



The South Africa I know, the home I understand

# Statistical release

**P0318**

## General household survey

**2015**

**Embargoed until:**

**2 June 2016**

**10:30**

### Enquiries:

User Information Services

Tel.: (012) 310 8600 / 4892 / 8390

### Forthcoming issue:

GHS 2016

### Expected release date

May 2017

## CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES .....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Summary and key findings.....	1
3. Basic population statistics.....	8
4. Education .....	9
4.1 Introduction .....	9
4.2 Educational profile of learners aged 0–4 years .....	9
4.3 General attendance of individuals aged 5 years and older at educational institutions.....	10
4.4 School attendance .....	14
4.5 Higher education institution attendance.....	17
4.6 Educational attainment of persons aged 20 years and older .....	18
5. Health.....	22
5.1 Health care provision and quality.....	22
5.2 Medical aid coverage .....	24
5.3 Teenage pregnancy .....	26
6. Disability.....	27
7. Social security services.....	28
8. Religious affiliation and observance .....	30
9. Housing.....	32
9.1 Housing types and ownership.....	32
9.2 State-subsidised housing.....	34
10. Household sources of energy .....	36
11. Water access and use .....	40
12. Sanitation and refuse removal.....	49
13. Telecommunications.....	54
14. Transport.....	57
15. Environmental trends .....	59
16. Household assets and sources of income .....	61
17. Access to food .....	65
19. Technical notes.....	69
19.1 Methodology and fieldwork .....	69
19.2 The questionnaire .....	69
19.3 Response rates.....	70
19.4 Data revisions .....	71
19.5 Limitations of the study .....	71
19.6 Sample design .....	71
19.7 Allocating sample sizes to strata .....	73
19.8 Weighting .....	76
19.9 Sampling and the interpretation of the data.....	76
19.10 Comparability with previous surveys .....	77
19.11 Editing and imputation .....	78
19.12 Definitions of terms .....	79
19.13 Classifications .....	80

**ADDENDUM TABLES**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Population.....</b>	<b>81</b>
1.1	By province, population group and sex, 2015.....	81
1.2	By age group, population group and sex, 2015.....	82
<b>2.</b>	<b>Education.....</b>	<b>83</b>
2.1	Population aged 20 years and older, by highest level of education and province, 2015 .....	83
2.2	Population aged 20 years and older, by highest level of education, population group and sex, 2015 .....	85
2.2	Population aged 20 years and older, by highest level of education, population group and sex, 2015 (concluded) .....	86
2.3	Population aged 20 years and older, by highest level of education, age group and sex, 2015 .....	87
2.4	Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, by literacy skills and province, 2015.....	89
2.5	Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, who have some, a lot of difficulty or are unable to do basic literacy activities by sex and province, 2015.....	91
2.6	Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, who have some, a lot of difficulty or are unable to do basic literacy activities, by population group and sex, 2015 .....	93
2.6	Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, who have some, a lot of difficulty or are unable to do basic literacy activities, by population group and sex, 2015 (concluded) .....	94
2.7	Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, by literacy skills and age group, 2015 .....	95
<b>3.</b>	<b>Attendance at an educational institution .....</b>	<b>97</b>
3.1	Population attending and not attending an educational institution by population group and age group, 2015 .....	97
3.2	Population attending an educational institution, by type of institution, age group and sex, 2015 .....	99
3.3	Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution, by type of institution and province, 2015 .....	100
3.4	Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution, by type of institution, population group and sex, 2015 .....	101
3.5	Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution, by annual tuition fee, population group and sex, 2015 .....	102
3.6	Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution, by annual tuition fee and type of institution, 2015 .....	103
3.7	Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution that benefited from reductions or partial bursaries, by type of institution, sex and province, 2015.....	104
3.8	Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution, by the kind of problems they experience at the institution, and by province, 2015.....	106
3.9	Population aged 5 years and older currently attending school by grade and by province, 2015 .....	107
3.10	Population aged 0–4 years attending a day care centre, crèche, early childhood development centre (ECD) playgroup, nursery school or pre-primary school, by whether they attend or not, and by province, 2015.....	108
3.11	Population aged 0–4 years attending a day care centre, crèche, early childhood development centre (ECD) playgroup, nursery school or pre-primary school, by whether they attend these institutions, and by population group and sex, 2015 .....	109
<b>4.</b>	<b>Medical aid coverage.....</b>	<b>110</b>
4.1	Medical aid coverage, by province and population group, 2015 .....	110
4.2	Medical aid coverage, by population group and sex, 2015 .....	112
4.3	Medical aid coverage, by age group, 2015.....	113

<b>5.</b>	<b>Health .....</b>	<b>114</b>
5.1	General health perception, by province, 2015 .....	114
5.2	People who were ill in the month prior to the interview and who consulted a health worker, by province, 2015 .....	115
5.3	People who were ill in the month prior to the interview and whether they consulted a health worker, by population group and sex, 2015 .....	116
5.4	The household's normal place of consultation by province, 2015 .....	117
5.5	The household's normal place of consultation and whether at least one member is covered by medical aid, 2015 .....	118
5.6	The respondent's level of satisfaction with the service received during their most recent visit, by kind of health facility used, 2015 .....	119
5.7	The respondent's level of satisfaction with the service received during their most recent visit to a health facility, by population group and sex, 2015 .....	120
5.8	People who were sick/injured and who did not consult a health worker in the month prior to the interview, by the reason for not consulting, and by population group and sex, 2015 .....	121
5.9	Population suffering from chronic health conditions as diagnosed by a medical practitioner or nurse, by sex and province, 2015 .....	122
<b>6.</b>	<b>Disabilities .....</b>	<b>125</b>
6.1	Population aged 5 years and older that have some difficulty or are unable to do basic activities, by province, 2015 .....	125
6.2	Population aged 5 years and older that have some difficulty, a lot of difficulty or are unable to do basic activities, by population group and sex, 2015 .....	127
6.3	Population aged 5 years and older that are using assistive devices, by sex and province, 2015 ....	129
<b>7.</b>	<b>Social welfare .....</b>	<b>131</b>
7.1	Population that received social grants, relief assistance or social relief, by population group, sex and province, 2015 .....	131
<b>8.</b>	<b>Dwellings and services .....</b>	<b>132</b>
8.1	Type of dwelling, by number of rooms in the dwelling .....	132
8.1.1	All population groups, 2015 .....	132
8.1.2	Black African population group, 2015 .....	133
8.1.3	Other** population groups, 2015 .....	134
8.2	Type of dwelling of households, by province, 2015 .....	135
8.3	Type of dwelling of households, by main source of water, 2015 .....	136
8.4	Households by type of dwelling, by tenure status, 2015 .....	138
8.5	Tenure status of households, by province, 2015 .....	139
8.6	Type of ownership of the dwellings of households, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015 .....	140
8.7	Type of dwelling of households, by main source of energy .....	141
8.7.1	For cooking, 2015 .....	141
8.7.2	For heating, 2015 .....	142
8.7.3	For lighting, 2015 .....	143
<b>9.</b>	<b>Water services .....</b>	<b>144</b>
9.1	Main source of water for households, by province, 2015 .....	144
9.2	Households by main source of water, by population group of the household head, 2015 .....	145
9.3	Households whose main source of water was supplied by the local municipality, by province, 2015 .....	146
9.4	Households whose main source of water was supplied by the local municipality, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015 .....	147
9.5	Households without water in the dwelling or on site, by the distance household members have to travel to reach the nearest water source, and population group of the household head, 2015 ...	148

9.6	Households' perceptions of water quality, per province, 2015 .....	149
<b>10.</b>	<b>Communication .....</b>	<b>150</b>
10.1	Households' ownership of a cellular phone, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015 .....	150
10.2	Households' ownership of a cellular phone, by province, 2015.....	151
10.3	Households with connection of a landline phone, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015 .....	152
10.4	Households' ownership of a landline phone, by province, 2015.....	153
<b>11.</b>	<b>Source of energy .....</b>	<b>154</b>
11.1	Electricity connection to the mains, by population group, sex of the household head and province, 2015 .....	154
11.2	Source of energy.....	<b>155</b>
11.2	Main source of energy used by households, by province.....	155
11.2.1	For cooking, 2015 .....	155
11.2.2	For heating, 2015.....	156
11.2.3	For lighting, 2015 .....	157
11.3	Main source of energy used by households, by population group of the household head .....	158
11.3.1	For cooking, 2015 .....	158
11.3.2	For heating, 2015.....	159
11.3.3	For lighting, 2015 .....	160
<b>12.</b>	<b>Sanitation.....</b>	<b>161</b>
12.1	Sanitation facility used by households, by province, 2015 .....	161
12.2	Sanitation facility used by households, by population group of the household head, 2015 .....	162
12.3	Sanitation facility used by households, by type of dwelling, 2015.....	163
<b>13.</b>	<b>Refuse removal .....</b>	<b>165</b>
13.1	Households who pay for their refuse removal, by type of refuse removal service and province, 2015 .....	165
13.2	Type of refuse removal services used by households, by population group of the household head, 2015 .....	166
13.3	Households currently paying for the removal of refuse, by province, 2015.....	167
<b>14.</b>	<b>Transport .....</b>	<b>168</b>
14.1	Number of trips made by household members per week using each of the following modes of transport, by province, 2015 .....	168
14.2	Distance travelled to get to the nearest minibus taxi/sedan taxi/bakkie taxi, bus and train, by population group of the household head, 2015 .....	169
14.3	Money spent during the previous calendar week by households per transport mode, by the sex of the household head, 2015 .....	170
14.4	Time taken to get to the health facility that members of the household normally go to, by transport mode, 2015.....	171
<b>15.</b>	<b>Environment .....</b>	<b>172</b>
15.1	Environmental problems experienced in the community or neighbouring farms, by province, 2015 .....	172
15.2	Environmental problems experienced in the community or neighbouring farms, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015 .....	173
<b>16.</b>	<b>Income and expenditure.....</b>	<b>174</b>
16.1	Sources of income for households, by province, 2015 .....	174
16.2	Households' sources of income, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015 .....	175
16.3	Monthly household expenditure category, by province, 2015 .....	176
16.4	Monthly household expenditure category, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015 .....	177

<b>17.</b>	<b>Households assets, 2015 .....</b>	<b>178</b>
17.1	Number of households owning a particular asset by province, 2015 .....	178
<b>18.</b>	<b>Agriculture .....</b>	<b>180</b>
18.1	Number of households involved in one or more agricultural production activity, by province, 2015 .....	180
18.2	Number of households involved in one or more agricultural production activity, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015 .....	181
18.3	Land used for crop production by province, 2015.....	182
18.4	Land used for crop production by population group and sex of the household head, 2015.....	183
18.5	The number of livestock the household has, per province, 2015 .....	184

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1:	Type of educational institution attended by population 5–24 years, 2015.....	11
Figure 2:	Percentage of persons aged 7 to 24 years who attended educational institutions by province, 2002 and 2015.....	11
Figure 3:	Percentage of persons aged 7 to 24 years who attended educational institutions by Metropolitan areas, 2015 .....	12
Figure 4:	Percentage distribution of main reasons given by persons aged 7 to 18 years for not attending an educational institution, by sex, 2015.....	12
Figure 5:	Percentage of those aged 5 years and older who attended schools and who do not pay tuition fees, 2002–2015 .....	13
Figure 6:	Percentage of persons who attended grade 10– 12 in a public school by their access to text books by quarter, 2014 and 2015.....	14
Figure 7:	Percentage of learners attending public schools who benefited from the school nutrition programme, 2010–2015.....	15
Figure 8:	Percentage of learners attending public schools who benefited from the school nutrition programme by Metropolitan areas, 2015 .....	15
Figure 9:	Percentage of learners who experienced corporal punishment at school by province, 2011–2015.....	16
Figure 10:	Percentage of learners who experienced corporal punishment at school by Metropolitan area, 2011–2015.....	16
Figure 11:	Percentage distributions of student participation rates for individuals aged 18 to 29 years by population group, 2002 and 2015.....	17
Figure 12:	Percentage distributions of student participation rates for individuals aged 18 to 29 years by Metropolitan areas, 2015 .....	18
Figure 13:	Percentage distribution of educational attainment for persons aged 20 years and older, 2002–2015.....	19
Figure 14:	Percentage of persons aged 20 years and older with no formal schooling per province, 2002 and 2015.....	19
Figure 15:	Percentage of persons aged 20 years and older with no formal education or highest level of education less than Grade 7 within each gender group, 2002–2015 ...	20
Figure 16:	Adult literacy rates for person aged 20 years and older by province, 2010–2015.....	21
Figure 17:	Adult literacy rates for person aged 20 years and older by Metropolitan Areas, 2015.....	21
Figure 18:	Percentage distribution of self-reported health status of individuals by sex and population group, 2015.....	22
Figure 19:	Percentage distribution of the type of health-care facility consulted first by the households when members fall ill or get injured, 2004–2015 .....	23
Figure 20:	Percentage of individuals who are members of medical aid schemes per province, 2010–2015.....	25
Figure 21:	Percentage of individuals who are members of medical aid schemes per Metropolitan area, 2015 .....	26
Figure 22:	Percentage of individuals who are members of medical aid schemes by population group, 2015 .....	26
Figure 23:	Percentage of females aged 14–19 who were pregnant during the year preceding the survey, 2015.....	27
Figure 24:	Percentage of households and persons who have benefited from social grants, 2003–2015.....	29
Figure 25:	Percentage of individuals and households benefiting from social grants per province, 2015 .....	29
Figure 26:	Percentage of individuals and households benefiting from social grants per metropolitan area, 2015 .....	30



Figure 27: Percentage distribution of religious observance by religious affiliation, 2015.....	31
Figure 28: Percentage distribution of dwelling ownership status for households living in formal dwellings, 2002–2015.....	32
Figure 29: Percentage of households that lived in formal, informal and traditional dwellings by province, 2015 .....	33
Figure 30: Percentage of households that lived in formal, informal and traditional dwellings by provincial Metropolitan area, 2015.....	33
Figure 31: Percentage of dwelling units with six rooms or more by population group of the household head, 2015 .....	34
Figure 32: Percentage of households that received a government housing subsidy by sex of the household head, 2002–2015 .....	34
Figure 33: Provincial percentage of households that received housing subsidies.....	35
Figure 34: Percentage of households that said that their 'RDP' or state-subsidised house had weak or very weak walls and/or roof by province, 2015.....	36
Figure 35: Percentage of households connected to the mains electricity supply by province, 2002–2015 .....	37
Figure 36: Percentage distribution of main sources of energy used for cooking by year, 2002–2015.....	37
Figure 37: Percentage distribution of main sources of energy used for cooking by province, 2015.....	39
Figure 38: Percentage of household rating the quality of electrical supply services as 'good', 2010–2015 .....	39
Figure 39: Percentage of households that paid for electricity that reported having had electricity interruptions during the six months before the survey, 2015 .....	40
Figure 40: Percentage of households with access to piped or tap water in their dwellings, off-site or on-site by province, 2002–2015 .....	41
Figure 41: Percentage of households with access to piped or tap water in their dwellings, off-site or on-site by Metropolitan areas, 2015 .....	41
Figure 42: Percentage of households rating the quality of water services provided by the municipality as good, and those that reported water interruptions, by province, 2015.....	44
Figure 43: Percentage of households rating the quality of water services provided by the municipality as good, and those that reported water interruptions, Metropolitan Areas, 2015 .....	45
Figure 44: Percentage distribution of households that received municipal water and that reported water interruptions that lasted more than 2 days at a time by province, 2010–2015.....	46
Figure 45: Percentage distribution of households that received municipal water and that reported water interruptions that lasted more than 2 days at a time by province, 2010–2015.....	46
Figure 46: Percentage of households that have access to improved sanitation per province, 2002–2015.....	49
Figure 47: Percentage of households that have access to improved sanitation by Metropolitan areas, 2015.....	50
Figure 48: Percentage of households that have no toilet facility or that have been using bucket toilets per province, 2002–2015 .....	50
Figure 49: Problems experienced by households that share sanitation facilities during the six months before the survey, 2015.....	51
Figure 50: Percentage distribution of household refuse removal, 2002–2015.....	52
Figure 51: Percentage distribution of household refuse removal by Metropolitan areas, 2015.....	52
Figure 52: Percentage of households who have a functional landline and cellular telephone in their dwellings by province, 2015.....	54



Figure 53: Percentage of households who have a functional landline and cellular telephone in their dwellings by Metropolitan areas, 2015.....	55
Figure 54: Percentage of households with access to the Internet at home, or for which at least one member has access to or used the Internet by province, 2015 .....	56
Figure 55: Percentage of households who made use of public transport during the week preceding the survey by province, 2015 .....	59
Figure 56: Percentage of households who experience specific kinds of environmental problems, 2003–2015 .....	60
Figure 57: Percentage of households who experience specific kinds of environmental problems, 2003–2015 .....	61
Figure 58: Percentage distribution of households by selected assets owned, by geotype, 2015 ..	62
Figure 59: Percentage distribution of sources of household income by province, 2015 .....	63
Figure 60: Percentage distribution of main source of household income by province, 2015 .....	64
Figure 61: Percentage distribution of main source of household income by province, 2015 .....	64
Figure 62: Vulnerability to hunger and access to food, 2002–2008; 2010–2015 .....	65
Figure 63: Percentage of households experiencing food adequacy or inadequacy by province, 2015 .....	66
Figure 64: Percentage of households experiencing food adequacy or inadequacy by province, 2015 .....	66
Figure 65: Percentage of households involved in agricultural activities by province, 2015 .....	67
Figure 66: Percentage distribution of the main reasons for agricultural involvement by province, 2015 .....	68
Figure 67: Distribution of primary sampling units by province, 2007 (old) Master Sample and the new Master Sample (designed in 2013) .....	73

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Population per province, 2002–2015 .....	8
Table 2: Number of households per province, 2002–2015 .....	8
Table 3: Percentage of children aged 0–4 years using different child care arrangements by province, 2015 .....	9
Table 4: Percentage of persons aged 5 years and older who are attending educational institutions by province and type of institution attended, 2015 .....	10
Table 5: Nature of the problems experienced by all learners who attended public schools per province, 2015 .....	13
Table 6: Level of satisfaction with public and private healthcare facilities, 2015 .....	24
Table 7: Medical aid coverage, 2002–2015 .....	25
Table 8: Persons aged 5 years and older with disability by gender and province, 2015 .....	28
Table 9: Percentage distribution of religious affiliation by province, 2015 .....	31
Table 10: Comparison of the main water source for drinking used by households, 2002–2015 .....	42
Table 11: Access to piped municipal water supplies, payment and service ratings for local municipalities, 2005–2015 .....	43
Table 12: Perceptions of households regarding the quality of the water they drink per province, 2005–2015 .....	47
Table 13: Households refuse removal by province and geotype, 2015 .....	53
Table 14: Households' access to the Internet by place of access, geotype and province, 2015 .....	57
Table 15: Mode of transport used by household members to travel to school and work, 2015 .....	58
Table 16: Nature of agricultural production activities per province, 2015 .....	68
Table 17: A summary of the contents of the GHS 2015 questionnaire .....	69
Table 18: Response rates per province, GHS 2015 .....	70
Table 19: Comparison between the 2007 (old) Master Sample and the new Master Sample (designed in 2013) .....	72
Table 20: Most important differences between the questionnaires introduced in 2015 and those used during preceding years .....	77

## GENERAL HOUSEHOLD SURVEY 2015

### 1. Introduction

This statistical release presents a selection of key findings from the General Household Survey (GHS) 2015. The survey was conducted by Statistics South Africa (Stats SA) from January to December 2015.

#### **Purpose**

The GHS is an annual household survey conducted by Stats SA since 2002. The survey replaced the October Household Survey (OHS) which was introduced in 1993 and was terminated in 1999. The survey is an omnibus household-based instrument aimed at determining the progress of development in the country. It measures, on a regular basis, the performance of programmes as well as the quality of service delivery in a number of key service sectors in the country.

The GHS covers six broad areas, namely education, health and social development, housing, household access to services and facilities, food security, and agriculture.

This report has three main objectives: firstly, to present the key findings of GHS 2015. Secondly, it provides trends across a fourteen year period, i.e. since the GHS was introduced in 2002; and thirdly, it provides a more in-depth analysis of selected service delivery issues. As with previous reports, this report will not include tables with specific indicators measured, as these will be included in a more comprehensive publication of development indicators, entitled *Selected development indicators* (P0318.2).

#### **Survey scope**

The target population of the survey consists of all private households in all nine provinces of South Africa and residents in workers' hostels. The survey does not cover other collective living quarters such as students' hostels, old-age homes, hospitals, prisons and military barracks, and is therefore only representative of non-institutionalised and non-military persons or households in South Africa.

The findings of the GHS 2015 provide a critical assessment of the levels of development in the country as well as the extent of service delivery and the quality of services in a number of key service sectors. Amongst these are: education, health, disability, social security, religious affiliation and observance, housing, energy, access to and use of water and sanitation, environment, refuse removal, telecommunications, transport, household income, access to food, and agriculture. Some topic covered such as religious affiliation and observance are totally new, whilst others, such as education, were deepened by focusing on access to work- and textbooks. Below is an executive summary of finding of each of the areas mentioned above.

### 2. Summary and key findings

#### **Education**

Research confirms that addressing the early childhood development needs of those aged 0–4 years pays significant dividends. South Africa has, in this regard; made comprehensive early childhood development (ECD) programmes a very important educational priority. The ECD programmes are offered at day-care centres, crèches, playgroups, nursery schools and in pre-primary schools. At the time of the survey, 33% of the 0–4-year-olds attended these kinds of institutions. Disparities are observed in terms of coverage by province. Approximately 48,1% of South African children aged 0–4

years attended day-care or educational facilities outside their homes. The highest attendance was reported in Free State (45,6%) and Gauteng (44,9%). A much lower enrolment was, however, observed amongst children in KwaZulu-Natal (20,7%) and Northern Cape (26,5%).

Nationally, 33,2% of individuals aged 5 years and older attended an educational institution. Approximately 88% of South African individuals above the age of five years who attended educational institutions, attended school, while a further 4,4% attended tertiary institutions. By comparison, only 2,5% of individuals attended Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET) colleges. Whilst the percentage in this broad age group has not changed, at peak ages of 7–15 years, attendance is almost universal. Just over a fifth (22,5%) of premature school leavers in this age group mentioned 'a lack of money' as the reason for not studying, while 20,3% reportedly fell out due to poor academic performance. Although 9,4% of individuals left their studies as a result of family commitments (i.e. getting married, minding children and pregnancy), it is noticeable that a larger percentage of females than males offered this as a reason (18,1% compared to 0,4%). Whilst this observation is accurate, the data also suggest that the 'No fee' school system and other funding initiatives are beginning to show improved results. The percentage of learners who reported that they were exempted from paying tuition fees increased from 0,4% in 2002 to 64,6% in 2015. Provincially, 92,5% of learners in Limpopo and 79,1% of learners in Eastern Cape attended no-fee schools, compared to 43% of learners in Western Cape and 41,6% of learners in Gauteng.

Learners' access to textbooks improved during the year. While just over one-quarter (74,9%) had access to textbooks in all their subjects at the end of quarter 1 (31 March 2015), almost nine-tenths (81,1%) had access to textbooks in all their subjects at the end of the school year (quarter 4).

There were approximately 14 million learners at school in 2015. Approximately six per cent of them attended private schools. Three-quarters (76,2%) of learners who attended public schools benefited from school feeding schemes. Furthermore, 70% of learners walked to school, while 8% used private vehicles.

Generally, the percentage of learners who experienced corporal punishment at school in 2015 has decreased nationally since 2011 and 11,3% of learners reportedly experienced corporal punishment at school in 2015. Corporal punishment was more prevalent at schools in eThekhwini (13,2%) and Mangaung (11,8%) whilst this sort of punishment was less likely to be found in Ekurhuleni (1,1%) and the City of Cape Town (1,3%).

Approximately 710 139 students were enrolled at higher educational institutions during 2015. More than two-thirds (68,5%) of these students were black African. However, proportionally this group is still under-represented. Only 3,1% of black Africans aged 18 to 29 years were studying as opposed to 14,3% of Indian/Asian individuals and 15,7% of the white population in this age group. Only 3,7% of the coloured population was studying during 2015. High enrolment rates were witnessed in eThekhwini (13,2%) and Mangaung (12%) respectively.

