides an overview of the results from the main and purposive samples, and provides brief reflections on those results. It then outlines the further work that should be undertaken, first in relation to improving the measure itself, with respect to scoring and aggregation, and in terms of specific further analyses of the South African data. A great deal of further analysis of the data is possible, to reveal a more nuanced understanding of which groups are experiencing which types of deprivation in South Africa. Further, when the IDM composite index is constructed it will be possible to see more clearly that deprivations cumulatively affect different groups of people; that is, their multidimensional poverty will be evident.

The overviews below are of the results of the two samples overall, as well as highlights from the subgroup analyses, comparing: men and women; three age groups (16–24, 25–64 and 65+ for the main sample, and 18–24, 25–64 and 65+ for the purposive sample); rural/urban locality; and, finally, those with disabilities to those without. For the main sample, results presented are ‘raw’; sampling weights have not yet been used to ensure national representativity.

The dimension-level results are discussed. Indicators are first created using variables (i.e. the survey questions). Where two or more indicators are aggregated to create a theme, these are equally weighted. Equal weighting arithmetic aggregation is also used from theme to dimension. Note that the results for the violence dimension are not presented in this report (see Section 3.10 for further details.)

## 7.1 Overview of the national-level main sample results

The ‘raw’ results of the national-level main sample results are derived from the survey of 8,652 individuals, carried out between February and June 2019.

Analysis at the dimensional level shows that, across the whole main sample, there are two dimensions where the proportion of those in the most deprived category is higher than 10.0%—in time use, 32.0% are most deprived, as are 30.7% in food. The remaining 12 dimensions have less than 10.0% of the sample in the most deprived category.

The food, family planning and time use dimensions are each constructed from only one indicator and one theme. Of the remaining 11 dimensions and 29 themes, five themes have more than 10.0% of the sample in the most deprived category: education level (12.7%) and functional literacy and numeracy (12.6%), both in the education dimension; heating energy in the energy dimension (12.3%); safe environment in the environment dimension (13.6%); and, voice in the public domain in the voice dimension (32.0%).
There are seven dimensions—shelter, health, sanitation, relationships, clothing and footwear, environment, and work—with indicators that have more than 10.0% of the sample in the most deprived category. However, as can be observed in the habitability theme of the shelter dimension, a high proportion classified as most deprived at the indicator level (e.g. 26.3% in crowdedness) does not always translate into a high proportion in that category at the theme or dimension level.

In terms of gender differences, the patterns of deprivation between men and women in the main survey are not noticeably different for the dimensions of water, shelter, education, energy, sanitation, clothing and footwear, voice, and work. For food, health, relationships, environment, and time use, women are more likely to be deprived than men. The only dimension in which men are more likely to be deprived than women is family planning. However, this appears to be driven by the higher proportion of men who refused to answer questions about this topic.8

Across the three age groups, there are no major differences in the dimensions of water, shelter, sanitation and relationships (although this does not mean that there are no differences at the theme or indicator level within these dimensions). For dimensions that have noticeable differences between age groups, the patterns of deprivation vary. In food, environment, time use, and work, the middle age group (25–64 years old) is more likely to be deprived, followed by the youth (16–24) and oldest age group. Older people (65+) are more likely to be deprived in health, education, and energy, while the youth are least likely to be deprived in these dimensions. The oldest age group also appears to be more deprived in family planning, however this is driven by the high proportion of those in the oldest age group who refused to answer this series of questions. The youth are more likely to be deprived in clothing and footwear, and voice, followed by the middle and oldest age groups. Most notably, in voice, the youth are worse off in all the indicators comprising the voice in the public domain theme, as well as slightly more so in the personal control over decision-making theme.

Comparing residents of urban and rural areas, in five dimensions—health, relationships, family planning, environment and work—there are no discernible differences between the two groups. However, rural residents are more deprived than their urban counterparts in eight of the nine remaining dimensions—food, water, shelter, education, energy, sanitation, clothing and footwear, and time use. In the food dimension, fewer rural residents are least deprived, while urban residents are more likely to be classified as either least deprived or most deprived, demonstrating extremes among urban residents. Voice is the only dimension in which urban residents are more likely to be deprived than their rural counterparts.