Educational attainment outcomes continue to improve with improved access to educational facilities and services. Among individuals aged 20 years and older, the percentage who attained Grade 12 as their highest level of education increased from 21,9% in 2002 to 28,0% in 2015. The percentage of these individuals with tertiary qualifications furthermore improved from 9,3% to 14,1%. The percentage of individuals without any schooling decreased from 10,6% in 2002 to 5,1% in 2015. Although results show that there were declines in percentages of persons who had no formal schooling in all the provinces over the period 2002 to 2015.

Whilst functional illiteracy declined from 27,3% to 15,4% between 2002 and 2015, improved access to schooling has led to a significant decline in the percentage of functionally illiterate individuals in

the 20–39 age group. Between 2002 and 2015, the prevalence of functional illiteracy in the age group 20–39 years declined noticeably for both men (17,2% to 7,3%) and women (15,6% to 4,8%). Nationally, the percentage of literate persons over the age of 20 years increased slightly from 91,9% in 2010 to 93,7% in 2015. The adult literacy rate, however, lagged behind this average in provinces such as KwaZulu-Natal (92,4%), Eastern Cape (90,7%), Mpumalanga (90,2%), North West (89,3%), Limpopo (89,2%) and in Northern Cape (88%) of the population were literate.

### ***Health***

Nearly seven in every ten (70,5%) households reported that they went to public clinics and hospitals as their first point of access when households members fell ill or got injured. By comparison, a quarter 25,3% of households indicated that they would go to private doctors, private clinics or hospitals. Most households (92,8%) went to the nearest facility of its kind. Of those that preferred to travel further to access health facilities, 18,9% presented long waiting periods as a reason for securing services beyond their normal catchment areas. The study found that 81,1% of households that attended public health-care facilities were either very satisfied or satisfied with the service they received compared to 97,7% of households that attended private health-care facilities. A slightly larger percentage of households that attended public facilities (6,1% as opposed to private facilities 0,5%) were very dissatisfied with the service they received. Nearly a quarter (23,5%) of South African households had at least one member who belonged to a medical aid scheme. However, a relatively small proportion 17,5% of the individuals in South Africa belonged to a medical aid scheme in 2015.

### ***Disability***

Results showed that 5,1% of South Africans aged 5 years and older were classified as disabled in 2015. Women (5,5%) were slightly more likely to be disabled than men (4,7%). North West (7,4%), Northern Cape (7,1%) and Eastern Cape (6,8%) presented the highest prevalence of disability in the country.

### ***Social security***

The percentage of individuals that benefited from social grants consistently increased from 12,7% in 2003 to 30,1% in 2015. Simultaneously, the percentage of households that received at least one grant increased from 29,9% to 45,5% in 2015. More than one-third of individuals in Eastern Cape (40,3%), Limpopo (38,2%), Northern Cape (36,9%) and KwaZulu-Natal (36,8%) were grant beneficiaries, compared to 17,5% in Gauteng and 22% in Western Cape. More than one-third of black African individuals (33,5%) received a social grant, compared to 27% of coloured individuals, and 12% of Indian/Asian individuals. Only 6,3% of the white population received grants.

### ***Religious affiliation and observance***

The vast majority (86,0%) of South Africans described their religious affiliation as 'Christian' while a further 5,2% said that they were not affiliated to any religion in particular. More than five per cent of individuals subscribed to religions that were described as, 'ancestral, tribal, animist or other traditional African religions'. Muslims, who comprised 1,9% of the total, were predominantly found in Western Cape, Gauteng and KwaZulu-Natal. Hindus comprised about 0,9% of the population of South Africa, however 3,3% of the population of KwaZulu-Natal were Hindus.

## ***Housing***

Between 2002 and 2015, the percentage of households that lived in formal dwellings and whose dwellings were fully owned increased from 52,9% to 53,8% while the percentage of partially owned dwellings declined from 15,5% to 9,7%. About 13,6% of households had 'other' forms of tenure arrangements in 2015.

More than three-quarters (78,1%) of South African households lived in formal dwellings, followed by 14,1% who lived in informal dwellings, and 6,9% in traditional dwellings. The highest concentration of households in Limpopo (90,5%) lived in formal dwellings, followed by the households in Northern Cape (86,1%). The highest percentage of informal dwellings were found in North West (22%) and Gauteng (21%).

At the time of the survey, 14,4% of South African households were living in 'RDP' or state-subsidised dwellings. A higher percentage of female-headed (18%) than male-headed households (12%) received a government housing subsidy. Some residents have, however, raised concerns about the quality of subsidised houses and 14,2% said that the walls were weak or very weak while 13,8% regarded the dwellings' roofs as weak or very weak.

## ***Energy***

The percentage of households connected to the electricity supply from the mains has increased consistently from 77,1% in 2002 to 85,5% in 2015. Percentage of households that used electricity for cooking increased from 58% in 2002 to 78,1% in 2015. The use of electricity as a source of energy for cooking was highest in Free State (86,9%), Northern Cape (85,9%) and Western Cape (85,4%) and lowest in more rural provinces such as Limpopo (60,1%), Eastern Cape (73,1%) and Mpumalanga (74,2%) where alternative fuels such as wood are, perhaps, more accessible and affordable.

## ***Water access and use***

Although 89,4% of South African households had access to piped water in 2015, only 74,9% of Eastern Cape households enjoyed such access. This situation does, however, represent a substantial improvement from that of 2002 when only 56,3% of households in this province had access to piped water. There were very high proportions of households in the City of Cape Town (99,5%), Mangaung (99%), Nelson Mandela Bay (98,9%), the City of Johannesburg (98,5%) and Ekurhuleni (98,5%) that had access to water either in their dwellings, off-site, or on-site.

Nationally, 62% of households rated the quality of water-related services they received as 'good'. Satisfaction has, however, been eroding steadily since 2005 when 76,4% of users rated the services as good. An estimated 45,8% of households had access to piped water in their dwellings in 2015. A further 27% accessed water on site while 13,9% relied on communal taps and 2,7% relied on neighbours' taps. Although generally households' access to water is improving, 4,4% of households still had to fetch water from rivers, streams, stagnant water pools and dams, wells and springs in 2015. This is a decrease of more than five percentage points from 9,5% of households that had to access water from these sources in 2002.

## ***Sanitation***

Nationally, the percentage of households with access to 'RDP—standard' sanitation increased from 62,3% in 2002 to 80% in 2015. The majority of households in Western Cape (93,3%) and Gauteng



(91%) had access to adequate sanitation, while about half those in Limpopo (54%) and just below two-thirds of those in Mpumalanga (65,8%) had adequate access. The majority of households in the City of Johannesburg (96,9%) and Nelson Mandela Bay (94,6%) had access to RDP standard toilet facilities, while households in the City of Tshwane (82,0%) and eThekweni (83,5%) were the least likely to have to RDP standard toilet facilities. Despite the improved access to RDP-standard sanitation facilities, many households continue to be without any proper sanitation facilities. Nationally, the percentage of households that continued to live without proper sanitation facilities had been declining consistently between 2002 and 2015, decreasing from 12,3% to 4,7% during this period.

About one-quarter of households expressed concern of poor lighting and inadequate hygiene, while 18,2% felt that their physical safeties were threatened when using the toilet in shared facilities. One-fifth complained that there was no water to wash their hands after they had used the toilet, and another 16,7% pointed to long waiting times.

### ***Refuse removal***

The percentage of households for which refuse were removed at least once per week increased from 56,7% in 2002 to 63,5% in 2015. The percentage of households that had to rely on their own or on communal rubbish dumps; or who had no facilities at all, decreased. Various modes of refuse removal are closely aligned with particular geographic areas. Households in urban areas were much more likely to receive some rubbish removal service than those in rural areas, and rural households were therefore much more likely to rely on their own rubbish dumps. In 2015, 54% of South African households were paying for the removal of their refuse. In addition to the 61,2% of households for whom refuse was removed on a weekly basis by the municipality. The highest percentage of households for which refuse was removed at least once per week was observed in the City of Johannesburg (95,3%) and Mangaung (92,4%).

### ***Telecommunications***

The survey (GHS) found that there was high access to telecommunications for households nationally, as only 3,5% of households did not have access to either landlines or cellular phones in 2015. By comparison, 85,5% of households had access to at least one cellular phone, while 10,9% of households had access to both a landline and a cellular phone. Only 0,1% of households had only a landline. However access to these means of communication differed by province. Households in historically rural provinces such as Mpumalanga (94,4%) and Limpopo (94,1%) were very reliant on the more accessible cellular telephones than landlines. By contrast, a combination of both cellular phones and landlines in households were most prevalent in the more affluent provinces, namely Western Cape (26,2%) and Gauteng (14,1%).

Half of South African households (53,5%) had at least one member who used the Internet either at home, workplace, place of study, or Internet cafés. More than half of households in Gauteng (65,7%) and Western Cape (63,3%) had access to the Internet while only just over one-third of households in Limpopo (39,3%) had access to the Internet.

### ***Transport***

Taxis were the most commonly used form of public/subsidised transport in South Africa as 38,1% of households had at least one household member who used a minibus/sedan taxi or bakkie taxi during the week preceding the survey. More than two-thirds (66,5%) of the individuals that attended an educational institution walked to get there compared to less than one-third (20%) of those that went to work. Only 9,3% of individuals travelling to school travelled by private car while a further 6,9%

used taxis. Private vehicles remained the most common source of transport for individuals travelling to work (33%), followed by taxis (22,9%). Approximately 11,8% of the working population worked from home and therefore needed no transport.

### ***Environment***

Waste removal problems and littering (39%) as well as land degradation and soil erosion (31,2%) continue to be the two environmental problems that concerned the highest percentage of households. The percentage of households that felt that there were problems with littering and waste removal in their areas increased significantly since 2003 when this question was first included in the questionnaire. Then 28,8% of households regarded this as a problem. In 2015, a lower percentage of households considered air pollution as a problem (19,5%).

### ***Household assets and income sources***

Results showed that 29,8% of households owned at least one vehicle, and that about one-fifth (20,3%) owned one or more computers. More than eight-tenths of households owned television sets (80,8%) and electric stoves (84,9%), while more than one-third (33,8%) owned washing machines. While a large percentage of rural households owned electric stoves (74,9%), televisions (69,8%) and refrigerators (57,7%) their ownership of vehicles (13,9%), washing machines (13,8%) and computers (7,5%) were much more limited. By contrast, three-quarters or more of metropolitan and urban households owned refrigerators, televisions and electric stoves, while ownership of computers, vehicles and washing machines was also more common.

Most households in South Africa continued to rely on incomes from salaries. Nationally, salaries (65,5%) and grants (46,2%) were received by the highest percentages of households. Provincially, the largest percentage of households that earned salaries were found in Western Cape (76,8%) and Gauteng (75%). Grants were more prevalent than salaries as a source of income in Eastern Cape (59,8%) and Limpopo (58,9%). Remittances as a source of income played an important role in most provinces, but especially in Eastern Cape (24,4%), Limpopo (23,7%) and Mpumalanga (21,3%).

### ***Access to food***

Although household access to food has improved since 2002, it has but remained static since 2011. The Household Food Insecurity Access Scale which is aimed at determining households' access to food showed that the percentage of South African households with inadequate or severely inadequate access to food decreased from 23,9% in 2010 to 22,6% in 2015. During this time, the percentage of individuals that were at risk decreased from 28,6% to 26,4%. Between 2002 and 2015, the percentage of households that experienced hunger decreased from 23,8% to 11,3% while the percentage of individuals who experienced hunger decreased from 29,3% to 13,1%.



***Agriculture***

Less than a fifth of South African households (16,9%) were involved in agricultural production. Most crop production took place in backyard gardens, and households involved in agricultural activities were mostly engaged in the production of food. Food production consisted of grains (51,6%), fruit and vegetables (50,8%), Livestock farming (34,3%) and poultry (33,7%). Only 12,1% of the households involved in agriculture reported getting agricultural-related support from the government. Nationally, slightly more than two per cent (2,1%) of the households reported receiving training and 6,8% received dipping/ livestock vaccination services.



**Pali Lehohla**  
**Statistician-General**

### 3. Basic population statistics

The population figures in Table 1 are based on the mid-year population estimates that were generated by applying modelled projections that incorporated the results of Census 2011 as well as the most recent demographic information available at the time. The new estimates were first used with the GHS 2012 that was released in 2013. To ensure comparability, historical data files (2002–2011) were also re-calibrated in 2012, based on the 2013 model. In order to maintain the comparability of population estimates used in the GHS, the 2013 model will be used until a new projection, with new assumptions and input data, is introduced into the GHS series. Please consult Statistical release P0302 for the most recent population estimates.

Table 1 shows that the population of South Africa has increased from 45,8 million in 2002 to 54,4 million in 2015. In 2015, Gauteng was the most populous province, with more than 13 million residents, followed by KwaZulu-Natal and Eastern Cape with respectively 10,6 million and 6,6 million residents. Northern Cape remained the least populous province in the country.

**Table 1: Population per province, 2002–2015**

Province	Total population (Thousands)											
	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
WC	4 851	5 051	5 256	5 360	5 466	5 573	5 682	5 792	5 904	6 017	6 131	6 246
EC	6 290	6 343	6 400	6 431	6 460	6 491	6 522	6 554	6 586	6 620	6 656	6 693
NC	1 056	1 075	1 095	1 105	1 114	1 124	1 134	1 143	1 153	1 163	1 173	1 182
FS	2 724	2 726	2 729	2 732	2 735	2 737	2 740	2 744	2 749	2 753	2 758	2 763
KZN	9 326	9 517	9 715	9 816	9 918	10 023	10 129	10 237	10 346	10 457	10 571	10 688
NW	3 101	3 182	3 266	3 310	3 355	3 401	3 448	3 497	3 547	3 598	3 650	3 703
GP	10 048	10 501	10 965	11 202	11 446	11 694	11 946	12 202	12 464	12 728	12 996	13 268
MP	3 560	3 661	3 762	3 814	3 866	3 917	3 970	4 022	4 075	4 128	4 182	4 236
LP	4 852	4 964	5 081	5 141	5 201	5 262	5 325	5 388	5 452	5 518	5 585	5 654
RSA	45 809	47 020	48 270	48 910	49 561	50 223	50 896	51 580	52 275	52 982	53 701	54 432

**Table 2: Number of households per province, 2002–2015**

Province	Number of households (Thousands)											
	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
WC	1 198	1 269	1 348	1 389	1 432	1 477	1 524	1 571	1 619	1 669	1 720	1 775
EC	1 405	1 445	1 482	1 503	1 525	1 549	1 573	1 600	1 631	1 663	1 695	1 727
NC	231	242	254	261	268	275	282	289	296	304	312	320
FS	686	710	738	755	773	790	806	823	843	863	883	906
KZN	1 902	1 999	2 101	2 161	2 224	2 290	2 358	2 428	2 504	2 583	2 663	2 747
NW	837	878	926	952	980	1 010	1 040	1 071	1 105	1 140	1 177	1 215
GP	2 743	2 960	3 217	3 356	3 504	3 661	3 823	3 990	4 153	4 323	4 501	4 690
MP	774	825	882	914	947	981	1 015	1 051	1 088	1 127	1 168	1 211
LP	1 037	1 096	1 159	1 195	1 232	1 270	1 309	1 350	1 392	1 436	1 483	1 532
RSA	10 814	11 425	12 107	12 485	12 886	13 303	13 731	14 173	14 631	15 107	15 602	16 122

Table 2 outlines the estimated number of households to which the GHS data were benchmarked in each province. Households estimates, developed using the United National headship ratio methodology, were used to calibrate the household files. This model estimates that the number of households increased from 10,8 million in 2002 to 16,1 million in 2015. It is estimated that Gauteng had the largest number of households, followed by KwaZulu-Natal, Western Cape and Eastern Cape. Northern Cape, the least populous province, also had the least number of households.

## 4. Education

### 4.1 Introduction

All South Africans have a right to basic education and the Bill of Rights obliges the government to progressively make education available and accessible through reasonable measures. Human resources constitute the ultimate basis for the wealth of a nation, and it is therefore vital that a country develops the skills and knowledge of its residents to the greater benefit of all.

By tracking a number of core education and education-related indicators on an annual basis, particular aspects of the circumstances of learners can be analysed. As noted earlier, the focus of this section is to provide an overview of various aspects of the education profile of South Africans over the period 2002 to 2015. In this regard, the report will highlight important patterns and trends with respect to educational attendance of persons aged 0–4 years, individuals currently attending schools and higher education institutions, general attendance rates and educational achievements of individuals aged 20 years and older.

### 4.2 Educational profile of learners aged 0–4 years

Policy decisions and investments by government in access to early childhood development (ECD) provisioning has increased over time. It is unfortunately very difficult to measure the direct contribution of the state towards ECD activities since a household based survey is unlikely to accurately identify the suppliers of ECD services. That notwithstanding, access to ECD activities has overall increased over time.

**Table 3: Percentage of children aged 0–4 years using different child care arrangements by province, 2015**

Care arrangements for children aged 0-4 years	Province (Per cent)									
	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
Grade R, Pre-school, nursery school, crèche, edu-care centre	36,5	30,5	26,5	45,6	20,7	29,9	44,9	27,3	38,6	33,0
Day mother	12,5	6,2	7,3	17,1	19,8	4,4	21,9	10,6	11,7	14,1
At home with parent or guardian	41,9	57,6	59,5	29,3	48,6	60,9	29,2	53,4	44,8	45,8
At home with another adult	7,5	4,8	4,8	7,2	9,3	2,8	3,5	7,3	4,0	5,9
At home with someone younger than 18 years	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,2	0,0	0,1	0,3	0,2	0,1
At somebody else's dwelling	1,7	0,6	1,2	0,9	1,4	1,8	0,4	1,1	0,6	1,0
Other	0,0	0,2	0,9	0,0	0,0	0,2	0,1	0,0	0,2	0,1
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>

Table 3 summarises the attendance of young children aged 0–4 years at different types of ECD facilities or care arrangements, and the extent to which children were exposed to stimulation activities across provinces during 2015. Approximately 48,1% of South African children aged 0–4 years attended day-care or educational facilities outside their homes. The highest edu care centre attendance was reported in Free State (45,6%) and Gauteng (44,9%). More than a quarter of children attended these facilities or centres in Northern Cape (26,5%). Interestingly although KZN and EC in particular had very higher populations, the parents or care givers of children aged 0 to 4 tended to prefer to keep the children at home with a parent or guardian.

On the whole, and in general for the country, 45,8% of children remained home with their parents or guardians while another 5,9% were looked after by other adults. A larger percentage of children stayed at home with their parents or other adults in North West (63,7%) and less so in Gauteng (32,7%).

### 4.3 General attendance of individuals aged 5 years and older at educational institutions


In 2015, 33,2% of individuals aged 5 years and older attended an educational institution. Table 4 shows that, nationally, 88% of individuals above the age of five years who attended educational institutions, attended school, while a further 4,4% attended tertiary institutions. By comparison, only 2,5% of individuals attended Technical Vocational Education and Training(TVET) colleges.

**Table 4: Percentage of persons aged 5 years and older who are attending educational institutions by province and type of institution attended, 2015**


Type of institution	Province (per cent)									
	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
Pre-school	4,3	1,8	2,8	2,9	2,4	2,6	4,5	2,7	0,8	2,8
School	84,6	92,7	91,0	85,5	92,0	89,2	78,3	89,4	93,3	88,0
AET	0,4	0,4	0,4	1,1	0,6	1,4	1,0	0,4	0,7	0,7
Literacy classes	0,2	0,1	0,0	0,2	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,1
Higher education institutions	6,5	2,0	1,9	4,5	2,8	3,6	9,4	3,3	1,6	4,4
TVET	2,1	1,9	2,5	4,2	1,6	1,9	3,8	2,6	2,8	2,5
Other colleges	1,2	0,8	1,0	1,0	0,5	0,7	2,1	1,3	0,7	1,1
Home Schooling	0,4	0,3	0,0	0,4	0,1	0,0	0,1	0,1	0,0	0,1
Other	0,5	0,1	0,5	0,2	0,2	0,6	0,8	0,1	0,1	0,3
<b>Subtotal (thousands)</b>	<b>1 495</b>	<b>2 263</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>782</b>	<b>3 451</b>	<b>1 048</b>	<b>3 340</b>	<b>1 343</b>	<b>2 024</b>	<b>16 068</b>
<b>Unspecified (thousands)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>Total (thousands)</b>	<b>1 500</b>	<b>2 273</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>786</b>	<b>3 475</b>	<b>1 057</b>	<b>3 377</b>	<b>1 345</b>	<b>2 037</b>	<b>16 176</b>

Unspecified was excluded from the denominator when calculating percentages


The percentage of individuals aged 5–24 years that attended educational institutions by single ages is presented in Figure 1. The figure shows almost universal school attendance in the age group 7–15 years, after which the attendance of educational facilities drops off rapidly. By the age of 24 years, approximately 10,5% of individuals were still attending an educational facility. The figure also shows a noticeable representation of learners who are older than the ideal graduation age in primary and secondary schools.

**Figure 1 : Type of educational institution attended by population 5–24 years, 2015**

The proportion of persons aged 7 to 24 who attended educational institutions remained relatively stable between 2002 and 2015, increasing only slightly from 73,6% to 73,9% over this time. Enrolment rates declined in four of the nine provinces over this period. The highest enrolment in 2015 was recorded in Limpopo (80,4%), and the lowest in Western Cape (66,5%). This is presented in Figure 2. Figure 3 shows the percentage of learners aged 7 to 24 years who attended educational institution by Metropolitan area. The highest percentage was observed in Nelson Mandela Bay (78,5%), followed by Buffalo City (78,1%) and Mangaung (77,2%).


**Figure 2: Percentage of persons aged 7 to 24 years who attended educational institutions by province, 2002 and 2015**

**Figure 3: Percentage of persons aged 7 to 24 years who attended educational institutions by Metropolitan areas, 2015**



The main reasons provided by males and females in the age group 7–18 years for not attending any educational institutions are depicted in Figure 4. Nearly one-quarter (22,5%) of learners cited a lack of money as the main reason for not attending an educational institution while 20,3% reportedly fell out due to poor academic performance. Although 9,4% of individuals left their studies as a result of family commitments (i.e. getting married, minding children and pregnancy), it is noticeable that females were much more likely to offer these as reasons than males (18,1% compared to 0,4%). Approximately 9,1% of individuals reported that education was useless. More than one per cent of households felt that the distance to school, or difficulties they faced in getting to school were primary concerns.

**Figure 4: Percentage distribution of main reasons given by persons aged 7 to 18 years for not attending an educational institution, by sex, 2015**



Although inadequate access to money to pay for fees remain a major hurdle for learners, Figure 5 shows that attendance of no-fee schools have increased sharply over the past decade. The percentage of learners aged 5 years and older who attended schools where no tuition fees were levied increased from 0,4% in 2002 to 64,6% in 2015. Provincially, 92,5% of learners in Limpopo and 79,1% of learners in Eastern Cape attended no-fee schools, compared to 43% of learners in Western Cape and 41,6% of learners in Gauteng. Some 19,4% of learners benefitted from fee reductions or partial bursaries in 2015.

**Figure 5: Percentage of those aged 5 years and older who attended schools and who do not pay tuition fees, 2002–2015**




Table 5 presents some problems experienced by learners at the public schools they were enrolled at during the 2015 school year. Nationally, high fees (4,5%) and a lack of books (4,3%) were singled out as the most important problems, followed by bad facilities (3,7%) and large classes (3,6%). Learners in Mpumalanga (7,4%) and KZN (5,9%) were most concerned about a lack of books. Learners in Free State were least likely to complain about high fees (1,4%) while those in Western Cape (7,9%) were most likely to have done so.


**Table 5: Nature of the problems experienced by all learners who attended public schools per province, 2015**

Problems experienced in public school	Province (Per cent)									
	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	SA
Lack of books	3,4	2,2	2,7	5,4	5,9	5,4	3,9	7,4	2,5	4,3
Fees too high	7,9	2,5	1,8	1,4	4,8	6,8	4,5	6,4	2,7	4,5
Classes too large	5,1	3,1	0,4	2,7	3,3	3,9	5,7	4,4	1,1	3,6
Facilities bad	4,8	5,0	0,6	5,0	4,5	4,6	2,0	5,2	1,2	3,7
Lack of teachers	2,5	7,5	1,4	1,8	1,8	5,4	1,7	1,5	1,1	2,8
Poor teaching	3,2	0,7	0,5	1,3	1,3	2,8	2,1	1,0	1,0	1,6
Teachers absent	2,6	1,3	0,9	1,4	1,5	1,9	2,2	2,6	0,8	1,7
Teachers striking	1,8	0,5	0,0	0,6	1,2	0,7	1,1	1,1	1,6	1,1



Figure 6 shows that learners' access to textbooks generally improved slightly between 2014 and 2015. In 2014 the percentage of learners with access to textbooks increased consistently on a quarterly basis from 74% in quarter 1 to 80,4% in quarter 4. Access to textbooks was much more constrained in 2015. In this year (i.e. 2015) only 74,9% of learners had access to textbooks in all their subjects in quarter 1. This increased to 81,1% in quarter 4, slightly higher than the percentage of learners that had access to textbooks in all their subjects during quarter 4 of 2014 (80,4%). It is, however, important to note that a smaller percentage of learners had access to textbooks in most of their subjects in 2015 compared to 2014 except for the second quarter.

**Figure 6: Percentage of persons who attended grade 10– 12 in a public school by their access to text books by quarter, 2014 and 2015**



#### 4.4 School attendance

There were approximately 14,1 million learners at school in 2015. The largest percentage of these learners attended schools in KwaZulu-Natal (22,5%) and (Gauteng (18,5%).

Information about the type of schools that these learners attended revealed that approximately six per cent of learners attended private schools, but there were large variations between provinces as to this type of school attendance. While 16,4% of learners in Gauteng and 5,3% of learners in Western Cape attended private schools, only 3,5% of learners in Northern Cape and 3,1% of learners in Limpopo attended these institutions.

Large variations were also observed in terms of transport used to travel to school. While nearly three-quarters (70%) of learners walked to school, a further 8% used private vehicles. Another 5,1% travelled to school by taxi or minibus taxi. The time it took the learners to get to school also formed part of the survey. This information revealed that more than eighty per cent of learners (82,8%) needed 30 minutes or less to get to school. In addition, it seemed that most learners (84,7%) preferred to attend the nearest institution of its kind to their place of residence.

Figure 7 presents the percentage of individuals attending public schools and who benefited from a school nutrition programme. Almost three-quarters (76,2% ) of learners who attended public schools benefited from school feeding schemes. Learners in Limpopo (94,1%), Eastern Cape (89,2%), Mpumalanga (84,8%) and Northern Cape (84,8%) were the most likely to benefit from this programme while learners in Gauteng 50,4% and Western Cape 55,1% were least likely to benefit

from this type of programme. Large percentage point increases of learners that benefitted from school feeding schemes between 2010 and 2015 are noted in North West (14,4%) and Free State (13,4%). By comparison, the percentage of learners that attended public schools and benefitted from feeding schemes increased by 2,1% percentage points in Western Cape over the same period.

**Figure 7: Percentage of learners attending public schools who benefitted from the school nutrition programme, 2010–2015**




Figure 8 depicts the percentage of individuals attending public schools who benefitted from a school nutrition programme in metropolitan areas. More than half (55,1%) of learners attending public schools in metropolitan areas benefitted from a school feeding scheme. Learners from Nelson Mandela Bay (73,9%), Buffalo City (72,3%) and Mangaung (69,2%) were most likely to benefit from this programme whilst learners from the City of Tshwane (46,7%) and the City of Cape Town (49,2%) were least likely to do so.

**Figure 8: Percentage of learners attending public schools who benefitted from the school nutrition programme by Metropolitan areas, 2015**




Figure 9 shows that the percentage of learners that have experienced corporal punishment at school has been declining consistently on a national level, dropping from 16,7% in 2011 to 11,3% in 2015. Corporal punishment was still prevalent at schools in KwaZulu-Natal (20,2%), Eastern Cape (16,7%) and North West (13,6%) while this sort of punishment was least likely to occur in Western Cape and Gauteng where it was reported for respectively 1,7% and 2,7% of learners.

**Figure 9: Percentage of learners who experienced corporal punishment at school by province, 2011–2015**





Figure 10 shows that corporal punishment was more prevalent at schools in eThekhwini (13,2%) and Mangaung (11,8%) whilst this sort of punishment was less likely to be found in Ekurhuleni (1,1%) and the City of Cape Town (1,3%).

**Figure 10: Percentage of learners who experienced corporal punishment at school by Metropolitan area, 2011–2015**



#### 4.5 Higher education institution attendance


The survey estimates that 710 139 students were enrolled at higher education institutions (universities and universities of technology) in 2015. More than two-thirds (68,5%) of these students were black African, while 18,2% were white; 7,2% were Indian/Asian and 6,2% were coloured.

Even though most students were black African, the student participation rate of this population group remained proportionally low in comparison with the Indian/Asian and white population groups. This can be seen in Figure 11. This figure shows that 4,2% of persons aged 18 to 29 were enrolled at a higher education institution in the country – up from 4% in 2002. An estimated 15,7% of white individuals in this age group and 14,3% of Indian/Asian individuals were enrolled at a university compared to 3,7% of the coloured and 3,1% of the black African population groups.

The study found that 75,7% of students were enrolled at public institutions. More than one-third (41,3%) travelled to their place of study in a private vehicle while more than a quarter 25,8% used a minibus/taxi.

Approximately 89,3% of students paid R4 000 or more per year in tuition fees, and 5,5% reportedly did not pay fees. Only 19,5% of students benefitted from bursaries or fee reductions.

**Figure 11: Percentage distributions of student participation rates for individuals aged 18 to 29 years by population group, 2002 and 2015**



**Figure 12: Percentage distributions of student participation rates for individuals aged 18 to 29 years by Metropolitan areas, 2015**





Figure 12 indicates that 7,8% of persons aged 18 to 29 from Metropolitan areas were enrolled at a higher education institution. High enrolment rates were witnessed in eThekweni (13,2%) and Mangaung (12,0%) respectively. Buffalo City reported that only three per cent of persons aged 18 to 29 were enrolled at a higher education institution.

#### **4.6 Educational attainment of persons aged 20 years and older**

Figure 13 shows that the percentage of individuals aged 20 years and older who have attained Grade 12 has been increasing consistently since 2002, expanding from 21,9% in 2002 to 28,0% in 2015. Over the same period, the percentage of individuals with some post-school education increased from 9,3% to 14,1%. The percentage of individuals without any schooling decreased from 10,6% in 2002 to 5,1% in 2015.


**Figure 13: Percentage distribution of educational attainment for persons aged 20 years and older, 2002–2015**



Note that post-school education refers to any qualification higher than Grade 12.

The percentage of individuals without any formal education is presented in Figure 14. The highest percentage of persons without any schooling was observed in Limpopo (9,8%) and Mpumalanga (8,3%) while the lowest percentages were observed in Western Cape (1,5%) and Gauteng (2,3%). Figure 10 also shows that there were declines in percentages of persons who had no formal schooling in all the provinces over the period 2002 to 2015. The highest percentage point declines since 2002 were observed in Limpopo (10,3%) and Mpumalanga (8,8%).

**Figure 14: Percentage of persons aged 20 years and older with no formal schooling per province, 2002 and 2015**




The survey also investigated functional illiteracy among individuals aged 20 years and older. Functional illiteracy refers to individuals who have either received no schooling or who have not completed Grade 7 yet. According to Figure 15, the percentage of individuals over the age of 20 years who could be regarded as functionally illiterate has declined from 27,3% in 2002 to 15,4% in 2015.

Individuals over the age of 60 years have consistently remained most likely to be functionally illiterate, followed by individuals in the age groups 40–59 and 20–39. Improved access to schooling has led to a significant decline in the percentage of functionally illiterate individuals in the 20–39 age group. Between 2002 and 2015, the prevalence of functional illiteracy in the age group 20–39 years declined noticeably for both men (17,2% to 7,3%) and women (15,6% to 4,8%).

With the exception of women in the age group 20–39, women remain more likely to be functionally illiterate across all age groups. The difference between men and women has, however, declined significantly over time. Whereas women over the age of 60 years were much more likely to be functionally illiterate than males in 2015 (47,4% compared to 38,5%). However, the difference has declined in each successive age group, to the point that women in the age group 20–39 were actually less likely to be functionally illiterate than their male peers in 2015 (4,8% compared to 7,3%).

Literacy rates can be used as a key social indicator of development. A simple definition of literacy is the ability to read and write in at least one language. The simplicity of this measure is, however, complicated by the need to know what is read and written, and for what purpose and also how well it is done. Because it is so difficult to measure literacy, the GHS has historically measured adult literacy rates based on an individual's functional literacy, e.g. whether they have completed at least Grade 7 or not. Since a specific educational achievement is, however, not necessarily a good reflection of an individual's literacy ability, a question that directly measures literacy was introduced in 2009. The question requires respondents to indicate whether they have 'no difficulty', 'some difficulty', 'a lot of difficulty' or are 'unable to' read newspapers, magazines and books in at least one language; or write a letter in at least one language.

**Figure 15: Percentage of persons aged 20 years and older with no formal education or highest level of education less than Grade 7 within each gender group, 2002–2015**







**Figure 16: Adult literacy rates for person aged 20 years and older by province, 2010–2015**

Figure 16 shows that, nationally, the percentage of literate persons over the age of 20 years increased from 91,9% in 2010 to 93,7% in 2015. Provincially, 97,8% of individuals in Western Cape and 97,7% in Gauteng were literate compared to 88,0% of individuals in Northern Cape. According to Figure 17 almost 99% of persons aged 20 years and older were literate in the City of Cape Town, Nelson Mandela Bay and the City of Johannesburg while the lowest literacy rates (94,8%) were recorded for Buffalo City.


**Figure 17: Adult literacy rates for person aged 20 years and older by Metropolitan Areas, 2015**

## 5. Health

### 5.1 Health care provision and quality

Figure 18 shows that the majority of South Africans perceived their health as either 'good' or 'excellent'. A larger percentage of males than females rated their health as 'Excellent' (33,1%) compared to females (30,6%). Coloured individuals were most likely to rate their health as 'Excellent' and least likely to rate it as 'poor'. With the exception of the coloured population group, the figure generally shows very little variation between the self-perceived health assessments of different population groups.

**Figure 18: Percentage distribution of self-reported health status of individuals by sex and population group, 2015**



The type of health-care facility consulted first by households when household members fall ill or have accidents is presented in Figure 19. The figure shows that about 70,5% of households said that they would first go to public clinics or hospitals compared to 25,3% of households that said that they would first consult a private doctor, or go to a private clinic or hospital. Only 0,5% of respondents said that they would first go to a traditional healer. It is noticeable that the percentage of households that would go to public or private facilities have remained relatively constant since 2004 when the question was first asked in the GHS. The percentage of households that would first go to public clinics increased noticeably while those that indicated that they would first go to public hospitals decreased. The large change in the percentage of individuals who used private and public hospitals between 2008 and 2009 is due to a change in the questions that were asked during the two years.

More than nine-tenths (92,8%) of all households used the nearest health facility of its kind. Those who did not use the nearest facility generally travelled elsewhere because:

- They preferred to use a private health institution (40,9%);
- The waiting period was too long (18,9%);
- Drugs that were needed were not available at their nearest facility (7,8%); or
- Staff was rude/uncaring or turned patients away (5,6%).

**Figure 19: Percentage distribution of the type of health-care facility consulted first by the households when members fall ill or get injured, 2004–2015**




Table 6 shows that the users of private healthcare facilities seemed to be more satisfied with those facilities than users of public healthcare facilities across all provinces. Whereas 97,7% of users were satisfied with private facilities (91,9% were very satisfied), only 81,1% of users of public healthcare facilities were somewhat satisfied or very satisfied. Only 57,6% of individuals that used public healthcare facilities were very satisfied. Of those that used private healthcare facilities, households in Limpopo were most likely to be 'very satisfied' (97%) followed by households in Mpumalanga (95,3%) and Western Cape (94,6%). Households in Limpopo (73%) were most likely to be very satisfied with public healthcare facilities while those in Western Cape (45,5%) were least likely to be very satisfied.

**Table 6: Level of satisfaction with public and private healthcare facilities, 2015**

Level of satisfaction with the healthcare institution	Statistic (Numbers in thousands)	Province									
		WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
Public healthcare											
Very satisfied	Number	428	820	133	302	1 202	395	1 449	498	822	6 049
	Per cent	45,5	60,5	60,2	53,3	56,2	50,9	57,0	59,2	73,1	57,6
Somewhat satisfied	Number	204	382	45	110	581	170	574	207	191	2 465
	Per cent	21,8	28,2	20,4	19,4	27,2	21,9	22,6	24,6	17,0	23,5
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Number	97	66	16	55	206	63	231	50	54	838
	Per cent	10,3	4,9	7,5	9,7	9,6	8,1	9,1	5,9	4,8	8,0
Somewhat dissatisfied	Number	79	52	12	46	70	47	127	43	30	506
	Per cent	8,4	3,8	5,4	8,2	3,3	6,0	5,0	5,1	2,6	4,8
Very dissatisfied	Number	132	35	14	53	78	101	159	45	28	645
	Per cent	14,0	2,6	6,6	9,4	3,6	13,1	6,3	5,3	2,5	6,1
Private healthcare											
Very satisfied	Number	716	307	81	262	461	283	1 431	290	209	4 040
	Per cent	94,6	93,5	91,3	89,2	87,8	89,8	91,3	95,3	97,3	91,9
Somewhat satisfied	Number	26	17	4	22	48	25	97	11	3	253
	Per cent	3,5	5,3	4,0	7,4	9,2	7,8	6,2	3,7	1,4	5,8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Number	5	2	2	5	10	4	14	2	1	44
	Per cent	0,6	0,6	2,2	1,6	1,9	1,3	0,9	0,6	0,3	1,0
Somewhat dissatisfied	Number	6	2	0	4	5	2	18	1	1	37
	Per cent	0,7	0,6	0,0	1,2	0,9	0,7	1,1	0,2	0,5	0,9
Very dissatisfied	Number	5	0	2	2	1	1	8	1	1	21
	Per cent	0,6	0,0	2,5	0,7	0,2	0,4	0,5	0,2	0,5	0,5

Totals exclude unspecified cases.


## 5.2 Medical aid coverage

Table 7 shows that, between 2002 and 2015, the percentage of individuals covered by a medical aid scheme increased by approximately 1,6 percentage points to 17,5%. During this time the number of individuals who were covered by a medical aid scheme increased from 7,3 million to 9,5 million persons. Nearly a quarter (23,5%) of South African households had at least one member who belonged to a medical aid scheme.

**Table 7: Medical aid coverage, 2002–2015**

Indicator (Numbers in thousands)	Year										
	2002	2004	2006	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Number covered by a medical aid scheme	7 296	7 331	6 871	8 156	8 698	9 146	8 450	9 285	9 732	9 625	9 458
Number not covered by a medical aid scheme	38 325	39 600	41 337	41 253	41 168	41 474	42 888	42 658	43 048	43 572	44 599
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>45 620</b>	<b>46 930</b>	<b>48 208</b>	<b>49 410</b>	<b>49 866</b>	<b>50 621</b>	<b>51 337</b>	<b>51 943</b>	<b>52 780</b>	<b>53 197</b>	<b>54 057</b>
Percentage covered by a medical aid scheme	15,9	15,6	14,2	16,5	17,4	18,1	16,5	17,9	18,4	18,1	17,5
Do not know	135	60	36	98	20	23	18	51	36	48	68
Unspecified	53	29	25	54	337	252	224	281	166	456	308
<b>Total population</b>	<b>45 809</b>	<b>47 019</b>	<b>48 270</b>	<b>49 561</b>	<b>50 223</b>	<b>50 896</b>	<b>51 580</b>	<b>52 275</b>	<b>52 982</b>	<b>53 701</b>	<b>54 433</b>

Figure 20 shows that individuals were more likely to be covered by medical aid schemes in Gauteng 27,7% and Western Cape (24,2%) and least likely to be members of these schemes in Limpopo (8,5%) and Eastern Cape (10,7%). According to Figure 21 the individuals that were more likely to be covered by medical aid schemes were in the City of Tshwane (33%) and those least likely to be members of these schemes were found in eThekweni (19,2%). It should however be noted that the total for all metros (26,4%) exceeds the national average of 17,5%.

**Figure 20: Percentage of individuals who are members of medical aid schemes per province, 2010–2015**

**Figure 21: Percentage of individuals who are members of medical aid schemes per Metropolitan area, 2015**





Figure 22 shows that almost three-quarters (73,3%) of white individuals were members of a medical aid scheme compared to 44,5% of Indian/Asian individuals while only a paltry 10,6% of black Africans had such membership. It is still worth noting that the overall percentage of individuals covered by a medical scheme in the whole country is still worryingly low at 17,5%.


**Figure 22: Percentage of individuals who are members of medical aid schemes by population group, 2015**



### 5.3 Teenage pregnancy

The questionnaire asked whether any females between the ages of 12 and 50 years were pregnant during the 12 months before the survey. Figure 22 shows that 5,3% of females in the age group 14–19 years were pregnant during the 12 months before the survey. The prevalence of pregnancy increased with age, rising from 0,6% for females aged 14 years, to 9,7% for females aged 19 years.

**Figure 23: Percentage of females aged 14–19 who were pregnant during the year preceding the survey, 2015**



## 6. Disability

The questions used for disability were developed by the Washington Group and were first introduced in the 2009 questionnaire. These questions require each person in the household to rate their ability level for a range of activities such as seeing, hearing, walking a kilometre or climbing a flight of steps, remembering and concentrating, self-care, and communicating in his/her most commonly used language, including sign language. During the analysis, individuals who said that they had some difficulty with two or more of the activities or had a lot of difficulty, or were unable to perform any one activity, were classified as disabled. The analysis was only confined to individuals aged 5 years or older as children below the age of five years may often be mistakenly categorised as being unable to walk, remember, communicate or care for themselves when it may be due to their level of development rather than any innate disabilities they might have. The findings are presented in Table 8.



**Table 8: Persons aged 5 years and older with disability by gender and province, 2015**

Indicator	Statistic (number in thousands)	Province									
		WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
Male	Number	129	193	33	62	215	113	223	74	94	1 136
	Per cent	4,7	6,9	6,7	5,1	4,7	6,8	3,6	4,0	4,0	4,7
Female	Number	132	211	42	96	301	131	256	96	126	1 392
	Per cent	4,5	6,7	7,6	7,4	6,0	7,9	4,2	4,9	4,7	5,5
<b>Total</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>2 528</b>
	<b>Per cent</b>	<b>4,6</b>	<b>6,8</b>	<b>7,1</b>	<b>6,3</b>	<b>5,4</b>	<b>7,4</b>	<b>3,9</b>	<b>4,5</b>	<b>4,4</b>	<b>5,1</b>
Subtotal	Number	5 690	5 957	1 063	2 510	9 552	3 306	12 210	3 768	5 007	49 061
Unspecified	Number	11	11	1	4	31	14	62	20	15	170
<b>Total</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>5 701</b>	<b>5 968</b>	<b>1 064</b>	<b>2 514</b>	<b>9 583</b>	<b>3 320</b>	<b>12 272</b>	<b>3 788</b>	<b>5 022</b>	<b>49 231</b>

Using this classification system, 5,1% of South Africans aged 5 years and older were classified as disabled in 2015. A larger percentage of women (5,5%) than men (4,7%) were classified as disabled. North West (7,4%), Northern Cape (7,1%) and Eastern Cape (6,8%) presented the highest prevalence of disability in the country. Since older populations are more likely to have a higher prevalence of disability, the lower prevalence in Gauteng and Limpopo could be ascribed to the relatively youthful population that is often associated with net in-migration in these provinces.


## 7. Social security services

The percentage of individuals that benefited from social grants consistently increased from 12,7% in 2003 to 30,1% in 2015. Concurrently, the percentage of households that received at least one grant increased from 29,9% in 2003 to 45,5% in 2015. This is presented in Figure 24.

Figure 25 summarises the provincial distribution of individuals and households that benefited from social grants in 2015. More than one-third of individuals in Eastern Cape (40,3%), Limpopo (38,2%), Northern Cape (36,9%) and KwaZulu-Natal (36,8%) were grant beneficiaries, compared to 17,5% in Gauteng and 22% in Western Cape. Similarly, more than half of households in Northern Cape (59,9%), Eastern Cape (59,2%), Limpopo (57,6%), KwaZulu-Natal (53,1%), Free State (52,4%) and Mpumalanga (51,3%) received at least one form of grant compared to 30,8% of households in Gauteng and 37% of households in Western Cape.

More than one-third of black African individuals (33,5%) received a social grant, compared to 27% of coloured individuals, and 12% of Indian/Asian individuals. By comparison, only 6,3% of the white population received grants. Caution should be exercised when analysing the statistics on social grants as these are generally dependant on individuals being the ones who have to actively apply for grants instead of the government identifying them as needing such.

**Figure 24: Percentage of households and persons who have benefited from social grants, 2003–2015**



**Figure 25: Percentage of individuals and households benefiting from social grants per province, 2015**





Figure 26 demonstrates distribution of individuals and households that benefited from social grants by metropolitan areas in 2015. More than one-third of households in all metros except the City of Johannesburg (29,1%) were grant beneficiaries. Less than two in ten individuals in the City of Johannesburg (16,8%), Ekurhuleni(17,3%), the City of Tshwane (17,4%) and the City Cape of Town (19,1%) benefited from social grants compared to 31,1% in Nelson Mandela Bay, 31% in Buffalo City, 27,9% in eThekweni; and 27,3% in Mangaung.

**Figure 26: Percentage of individuals and households benefiting from social grants per metropolitan area, 2015**




## 8. Religious affiliation and observance

Table 9 shows that an estimated 86% of South Africans were affiliated to the Christian religion, while 5,4% professed to following ancestral, tribal, animist or other traditional religions. An estimated 1,9% of the population considered themselves Muslim while 5,2% did not follow any religion in particular. The latter figure was particularly high in Limpopo (14,4%). Only 0,2% of individuals were estimated to be Jewish.

Individuals were most likely to be Christians in Northern Cape (98,4%), Free State (97,7%) and least likely to be so in KZN (78,5%) where 12,3% of individuals followed ancestral, tribal, animist or other traditional African religions and 3,3% professed following 'nothing in particular'. The highest concentrations of Muslims were found in Western Cape (5,3%) and Gauteng (2,4%), while the highest percentage of Hindus was found in KwaZulu-Natal (3,3%).

**Table 9: Percentage distribution of religious affiliation by province, 2015**

Religious affiliation	Province (per cent)									
	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
Christian	87,8	83,5	98,4	97,7	78,5	93,3	87,1	93,2	79,9	86,0
Muslim	5,3	0,4	0,9	0,6	2,0	1,5	2,4	0,8	0,9	1,9
Ancestral, tribal, animist or other traditional African religions	2,8	8,6	0,0	1,4	12,3	3,0	2,3	4,0	4,5	5,4
Hindu	0,4	0,1	0,0	0,0	3,3	0,1	0,8	0,1	0,0	0,9
Jewish	0,5	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,1	0,2
Other religion	0,7	0,2	0,3	0,1	0,5	0,1	0,6	0,4	0,2	0,4
Nothing in particular	2,6	7,2	0,3	0,1	3,3	2,1	6,3	1,5	14,4	5,2
Do not know	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>

**Figure 27: Percentage distribution of religious observance by religious affiliation, 2015**

Religious observance by religious affiliation is explored in Figure 27. Just over seven-tenths (75,6%) of individuals that followed the Muslim faith attended religious services and ceremonies (excluding weddings and funerals) at least once per week. By comparison, 52,5% of Christians and 36,6% of Hindus attended services on a weekly basis. The most infrequent participation in services were noted for individuals that said they followed ancestral, tribal, animist or other traditional African religions. Individuals affiliated to this religion (16,7%) were most likely to never attend religious services followed by Muslims (8,4%) and Hindus (6,6%).

## 9. Housing

One of the major objectives of the GHS is to collect information from households regarding their access to a range of basic services as well as their general living conditions. In this regard, this section presents selected findings over the period 2002 to 2015. The analyses will focus on the type of dwellings in which South African households live and then on the extent of use of state-subsidised housing as well as the perceived quality thereof.