There are several dimensions for which there are no major differences between individuals with disabilities and those without, including shelter, sanitation, voice, time use, and work. For all the remaining dimensions, except family planning, people with disabilities are more likely to be more deprived than those without disabilities. This is most notable in food, education, health, and relationships, where the difference between people with and without disabilities in the least deprived category is at least 10%. Differences in the family planning dimension between people with and without disabilities appear to be due to relatively higher rates of refusal to answer by those with disabilities, compared to those without.

---

8 As illustrated in Section A.11 in Appendix A.1, those who refuse to answer are given a score midway between the lowest and highest possible scores.
7.2 Overview of the purposive sample results

The purposive sample consists of the 826 purposively selected individuals with disabilities and their adult household members, for a total sample size of 2,311. These surveys were conducted in Gauteng and Limpopo.

Three dimensions with high proportions of purposive sample respondents in the most deprived category are food (38.4%), education (27.0%) and time use (31.2%). While both food and time use share similar patterns of deprivation as those in the main sample, education stands out, with those in the purposive sample having more severe deprivation.

At the theme level, of the 11 dimensions that include more than one theme, there are nine themes in eight dimensions that have relatively high proportions classified as most deprived. This is true of both themes in the education dimension—education level (30.9%), and functional literacy and numeracy (31.9%). This is also true for ownership of essential household items (14.4% in shelter), health status (12.1% in health), washing facilities (14.3% in sanitation), basic clothing and footwear (11.5% in clothing and footwear), safe environment (13.2% in environment), voice in the public domain (22.0% in voice), and the work for pay, profit and production (23.7% in the work dimension).

In terms of the subgroup analysis between people with and without disabilities, there are no differences between the two groups in five dimensions—water, energy, clothing and footwear, family planning and environment. People with disabilities are more likely to be more deprived than people without disabilities in the six dimensions of food, health, education, sanitation, relationships, and work. Further, for three essential dimensions of food, health, and education, people with disabilities are considerably more likely to be in the most deprived category than those without. Of people with disabilities, 39.0% are most deprived in education, compared to 12.8% of those without, while 61.8% of people with disabilities are in the most deprived or deprived categories in food, compared to 49.0% of those without disabilities. Individuals without disabilities are more likely to be deprived than those with disabilities in the dimensions of shelter, voice, and time use.

There are six dimensions where there are no discernible differences between men and women at the dimension level—water, shelter, education, energy, family planning, and work. However, there are higher proportions of women than men that are in the deprived and most deprived categories in the work for pay, profit and own production theme in the work dimension. In relationships, clothing and footwear, environment, and time use, women are more likely to be more deprived than men. In the remaining dimensions—food, health, sanitation and voice—men are more likely to be more deprived than women.

In the comparisons between the three age groups, the youth (aged 18–24) are most likely to be in the most deprived category in the shelter, relationships, and voice dimensions. The middle age group (25–64) are more likely to be worse off than the other two age groups in the work dimension. Together with the youngest group, the middle age group are more likely than the elderly to be more deprived in clothing and footwear, family planning, and time use. The older age group (65+*) are more likely than the other two age groups to be deprived in education and environment. The deep deprivation of the elderly in education is not surprising, given the historical context of South Africa, whereas deprivation in environment is due to the lack of availability of biomass fuel, and the greater likelihood of their being responsible for fuel collection. For the dimensions of food, water, health, energy, and sanitation, there were no differences between the three age groups at the dimension level.
The greatest number of dimensions showing differences between subgroups is found when comparing rural and urban residents. Rural residents are more likely to be in more deprived categories in seven dimensions—food, water, health, education, energy, sanitation, and time use. While around 72.0% of rural residents experience some form of food insecurity, compared to 57.3% of urban residents, there is greater inequality among urban respondents. In contrast, urban residents are more likely to be in more deprived categories in shelter, relationships, clothing and footwear, environment, and voice, although the differences are relatively small. There are no differences between the two groups in the family planning and work dimensions.

7.3 Reflecting on the analyses of both samples

The purposive sample of people with disabilities and their household members was undertaken to gain a deeper appreciation of the deprivations faced by people with disabilities, and their households, and to ensure a sufficiently large sample size, in case this was not achieved through random dwelling selection in the main sample. It is striking that in the purposive sample, there are fewer differences in the comparisons between individuals with disabilities and those without than in the main sample. This seems to indicate that in households with at least one person with a disability, the level of deprivation of all members of the household is somewhat greater than for other households. Greater levels of deprivation for some dimensions in the purposive sample, compared to the main sample, also point to this. However, to test this supposition, the results for the main and purposive samples need to be systematically compared, using provincial-level analyses for Gauteng and Limpopo.

When examining the results of the main and purposive samples, there are many similarities in the trends revealed. Over 30.0% of both the main and purposive samples are categorised as most deprived in food, indicating that many individuals are suffering severe food insecurity. Since poor men and women ranked food as the highest priority dimension in the development phase of the IDM (Wisor et al. 2014), this is a concern. In both samples, those with disabilities are notably more deprived in food. This may reflect an overall shortage of food in these households, and could potentially indicate the need to prioritise providing food to the household members who are engaged in productive work or income generation. However, an analysis of the data to test this hypothesis has not been carried out.

The other dimension with over 30.0% of both samples categorised as most deprived is time use, which is a function of dividing time burden (the combined time spent on work for pay, profit and production, on unpaid and domestic care work and obligatory activities) into quartiles (see Section A.14 in Appendix A.1). It also indicates that some people may have little time to rest, and may spend a considerable proportion of their time on call (i.e. caring for children and/or the sick, disabled and elderly).

It is also important that almost a third of the main and purposive sample respondents are most deprived in terms of voice in the public domain, since this means they feel they have little to no influence on decision-making and policies that might affect them. Over a quarter of purposive sample respondents are also most deprived in education, and while this improves for younger groups, the results indicate that there is much scope for improvement regarding access to quality education, particularly for those with disabilities.

The relatively small differences in levels of deprivation between men and women on many dimensions (though not all) and in both samples, were unexpected. While Fransman and Yu (2018) found that although female-headed households experienced more severe poverty than male-headed ones—as measured by the
South African multidimensional poverty index (MPI)—their study also revealed that male and female MPI scores had narrowed over the years 2001–2016, and perhaps, the results of the IDM confirm that trend.

On a number of indicators or dimensions that were designed to be particularly gendersensitive—such as safe environment (in the environment dimension), participation during menstruation (in the relationships dimension), prenatal health care access (in health), and the time use dimension—the findings relating to women revealed particular deprivations. Deprivation in safe environment and time use is experienced by higher proportions of women than men, and deprivations relating to menstruation and prenatal care are revealed for certain groups of women (of course, men and some other women cannot be deprived in these indicators). The proportion of men more deeply deprived than women in the psycho-social health indicator of the health dimension merits further investigation.

Greater differentiation between men and women in personal control over decision-making may also have been expected. Nevertheless, the lack of nuance in the data may relate to the questions asked in the survey instrument, which will need future revision, as similar problems emerged in the Indonesian study (Bexley et al. 2020). Alternatively, household demographics, such as a higher proportion of young men than women reporting they were prevented by another household member from doing certain things, may be contributing to the results. This needs further investigation, using intersectional analyses.

A greater distinction between men and women was anticipated in unpaid domestic and care work (in the work dimension). However, this category of activities includes maintenance and repair work around the house, which might account for men’s levels of deprivation being almost equal to women’s deprivation.

It is perhaps not surprising that the middle age group in the main sample are relatively more deprived in the dimensions of food, environment, time use, and work, as well as in the psycho-social health status indicator within the health dimension, with many individuals in this age bracket likely being responsible for providing for families. Most notable in the purposive sample is the high proportion of people in the youngest and middle age groups who are most deprived in time use, probably indicating the considerable time spent caring for others in their households.

Unexpectedly, there are no significant differences between the three age groups in either sample with respect to unpaid domestic and care work. Greater differences may be found in an analysis of the intersection of age and gender—it would be expected that women in the middle age group would be more likely to be responsible for unpaid domestic and care work than others.

The fact that the youth have better outcomes in education and health than older groups is to be expected. In the case of education, this indicates a positive trend in educational provision over time. What is particularly concerning are the high levels of deprivation for the youth in voice in the public domain (notwithstanding that some were too young to vote at the election prior to enumeration), which suggests that they are increasingly disengaged compared to older generations.