### 9.1 Housing types and ownership

The characteristics of the dwellings in which households live and their access to various services and facilities provide an important indication of the well-being of household members. It is widely recognised that shelter satisfies a basic human need for physical security and comfort.

Figure 28 shows the percentage of households according to their tenure status. The percentage of households that fully owned the dwellings they inhabited increased slightly from 52,9% in 2002 to 61,4% in 2008, before declining to 53,8% in 2015. This increase (in 2008) was accompanied by a decrease of about six percentage points for households that partially owned their houses, and a slight increase in the percentage of households that rented accommodation. Households that maintained 'other' tenure arrangements increased from 11,7% in 2002 to 13,6% in 2015.

**Figure 28: Percentage distribution of dwelling ownership status for households living in formal dwellings, 2002–2015**



Figure 29 shows that in 2015, more than three-quarters (78,1%) of South African households lived in formal dwellings, followed by 14,1% who lived in informal dwellings, and 6,9% in traditional dwellings. The highest concentration of households in Limpopo (90,5%) lived in formal dwellings, followed by the households in Northern Cape (86,1%). Although the highest concentration of informal dwellings were found in North West (22%) and Gauteng (21%), it is worth noting though that the majority of households in these two provinces lived in formal dwellings: with 77,5% of North West households living in formal dwellings and 77,2% of Gauteng living in formal households. More than one-fourth of households (27,8%) in Eastern Cape resided in traditional dwellings compared to 17,7% of households in KwaZulu-Natal.

**Figure 29: Percentage of households that lived in formal, informal and traditional dwellings by province, 2015**





Figure 30 depicts that more than three-quarters (78,5%) of households in metropolitan areas lived in formal dwellings followed by 19,2% who lived in informal dwellings and 1,1% in traditional dwellings. Nelson Mandela Bay had no households in the sample who lived in a traditional dwellings while Buffalo City (5,6%) and eThekweni (5,2%) had the highest percent of households living in traditional dwellings.

**Figure 30: Percentage of households that lived in formal, informal and traditional dwellings by provincial Metropolitan area, 2015**



Findings from the General Household Survey on the percentage of dwelling units with six rooms or more per population group is depicted in Figure 31. The number of rooms includes all rooms in the dwelling (including toilets and bathrooms). This question reflects the standard of living of the household and can be tied to other characteristics such as education or perceived wealth status. White-headed (82,3%) and Indian/Asian headed (78,5%) households were much more likely to live in dwellings with six or more rooms than coloured-headed (41,3%) or black African-headed (33,8%) households

**Figure 31: Percentage of dwelling units with six rooms or more by population group of the household head, 2015**



## 9.2 State-subsidised housing

The GHS 2015 included a number of questions aimed at establishing the extent to which subsidised housing provided by the state was used, the quality of these dwellings as well as the use of housing waiting lists. At the time of the survey, 14,4% of South African households were living in 'RDP' or state-subsidised dwellings. Figure 32 shows that the percentage of households that received a government housing subsidy increased from 5,5% in 2002 to 14,4% in 2015. Female-headed households were more likely to have received housing subsidies (18%) than male-headed households in 2015 (12%). This is in line with government policies that give preference to households headed by individuals from vulnerable groups, including females, and individuals with disabilities.

**Figure 32: Percentage of households that received a government housing subsidy by sex of the household head, 2002–2015**








Figure 33 shows the change in the percentage of households that received subsidised dwellings between 2002 and 2015 by province. The largest change was observed in Free State (+16,1%), followed by North West (+11,6%) and Western Cape (+9,9%). The slowest growth was observed in Northern Cape (+3,3%).

As a result of the concerns raised by community groups about the quality of state-provided housing, a number of questions were included in the GHS questionnaires to facilitate an analysis of the extent of problems experienced by households with the construction of these dwellings. Respondents were asked to indicate whether the walls and roof of their dwellings were: very good, good, needed minor repairs, weak or very weak. Figure 34 shows that 14,2% of households with subsidised dwellings reported weak or very weak walls while 13,8% reported the same for their roofs. Responses vary across provinces. Households in Eastern Cape, Western Cape and Northern Cape were least satisfied with the quality of walls and roofs, while those in Limpopo complained least about walls (6,3%) and roofs (7,6%).

**Figure 33: Provincial percentage of households that received housing subsidies**




**Figure 34: Percentage of households that said that their 'RDP' or state-subsidised house had weak or very weak walls and/or roof by province, 2015**




## 10. Household sources of energy

The percentage of South African households that were connected to the mains electricity supply increased from 77,1% in 2002 to 85,5% in 2015. This is presented in Figure 35. The largest increases (in percentage points) were noted in Eastern Cape (+27 percentage points), Limpopo (+20,4 percentage points), KwaZulu-Natal (+12,8 percentage points) and Mpumalanga (+11,9 percentage points). The percentage of households with access to mains electricity increased by less than two percentage points in Western Cape over this time, while the percentage of households with access to mains electricity actually declined by 3,9 percentage points between 2002 and 2015 in Gauteng. The decline noted in Gauteng is almost certainly linked to the high influx of migrants and creation of informal dwellings. Households in Limpopo (92,9%) and Northern Cape (92,4%) were most likely to have access to electricity, while those in KwaZulu-Natal (81,7%) and Eastern Cape (82,3%) were least likely to have access.

The main sources of energy used by households for cooking during the period 2002 to 2015 are presented in Figure 36. The figure shows that the percentage of households that used electricity for cooking increased from 58% in 2002 to 78,1% in 2015. Concurrently, the use of paraffin and fire wood declined. The percentage of households that used paraffin declined from 16,2% in 2002 to 5,4% in 2015, while the percentage of households that used firewood decreased from 19,3% to 9,3%. The percentage of households that used gas increased from 2,2% in 2002 to 3,5% in 2015.

**Figure 35: Percentage of households connected to the mains electricity supply by province, 2002–2015**

The main sources of energy used for cooking in 2015 by province are presented in Figure 37. The use of electricity as a main source of energy for cooking was highest in Free State (86,9%), Northern Cape (85,9%) and Western Cape (85,4%) and lowest in more rural provinces such as Limpopo (60%), Eastern Cape (73%) and Mpumalanga (74%) where alternative fuels such as wood are, perhaps, more accessible and affordable. More than one-tenth of households in Eastern Cape (10,1%) used paraffin as their main source of energy for cooking compared to only 1,5% in Western Cape and Limpopo (1,9%). The use of wood was particularly noticeable in Limpopo (35,0%), Mpumalanga (16%), KwaZulu-Natal (15,3%) and Eastern Cape (11,1%). Less than one per cent of households usually used wood for cooking in Western Cape and Gauteng (0,7% and 0,5% respectively). The use of gas was more common in Western Cape (10%), Northern Cape (5,3%) and Eastern Cape (4,2%).

**Figure 36: Percentage distribution of main sources of energy used for cooking by year, 2002–2015**



**Figure 37: Percentage distribution of main sources of energy used for cooking by province, 2015**




Figure 38 presents information on households that rated their electrical supply services as 'good'. The figure shows that households in Western Cape (73,3%), Limpopo (71,3%) and Mpumalanga (68,2%) rated their electricity supply services as 'good', while only 46,4% of households in Eastern Cape and 50,6% of households in Gauteng did likewise. Having dropped between 2011 and 2012, the percentage of households in the country that rated electricity supply as 'good' increased to 66,5% in 2014 before dropping to 60,2% in 2015.

**Figure 38: Percentage of household rating the quality of electrical supply services as 'good', 2010–2015**





Figure 39 shows that 23,6% of households that paid for electricity, either through bills or buying pre-paid electricity, reported that they had electrical interruptions in the six months before they were surveyed. The prevalence of interruptions was highest in North West (60,6%), Mpumalanga (35,9%) and Gauteng (33,9%). Limpopo (1,4%), Free State (5,6%) and KwaZulu-Natal (7,2%) reported the least interruptions.


**Figure 39: Percentage of households that paid for electricity that reported having had electricity interruptions during the six months before the survey, 2015**



## 11. Water access and use

The proportion of households with access to piped or tap water in their dwellings, off-site or on-site by province is presented in Figure 40. There were very high proportions of households in Western Cape (99,2%), Gauteng (97,7%), Northern Cape (96,5%) and Free State (96,1%) that had access to water either inside their dwellings, off-site, or on-site than in other provinces. Since 2002, the percentage of households in Eastern Cape with access to water increased by 19 percentage points to 75%. By contrast, the percentage of households with easy access to water (as defined above) in Eastern Cape declined from 80,5% to 75% between 2013 and 2015. As a result Eastern Cape was rated as the province in which households had the poorest access to water in 2015.

**Figure 40: Percentage of households with access to piped or tap water in their dwellings, off-site or on-site by province, 2002–2015**



The proportion of households with access to piped or tap water in their dwellings, off-site or on-site by metropolitan area is presented in Figure 41. There were very high proportions of households in the City of Cape Town (99,5%), Mangaung (99%), Nelson Mandela Bay (98,9%), the City of Johannesburg (98,5%) and Ekurhuleni (98,5%) that had access to water either in their dwellings, off-site, or on-site. The City of Tshwane (95,6%) recorded the lowest percentage of households with access to water either in their dwellings, off-site, or on-site in 2015. However, this was still higher than the national average (89,4%) for all settlement types as presented in Figure 40.

**Figure 41: Percentage of households with access to piped or tap water in their dwellings, off-site or on-site by Metropolitan areas, 2015**






Table 10 presents a comparison of the main sources of drinking water used by households. An estimated 45,8% of households had access to piped water in their dwellings in 2015. A further 27% accessed water on site while 14% relied on communal taps and 2,7% relied on neighbours' taps. Although generally households' access to water improved, 4,4% of households still had to fetch water from rivers, streams, stagnant water pools, dams, wells and springs in 2015. This is a decrease of more than five percentage points from 9,5% of households that had to access water from these sources in 2002.

**Table 10: Comparison of the main water source for drinking used by households, 2002–2015**

Water source	Statistic	Year											
		2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Piped water in dwelling	Number	4 409	4 607	4 980	5 163	5 611	5 622	5 862	6 294	6 504	6 845	7 221	7 385
	Percentage	40,8	40,4	41,2	41,6	43,7	42,3	42,7	44,4	44,5	45,3	46,3	45,8
Piped water on site	Number	3 009	3 367	3 681	3 838	3 501	3 743	4 019	4 106	4 055	4 051	4 213	4 354
	Percentage	27,8	29,5	30,5	30,9	27,3	28,1	29,3	29	27,7	26,8	27,0	27,0
Borehole on site	Number	290	188	141	155	155	190	157	212	203	259	293	259
	Percentage	2,7	1,6	1,2	1,3	1,2	1,4	1,1	1,5	1,4	1,7	1,9	1,6
Rainwater tank on site	Number	142	38	49	61	68	44	45	91	82	74	68	120
	Percentage	1,3	0,3	0,4	0,5	0,5	0,3	0,3	0,6	0,6	0,5	0,4	0,7
Neighbour's tap	Number	60	260	250	265	336	358	346	388	424	388	426	431
	Percentage	0,6	2,3	2,1	2,1	2,6	2,7	2,5	2,7	2,9	2,6	2,7	2,7
Public/communal tap	Number	1 465	1 682	1 852	1 910	1 996	2 201	2 131	2 008	2 307	2 290	2 180	2 247
	Percentage	13,6	14,7	15,3	15,4	15,6	16,5	15,5	14,2	15,8	15,2	14,0	13,9
Water-carrier/tanker	Number	68	69	134	123	146	171	200	134	199	230	198	304
	Percentage	0,6	0,6	1,1	1	1,1	1,3	1,5	0,9	1,4	1,5	1,3	1,9
Borehole off-site/communal	Number	300	297	273	199	248	209	177	183	165	189	199	229
	Percentage	2,8	2,6	2,3	1,6	1,9	1,6	1,3	1,3	1,1	1,3	1,3	1,4
Flowing water/stream/river	Number	606	519	390	406	442	507	433	374	336	382	420	379
	Percentage	5,6	4,5	3,2	3,3	3,4	3,8	3,2	2,6	2,3	2,5	2,7	2,4
Stagnant water/dam/pool	Number	77	62	30	52	37	30	41	53	30	42	55	35
	Percentage	0,7	0,5	0,2	0,4	0,3	0,2	0,3	0,4	0,2	0,3	0,4	0,2
Well	Number	146	113	124	64	70	50	37	75	55	71	77	90
	Percentage	1,3	1,0	1	0,5	0,5	0,4	0,3	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,5	0,6
Spring	Number	208	196	158	146	188	119	208	172	191	143	148	186
	Percentage	1,9	1,7	1,3	1,2	1,5	0,9	1,5	1,2	1,3	0,9	0,9	1,2
Other	Number	28	17	24	26	32	59	75	82	70	143	105	103
	Percentage	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,4	0,5	0,6	0,5	1,0	0,7	0,6
Subtotal	Number	10 806	11 413	12 087	12 409	12 830	13 303	13 731	14 172	14 620	15 107	15 601	16 122
	Percentage	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Unspecified	Number	8	12	20	76	55	0	0	1	11	0	0	0
Total	Number	10 814	11 425	12 107	12 485	12 885	13 303	13 731	14 173	14 631	15 107	15 601	16 122

Table 11 confirms that the number and percentage of households with access to piped water had increased since 2002, and that 13,6 million households had access to piped water in 2015 compared to 9,3 million in 2005. The increase in the percentage of households with access to water coincided with a decline in the percentage of households who paid for the piped water they received. The proportion of households who reported paying for water has been declining steadily over the past decade, dropping from 61,9% in 2005 to only 43,9% in 2015.

Less than two-thirds (62,0%) of households rated the water services as 'good' in 2015. Although this is slightly higher than the 60,1% recorded in 2012, it is much lower than the 76,4% approval rating reported in 2005. The percentage of users who rated water services as average increased from 15,8% in 2005 to 31,8% in 2009, before it eventually declined to 25,5% in 2015. The percentage of households that rated water services as 'poor' increased from 7,8% in 2005 to 12,5% in 2015. This deterioration in levels of satisfaction is mirrored by an increase over time in the percentage of households who feel that their water is not clean, clear, does not taste or is free of bad smells.

**Table 11: Access to piped municipal water supplies, payment and service ratings for local municipalities, 2005–2015**

Access to piped water	Statistic	Year										
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Yes	Number	9 369	9 254	9 976	9 619	11 100	11 724	11 932	12 372	12 858	13 231	13 603
	Percentage	79,9	76,6	80,2	75,0	83,9	86,5	85,6	85,9	86,4	85,9	85,9
No	Number	2 358	2 826	2 467	3 208	2 131	1 833	2 015	2 022	2 020	2 164	2 225
	Percentage	20,1	23,4	19,8	25,0	16,1	13,5	14,4	14,1	13,6	14,1	14,1
Subtotal	Number	11 727	12 080	12 443	12 827	13 231	13 557	13 947	14 394	14 878	15 395	15 828
	Percentage	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Unspecified/ do not know	Number	26	27	42	59	72	173	227	237	228	207	58
Total	Number	11 753	12 107	12 485	12 886	13 303	13 730	14 174	14 631	15 106	15 602	15 886
Pay for water		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Yes	Number	5 794	5 991	6 375	6 417	5 471	5 483	5 601	5 586	5 720	5 742	5 937
	Percentage	61,9	65,0	64,2	67,3	49,3	46,8	47,2	45,3	44,5	43,7	43,9
No	Number	3 569	3 221	3 560	3 113	5 616	6 220	6 266	6 745	7 124	7 404	7 602
	Percentage	38,1	35,0	35,8	32,7	50,7	53,2	52,8	54,7	55,5	56,3	56,1
Subtotal	Number	9 363	9 212	9 935	9 530	11 087	11 703	11 867	12 331	12 844	13 146	11 950
	Percentage	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Unspecified	Number	7	42	41	88	12	21	65	41	14	84	64
Total	Number	9 370	9 254	9 976	9 618	11 099	11 724	11 932	12 372	12 858	13 230	12 014

**Table 12: Access to piped municipal water supplies, payment and service ratings for local municipalities, 2005–2015 (concluded)**

Water services ratings		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Good	Number	7 141	6 784	7 177	5 844	6 399	7 398	7 369	7 380	8 077	8 035	8 379
	Percentage	76,4	73,5	72,1	61,1	58,0	63,6	62,1	60,1	63,2	61,4	62,0
Average	Number	1 472	1 818	2 039	2 785	3 511	3 152	3 347	3 415	3 207	3 457	3 450
	Percentage	15,8	19,7	20,5	29,1	31,8	27,1	28,2	27,8	25,1	26,4	25,5
Poor	Number	730	634	734	939	1 127	1 089	1 159	1 490	1 488	1 592	1 688
	Percentage	7,8	6,9	7,4	9,8	10,2	9,4	9,8	12,1	11,7	12,2	12,5
Subtotal	Number	9 343	9 236	9 950	9 568	11 037	11 639	11 875	12 285	12 772	13 084	13 517
	Percentage	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Unspecified	Number	27	18	25	51	63	85	57	87	86	146	86
Total	Number	9 370	9 254	9 975	9 619	11 100	11 724	11 932	12 372	12 858	13 230	13 603

*The totals used as the denominator to calculate percentages are excluded from unspecified responses. Levels of satisfaction with water services were not measured prior to 2005.*

Figure 42 shows a comparison of the percentage of households that rated the water services they received from municipalities as 'good' and the percentage that reported water interruptions. An inverse relationship between the perceived quality of services and the number of interruptions seems to exist. The provinces with the lowest percentage of households that reported interruptions with water services, namely Western Cape (3%) and North West (6,6%), also reported the highest satisfaction with water delivery services (86,4% for Western Cape, and 76,8% for North West). Conversely, the provinces in which interruptions were more frequent were less likely to rate water service delivery as 'good'. Whereas 60,9% of households in Limpopo and 59,4% of households in Mpumalanga reported having had interruptions, only 32,4% of households in Limpopo and 40,2% of households in Mpumalanga rated water service delivery as 'good'.



**Figure 42: Percentage of households rating the quality of water services provided by the municipality as good, and those that reported water interruptions, by province, 2015**


Figure 43 shows a comparison of the percentage of households that rated the water services they received from metropolitan municipalities as 'good' and the percentage that reported water interruptions. An inverse relationship between the perceived quality of services and the number of interruptions seems to exist. The metropolitan areas with the lowest percentage of households that reported interruptions with water services were the City of Cape Town (3,6%) and Nelson Mandela Bay (5,9%). Nearly a third (31%) of households living in Mangaung had problems with interruptions. The metropolitan areas that reported the highest satisfaction with water delivery services were the City of Cape Town (87,8%), eThekweni (84,4%) and the City of Johannesburg (79,6%).

**Figure 43: Percentage of households rating the quality of water services provided by the municipality as good, and those that reported water interruptions, Metropolitan Areas, 2015**



The functionality of municipal water supply services measures the extent to which households that received water from a municipality had reported, over the 12 months before the survey, interruptions that lasted more than 2 days at a time, or more than 15 days in total during the whole period. Figure 44 shows that households in Limpopo (60,9%) and Mpumalanga (59,4%) consistently reported the most interruptions, while Western Cape (3,1%) and Gauteng (6,6%) experienced the least interruptions. More than one-quarter (25,4%) of South African households reported some dysfunctional service with their water supply in 2015.

**Figure 44: Percentage distribution of households that received municipal water and that reported water interruptions that lasted more than 2 days at a time by province, 2010–2015**



**Figure 45: Percentage distribution of households that received municipal water and that reported water interruptions that lasted more than 2 days at a time by province, 2010–2015**




Figure 45 shows that households in Mangaung (31,1%) and Buffalo City (15,2%) reported the most interruptions, while the City of Cape Town (3,6%) and Nelson Mandela Bay (5,9%) experienced the least interruptions.

Households' perceptions regarding the quality of water they drink are presented in Table 12. It seems as if households in Eastern Cape and Mpumalanga have consistently, since 2005, been the most displeased with the quality of water they received while those in Western Cape and Gauteng have been the most satisfied. Although the proportion of households in South Africa complaining about the safety of water remained stable between 7,7% in 2005 and 7,5% in 2015, improvements were noted in Eastern Cape (from 23,9% to 17,1%). While households' perceptions of water safety generally did not improve between 2011 and 2015, a larger percentage of households in Free State (+7,0 % percentage points) felt that their water was more unsafe to drink compared to 2005. In 2015, households in Eastern Cape (17,1%) have been most unhappy with their water safety, followed by households in Mpumalanga (16,8%) and Free State (12,3%)

**Table 13: Perceptions of households regarding the quality of the water they drink per province, 2005–2015**

Year	Perception	Statistic (numbers in thousands)	Province									
			WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
2005	Not safe to drink	Number	23	349	13	39	264	27	28	73	90	905
		Percentage	1,8	23,9	5,3	5,3	12,9	3,0	0,9	8,6	8,0	7,7
	Not clear	Number	32	335	16	49	254	45	45	93	91	959
		Percentage	2,4	22,9	6,3	6,7	12,4	5,0	1,5	11,0	8,1	8,2
	Not good in taste	Number	37	373	22	57	269	45	45	76	154	1 078
		Percentage	2,9	25,5	8,8	7,9	13,1	5,0	1,5	8,9	13,7	9,2
	Not free from bad smells	Number	44	312	14	46	272	79	46	74	96	983
		Percentage	3,4	21,4	5,6	6,4	13,3	8,7	1,5	8,7	8,6	8,4
2006	Not safe to drink	Number	18	289	17	47	254	35	48	106	61	876
		Percentage	1,3	19,6	6,6	6,5	12,1	3,8	1,5	12,1	5,3	7,3
	Not clear	Number	32	285	20	55	247	37	60	135	59	931
		Percentage	2,4	19,3	8,0	7,5	11,8	4,0	1,9	15,3	5,1	7,7
	Not good in taste	Number	21	312	22	58	261	41	67	121	116	1 019
		Percentage	1,6	21,1	8,8	7,8	12,4	4,5	2,1	13,7	10,0	8,4
	Not free from bad smells	Number	39	256	14	49	249	46	74	114	61	903
		Percentage	2,9	17,3	5,4	6,7	11,9	5,0	2,3	13,0	0,5	7,5
2007	Not safe to drink	Number	20	256	11	40	229	27	28	101	89	800
		Percentage	1,4	17,1	4,3	5,3	10,6	2,9	0,8	11,1	7,5	6,4
	Not clear	Number	30	231	12	48	228	56	31	106	84	826
		Percentage	2,2	15,4	4,7	6,3	10,6	5,8	0,9	11,6	7,1	6,6
	Not good in taste	Number	24	263	18	52	230	54	40	110	139	930
		Percentage	1,8	17,5	6,8	6,9	10,7	5,7	1,2	12,1	11,7	7,5
	Not free from bad smells	Number	33	221	10	46	229	51	25	108	86	807
		Percentage	2,4	14,7	4,0	6,1	10,6	5,3	0,8	11,8	7,2	6,5
2009	Not safe to drink	Number	27	306	18	70	204	52	54	116	99	946
		Percentage	1,9	19,8	6,4	8,8	8,9	5,2	1,5	11,9	7,8	7,1
	Not clear	Number	35	313	19	69	228	52	50	145	90	1 002
		Percentage	2,4	20,2	7,1	8,8	9,9	5,2	1,4	14,7	7,2	7,5
	Not good in taste	Number	47	371	22	70	222	55	57	132	134	1 109
		Percentage	3,2	24,0	8,0	8,8	9,7	5,5	1,6	13,5	10,6	8,3
	Not free from bad smells	Number	74	296	12	42	243	44	37	102	87	937
		Percentage	5,0	19,1	4,3	5,4	10,6	4,4	1,0	10,4	6,9	7,1

**Table 14: Perceptions of households regarding the quality of the water they drink per province, 2005–2015 (continued)**