Overall, rural respondents are more deprived than urban respondents. In particular, this deprivation tends to cluster in those dimensions identified as somewhat more important to people living in poverty in the earlier study (Wisor et al. 2014)—in particular, in both samples in food, water, education, energy and sanitation—which suggests some priority attention is required in rural areas on these issues. However, there is a bifurcation of outcomes—particularly in food in urban areas—with some urban dwellers as, or more deeply, deprived than people in rural areas, which should not be overlooked. In the purposive sample, of the almost six in ten urban residents who are food insecure, most are severely food insecure, suggesting a lack of income to purchase food may be the key problem.
Disability was one of the key indicators of multidimensional poverty in the earlier MPI study in South Africa (Fransman and Yu 2018). The findings from the analyses of both IDM samples also indicate that individuals with disabilities are likely to have worse outcomes than those without, across virtually all dimensions. Those with disabilities in the purposive and main samples are more deprived in five and seven of the nine higher priority dimensions of the IDM, respectively. It is clear that this group needs special attention in each of these dimensions.

It may not be too surprising that health and education are key dimensions where people with disabilities are more deprived than those without. People with disabilities are more deprived in health care access and quality as well as (physical and psycho-social) health status, which suggests a particular area for further work, to overcome problems largely related to the quality of health care received.

Deprivation, particularly of those with disabilities, in education invites consideration of how to strengthen educational opportunities for today’s young people and children with disabilities. The fact that transport is not a dimension of the IDM means it may be missing an aspect of life that is of special importance for people living with disabilities.

There are five dimensions where there were no significant differences between people with disabilities and those without in the main sample (shelter, sanitation, voice, time use, and work). Shelter and sanitation largely reflect household-level indicators, while the lack of difference in time use and work indicates that, despite their disabilities, individuals are making significant contributions, especially in paid and unpaid care work to their households. In contrast, in the purposive sample, those without disabilities are more deprived in time use, perhaps related to their caring responsibilities.

### 7.4 Improving the IDM measure: lessons from the South African Country Study

The South Africa Country Study’s findings highlight several issues with respect to the IDM as a measure of individual-level multidimensional deprivation, and how it can be improved. Some of this work, and the final index construction, will be undertaken before this program ends in mid-2020, but as with any measure, refinement is a continuous process and, as the measure is used in other countries, further improvements will be necessary. Much of the work that should be undertaken, outlined below, will be dependent on availability of funding beyond this IDM Program and likely after the COVID19 crisis.

There are a number of areas where the survey questions will need to be revised, as discussed in detail throughout Section 5. As also noted above, the relatively small differences in levels of deprivation between men and women, particularly in the work dimension, were unexpected—it may be that in areas of high unemployment and low labour force participation rates, there could be more relevant aspects with respect to gender sensitivity than are currently being measured.

Other issues requiring refinement relate to the scoring and aggregation process. One issue relates to where the cut-offs fall for each of the four categories of deprivation, from least to most deprived, and how context-dependent these should be in a measure that is intended for global use. An issue for further consideration and systematisation is how to score respondents where an indicator is not relevant to them. This is particularly problematic where an indicator or theme has been included to strengthen gender sensitivity.
The current approach to the construction of themes and dimensions, using nested equal weighted arithmetic aggregation, can mask deprivations on certain indicators or themes (e.g. in relation to prenatal health care or menstruation). Such deprivations should not be so easily hidden, and thus, also need further consideration. Further, this approach can mean that a theme where a respondent is classified as least deprived (e.g. because it is not relevant to the individual) compensates for lower scores on other themes within the dimension. Alternative aggregation and weighting methods—particularly those that demonstrate non-compensability—will be investigated but will not be reported for South Africa within the life of this program. Sensitivity testing of such revisions will need to be undertaken with a view to ensuring the most appropriate approach is adopted.

The novel construction of indicators, themes, and dimensions in the IDM, as described throughout the report, means the results presented differ from those of other South African poverty assessments, even where variable-level data collected tend to be very similar to other South African data (e.g. regarding drinking water or cooking energy sources).

The next step will be to aggregate the dimension-level results into a single IDM composite index, and the most appropriate method for doing so is currently being explored. The cumulative effect of greater levels of deprivation across multiple dimensions will show the depth or 'intensity' of multidimensional poverty being experienced. However, it must be noted that the creation of a composite index inevitably masks underlying detail in the aggregation process. It will also be important to explore relationships within and between dimensions, themes and/or indicators, to deepen understanding of multidimensional poverty.