Year	Perception	Statistic (numbers in thousands)	Province									
			WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
2010	Not safe to drink	Number	14	306	34	49	264	77	57	157	89	1 046
		Percentage	0,9	19,6	12,2	6,1	11,3	7,4	1,5	15,5	6,8	7,7
	Not clear	Number	22	335	42	69	222	82	64	166	83	1 084
		Percentage	1,5	21,4	14,9	8,5	9,5	7,9	1,7	16,5	6,4	7,9
	Not good in taste	Number	34	367	41	61	209	97	71	170	150	1 200
		Percentage	2,2	23,5	14,6	7,6	8,9	9,3	1,9	16,8	11,6	8,8
	Not free from bad smells	Number	25	250	32	54	201	69	89	137	74	932
		Percentage	1,6	16	11,4	6,8	8,6	6,7	2,4	13,6	5,7	6,8
2011	Not safe to drink	Number	45	246	35	41	236	60	75	107	60	905
		Percentage	2,9	15,5	12,0	5,0	9,9	5,6	2,0	10,2	4,5	6,4
	Not clear	Number	51	241	40	53	221	72	88	109	59	936
		Percentage	3,3	15,2	14,0	6,5	9,2	6,7	2,2	10,4	4,4	6,6
	Not good in taste	Number	60	268	45	47	207	77	93	116	114	1026
		Percentage	3,8	16,9	15,5	5,7	8,6	7,2	2,3	11,1	8,5	7,3
	Not free from bad smells	Number	48	186	24	40	203	41	71	99	53	765
		Percentage	3,1	11,8	8,3	4,8	8,4	3,8	1,8	9,5	4,0	5,4
2012	Not safe to drink	Number	46	238	24	127	191	50	115	156	72	1020
		Percentage	2,9	14,7	8,2	15,1	7,7	4,6	2,8	14,4	5,2	7,0
	Not clear	Number	62	243	35	138	177	74	114	141	69	1 052
		Percentage	3,9	15,0	11,7	16,5	7,2	6,8	2,8	13,1	5,0	7,3
	Not good in taste	Number	67	247	31	127	174	76	130	164	131	1 147
		Percentage	4,2	15,3	10,6	15,2	7,0	6,9	3,2	15,2	9,5	7,9
	Not free from bad smells	Number	54	182	21	127	226	54	98	126	65	954
		Percentage	3,4	11,3	7,3	15,1	9,2	5,0	2,4	11,7	4,7	6,6
2013	Not safe to drink	Number	29	209	41	149	222	106	94	150	112	1 110
		Percentage	1,7	12,6	13,5	17,3	8,6	9,3	2,2	13,3	7,8	7,4
	Not clear	Number	44	204	46	173	210	130	115	157	109	1 189
		Percentage	2,7	12,4	15,1	20,1	8,2	11,4	2,7	14,0	7,7	7,9
	Not good in taste	Number	41	243	46	169	207	133	124	175	194	1 332
		Percentage	2,5	14,7	15,1	19,7	8,1	11,7	2,9	15,6	13,5	8,9
	Not free from bad smells	Number	28	125	33	156	203	107	104	135	150	1 043
		Percentage	1,7	7,6	10,9	18,1	7,9	9,5	2,4	12,0	10,5	6,9
2014	Not safe to drink	Number	25	252	46	124	244	91	116	162	118	1 178
		Percentage	1,4	14,9	14,8	14,2	9,2	7,8	2,6	14,1	8,0	7,6
	Not clear	Number	32	238	50	156	233	113	136	143	125	1 227
		Percentage	1,8	14,1	16,1	17,8	8,8	9,6	3,0	12,6	8,4	7,9
	Not good in taste	Number	42	298	50	148	231	111	139	179	183	1 382
		Percentage	2,5	17,7	16,1	17,0	8,7	9,5	3,1	15,7	12,4	8,9
	Not free from bad smells	Number	28	145	39	139	222	90	131	117	123	1 034
		Percentage	1,7	8,7	12,5	15,9	8,5	7,7	3,0	10,4	8,3	6,7



**Table 15: Perceptions of households regarding the quality of the water they drink per province, 2005–2015 (concluded)**

Year	Perception	Statistic (numbers in thousands)	Province									
			WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
2015	Not safe to drink	Number	29	295	33	111	250	109	90	200	86	1 205
		Percentage	1,7	17,1	10,3	12,3	9,1	9,0	1,9	16,8	5,7	7,5
	Not clear	Number	51	226	41	162	247	134	104	208	97	1 271
		Percentage	2,9	13,1	12,8	17,9	9,0	11,1	2,2	17,4	6,4	7,9
	Not good in taste	Number	50	334	36	120	253	136	106	212	166	1 413
		Percentage	2,8	19,4	11,4	13,3	9,3	11,2	2,3	17,8	10,9	8,8
	Not free from bad smells	Number	54	176	21	135	234	116	94	173	94	1 097
		Percentage	3,1	10,3	6,7	14,9	8,5	9,6	2,0	14,5	6,2	6,8

*The total used as the denominator to calculate percentages excluded unspecified responses on the quality of water. Perceptions related to water quality were not measured prior to 2005.*

## 12. Sanitation and refuse removal

Environmental hygiene plays an essential role in the prevention of many diseases. It also impacts on the natural environment and the preservation of important natural assets, such as water resources. Proper sanitation is one of the key elements in improving environmental sanitation.

Figure 46 identifies the percentage of households per province that had access to RDP standard toilet facilities, i.e. flush toilets connected to a public sewerage system or a septic tank, and a pit toilet with a ventilation pipe. Nationally, the percentage of households with access to 'RDP—standard' sanitation increased from 62,3% in 2002 to 80% in 2015. The majority of households in Western Cape (93,3%) and Gauteng (91%) had access to adequate sanitation, while about half those in Limpopo (54%) and just below two-thirds of those in Mpumalanga (65,8%) had adequate access. It is notable that access to adequate sanitation grew most rapidly in Eastern Cape (+48,2 percentage points) between 2002 and 2015.




**Figure 46: Percentage of households that have access to improved sanitation per province, 2002–2015**

Figure 47 identifies the percentage of households per metropolitan area that had access to RDP standard toilet facilities, i.e. flush toilets connected to a public sewerage system or a septic tank, and a pit toilet with a ventilation pipe. The majority of households in the City of Johannesburg (96,9%) and Nelson Mandela Bay (94,6%) had access to RDP standard toilet facilities, while households in the City of Tshwane (82,0%) and eThekweni (83,5%) were the least likely to have to RDP standard toilet facilities.

**Figure 47: Percentage of households that have access to improved sanitation by Metropolitan areas, 2015**




**Figure 48: Percentage of households that have no toilet facility or that have been using bucket toilets per province, 2002–2015**



Despite the improved access to RDP-standard sanitation facilities, many households continue to be without any proper sanitation facilities. Figure 48 shows the percentage of households that either had no sanitation facilities or that had to use bucket toilets. Nationally, the percentage of households that continued to live without proper sanitation facilities had been declining consistently between 2002 and 2015, decreasing from 12,3% to 4,7% during this period. The most rapid decline over this period was observed in Eastern Cape (-29,1%), Limpopo (-13,8%), Free State (-11,0%) and Northern Cape (-9,9%).

A set of questions were introduced in GHS 2013 in order to assess the quality of the sanitation facilities to which households had access to sanitation facilities. Figure 49 outlines the extent to which households that share toilet facilities, regardless of its modality, have experienced some of the issues raised in the questionnaire. About one-quarter (24,7%) of households were concerned by poor lighting and inadequate hygiene (22,2%), while 18,2% felt that their physical safety were threatened when using the toilet. About one-fifth (18,5%) complained that there was no water to wash their hands after they had used the toilet, and another 16,7% pointed to long waiting times. Only 10,3% of households complained that the toilets were not properly enclosed. Only 4,8% of households complained that there were breakages in the municipal system and 7,5% of the household had blocked up toilets.

**Figure 49: Problems experienced by households that share sanitation facilities during the six months before the survey, 2015**



The proper disposal of household waste and refuse is important to maintain environmental hygiene of the households' neighbourhoods. Figure 50 shows that the percentage of households for which refuse was removed at least once per week increased from 56,7% in 2002 to 64% in 2015, while the percentage of households that had to rely on their own or communal rubbish dumps, or who had no facilities at all, decreased over the same period.



**Figure 50: Percentage distribution of household refuse removal, 2002–2015**

Figure 51 shows that the majority of households in metropolitan areas refuse is being removed at least once a week while a smaller percentage of households reported that they had to rely on their own or communal rubbish dumps. The highest percentage of households for which refuse was removed at least once per week was observed in the City of Johannesburg (95,3%) and Mangaung (92,4%).

**Figure 51: Percentage distribution of household refuse removal by Metropolitan areas, 2015**

The national figures, however, hide large discrepancies between particularly rural and urban areas, but also between urban and metropolitan areas. Households in urban areas were much more likely to receive some rubbish removal service than those in rural areas, and rural households were therefore much more likely to rely on their own rubbish dumps. This information is presented in Table 13.

**Table 16: Households refuse removal by province and geotype, 2015**

Province	Geotype	Removed at least once a week	Removed less often than once a week	Communal refuse dump	Own refuse dump	Dump or leave rubbish anywhere	Other	Total
Western Cape	Rural	44,6	2,5	15,7	35,0	1,5	0,8	100,0
	Urban	97,2	0,8	0,5	0,6	0,6	0,4	100,0
	Metro	90,1	1,6	7,7	0,2	0,4	0,0	100,0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>89,6</b>	<b>1,4</b>	<b>6,1</b>	<b>2,2</b>	<b>0,5</b>	<b>0,2</b>	<b>100,0</b>
Eastern Cape	Rural	0,4	0,4	0,7	92,8	1,9	3,8	100,0
	Urban	64,0	5,7	1,4	26,2	0,9	1,8	100,0
	Metro	64,3	21,7	3,0	9,6	1,3	0,0	100,0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>36,0</b>	<b>8,7</b>	<b>1,6</b>	<b>50,1</b>	<b>1,5</b>	<b>2,1</b>	<b>100,0</b>
Northern Cape	Rural	17,1	2,3	3,8	61,6	8,1	7,1	100,0
	Urban	86,2	3,0	1,6	5,3	2,6	1,3	100,0
	Metro	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>66,9</b>	<b>2,8</b>	<b>2,2</b>	<b>21,0</b>	<b>4,2</b>	<b>2,9</b>	<b>100,0</b>
Free State	Rural	1,1	0,6	1,9	64,0	27,9	4,6	100,0
	Urban	85,7	2,2	0,7	5,9	5,6	0,0	100,0
	Metro	92,4	1,3	2,2	3,0	0,8	0,3	100,0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>75,9</b>	<b>1,7</b>	<b>1,3</b>	<b>13,1</b>	<b>7,3</b>	<b>0,7</b>	<b>100,0</b>
KwaZulu-Natal	Rural	4,6	0,5	2,6	88,2	4,1	0,1	100,0
	Urban	68,1	3,5	3,9	22,6	1,9	0,1	100,0
	Metro	84,6	0,9	3,6	10,5	0,4	0,1	100,0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>49,5</b>	<b>1,3</b>	<b>3,3</b>	<b>43,6</b>	<b>2,2</b>	<b>0,1</b>	<b>100,0</b>
North West	Rural	33,0	2,2	1,4	59,6	3,9	0,0	100,0
	Urban	82,6	2,4	3,2	5,4	6,2	0,1	100,0
	Metro	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>57,1</b>	<b>2,3</b>	<b>2,3</b>	<b>33,3</b>	<b>5,0</b>	<b>0,1</b>	<b>100,0</b>
Gauteng	Rural	34,5	10,6	18,0	34,6	2,3	0,0	100,0
	Urban	89,9	3,9	1,3	1,9	2,8	0,3	100,0
	Metro	91,1	0,9	3,1	2,6	2,3	0,1	100,0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>90,5</b>	<b>1,4</b>	<b>3,0</b>	<b>2,8</b>	<b>2,3</b>	<b>0,1</b>	<b>100,0</b>
Mpumalanga	Rural	8,5	1,2	3,0	81,4	5,9	0,0	100,0
	Urban	79,2	2,2	1,8	13,8	3,0	0,0	100,0
	Metro	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>39,5</b>	<b>1,6</b>	<b>2,5</b>	<b>51,8</b>	<b>4,7</b>	<b>0,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>
Limpopo	Rural	4,8	0,5	1,1	89,9	3,1	0,6	100,0
	Urban	75,1	8,7	3,3	9,6	3,3	0,0	100,0
	Metro	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>21,4</b>	<b>2,4</b>	<b>1,6</b>	<b>70,9</b>	<b>3,1</b>	<b>0,5</b>	<b>100,0</b>
South Africa	Rural	9,6	1,0	2,2	81,7	4,4	1,1	100,0
	Urban	81,2	3,4	2,0	10,0	3,1	0,4	100,0
	Metro	87,9	2,7	3,9	3,9	1,5	0,1	100,0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>63,5</b>	<b>2,4</b>	<b>2,9</b>	<b>28,0</b>	<b>2,8</b>	<b>0,4</b>	<b>100,0</b>

Table 13 shows that households in Gauteng (90,5%) and Western Cape (89,6%) were most likely to have had their refuse removed at least once per week, while households in Limpopo (21,4%), Eastern Cape (36,0%) and Mpumalanga (39,5%) were least likely to have had regular refuse removal. Various modes of refuse removal are closely aligned with particular geographic areas. Households in urban and metropolitan areas were most likely to have had refuse removal services which are usually provided through local municipalities, while rural areas mostly relied on their own refuse dumps. Nationally, more than nine-tenths (86,1%) of households in rural areas discarded refuse themselves compared to only 13,3% of households in urban, and 5,4% of households in metropolitan areas. The latter households were most likely to be in informal settlement type areas. In 2015, 54% of South African households were paying for the removal of their refuse. In addition to the 61,2% of households for whom refuse was removed on a weekly basis by the municipality, the municipality less frequently removed refuse for a further 1,8% of households.

### 13. Telecommunications

Figure 52 summarises statistics collected on access to functional landlines and cellular phones within the sampled dwelling units in 2015. Nationally, only 3,5% of households did not have access to either landlines or cellular phones. Households without access to these communication media were most common in Northern Cape (11,1%) and Eastern Cape (7,0%). Merely 0,1% of South African households used only landlines. By comparison, 85,5% of South African households had the use of only cellular phones in their dwellings/ households. The largest percentages were observed in Mpumalanga (94,4%), Limpopo (94,1%), North West (89,5%) and Free State (89,0%). Western Cape had the lowest percentage of households who had only cellular phones in their dwellings (69,2%) and this province also had the highest percentage of households that were using only landlines (0,2%). The use of a combination of both cellular phones and landlines in households was most prevalent in the more affluent provinces, namely Western Cape (26,2%) and Gauteng (14,1%).

**Figure 52: Percentage of households who have a functional landline and cellular telephone in their dwellings by province, 2015**




Figure 53 shows that households without access to these communication media were most common in Buffalo City (6,6%), Nelson Mandela Bay (5,9%) and Mangaung (3,6%). Merely 0,1% of South African households living in metropolitan areas used only landlines, but as many as 81,1% of South African households living in metropolitan areas used only cellular phones in their dwellings. The largest percentages for cellular phones usage were observed in Mangaung (88,5%), Ekurhuleni (86,1%), and Buffalo City (84,7%). The City of Cape Town (69,3%) had the lowest percentage of households who had only cellular phones in their dwellings. The use of a combination of both cellular phones and landlines in households was most prevalent in the City of Cape Town (28,3%) and eThekweni (17,6%).

**Figure 53: Percentage of households who have a functional landline and cellular telephone in their dwellings by Metropolitan areas, 2015**





Figure 54 shows that 53,5% of South African households had at least one member who had access to or used the Internet either at home, work, place of study or Internet cafés. Access to the Internet using all available means was highest in Gauteng (65,7%), Western Cape (63,3%) and Mpumalanga (55,7%). The lowest was in Limpopo (39,6%) and KwaZulu-Natal (42,3%). Nearly one-tenth of South African households had access to the Internet at home. Access to the Internet at home was highest among households in Western Cape (21,4%) and Gauteng (15,6%), and lowest in Limpopo (1,3%) and North West (3,6%).



**Figure 54: Percentage of households with access to the Internet at home, or for which at least one member has access to or used the Internet by province, 2015**



The places where the largest percentages of South Africans tend to access the Internet include, at work (15,1%), within the household/ at home (9,7%), and at school/university/college (5,1%).

Table 14 shows that households in rural areas had the least access to the Internet while those in metro areas generally had the best access. Households in Western Cape (21,4%) and Gauteng (15,6%) were most likely to access the Internet at home while households in Limpopo (1,3%) were least likely to have done so. While 16% of households in metropolitan areas had access to the Internet, only 1,2% of households in the rural areas of Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal (1,1%), North West (0,9%) and Limpopo (0,5%) enjoyed the same access. Households were generally more likely to have access to the Internet at work than at home or at Internet cafes or at educational institutions. Households in Gauteng and Western Cape were most likely to access the Internet at work while those in Limpopo were least likely to do so.



**Table 17: Households' access to the Internet by place of access, geotype and province, 2015**

Place Internets accessed	Geotype	Province (per cent)									
		WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
At home	Metro	25,2	10,8	NA	10,1	8,2	NA	16,4	NA	NA	16,0
	Urban	14,4	4,9	7,0	4,5	6,0	6,5	10,6	7,9	3,7	7,5
	Rural	12,6	1,2	4,5	4,1	1,1	0,9	10,2	6,0	0,5	2,1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>21,4</b>	<b>5,2</b>	<b>6,3</b>	<b>6,1</b>	<b>4,9</b>	<b>3,6</b>	<b>15,6</b>	<b>6,8</b>	<b>1,3</b>	<b>9,6</b>
At work	Metro	22,7	19,9	NA	13,9	21,7	NA	24,5	NA	NA	23,1
	Urban	13,9	12,2	11,6	9,7	20,7	12,5	14,6	15,5	15,7	14,4
	Rural	4,7	1,1	4,9	3,8	4,7	4,1	11,7	5,7	2,8	3,7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>19,1</b>	<b>9,8</b>	<b>9,7</b>	<b>10,0</b>	<b>14,7</b>	<b>8,2</b>	<b>23,1</b>	<b>9,9</b>	<b>5,8</b>	<b>15,0</b>
Using mobile devices	Metro	63,7	53,1	NA	56,7	36,3	NA	56,9	NA	NA	54,7
	Urban	39,4	50,3	51,6	45,2	48,8	50,6	58,7	63,1	50,5	51,1
	Rural	12,3	29,5	33,4	36,1	28,8	39,9	54,7	45,5	31,9	33,7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>53,6</b>	<b>41,9</b>	<b>46,4</b>	<b>47,1</b>	<b>36,2</b>	<b>45,1</b>	<b>57,1</b>	<b>53,2</b>	<b>36,3</b>	<b>47,6</b>
At Internet Cafes or educational facilities	Metro	15,5	13,6	NA	6,8	9,5	NA	16,7	NA	NA	14,9
	Urban	9,5	8,1	2,2	7,0	9,5	6,3	6,9	7,1	2,4	7,0
	Rural	0,8	1,3	2,6	6,6	4,2	5,3	1,2	5,0	0,9	3,1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>12,9</b>	<b>6,9</b>	<b>2,3</b>	<b>6,9</b>	<b>7,4</b>	<b>5,8</b>	<b>15,3</b>	<b>5,9</b>	<b>1,2</b>	<b>9,3</b>

Using mobile devices to access the Internet comprises access on cellular telephones or using mobile access devices such as 3G cards. It is clear from Table 14 that mobile access to the Internet has made it much more accessible to households in rural areas. Whereas only 2,1%, 3,7% and 3,1% of households respectively had access to the Internet at home, at work and elsewhere, More than a third (33,7%) had access through mobile devices. Mobile devices also created opportunities in urban areas where larger proportions of urban and metropolitan households had access to the Internet through mobile devices in Western Cape and Gauteng.

## 14. Transport


Table 15 shows that than two-thirds (66,5%) of the individuals attending school walked to get there. A further 9,3% travelled by private car while another 6,9% used taxis. The most commonly used mode of transport to travel to work was a private car (33,0%), followed by taxis (22,9%) and walking (20,0%). The study found that 11,8% of the working population worked from home and that they therefore had no need for transport.

**Table 18: Mode of transport used by household members to travel to school and work, 2015**

Mode of transport	Statistic (Numbers in thousands)	Usual transport to school	Usual transport to work
Walking	Number	10 328	3 344
	Percentage	66,5	20,0
Bicycle/motorcycle	Number	125	163
	Percentage	0,8	0,97
Minibus taxi/sedan taxi/bakkie taxi	Number	1 076	3 846
	Percentage	6,9	22,9
Bus	Number	563	927
	Percentage	3,6	5,5
Train	Number	95	532
	Percentage	0,6	3,2
Minibus/bus provided by institution/government and not paid for	Number	385	Na
	Percentage	2,5	Na
Vehicle hired by a group of parents	Number	1 460	Na
	Percentage	9,4	Na
Own car or other private vehicle	Number	1 449	5 529
	Percentage	9,3	33,0
Lift club	Number	Na	381
	Percentage	Na	2,3
None, studies/works from home	Number	Na	1 975
	Percentage	Na	11,8
Other	Number	51	70
	Percentage	0,3	0,4
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>15 481</b>	<b>16 767</b>
	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>
Unspecified	Number	235	213
<b>Total</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>15 716</b>	<b>16 980</b>

The transport questions focus primarily on the use of public and/or state-subsidised transport, the cost of transport to households and the types of transport and time needed to travel to work, school and healthcare facilities. Figure 55 shows that 38,1% of South African households had at least one household member who used a minibus taxi/sedan taxi/bakkie taxi during the week preceding the survey. Provinces with the highest levels of use of minibus taxis were: Gauteng (43,1%), North West (42,9%), Mpumalanga (42,8%) and KwaZulu-Natal (37,7%). By comparison, only seven per cent of South African households used a bus during the preceding week. It is notable that 17,5% of households in Mpumalanga used the bus. The use of trains was most common in Western Cape (11,5%) and Gauteng (7,5%).

**Figure 55: Percentage of households who made use of public transport during the week preceding the survey by province, 2015**




## 15. Environmental trends

The GHS includes a number of questions on the environment, the most important of which has been included in the questionnaire from 2003 onwards, and which specifically asks households whether they have experienced any of a list of environmental problems in the area where they live. Figure 56 summarises these responses between 2003 and 2015. The figure reveals that waste removal problems and littering<sup>1</sup> (39,0%) as well as land degradation and soil erosion (31,2%) were the two environmental problems that concerned the highest percentage of households. Strikingly, the percentage of households that considered land degradation and soil erosion a problem increased from 15,5% in 2003 to 34,4% in 2014 before dropping to 31,2% in 2015. The proportion of households that felt that there were problems with littering and waste removal in their areas increased notably since 2003 when 28,8% of households regarded this as a problem. The percentage of households that perceived water pollution as a problem has fluctuated significantly before settling on 16,2% in 2015. Households that considered air pollution to be a problem decreased from 22,8% in 2003 to 19,5% in 2015.

<sup>1</sup>The question related to waste removal/littering was asked slightly differently in 2009 in that the two categories were separated in 2009, whilst it was combined as an option in the previous years. For the purposes of comparison they were grouped together again for 2009. This slight modification may also have contributed to the higher number of households concerned about waste removal/littering.


Figure 57 reveals that waste removal problems and littering (34,7%) as well as air pollution (19,1%) were the two environmental problems that concerned the highest percentage of households in metros. The highest percentage of households that perceived waste removal problems and littering were observed in Mangaung (45,6%) and Buffalo City (45,0%), while the lowest percentage was observed in Nelson Mandela Bay (26,9%) and City of Cape Town (27,7%). The highest percentage of households that perceived air pollution problems were observed in Buffalo City (32,3%) and Ekurhuleni (22,7%) while the lowest percentage was observed in Nelson Mandela Bay (10,8%) and City of Cape Town (14,3%).

**Figure 56: Percentage of households who experience specific kinds of environmental problems, 2003–2015**



During the 12 months preceding the survey, 46,6% of households used pesticides in their dwellings and 12,7% used pesticides in their yards. A further 7,9% used herbicides in their yards or gardens. Most South Africans are aware of the need to save resources.

**Figure 57: Percentage of households who experience specific kinds of environmental problems, 2003–2015**



## 16. Household assets and sources of income

Household assets influence the extent to which households can diversify their livelihoods. Asset poverty is an economic and social condition that is more persistent and prevalent than income poverty. Figure 58 shows that 29,8% of households owned at least one vehicle, and that about one-fifth (20,3%) owned one or more computers. More than eight-tenths of households owned television sets (80,8%) and electric stoves (84,9%), while more than one-third (33,8%) owned washing machines.

Households in urban and metropolitan areas were much more likely to own any of the assets used in Figure 58 than households in rural areas. The figure also shows that households in urban areas were generally more likely to own these assets than households in non-metropolitan/ rural areas. While a large percentage of rural households owned electric stoves (73,9%), televisions (69%) and refrigerators (57,7%), their ownership of vehicles (13,9%), washing machines (13,8%) and computers (7,5%) were much more limited. By contrast, three-quarters or more of metropolitan and urban households owned refrigerators, televisions and electric stoves, while ownership of computers, vehicles and washing machines was also more common.



**Figure 58: Percentage distribution of households by selected assets owned, by geotype, 2015**



Figure 59 summarises the percentage of households according to the various sources of income reported by households. Nationally, salaries (65,5%) and grants (46,2%) were reported as income sources by the highest percentages of households. Provincially, the largest percentage of households that earned salaries were found in Western Cape (76,8%) and Gauteng (75%). Grants were more prevalent than salaries as a source of income in Eastern Cape (59,8%) and Limpopo (58,9%). Remittances as a source of income played an important role in most provinces, but especially in Eastern Cape (24,4%), Limpopo (23,7%) and Mpumalanga (21,3%).

**Figure 59: Percentage distribution of sources of household income by province, 2015**

A specific household can have more than one source of income. Percentages therefore do not add up to 100%.

Households' main sources of income are presented in Figure 60. Nationally, 58,0% of households reported salaries/wages/commission as their main sources of income, followed by grants (21,7%), other sources (9,6%) and remittances (7,9%). Considerable provincial variations are notable. Western Cape (70,4%) and Gauteng (70,0%) were the only two provinces in which more than two-thirds of households reported salaries as their main sources of income. By comparison, a large dependence on social grants was noticed in Eastern Cape (37,6%), Limpopo (33,2%), Northern Cape (32,1%) and KwaZulu-Natal (28,0%). Fourteen per cent of Limpopo households listed remittances as their main source of income.

Households' main sources of income by metropolitan area are presented in Figure 61. The majority of households living in metropolitan areas, 68,9%, reported salaries/wages/commission as their main source of income, followed by other sources (11,7%), grants (11,5%) and remittances (4,8%). The City of Johannesburg (71,6%), City of Cape Town (71,0%) and City of Tshwane (71,0%) were the only three metropolitan areas in which more than three-quarters of households reported salaries as their main sources of income. By comparison, a large dependence on other sources was noticed in the City of Johannesburg (14,2%), Ekurhuleni (13,3%), Mangaung (12,4%) and the City of Cape Town (12,2%). More than a quarter, 27,6%, of Nelson Mandela Bay households listed grants as their main source of income.

**Figure 60: Percentage distribution of main source of household income by province, 2015****Figure 61: Percentage distribution of main source of household income by province, 2015**



## 17. Access to food

Between 2002 and 2008, the GHS has asked households to indicate whether, and how often adults and children went hungry because there was not enough food in the household. The question was discontinued in 2009 but reinstated in the 2010 questionnaire. Figure 62 shows that the percentage of persons that experienced hunger decreased from 29,3% in 2002 to 13,7% in 2007, before rebounding slightly to 15,9% in 2008. The percentage dropped to 13,1% in 2015. The percentage of households who were vulnerable to hunger reflects the same pattern as persons. The percentage of households that were vulnerable to hunger declined from 23,8% in 2002 to 11,3% in 2015, including a spell during which the percentage increased to 16% in 2008 before continuing its decline.

Since 2009, the GHS questionnaire has also included a set of questions based on the Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) to determine households' access to food. These questions aim to measure households' food access by asking households about modifications they made in their diet or eating patterns during the previous month because of limited sources available where they can obtain food. The index provides a slightly more sensitive measure of food access than the question on hunger. The question used in 2009 was expanded in 2010 with the addition of a question on possible decreases in the variety of foods consumed. The index seems to reflect a similar pattern, though it is slightly higher.

Figure 62 shows that the percentage of households that had limited access to food decreased from 23,9% in 2010 to 22,6% in 2015. Simultaneously, the percentage of persons with more limited access to food declined from 28,6% in 2010 to 26,4% in 2015.

**Figure 62: Vulnerability to hunger and access to food, 2002–2008; 2010–2015**




Figure 63 shows that food access problems were the most common in North West where 39% of households had inadequate or severely inadequate food access. Inadequate or severely inadequate access to food were also observed in Mpumalanga (31,7%), Northern Cape (31,3%) and Eastern Cape (28,4%).

**Figure 63: Percentage of households experiencing food adequacy or inadequacy by province, 2015**





Figure 64 shows that 17,7% of households living in metropolitan areas reported that they are experiencing food access problems. Food access problems were most common in the City of Cape Town (31%), Nelson Mandela Bay (28,9%) and Mangaung (25,5%).


**Figure 64: Percentage of households experiencing food adequacy or inadequacy by province, 2015**



## 18. Agriculture

Figure 65 shows that less than one-fifth of South African households (16,9%) were involved in agricultural production activities during the reference period. Of these, 11,8% cultivated farmland while 91,3% created backyard gardens.

**Figure 65: Percentage of households involved in agricultural activities by province, 2015**



It is clear from Figure 66 that, nationally, more than three-quarters (77,9%) of households that were involved in agriculture were involved in an attempt to secure an additional source of food. Provincially, 93,2% of households in Limpopo, 84,5% of households in Eastern Cape and 77,6% of households in Mpumalanga wanted to augment their existing sources of food. Half (50,8%) of households in Western Cape used agriculture as a leisure activity. In Northern Cape, 19,5% of households attempted to create an additional source of income through agriculture. It is noticeable that almost one-fifth (17,2%) of households that were involved in agriculture in KwaZulu-Natal, reported that they did so to create a main source of food. Since agriculture is not so common in Gauteng (see Figure 48) this finding might point to the fact that many households that do engage in it do so as a last option.


**Figure 66: Percentage distribution of the main reasons for agricultural involvement by province, 2015**

Table 16 shows that, of the households that were engaged in agricultural production, 51,6% cultivated grains, while 50,8% grew fruit and vegetables. Livestock was produced by 34,3% of the households, while 33,7% produced poultry.

**Table 19: Nature of agricultural production activities per province, 2015**

Production activity	Statistic (Numbers in thousands)	Province									
		WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	SA
Livestock production	Number	5	315	20	20	257	87	3	71	151	929
	Percentage	7,2	54,9	49,6	12,3	46,3	62,3	1,7	20,8	22,5	34,3
Poultry production	Number	5	354	6	21	236	72	9	93	116	912
	Percentage	6,5	61,7	15,7	13,2	42,5	52,1	5,7	27,0	17,3	33,7
Grains and food crops	Number	3	331	2	15	329	8	15	188	507	1 399
	Percentage	3,6	57,6	3,8	9,3	59,3	6,0	10,1	54,9	75,8	51,6
Industrial crops	Number	0	3	0	1	4	0	2	1	4	14
	Percentage	0,0	0,5	0,0	0,4	0,8	0,0	1,0	0,2	0,7	0,5
Fruit and vegetable crops	Number	63	269	17	141	170	28	131	226	331	1 377
	Percentage	86,2	46,9	42,9	86,7	30,7	20,1	85,8	65,9	49,5	50,8
Fodder grazing/ pasture grass of animals	Number	4	6	1	4	8	1	5	5	7	40
	Percentage	4,9	1,0	3,3	2,6	1,4	0,4	3,5	1,5	1,0	1,5
Forestry	Number	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	3
	Percentage	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,8	0,2	0,0	0,1
Fish farming/aquaculture	Number	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
	Percentage	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2	0,0	0,1
Game farming	Number	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
	Percentage	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,1
Other	Number	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	9
	Percentage	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,2	0,1	0,3

A particular household can be involved in more than one activity and percentages therefore do not add up to 100%.

Only 12,1% of the households involved in agriculture reported getting agricultural-related support from the government during the year preceding the survey. The only provinces where significant support was provided for farming households were KwaZulu-Natal (18,1%), Eastern Cape (24,1%) and Northern Cape (12,9%). Nationally, slightly more than three per cent (2,1%) of the households reported receiving training and 6,8% received dipping/ livestock vaccination services.

## 19. Technical notes

### 19.1 Methodology and fieldwork

A multi-stage design was used in this survey, which is based on a stratified design with probability proportional to size selection of primary sampling units (PSUs) at the first stage and sampling of dwelling units (DUs) with systematic sampling at the second stage. After allocating the sample to the provinces, the sample was further stratified by geography (primary stratification), and by population attributes using Census 2011 data (secondary stratification). Survey officers employed and trained by Stats SA visited all the sampled dwelling units in each of the nine provinces. During the first phase of the survey, sampled dwelling units were visited and informed about the coming survey as part of the publicity campaign. The actual interviews took place four weeks later. A total of 21 601 households (including multiple households) were successfully interviewed during face-to-face interviews.

Two hundred and thirty-three enumerators (233) and 62 provincial and district coordinators participated in the survey across all nine provinces. An additional 27 quality assurers were responsible for monitoring and ensuring questionnaire quality. National refresher training took place over a period of two days. The national trainers then trained provincial trainers for two days at provincial level.

### 19.2 The questionnaire

Table 17 summarises the details of the questions included in the GHS questionnaire. The questions are covered in 10 sections, each focusing on a particular aspect. Depending on the need for additional information, the questionnaire is adapted on an annual basis. New sections may be introduced on a specific topic for which information is needed or additional questions may be added to existing sections. Likewise, questions that are no longer necessary may be removed.

**Table 20: A summary of the contents of the GHS 2015 questionnaire**

Section	Number of questions	Details of each section
<b>Cover page</b>		Household information, response details, field staff information, result codes, etc.
<b>Flap</b>	7	Demographic information (name, sex, age, population group, etc.)
<b>Section 1</b>	41	Biographical information (education, health, disability, welfare)
<b>Section 2</b>	13	Health and general functioning
<b>Section 3</b>	6	Social grants and social relief
<b>Section 4</b>	16	Economic activities
<b>Section 5</b>	59	Household information (type of dwelling, ownership of dwelling, electricity, water and sanitation, environmental issues, services, transport, etc.)
<b>Section 6</b>	11	Communication, postal services and transport
<b>Section 7</b>	15	Health, welfare and food security
<b>Section 8</b>	29	Households Livelihoods (agriculture, household income sources and expenditure)
<b>Section 9</b>	7	Mortality in the last 12 months
<b>Section 10</b>	3	Questions to interviewers
<b>All sections</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>Comprehensive coverage of living conditions and service delivery</b>

The GHS questionnaire has undergone some revisions over time. These changes were primarily the result of shifts in focus of government programmes over time. The 2002–2004 questionnaires were very similar. Changes made to the GHS 2005 questionnaire included additional questions in the education section with a total of 179 questions. Between 2006 and 2008, the questionnaire remained virtually unchanged. For GHS 2009, extensive stakeholder consultation took place during which the questionnaire was reviewed to be more in line with the monitoring and evaluation frameworks of the various government departments. Particular sections that were modified substantially during the review were the sections on education, social development, housing, agriculture, and food security. Even though the number of sections and pages in the questionnaire remained the same, questions in the GHS 2009 were increased from 166 to 185 between 2006 and 2008. Following the introduction of a dedicated survey on Domestic Tourism, the section on tourism was dropped for GHS 2010. Due to a further rotation of questions, particularly the addition of a module on mortality in 2014, the GHS 2015 questionnaire contained 207 questions.

### 19.3 Response rates

The national response rate for the survey was 90,5%. The highest response rate (98,8%) was recorded in Limpopo and the lowest in Gauteng (78,0%).

**Table 21: Response rates per province, GHS 2015**

Province / Metropolitan Area	Response rates
<b>Western Cape</b>	<b>91,7</b>
Non-Metro	93,2
City of Cape Town	91,0
<b>Eastern Cape</b>	<b>94,8</b>
Non-Metro	96,7
Buffalo City	92,5
Nelson Mandela Bay	89,5
<b>Northern Cape</b>	<b>95,0</b>
<b>Free State</b>	<b>95,0</b>
Non Metro	95,4
Mangaung	94,1
<b>KwaZulu-Natal</b>	<b>95,2</b>
Non-Metro	96,6
eThekweni	92,9
<b>North West</b>	<b>95,0</b>
<b>Gauteng</b>	<b>78,0</b>
Non-Metro	93,6
Ekurhuleni	81,8
City of Johannesburg	71,1
City of Tshwane	75,5
<b>Mpumalanga</b>	<b>97,2</b>
<b>Limpopo</b>	<b>98,8</b>
<b>South Africa</b>	<b>90,5</b>

## 19.4 Data revisions

Stats SA revised the population model to produce mid-year population estimates during 2013 in the light of the Census 2011 finding. The new data have been used to adjust the benchmarking for all previous datasets. Weighting and benchmarking were also adjusted for the provincial boundaries that came into effect in 2011. The data for the GHS 2002 to 2015 as presented in this release are therefore comparable.

As a result of statistical programs used for weighting, which discard records with unspecified values for the benchmarking variables, namely age, sex and population group, it became necessary to impute missing values for these variables. A combination of logical and hot-deck imputation methods were used to impute the demographic variables of the whole series from 2002 to 2015.

Household estimates, developed using the UN headship ratio methodology, were used to calibrate household files. The databases of Census 1996, Census 2001, Community Survey 2007 and Census 2011 were used to analyse trends and develop models to predict the number of households for each year. The weighting system was based on tables for the expected distribution of household heads for specific age categories, per population group and province.

Missing values and unknown values were excluded from totals used as denominators for the calculation of percentages, unless otherwise specified. Frequency values have been rounded off to the nearest thousand. Population totals in all tables reflect the population and sub-populations as calculated with SAS and rounded off. This will not always correspond exactly with the sum of the preceding rows because all numbers are rounded off to the nearest thousand.

## 19.5 Limitations of the study

The questionnaires for the GHS series were revised extensively in 2009 and some questions might not be exactly comparable to the data series before then. Please refer to Section 19.10 for more details about the questions that are not comparable. Analysts and users of the data are also advised not to do a comparative analysis over time before studying the questionnaires of the years concerned in detail, as there have also been small modifications to options to a number of questions that are not highlighted in Section 19.10.

In addition to changes to the questions, the data collection period has also changed since 2002. Between 2002 and 2008 data were gathered during July. The data collection period was extended to 3 months (July to September) between 2010 and 2012. As from 2013, the data collection period was extended to 12 months (January to December). Although the extension is not necessarily a limitation, it should be borne in mind when using the data for comparative purposes.

## 19.6 Sample design

The General Household Survey (GHS) uses the Master Sample frame which has been developed as a general-purpose household survey frame that can be used by all other Stats SA household-based surveys having design requirements that are reasonably compatible with the GHS. The GHS 2015 collection was based on the 2013 Master Sample. This Master Sample is based on information collected during the 2011 Census conducted by Stats SA. In preparation for Census 2011, the country was divided into 103 576 enumeration areas (EAs). The census EAs, together with the auxiliary information for the EAs, were used as the frame units or building blocks for the formation of primary sampling units (PSUs) for the Master Sample, since they covered the entire country and had other information that is crucial for stratification and creation of PSUs. There are 3 324 primary sampling units (PSUs) in the Master Sample with an expected sample of approximately 33 000

dwelling units (DUs). The number of PSUs in the current Master Sample (3 324) reflect an 8,0% increase in the size of the Master Sample compared to the previous (2008) Master Sample (which had 3 080 PSUs). The larger Master Sample of PSUs was selected to improve the precision (smaller coefficients of variation, known as CVs) of the GHS estimates.

The Master Sample is designed to be representative at provincial level and within provinces at metro/non-metro levels. Within the metros, the sample is further distributed by geographical type. The three geography types are Urban, Tribal and Farms. This implies, for example, that within a metropolitan area, the sample is representative of the different geography types that may exist within that metro.

The sample for the GHS is based on a stratified two-stage design with probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling of PSUs in the first stage, and sampling of dwelling units (DUs) with systematic sampling in the second stage.

**Table 22: Comparison between the 2007 (old) Master Sample and the new Master Sample (designed in 2013)**


	<b>2007 Master Sample (GHS 2008-2014)</b>	<b>2013 Master Sample (GHS 2015 onwards)</b>
Design	Two-stage stratified design	Two-stage stratified design
Number of primary sampling units (PSUs)	3 080 PSUs	3 324 PSUs
Number of dwelling units (DUs)	Approximately 30 000 DUs	Approximately 33 000 DUs
Stratification	No stratification by geo-type within metros/non-metros	Stratification by geo-type within metros/non-metros
Geo-types	4 geo-types, namely urban formal, urban informal, tribal areas, and rural formal	3 geo-types, namely urban, traditional, and farms
Sample	Sample representative at national, provincial and metro levels, but estimates only produced to provincial level	Sample representative at national, provincial and metro levels Weights produced to publish estimates at metro level

There are a number of aspects in which the two Master Samples differ. The number of geo-types was reduced from 4 to 3 while the new Master Sample allows for the publication of estimates at metro level.

Primary stratification occurred at provincial and metro/non-metro levels, for mining, and geography type, while the secondary strata were created within the primary strata based on the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the population.



**Figure 67: Distribution of primary sampling units by province, 2007 (old) Master Sample and the new Master Sample (designed in 2013)**



Given the change in the provincial distribution of the South African population between 2001 and 2011, the Master Sample was accordingly adjusted. There was also an 8% increase in the sample size of the Master Sample of PSUs to improve the precision of the GHS estimates. In particular, the sample sizes increased most notably in Gauteng, Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal.

### 19.7 Allocating sample sizes to strata<sup>2</sup>

The randomised PPS systematic sampling method is described below. This procedure was applied independently within each design stratum.

Let  $N$  be the total number of PSUs in the stratum, and the number of PSUs to be selected from the stratum is denoted by  $n$ . Also, let  $x_i$  denote the size measure of the PSU  $i$  within the stratum, where  $i=1, 2, 3, \dots, N$ . Then, the method for selecting the sample of  $n$  PSUs with the Randomised PPS systematic sampling method can be described as follows:

<sup>2</sup>Source: Sample Selection and Rotation for the Redesigned South African Labour Force Survey by G. HussainChoudhry, 2007.

### Step 1: Randomise the PSUs within the stratum

The list of  $N$  PSUs within the stratum can be randomised by generating uniform random between 0 and 1, and then by sorting the  $N$  PSUs in ascending or descending order of these random numbers. Once the PSUs have been randomised, we can generate permanent sequence numbers for the PSUs.

### Step 2: Define normalised measures of size for the PSUs

We denote by  $x_i$  the measure of size (MOS) of PSU  $i$  within the design stratum. Then, the

measure of size for the stratum is given by  $X = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$ . We define the normalised size measure  $p_i$  of PSU  $i$  as  $p_i = x_i / X$ ;  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$ , where  $N$  is the total number of PSUs in the design

stratum. Then,  $p_i$  is the relative size of the PSU  $i$  in the stratum, and  $\sum_{i=1}^N p_i = 1$  for all strata. It should be noted that the value of  $n \times p_i$ , which is the selection probability of PSU  $i$  must be less than one.

### Step 3: Obtain inverse sampling rates (ISRs)

Let  $R$  be the stratum inverse sampling rate (ISR). The stratum ISR is the same as the corresponding provincial ISR because of the proportional allocation within the province. It should also be noted that the proportional allocation within the province also results in a self-weighting design.

Then, the PSU inverse sampling rates (ISRs) are obtained as follows:

First, define  $N$  real numbers  $Z_i = n \times p_i \times R$ ;  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$ . It is easy to verify that

$\sum_{i=1}^N Z_i = n \times R$ . Next, round the  $N$  real numbers  $Z_i$ ;  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$  to integer values  $R_i$ ;  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$  such that each  $R_i$  is as close as possible to the corresponding  $Z_i$  value and

the  $R_i$  values add up to  $n \times R$  within the stratum. In other words, the sum of the absolute differences between the  $R_i$  and the corresponding  $Z_i$  values is minimised subject to the constraint that the  $R_i$  values add up to  $n \times R$  within the stratum. Drew, Choudhry and Gray (1978) provide a simple algorithm to obtain the integer  $R_i$  values as follows:

Let " $d$ " be the difference between the value  $n \times R$  and the sum  $S = \sum_{i=1}^N [Z_i]$ , where  $[\cdot]$  is the integer function, then  $R_i$  values can be obtained by rounding up the " $d$ "  $Z_i$  values with the largest

fraction parts, and by rounding down the remaining  $(N-d)$  of them. It should be noted that the integer sizes  $R_i; i=1, 2, 3, \dots, N$  are also the PSU inverse sampling rates (ISRs) for systematic sampling of dwelling units.

#### Step 4: Obtain cumulative ISR values

We denote by  $C_i; i=1, 2, 3, \dots, N$  the cumulative ISRs of the PSUs within the stratum. It should be noted that the PSUs within the stratum have been sorted according to the sequence numbers that were assigned after the randomisation. Then, the cumulative ISRs are defined as follows:

$$C_1 = R_1,$$

$$C_j = C_{(j-1)} + R_j; \quad j = 2, 3, \dots, N.$$

It should be noted that the value  $C_N$  will be equal to  $n \times R$ , which is also the total number of systematic samples of dwelling units that can be selected from the stratum.

#### Step 5: Generate an integer random number $r$ between 1 and $R$ , and compute $r_i$ integers

$r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$  as follows:

$$r_1 = r$$

$$r_2 = r_1 + R$$

$$r_3 = r_2 + R$$

$$\cdot$$

$$\cdot$$

$$r_i = r_{(i-1)} + R$$

$$\cdot$$

$$\cdot$$

$$r_n = r_{(n-1)} + R.$$

#### Step 6: Select $n$ PSUs out of the $N$ PSUs in the stratum with the labels (sequence numbers) number $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n$ such that:

$$C_{i_1-1} < r_1 \leq C_{i_1}$$

$$C_{i_2-1} < r_2 \leq C_{i_2}$$

$$\cdot$$

$$\cdot$$

$$C_{i_n-1} < r_n \leq C_{i_n}.$$

Then, the  $n$  PSUs with the labels  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n$  would get selected with probabilities proportional to size, and the selection probability of the PSU  $i$  will be given by  $R_i / R$ .

## 19.8 Weighting<sup>3</sup>

The sample weights were constructed in order to account for the following: the original selection probabilities (design weights), adjustments for PSUs that were sub-sampled or segmented, excluded population from the sampling frame, non-response, weight trimming, and benchmarking to known population estimates from the Demographic Analysis Division within Stats SA.

The sampling weights for the data collected from the sampled households were constructed so that the responses could be properly expanded to represent the entire civilian population of South Africa. The design weights, which are the inverse sampling rate (ISR) for the province, are assigned to each of the households in a province.

Mid-year population estimates produced by the Demographic Analysis Division were used for benchmarking. The final survey weights were constructed using regression estimation to calibrate to national level population estimates cross-classified by 5-year age groups, gender and race, and provincial population estimates by broad age groups. The 5-year age groups are: 0–4, 5–9, 10–14, 15–19, 20–24, 25–29, 30–34, 35–39, 40–44, 45–49, 50–54, 55–59, 60–64; and 65 and over. The provincial level age groups are 0–14, 15–34, 35–64; and 65 years and over. The calibrated weights were constructed such that all persons in a household would have the same final weight.

The Statistics Canada software StatMx was used for constructing calibration weights. The population controls at national and provincial level were used for the cells defined by cross-classification of Age by Gender by Race. Records for which the age, population group or sex had item non-response could not be weighted and were therefore excluded from the dataset. No additional imputation was done to retain these records.

Household estimates that were developed using the UN headship ratio methodology were used to weight household files. The databases of Census 1996, Census 2001, Community Survey 2007 Census 2011 were used to analyse trends and develop models to predict the number of households for each year. The weighting system was based on tables for the expected distribution of household heads for specific age categories, per population group and province.

## 19.9 Sampling and the interpretation of the data

Caution must be exercised when interpreting the results of the GHS at low levels of disaggregation. The sample and reporting are based on the provincial boundaries as defined in 2011. These new boundaries resulted in minor changes to the boundaries of some provinces, especially Gauteng, North West, Mpumalanga, Limpopo and Eastern and Western Cape. In previous reports the sample was based on the provincial boundaries as defined in 2006, and there will therefore be slight comparative differences in terms of provincial boundary definitions.