At the end of the individual survey, respondents are asked to rank the dimensions in order of importance to them. It will be possible to weight results according to these individual-level rankings.

### 7.4.1 Refinements of current analyses

There are several refinements that can be made to the existing analyses to improve their interpretability. To obtain more demographically accurate, nationally representative results, sampling weights can be applied to the main sample to ensure results reflect the national demographic patterns.

Another such refinement would be to change the age groups to suit different purposes—the middle age group, aged 25–64, is by far the largest, and it may be valuable to split it. Differences may be expected—particularly for women—between those younger than, say, 50 years old (who may have more child care, prenatal health care and family planning concerns) and those 51 and older. Alternatively, the definition of 'youth' in South Africa includes persons from 14 to 35 years old, so another option for age disaggregation would be to increase the cut-off age of the youngest group to 35 years.

There may be value in updating the rural/urban categories of enumeration areas (that were based on the Statistics South Africa 2011 census) to reflect the demographic and land-use changes between 2011 and 2019. There may be additional value in re-examining urban areas to classify sampled dwellings into formal and informal settlements for a more nuanced urban analysis.
7.5 Possible future analyses

As indicated, this is an initial analysis of the South African Country Study data—there remains a great deal more that it is possible to do, and the particular interests of South African stakeholders should contribute to the prioritisation of further analyses. Several of areas where further analysis could provide additional insights from this data set are identified below, however, the list is far from exhaustive and would depend on further funding.

Although analysis by subgroups—by gender, age, urban/rural locality, and disability status—has been undertaken, analysis of intersections between these characteristics would be of great benefit in furthering the understanding of how multidimensional poverty is affected by these characteristics. An important feature of the IDM’s individual-level data is that such analysis is possible, to more precisely identify categories of people who are particularly deprived.

The main sample has a minimum provincial sample size of 800, which enables subgroup analyses by province. However, these may not include intersectional analyses if sample sizes for the intersections are too small. Provincial-level analyses would also be of particular use in facilitating comparisons between the Gauteng and Limpopo results of the main sample and the purposive sample results. Inter-household analysis is also possible with these data.

The IDM data have not yet been analysed by household structure, but this is another area worthy of analysis, which would include comparing households that are female- or male-headed, as well as by household size and composition. As many households in South Africa are female-headed, and known to be more income-poor than others (Stats SA 2018) it would be of interest to gender researchers and policy makers to explore whether these are also more multidimensionally deprived than other households and, if so, in what way.

Another advantage of the IDM is that it enables the analysis of differences in deprivation within households. Such an analysis would provide valuable information unobtainable from household surveys.

Apart from standard demographic data and questions relating to variables for dimension scoring, the IDM data also contains information about the language most commonly used by individuals at home, perceived quality of life, experience of any major problems or shocks in the 12 months prior to the survey, and assessments of living standards compared to a year earlier. The data set also contains information on ownership (solely or with others) of a range of productive and consumer assets. This information about assets can be used as a proxy for (accumulated) income, so it would be valuable to examine correlations between the information on assets and the IDM index, to explore the relationship between wealth and multidimensional poverty. Analysis of the relationship between any of these data and dimension-level and index-level results could be of interest, and could be mapped and visually displayed.
7.6 Conclusion

As can easily be imagined, there are rich opportunities for many further analyses of this data, including by South African researchers, government officials and practitioners. As is clear, the IDM data can reveal an enormous amount of information of interest to anyone who wants to ensure that no one is left behind in the goal of eliminating poverty.

The South Africa Country Study has been critically important in testing the IDM and identifying (from working with actual data) how well the survey questions, scoring methods and dimension construction approaches work. While improvement will be continuous, it is hoped that such a rich, disaggregated dataset can be of considerable value and interest to policy makers, researchers and practitioners.

This report indicates how data that is both gender-sensitive and individual provides rich insights that existing poverty measures cannot. Though this IDM Program is coming to an end, it is hoped that further analysis of both the main and purposive samples will be possible in the future, so that maximum value can be obtained from them. Further analyses should contribute to a deeper understanding of multidimensional poverty and enable more precise targeting of policy and program interventions to improve the lives of people who continue to experience many, and often deep, deprivations.
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