<sup>3</sup> Source: Sampling and Weighting System for the Redesigned South African Labour Force Survey, by G. HussainChoudhry, 2007.

### 19.10 Comparability with previous surveys

The revision of the GHS questions are never taken lightly but are necessitated by changing government priorities as well as gaps identified through stakeholder interaction. When modifying the questionnaire, a balance is always struck between trying to maintain comparability over time and improving the quality of our measurements over time.

Table 20, below, summarises key questions that have been included in the GHS since 2002/2003 and highlights those questions where changes may affect comparability.

**Table 23: Most important differences between the questionnaires introduced in 2015 and those used during preceding years**

GHS 2002–2008	GHS 2009–2015	Comparability
<b>Marital status</b>	Categories in GHS 2009 were moved around and single was separated into two subgroups.	Good if single categories are re-combined
<b>Highest level of education</b>	Categories in 2009 have been expanded and are more detailed than before.	Good if categories are combined
<b>Literacy</b>	Completely different question on different literacy types included.	None
<b>Attendance of educational institutions</b>	In GHS 2009 and 2010 the age group 0–4 has its own separate section. Thus the questions about attendance are only asked for persons aged 5 years and older.	Good only if in historical data the age group 0–4 is excluded
<b>Type of educational institution attended</b>	Categories are different from previous years.	Poor for some categories
<b>Tuition fees paid</b>	More categories in the higher range were added.	Good if categories are combined
<b>Reasons for non-payment</b>	Categories were expanded.	Fair
<b>Problems experienced in educational institutions</b>	Very similar – one category added.	Good
<b>Disability</b>	A set of questions devised by the Washington Group replaced the questions used until 2008. Each individual is asked to rate their ability to perform six different tasks and their inability to perform two or more of the activities, of alternatively being unable to do one renders them disabled.	None
<b>Social grants</b>	Very similar, GHS 2009 added a general question about grant receipt. Prompt details are added next to each grant to help individuals identify each grant better.	Good
<b>Tenure status of dwelling</b>	Options are arranged differently and the option 'owned, but not fully paid off' split in two. Rental of informal dwellings was for the first time very clearly defined to also include cases where someone owns the dwelling, but pays rent for the land on which it was erected.	Good, except for informal dwellings
<b>Total number of rooms</b>	Number of individual rooms and total number of rooms.  One room with multiple uses were added in 2014, based on the Census 2011 categories.	Not good. Previous question was sometimes confused in the vernacular with 'bedrooms' and bathrooms and toilets were excluded.
<b>Use of pesticides/herbicides</b>	The options not applicable were added for households who do not have yards.	Fair provided that some editing can be done

**Table 20: Most important differences between the questionnaires introduced in 2015 and those used during preceding years (concluded)**

GHS 2002–2008	GHS 2009–2015	Comparability
<b>Cellular phone</b>	Before 2009 the question was whether someone has access to a cellular phone; in 2009 the question asks whether it is available within the household.	None
<b>Assessment of the quality of health services</b>	Before 2009, the question was asked of individuals who were sick and who used a specific service. However, because of proxy respondents it was difficult to get an accurate assessment of levels of satisfaction with the service. In 2009 the question very specifically relates to the respondents' own experience during their most recent visit.	Not comparable
<b>Agricultural production</b>	The question before was general and did not specifically prod the interviewer to include small-scale activities such as backyard food gardening etc. In 2009 all activities that relate to food production have to be included.	Not comparable
<b>Sources of income</b>	Income from a business was never listed as a separate source of income and was often not recorded, or recorded under 'Other'. In 2009 this option was added to the list.	Fair
<b>Monthly household expenditure</b>	In 2009 the response categories were broken down into finer categories than before.	Good if categories are re-combined

## 19.11 Editing and imputation

Historically the GHS used a conservative and hands-off approach to editing. Manual editing, and little if any imputation was done. The focus of the editing process was on clearing skip violations and ensuring that each variable only contains valid values. Very few limits to valid values were set, and data were largely released as they were received from the field.

With GHS 2009, Stats SA introduced an automated editing and imputation system that was continued for GHSs 2010–2015. The challenge was to remain true, as much as possible, to the conservative approach used prior to GHS 2009, and yet, at the same time, to develop a standard set of rules to be used during editing which could be applied consistently across time. When testing for *skip violations* and doing automated editing, the following general rules are applied in cases where *one question follows the filter question* and the skip is violated:

- If the filter question had a missing value, the filter is allocated the value that corresponds with the subsequent question which had a valid value.
- If the values of the filter question and subsequent question are inconsistent, the filter question's value is set to missing and imputed using either the hot-deck or nearest neighbour imputation techniques. The imputed value is then once again tested against the skip rule. If the skip rule remains violated, the question subsequent to the filter question is dealt with by either setting it to missing and imputing or, if that fails, printing a message of edit failure for further investigation, decision-making and manual editing.

In cases where *skip violations* take place for questions where *multiple questions follow the filter question*, the rules used are as follows:

- If the filter question has a missing value, the filter is allocated the value that corresponds with the value expected given the completion of the remainder of the question set.

- If the filter question and the values of subsequent questions values were inconsistent, a counter is set to see what proportion of the subsequent questions have been completed. If more than 50% of the subsequent questions have been completed, the filter question's value is modified to correspond with the fact that the rest of the questions in the set were completed. If less than 50% of the subsequent questions in the set were completed, the value of the filter question is set to missing and imputed using either the hot-deck or nearest neighbour imputation techniques. The imputed value is then once again tested against the skip rule. If the skip rule remains violated the questions in the set that follows the filter question are set to missing.

When dealing with *internal inconsistencies*, as much as possible was done using logical imputation, i.e. information from other questions is compared with the inconsistent information. If other evidence is found to back up either of the two inconsistent viewpoints, the inconsistency is resolved accordingly. If the internal consistency remains, the question subsequent to the filter question is dealt with by either setting it to missing and imputing its value or printing a message of edit failure for further investigation, decision-making and manual editing.

Two imputation techniques were used for imputing missing values: hot deck and nearest neighbour. In both cases the already published code was used for imputation. The variable composition of hot decks is based on a combination of the variables used for the Census (where appropriate), an analysis of odds ratios and logistic regression models. Generally, as in the QLFS system, the GHS adds geographic variables such as province, geography type, metro/non-metro, population group, etc. to further refine the decks. This was not done for Census 2001 and it is assumed that the reason for this is the differences in deck size and position for sample surveys as opposed to a multi-million record database.

The 'No' imputations assume that if the 'Yes'/'No' question had to be completed and there is a missing value next to any of the options, the response should have been 'No'. Missing values are therefore converted to the code for 'No', namely '2'. This is only done if there is some evidence that the questions have been completed. Otherwise all remain missing. For questions for which each option represents a question, no 'No' imputations were made.

## 19.12 Definitions of terms

**A household** is a group of persons who live together and provide themselves jointly with food and/or other essentials for living, or a single person who lives alone.

**Note:** The persons basically occupy a common dwelling unit (or part of it) for at least four nights in a week on average during the past four weeks prior to the survey interview, sharing resources as a unit. Other explanatory phrases can be 'eating from the same pot' and 'cook and eat together'.

Persons who occupy the same dwelling unit but do not share food or other essentials, are regarded as separate households. For example, people who share a dwelling unit, but buy food separately, and generally provide for themselves separately, are regarded as separate households within the same dwelling unit.

Conversely, a household may occupy more than one structure. If persons on a plot, stand or yard eat together, but sleep in separate structures (e.g. a room at the back of the house for single young male members of a family), all these persons should be regarded as one household.

**Multiple households** occur when two or more households live in the same dwelling unit.

**Note:** If there are two or more households in the selected dwelling unit and they do not share resources, all households are to be interviewed. The whole dwelling unit has been given one chance of selection and all households located there were interviewed using separate questionnaires.

**Household head** is the main decision-maker, or the person who owns or rents the dwelling, or the person who is the main breadwinner.

**Acting household head** is any member of the household acting on behalf of the head of the household.

**Formal dwelling** refers to a structure built according to approved plans, i.e. house on a separate stand, flat or apartment, townhouse, room in backyard, rooms or flatlet elsewhere.

Contrasted with *informal dwelling* and *traditional dwelling*.

**Informal dwelling** is a makeshift structure not erected according to approved architectural plans, for example *shacks* or *shanties* in *informal settlements* or in backyards

**Piped water in dwelling or onsite** is piped water inside the household's own dwelling or in their yard. It excludes water from a neighbour's tap or a public tap that is not on site.

**Electricity for cooking, heating and/or lighting** refers to electricity from the public supplier.

**Free basic water** is an amount of water determined by government that should be provided free to poor households to meet basic needs, currently set at 6 kℓ per month per household within 200 metres from each dwelling.

**Hygienic toilet facility** refers to flush toilet, chemical toilet or pit latrine with ventilation pipe.

**Indigent households** are households that qualify to receive some or all basic services for free because they have no income or low income.

## 19.13 Classifications

### ***UN disability***

Concentrating and remembering are grouped together as one category. If an individual has 'Some difficulty' with two or more of the six categories, then they are disabled. If an individual has 'A lot of difficulty' or is 'Unable to do' for one or more category they are classified as disabled.

### ***Severe disability***

If an individual has 'A lot of difficulty' or is 'Unable to do' for one or more category they are classified as severely disabled.

### ***Water of RDP standard or higher***

'Piped water in dwelling or in yard', and 'Water from a neighbour's tap or public/communal tap' are also included provided that the distance to the water source is less than 200 metres.



### 1.1 By province, population group and sex, 2015

Thousands															
Province	Black African			Coloured			Indian/Asian			White			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Western Cape	975	992	1 967	1 566	1 652	3 217	20	20	39	478	544	1 022	3 038	3 207	6 246
Eastern Cape	2 811	3 133	5 944	227	261	488	12	11	23	119	118	237	3 169	3 523	6 693
Northern Cape	303	335	638	217	238	455	2	*	2	41	46	87	563	619	1 182
Free State	1 175	1 244	2 419	38	37	75	4	2	6	118	145	263	1 335	1 428	2 763
KwaZulu-Natal	4 551	4 948	9 499	56	58	113	381	398	779	155	142	297	5 142	5 546	10 688
North West	1 694	1 711	3 406	27	33	60	20	15	34	98	104	203	1 840	1 863	3 703
Gauteng	5 261	5 047	10 308	204	204	408	217	211	429	1 042	1 081	2 123	6 725	6 543	13 268
Mpumalanga	1 929	2 025	3 955	7	5	12	10	4	14	124	132	256	2 070	2 166	4 236
Limpopo	2 627	2 881	5 509	11	22	33	24	15	38	40	35	74	2 701	2 953	5 654
South Africa	21 327	22 318	43 645	2 352	2 509	4 861	690	676	1 366	2 215	2 346	4 561	26 584	27 849	54 432

Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals. Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 1. Population

## 1.2 By age group, population group and sex, 2015

Age group	Thousands											
	Black African			Coloured			Indian/Asian			White		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
00-04	2 231	2 193	4 424	210	207	418	51	50	101	132	127	259
05-09	2 213	2 194	4 407	213	211	424	49	48	98	136	131	268
10-14	2 124	2 122	4 245	221	220	441	46	46	92	140	135	276
15-19	2 143	2 145	4 288	227	225	451	50	50	100	153	147	300
20-24	2 166	2 137	4 303	217	216	433	55	54	109	157	152	309
25-29	2 107	2 000	4 107	195	194	390	62	57	118	146	142	289
30-34	1 919	1 892	3 811	176	187	363	66	58	124	141	142	283
35-39	1 662	1 580	3 242	180	194	374	63	55	118	140	143	282
40-44	1 375	1 461	2 836	176	195	371	54	49	104	145	148	293
45-49	940	1 067	2 006	146	165	311	48	45	93	171	172	343
50-54	773	930	1 703	125	144	269	41	41	82	170	172	342
55-59	609	760	1 369	97	116	213	34	36	70	165	173	338
60-64	431	553	984	68	87	155	27	31	59	144	155	299
65-69	292	527	819	46	60	106	19	23	42	109	140	249
70-74	173	369	543	28	39	67	12	16	28	80	110	190
75+	170	387	557	26	47	74	11	18	29	87	155	241
<b>Total</b>	<b>21 327</b>	<b>22 318</b>	<b>43 645</b>	<b>2 352</b>	<b>2 509</b>	<b>4 861</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>676</b>	<b>1 366</b>	<b>2 215</b>	<b>2 346</b>	<b>4 561</b>
										<b>26 584</b>		<b>27 849</b>
												<b>54 432</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 2. Education

### 2.1 Population aged 20 years and older, by highest level of education and province, 2015

Highest level of education	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
None	61	229	58	60	411	162	209	208	312	1 711
Grade R/0	5	12	3	5	13	4	13	3	3	61
Grade 1/Sub A/Class 1	15	32	8	16	53	19	30	18	27	218
Grade 2/Sub B/Class 2	15	51	7	20	86	25	47	22	28	301
Grade 3/Standard 1/AET 1 (KhaRiGude, Sanli)	32	74	15	31	123	41	52	34	55	457
Grade 4/Standard 2	73	108	18	52	153	67	100	51	73	695
Grade 5/Standard 3/AET 2	78	113	18	43	143	77	131	43	69	716
Grade 6/Standard 4	106	196	33	56	178	87	175	87	112	1 030
Grade 7/Standard 5/AET 3	227	239	46	89	267	128	304	127	172	1 600
Grade 8/Standard 6/Form 1	284	299	62	123	339	164	432	112	194	2 008
Grade 9/Standard 7/Form 2/AET 4	309	360	65	154	354	172	390	155	287	2 246
Grade 10/Standard 8/Form 3	506	444	90	226	629	295	954	279	403	3 826
Grade 11/Standard 9/Form 4	382	456	56	179	844	225	1 093	333	431	3 999
Grade 12/Standard 10/Form 5/Matric (No Exemption)	1 050	649	153	474	1 799	483	2 746	581	593	8 529
Grade 12/Standard 10/Form 5/Matric (Exemption *)	170	39	21	28	70	33	227	59	33	681
NTC 1/N1/NC (V) Level 2	1	2	*	4	3	*	12	3	14	39
NTC 2/N2/NC (V) Level 3	6	8	2	3	12	7	25	13	10	87
NTC 3/N3/NC (V)/Level 4	22	11	3	6	16	11	37	21	20	146
N4/NTC 4	10	4	2	2	17	13	34	15	13	110
N5/NTC 5	9	7	1	6	6	8	26	13	8	85
N6/NTC 6	10	7	3	6	9	10	57	15	10	127
Certificate with less than Grade 12/Std 10	10	10	2	6	6	3	23	9	15	83

## 2. Education

### 2.1 Population aged 20 years and older, by highest level of education and province, 2015 (concluded)

Highest level of education	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Diploma with less than Grade 12/Std 10	19	15		7	13	3	31	5	7	101
Certificate with Grade 12/Std 10	46	40	15	25	76	45	278	60	52	638
Diploma with Grade 12/Std 10	277	130	24	49	211	73	523	105	115	1 508
Higher Diploma (Technikon/University of Technology)	55	43	1	12	70	5	186	17	16	405
Post Higher Diploma (Technikon/University of Technology Masters, Doctoral)	33	20	1	5	21	*	56	4	2	143
Bachelor's Degree	161	90	9	43	134	47	432	50	48	1 014
Bachelor's Degree and post-graduate diploma	38	11	*	8	16	5	76	6	6	165
Honours Degree	43	13	2	10	33	14	145	22	28	310
Higher degree (Masters, Doctorate)	54	9	1	6	15	6	91	11	7	199
Other	24	9	*	1	11	1	80	10	2	137
Do not know	39	7	3	13	35	33	171	12	16	330
Unspecified	7	12	3	10	23	12	48	10	13	137
Total population aged 20 years and older	4 177	3 750	727	1 781	6 188	2 276	9 234	2 514	3 194	33 841

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks. This table measures the highest level of education for adults over the age of 20 years.

## 2. Education

### 2.2 Population aged 20 years and older, by highest level of education, population group and sex, 2015

Highest level of education	Thousands														
	Black African					Coloured					Indian/Asian				
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
None	582	1 023	1 605	44	35	79	4	9	13	6	8	14	635	1 076	1 711
Grade R/0	25	26	51	4	3	8	2	*	2	*	*	*	31	30	61
Grade 1/Sub A/Class 1	96	106	201	8	5	13	1	*	1	*	3	3	105	113	218
Grade 2/Sub B/Class 2	123	160	282	6	8	14	*	2	2	*	2	2	129	173	301
Grade 3/Standard 1/AET 1 (KhaRiGude, Sanli)	197	211	408	20	20	41	1	3	4	1	3	4	220	237	457
Grade 4/Standard 2	277	335	613	31	37	67	3	5	8	1	5	6	313	382	695
Grade 5/Standard 3/AET 2	312	303	615	41	46	86	4	5	8	2	5	7	358	358	716
Grade 6/Standard 4	429	468	897	52	59	111	2	11	13	2	6	8	485	545	1 030
Grade 7/Standard 5/AET 3	636	696	1 332	89	143	232	12	8	20	5	11	16	742	858	1 600
Grade 8/Standard 6/Form 1	776	853	1 629	118	159	277	18	28	46	26	30	56	939	1 070	2 008
Grade 9/Standard 7/Form 2/AET 4	971	919	1 890	136	153	289	13	8	21	25	21	46	1 145	1 101	2 246
Grade 10/Standard 8/Form 3	1 527	1 452	2 978	212	219	432	46	40	85	140	191	330	1 925	1 901	3 826
Grade 11/Standard 9/Form 4	1 690	1 929	3 619	116	131	247	28	23	50	40	43	83	1 873	2 126	3 999
Grade 12/Standard 10/Form 5/Matric (No Exemption)	3 120	3 124	6 244	359	403	762	196	179	376	513	633	1 147	4 189	4 340	8 529
Grade 12/Standard 10/Form 5/Matric (Exemption *)	192	186	379	41	39	80	17	31	47	79	97	176	329	353	681
NTC 1/N1/NC (V) Level 2	13	20	33	*	1	1	2	*	2	3	1	4	17	22	39
NTC 2/N2/NC (V) Level 3	31	34	66	2	1	3	3	*	3	13	3	16	49	38	87
NTC 3/N3/NC (V)/Level 4	51	49	100	6	3	9	2	*	2	32	3	35	90	56	146
N4/NTC 4	52	29	80	3	*	3	1	2	3	15	8	23	71	39	110
N5/NTC 5	31	33	65	3	3	7	1	1	2	12	*	12	47	38	85
N6/NTC 6	40	42	82	4	1	5	4	1	5	29	6	36	76	50	127
Certificate with less than Grade 12/Std 10	36	29	65	4	2	6	*	*	*	4	8	12	43	39	83

## 2.2 Population aged 20 years and older, by highest level of education, population group and sex, 2015 (concluded)

Thousands															
Highest level of education	Black African			Coloured			Indian/Asian			White			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Diploma with less than Grade 12/Std 10	25	35	59	4	5	10	1	6	7	8	17	25	39	63	101
Certificate with Grade 12/Std 10	220	287	507	13	25	38	5	9	14	38	40	79	277	361	638
Diploma with Grade 12/Std 10	391	531	922	71	65	135	30	33	63	187	200	387	679	829	1 508
Higher Diploma (Technikon/University of Technology)	97	129	226	12	16	28	14	12	26	62	62	124	185	220	405
Post Higher Diploma (Technikon/University of Technology Masters, Doctoral)	28	36	63	3	8	11	7	4	11	26	31	57	64	79	143
Bachelor's Degree	250	272	522	30	24	53	41	28	69	180	190	370	500	514	1 014
Bachelor's Degree and post-graduate diploma	40	33	73	8	7	15	6	7	14	34	29	63	88	77	165
Honours Degree	73	74	147	4	5	10	10	11	21	70	63	133	157	153	310
Higher degree (Masters, Doctorate)	24	30	54	4	5	8	8	9	16	75	46	121	110	89	199
Other	54	38	92	6	1	7	8	3	11	11	16	27	79	58	137
Do not know	155	116	271	22	11	33	4	3	7	5	13	18	186	143	330
Unspecified	53	55	107	5	3	8	*	3	3	10	9	19	68	69	137
Total population aged 20 years and older	12 616	13 664	26 280	1 480	1 646	3 127	493	482	975	1 654	1 804	3 459	16 243	17 597	33 841

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

Due to rounding, numbers are not necessarily equal to totals. Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 2. Education

### 2.3 Population aged 20 years and older, by highest level of education, age group and sex, 2015

Highest level of education	Thousands														
	20-24			25-34			35-44			45+			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
None	12	12	24	51	46	98	73	86	158	499	931	1 431	635	1 076	1 711
Grade R/0	4	4	8	6	8	14	4	7	11	17	11	27	31	30	61
Grade 1/Sub A/Class 1	7	5	12	15	8	24	24	18	42	59	82	141	105	113	218
Grade 2/Sub B/Class 2	6	4	10	17	12	29	23	24	47	84	131	215	129	173	301
Grade 3/Standard 1/AET 1(KhaRiGude, Sanli)	19	5	24	46	13	59	35	31	65	120	188	309	220	237	457
Grade 4/Standard 2	22	14	36	47	28	74	61	42	103	183	299	482	313	382	695
Grade 5/Standard 3/AET 2	24	15	39	65	40	105	73	56	128	197	247	444	358	358	716
Grade 6/Standard 4	51	28	79	106	66	172	95	88	183	233	362	595	485	545	1 030
Grade 7/Standard 5/AET 3	84	51	135	190	129	318	146	159	305	321	520	841	742	858	1 600
Grade 8/Standard 6/Form 1	129	87	216	209	197	406	175	199	374	426	586	1 012	939	1 070	2 008
Grade 9/Standard 7/Form 2/AET 4	290	214	504	359	340	700	228	243	471	267	303	570	1 145	1 101	2 246
Grade 10/Standard 8/Form 3	363	310	672	645	570	1 215	423	419	842	493	602	1 096	1 925	1 901	3 826
Grade 11/Standard 9/Form 4	418	452	870	705	816	1 521	505	532	1 037	244	327	571	1 873	2 126	3 999
Grade 12/Standard 10/Form 5/Matric (No Exemption)	793	932	1 724	1 470	1 434	2 904	1 101	1 077	2 178	826	897	1 722	4 189	4 340	8 529
Grade 12/Standard 10/Form 5/Matric (Exemption *)	108	127	234	96	96	191	59	61	120	67	69	136	329	353	681
NTC 1/N1/NC (V) Level 2	9	10	19	5	7	12	2	2	4	2	3	5	17	22	39
NTC 2/N2/NC (V) Level 3	10	14	24	14	13	27	15	7	23	10	3	13	49	38	87
NTC 3/N3/NC (V)/Level 4	15	10	25	22	21	43	19	16	35	34	9	43	90	56	146
N4/NTC 4	14	11	26	28	12	40	16	10	26	12	6	18	71	39	110
N5/NTC 5	10	8	18	18	16	34	13	11	23	7	3	9	47	38	85
N6/NTC 6	8	8	16	21	21	42	22	17	39	26	4	30	76	50	127
Certificate with less than Grade 12/Std 10	3	5	8	19	16	35	11	7	18	10	12	22	43	39	83

### 2.3 Population aged 20 years and older, by highest level of education, age group and sex, 2015 (concluded)

Highest level of education	Thousands														
	20-24			25-34			35-44			45+			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Diploma with less than Grade 12/Std 10	2	3	4	16	16	33	6	15	21	14	29	43	39	63	101
Certificate with Grade 12/Std 10	40	47	88	103	145	248	76	98	174	57	71	128	277	361	638
Diploma with Grade 12/Std 10	54	79	133	194	231	425	197	235	432	235	283	518	679	829	1 508
Higher Diploma (Technikon/University of Technology)	8	15	23	42	53	95	57	71	129	78	81	159	185	220	405
Post Higher Diploma (Technikon/University of Technology Masters, Doctoral)	1	5	7	24	19	43	15	22	37	24	32	56	64	79	143
Bachelor's Degree	40	49	89	129	148	277	135	136	272	196	180	376	500	514	1 014
Bachelor's Degree and post-graduate diploma	6	5	12	31	24	55	17	19	36	34	29	63	88	77	165
Honours Degree	9	4	13	29	50	79	46	42	88	73	57	130	157	153	310
Higher degree (Masters, Doctorate)	2	2	4	13	30	43	33	22	56	62	35	98	110	89	199
Other	17	9	26	30	16	46	20	11	31	12	22	34	79	58	137
Do not know	7	4	11	31	17	48	51	29	80	97	94	191	186	143	330
Unspecified	12	11	24	17	14	31	18	11	29	21	32	54	68	69	137
Total population aged 20 years and older	2 595	2 559	5 154	4 813	4 673	9 486	3 794	3 825	7 620	5 040	6 541	11 581	16 243	17 597	33 841

Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals. Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.



## 2. Education

### 2.4 Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, by literacy skills and province, 2015

Literacy skills		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Writing his/her name	No difficulty	354	651	126	235	903	361	669	340	439	4 077
	Some difficulty	9	24	3	6	27	27	26	20	37	179
	A lot of difficulty	3	20	3	7	59	12	16	27	80	226
	Unable to do	41	219	42	50	241	116	71	104	166	1 050
	<b>Total</b>	407	914	173	298	1 230	515	783	490	722	5 533
Reading	No difficulty	294	515	80	190	731	257	519	228	326	3 140
	Some difficulty	40	71	14	22	92	38	88	43	73	481
	A lot of difficulty	19	56	16	20	104	28	55	64	119	481
	Unable to do	54	273	63	68	303	187	122	157	205	1 431
	<b>Total</b>	407	915	173	299	1 231	510	784	492	723	5 535
Filling in a form	No difficulty	243	328	54	139	442	182	417	146	209	2 161
	Some difficulty	55	111	11	25	102	39	95	56	80	573
	A lot of difficulty	37	99	13	21	178	43	88	84	166	728
	Unable to do	73	379	96	115	509	244	184	206	268	2 073
	<b>Total</b>	407	917	173	299	1 232	506	784	492	723	5 535
Writing a letter	No difficulty	271	496	77	186	690	246	514	216	320	3 016
	Some difficulty	44	76	9	21	93	29	65	43	70	451
	A lot of difficulty	28	55	17	17	105	31	63	50	120	488
	Unable to do	63	288	71	75	344	203	141	182	213	1 580
	<b>Total</b>	407	916	173	299	1 232	509	784	491	723	5 534

## 2. Education

### 2.4 Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, by literacy skills and province, 2015 (concluded)

Literacy skills	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Calculating change	No difficulty	749	118	254	907	414	654	392	546	4 363
	Some difficulty	56	9	10	94	27	47	29	56	363
	A lot of difficulty	12	14	5	76	21	22	18	53	232
	Unable to do	100	33	30	148	50	61	56	69	580
	<b>Total</b>	917	173	299	1 226	513	784	495	723	5 537
Reading road signs	No difficulty	549	77	235	755	308	590	297	398	3 527
	Some difficulty	94	17	15	109	37	72	49	63	493
	A lot of difficulty	65	12	8	131	23	31	43	90	415
	Unable to do	208	66	40	232	141	88	104	172	1 090
	<b>Total</b>	916	173	298	1 227	509	781	494	722	5 526
<b>Total population aged 15 years and older with level of education lower than Grade 7</b>		919	174	300	1 233	518	791	497	726	5 568
<b>Total population aged 15 years and older</b>	4 655	4 522	841	2 028	7 263	2 622	10 230	2 950	3 868	38 980

Totals exclude unspecified literacy skills.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 2. Education

### 2.5 Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, who have some, a lot of difficulty or are unable to do basic literacy activities by sex and province, 2015

Literacy skills		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	KwaZulu-Natal	Northern Cape	Free State	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Writing his/her name	Male	74	191	44	44	194	134	118	106	119	1 024
	Female	61	229	53	69	348	129	151	170	284	1 494
	Total	136	420	97	113	542	263	269	275	403	2 518
	Male	64	174	42	41	178	130	118	98	116	962
Reading	Female	50	226	51	68	322	123	147	165	281	1 432
	Total	114	400	93	109	500	254	265	263	397	2 394
	Male	89	274	56	66	303	167	169	147	169	1 441
	Female	75	314	63	94	486	158	198	199	346	1 933
Filling in a form	Total	164	588	119	160	790	325	367	346	514	3 374
	Male	74	191	44	44	194	134	118	106	119	1 024
	Female	61	229	53	69	348	129	151	170	284	1 494
	Total	136	420	97	113	542	263	269	275	403	2 518
Writing a letter	Male	42	79	26	15	103	51	59	35	45	454
	Female	39	89	29	29	215	48	71	68	132	720
	Total	80	168	56	44	318	98	130	103	177	1 174
	Male	44	156	43	22	147	96	80	59	85	732
Calculating/working out how much change he/she should receive	Female	45	211	53	41	324	105	111	137	239	1 267
	Total	88	367	96	63	471	201	191	197	324	1 999
	Male	217	453	82	135	481	270	386	231	277	2 533
	Female	191	466	92	165	752	248	405	267	449	3 035
Total population aged 15 years and older with level of education lower than Grade 7	Total	409	919	174	300	1 233	518	791	497	726	5 568

## 2. Education

### 2.5 Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, who have some, a lot of difficulty or are unable to do basic literacy activities by sex and province, 2015 (concluded)

Literacy skills	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	KwaZulu- Natal	Northern Cape	Free State	North West	Gauteng	Mpuma- langa	Limpopo	South Africa
	2 217	2 071	398	966	3 426	1 300	5 201	1 420	1 816	18 815
	2 438	2 451	443	1 063	3 837	1 321	5 030	1 530	2 052	20 164
	4 655	4 522	841	2 028	7 263	2 622	10 230	2 950	3 868	38 980
Total population aged 15 years and older										

Totals exclude unspecified literacy skills.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 2. Education

### 2.6 Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, who have some, a lot of difficulty or are unable to do basic literacy activities, by population group and sex, 2015

Literacy skills		Thousands				Total
		Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	
Writing his/her name	Male	467	39	5	3	514
	Female	889	37	4	12	942
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 357</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1 456</b>
Reading	Male	880	71	7	4	962
	Female	1 340	67	7	18	1 432
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2 220</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2 394</b>
Filling in a form	Male	1 327	104	7	3	1 441
	Female	1 809	93	10	21	1 933
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3 136</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3 374</b>
Writing a letter	Male	933	83	6	3	1 024
	Female	1 387	82	8	18	1 494
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2 320</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2 518</b>
Calculating/working out how much change he/she should receive	Male	397	48	5	4	454
	Female	659	45	3	13	720
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 056</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1 174</b>
Reading road signs	Male	667	57	5	3	732
	Female	1 187	61	4	14	1 267
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 855</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1 999</b>

## 2.6 Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, who have some, a lot of difficulty or are unable to do basic literacy activities, by population group and sex, 2015 (concluded)

Literacy skills		Thousands				Total
		Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	
	Male	2 272	227	18	16	2 533
	Female	2 741	219	37	38	3 035
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5 013</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>5 568</b>
<b>Total population aged 15 years and older with level of education lower than Grade 7</b>						
	<b>Male</b>	14 758	1 707	543	1 807	18 815
	<b>Female</b>	15 810	1 871	532	1 952	20 164
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30 568</b>	<b>3 578</b>	<b>1 075</b>	<b>3 759</b>	<b>38 980</b>
<b>Total population aged 15 years and older</b>						

Totals exclude unspecified literacy skills.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 2. Education

### 2.7 Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, by literacy skills and age group, 2015

Literacy skills	Thousands									
	15–19	20–24	25–29	30–34	35–39	40–44	45–49	50–54	55+	Total
Writing his/her name	No difficulty	355	202	229	256	262	336	456	1 595	4 077
	Some difficulty	5	3	8	6	8	8	23	103	179
	A lot of difficulty	2	5	7	9	9	13	23	145	226
	Unable to do	14	19	32	27	39	56	91	710	1 050
	<b>Total</b>	376	229	277	297	317	413	594	2 554	5 533
Reading	No difficulty	326	166	195	205	200	268	345	1 133	3 140
	Some difficulty	17	13	22	26	30	38	57	240	481
	A lot of difficulty	14	18	15	22	24	30	54	262	481
	Unable to do	21	31	46	43	66	79	136	916	1 431
	<b>Total</b>	378	229	278	296	320	415	592	2 551	5 535
Filling in a form	No difficulty	227	120	153	137	144	194	238	747	2 161
	Some difficulty	47	27	30	34	34	45	63	240	573
	A lot of difficulty	41	24	22	49	40	55	89	335	728
	Unable to do	61	57	72	76	102	120	203	1 231	2 073
	<b>Total</b>	377	229	278	296	320	413	593	2 554	5 535
Writing a letter	No difficulty	312	160	189	191	193	258	331	1 088	3 016
	Some difficulty	24	14	16	30	26	32	59	219	451
	A lot of difficulty	17	16	21	27	28	32	57	250	488
	Unable to do	25	37	52	47	72	92	147	998	1 580
	<b>Total</b>	378	228	278	295	319	414	593	2 554	5 534

## 2. Education

### 2.7 Population aged 15 years and older with a level of education lower than Grade 7, by literacy skills and age group, 2015 (concluded)

Literacy skills		Thousands									
		15–19	20–24	25–29	30–34	35–39	40–44	45–49	50–54	55+	Total
Calculating change	No difficulty	341	195	230	244	261	345	409	489	1 848	4 363
	Some difficulty	10	6	11	20	17	19	20	32	228	363
	A lot of difficulty	10	6	6	9	10	14	14	28	135	232
	Unable to do	16	22	29	23	31	37	33	48	342	580
	Total	378	228	277	296	317	415	476	597	2 553	5 537
Reading road signs	No difficulty	308	175	197	210	224	295	343	402	1 373	3 527
	Some difficulty	29	15	21	32	27	30	35	53	251	493
	A lot of difficulty	17	8	16	20	20	27	34	44	229	415
	Unable to do	23	30	41	35	47	63	62	94	696	1 090
	Total	377	228	276	296	318	415	474	593	2 549	5 526
Total population aged 15 years and older with level of education lower than Grade 7		379	232	278	297	321	418	477	598	2 568	5 568
Total population aged 15 years and older		5 139	5 154	4 904	4 582	4 016	3 603	2 753	2 395	6 433	38 980

Totals exclude unspecified literacy skills.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.



### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.1 Population attending and not attending an educational institution by population group and age group, 2015

Population group and age group		Thousands				
		Attending	Not attending	Do not know	Unspecified	Total
Black African	05–06	1 605	126	*	31	1 762
	07–15	7 694	97	*	13	7 804
	16–20	3 113	1 105	1	9	4 228
	21–25	792	3 526	1	42	4 361
	26+	508	20 322	12	223	21 066
	<b>Total</b>	<b>13 711</b>	<b>25 176</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>39 221</b>
	05–06	131	20	*	3	154
Coloured	07–15	801	13	*	*	813
	16–20	222	228	*	*	449
	21–25	29	389	*	4	423
	26+	39	2 547	*	18	2 604
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 222</b>	<b>3 196</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4 443</b>
	05–06	38	5	*	2	45
	07–15	166	1	*	*	167
Indian/Asian	16–20	58	40	*	*	98
	21–25	31	79	*	*	110
	26+	24	810	*	11	845
	<b>Total</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>934</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1 265</b>

### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.1 Population attending and not attending an educational institution by population group and age group, 2015 (concluded)

Population group and age group		Thousands				
		Attending	Not attending	Do not know	Unspecified	Total
	05–06	106	11	*	2	119
	07–15	488	2	*	1	491
	16–20	207	84	*	4	294
	21–25	75	220	*	2	298
	26+	51	2 977	*	72	3 100
	<b>Total</b>	<b>927</b>	<b>3 293</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>4 302</b>
White	05–06	1 880	161	*	39	2 079
	07–15	9 148	113	*	14	9 275
	16–20	3 599	1 456	1	14	5 070
	21–25	927	4 214	1	49	5 191
	26+	622	26 655	13	325	27 616
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16 176</b>	<b>32 599</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>49 231</b>

Totals exclude not applicable attendance.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

### 3.2 Population attending an educational institution, by type of institution, age group and sex, 2015

Educational institution	Thousands																	
	05-06			07-15			16-20			21-25			26+			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Pre-school	167	160	328	47	46	93	14	9	24	3	2	5	1	*	1	232	217	450
School	748	788	1 536	4 503	4 487	8 990	1 663	1 549	3 212	215	148	362	16	18	34	7 145	6 990	14 135
Adult Basic Education and Training Learning Centre	3	1	4	7	7	14	8	11	18	11	16	28	11	35	46	39	70	110
Literacy classes	*	*	*	1	1	2	*	*	*	*	2	2	2	2	5	4	5	9
Higher Educational Institution	*	*	*	*	*	*	73	84	157	120	141	261	131	161	292	324	386	710
Further Education and Training College (FET)	*	*	*	*	*	*	53	68	121	79	113	192	41	53	93	172	235	407
Other College	2	3	5	4	6	10	18	21	39	21	31	51	22	45	67	67	104	172
Home-based education/home schooling	1	1	2	8	5	14	1	2	3	*	1	1	*	2	2	11	11	22
Other than any of the above	*	1	1	16	8	24	8	6	14	3	2	5	5	6	11	31	23	54
Unspecified	1	3	4	2	1	3	7	3	10	8	12	19	38	33	71	56	52	107
Total	923	957	1 880	4 588	4 560	9 148	1 847	1 752	3 599	459	468	927	265	357	622	8 082	8 093	16 176

Due to rounding numbers do not necessarily add up to totals

### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.3 Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution, by type of institution and province, 2015

Educational institution	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Pre-school	64	41	9	23	84	27	149	36	17	450
School	1 264	2 098	294	668	3 174	934	2 615	1 200	1 887	14 135
Adult Basic Education and Training Learning Centre	6	8	1	8	20	15	32	5	14	110
Literacy classes	2	1	*	2	1	1	*	2	*	9
Higher Educational Institution	97	46	6	35	97	38	315	44	33	710
Further Education and Training College (FET)	31	44	8	33	54	20	127	35	57	407
Other College	18	18	3	8	16	7	70	18	13	172
Home-based education/home schooling	5	6	*	3	2	*	4	2	*	22
Other than any of the above	7	2	1	2	5	6	28	1	2	54
Unspecified	4	10	2	5	24	10	37	3	13	107
Total population 5 years and older attending educational institution	1 500	2 273	325	786	3 475	1 057	3 377	1 345	2 037	16 176

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.4 Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution, by type of institution, population group and sex, 2015

Educational institution	Thousands													
	Black African				Coloured				Indian/Asian				White	
	Male	Female	Total		Male	Female	Total		Male	Female	Total		Male	Female
Pre-school	174	184	358		17	16	32		12	30	42		232	217
School	6 158	5 972	12 130		541	547	1 089		103	343	696		7 145	6 990
Adult Basic Education and Training Learning Centre	37	66	103		2	*	2		*	1	4		39	70
Literacy classes	3	5	8		*	*	*		*	*	*		4	5
Higher Educational Institution	223	263	486		19	25	44		25	56	73		324	386
Further Education and Training College (FET)	156	209	366		8	17	25		1	6	8		172	235
Other College	55	85	141		2	7	9		3	7	11		67	104
Home-based education/home schooling	2	5	7		1	3	4		1	6	3		11	11
Other than any of the above	21	16	37		5	2	6		1	4	2		31	23
Unspecified	44	32	76		3	7	10		7	2	5		56	52
<b>Total</b>	<b>6 873</b>	<b>6 838</b>	<b>13 711</b>		<b>598</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>1 222</b>		<b>154</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>927</b>		<b>8 082</b>	<b>8 093</b>
														<b>16 176</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.5 Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution, by annual tuition fee, population group and sex, 2015

Tuition fees	Thousands											
	Black African			Coloured			Indian/Asian			White		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
None	4 541	4 343	8 884	278	277	555	4	8	12	17	12	29
R1–R100	365	370	735	17	17	34	1	*	1	*	2	2
R101–R200	279	286	565	18	17	35	*	1	1	*	2	2
R201–R300	160	171	331	21	16	37	4	2	7	1	2	3
R301–R500	158	190	348	34	24	58	5	5	10	1	*	1
R501–R1 000	180	170	350	64	69	133	14	21	35	14	7	21
R1 001–R2 000	185	191	375	43	40	84	17	18	36	15	26	41
R2 001–R3 000	80	100	180	14	19	33	6	8	14	10	14	25
R3 001–R4 000	81	92	173	17	11	27	6	15	22	23	24	47
R4 001–R8 000	232	260	492	26	34	60	25	17	42	69	59	129
R8 001–R12 000	152	164	315	20	29	49	18	17	35	78	74	152
R12 001–R16 000	97	119	216	12	20	32	14	17	31	48	57	104
R16 001–R20 000	75	76	151	4	11	15	4	5	10	43	55	98
More than R20 000	146	171	317	18	19	37	26	17	43	109	104	213
Do not know	74	75	149	7	9	16	2	2	4	15	18	34
Unspecified	67	61	128	5	12	17	7	7	13	14	13	27
<b>Total</b>	<b>6 873</b>	<b>6 838</b>	<b>13 711</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>1 222</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>927</b>
										<b>8 082</b>		<b>8 093</b>
												<b>16 176</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.6 Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution, by annual tuition fee and type of institution, 2015

Tuition fees	Thousands										Total
	Pre-school	School	Adult Basic Education and Training Learning Centre	Literacy classes	Higher Educational Institution	Further Education and Training College (FET)	Other College	Home-based education/home schooling	Other than any of the above	Unspecified	
None	125	9 106	69	4	38	86	30	1	19	1	9 480
R1-R100	11	753	5	*	*	1	3	*	*	*	772
R101-R200	21	569	5	*	*	3	2	1	2	*	603
R201-R300	15	349	5	1	2	3	3	*	*	*	377
R301-R500	27	373	5	*	1	6	3	*	1	*	417
R501-R1 000	34	484	6	*	1	9	2	*	3	*	539
R1 001-R2 000	59	423	2	*	7	33	6	3	3	*	536
R2 001-R3 000	26	186	1	*	8	24	6	*	1	*	252
R3 001-R4 000	19	210	*	2	14	18	3	*	3	*	270
R4 001-R8 000	35	521	4	*	50	72	35	2	3	1	723
R8 001-R12 000	23	377	3	*	80	43	18	*	1	6	551
R12 001-R16 000	19	228	2	*	95	24	14	*	1	1	383
R16 001-R20 000	8	128	1	*	100	22	14	2	*	*	274
More than R20 000	17	258	*	1	268	31	27	*	6	3	611
Do not know	7	123	2	*	33	28	5	*	7	*	204
Unspecified	5	46	1	*	14	5	2	14	3	95	185
<b>Total</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>14 135</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>710</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>16 176</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.7 Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution that benefited from reductions or partial bursaries, by type of institution, sex and province, 2015

Educational institution		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Pre-school	Male	2	1	*	1	2	*	2	*	*	8
	Female	*	*	*	*	1	*	1	1	*	4
	Total	2	1	*	2	3	*	3	1	*	11
School	Male	70	71	1	62	156	1	67	30	9	467
	Female	63	61	2	69	149	2	57	28	7	439
	Total	133	133	3	131	305	4	124	58	16	906
Adult Basic Education and Training Learning Centre	Male	*	1	*	1	*	1	1	*	*	4
	Female	*	*	*	*	2	1	1	*	*	4
	Total	*	1	*	1	2	2	2	*	*	8
Literacy classes	Male	*	*	*	2	*	*	*	*	*	2
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Total	*	*	*	2	*	*	*	*	*	2
Higher Educational Institution	Male	5	5	1	3	5	2	21	5	5	53
	Female	12	9	1	2	14	3	29	3	3	77
	Total	18	14	3	5	19	6	50	8	8	130
Further Education and Training College (FET)	Male	4	4	*	3	4	2	15	6	7	45
	Female	9	9	2	7	19	5	14	8	10	82
	Total	12	12	2	10	22	7	28	14	17	126
Other College	Male	2	1	*	1	*	1	2	1	1	10
	Female	2	2	*	1	5	*	4	4	*	18
	Total	4	3	*	1	5	1	7	5	1	28



### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.7 Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution that benefited from reductions or partial bursaries, by type of institution, sex and province, 2015 (concluded)

Educational institution		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Other than any of the above	Male	1	*	*	*	1	*	2	*	*	3
	Female	1	*	*	*	1	*	1	*	*	2
	Total	1	*	*	*	1	*	2	*	*	5
	Male	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	1
Unspecified	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Total	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	1
	Male	84	83	2	74	167	8	110	42	22	592
Total	Female	87	81	7	78	190	12	108	44	20	627
	Total	170	164	9	153	358	19	218	86	42	1 218

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.8 Population aged 5 years and older attending an educational institution, by the kind of problems they experience at the institution, and by province, 2015

Kind of problem experienced	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Lack of books	48	56	8	38	195	51	115	90	47	649
Poor quality of teaching	36	28	4	10	51	19	63	30	15	257
Lack of teachers	35	162	5	12	59	53	52	18	22	418
Facilities in bad condition	64	106	2	35	146	45	63	61	22	544
Fees too high	77	86	1	22	118	48	218	59	23	652
Classes too large/too many learners	109	55	5	10	156	64	123	76	52	648
Teachers are often absent from school	43	16	2	9	42	26	61	12	18	228
Teachers were involved in a strike	23	10	*	4	39	6	34	12	30	159
Other	27	30		5	33	8	45	24	14	185
Total	463	549	27	144	839	321	774	382	242	3 741

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.9 Population aged 5 years and older currently attending school by grade and by province, 2015

School grade	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Grade R/0	63	122	19	35	122	52	109	41	94	657
Grade 1	109	201	22	51	275	84	237	103	140	1 222
Grade 2	113	163	23	57	282	73	220	111	141	1 184
Grade 3	105	175	21	51	248	87	221	96	125	1 129
Grade 4	123	175	25	54	263	86	198	84	132	1 140
Grade 5	106	167	28	57	251	78	199	98	122	1 106
Grade 6	97	147	22	54	241	69	193	81	116	1 019
Grade 7	108	159	27	44	218	64	188	82	141	1 031
Grade 8	87	162	27	46	240	77	202	93	135	1 070
Grade 9	107	160	24	58	235	58	174	108	159	1 082
Grade 10	90	196	19	67	271	85	235	119	243	1 324
Grade 11	81	151	21	50	269	60	221	97	193	1 142
Grade 12/Matric	60	108	14	39	235	56	169	78	129	887
NC (V) Level 2 (N1/NTC 1)	*	*	*	*	1	*	1	*	1	3
NC (V) Level 3 (N2/NTC 2)	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	1
NC (V) Level 4 (N3/NTC 3)	*	*	*	*	1	*	1	1	*	3
Other	4	*	*	3	3	2	8	*	2	23
Unspecified	12	11	2	4	19	3	39	7	14	110
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 264</b>	<b>2 098</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>3 174</b>	<b>934</b>	<b>2 615</b>	<b>1 200</b>	<b>1 887</b>	<b>14 135</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.10 Population aged 0–4 years attending a day care centre, crèche, early childhood development centre (ECD) playgroup, nursery school or pre-primary school, by whether they attend or not, and by province, 2015

Province	Thousands		
	Attend	Do not attend	Total
Western Cape	191	349	540
Eastern Cape	206	504	710
Northern Cape	31	87	118
Free State	107	139	246
KwaZulu-Natal	210	865	1 074
North West	113	268	381
Gauteng	415	550	964
Mpumalanga	115	325	441
Limpopo	222	393	616
<b>South Africa</b>	<b>1 609</b>	<b>3 481</b>	<b>5 090</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

### 3. Attendance at an educational institution

#### 3.11 Population aged 0–4 years attending a day care centre, crèche, early childhood development centre (ECD) playgroup, nursery school or pre-primary school, by whether they attend these institutions, and by population group and sex, 2015

Population group and sex		Thousands		
		Attend	Do not attend	Total
Black African	Male	672	1 507	2 179
	Female	691	1 457	2 148
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 363</b>	<b>2 964</b>	<b>4 327</b>
Coloured	Male	54	152	207
	Female	47	159	206
	<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>413</b>
Indian/Asian	Male	13	38	50
	Female	12	38	50
	<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>
White	Male	51	75	127
	Female	69	54	123
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>250</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>1 772</b>	<b>2 562</b>
	<b>Female</b>	<b>819</b>	<b>1 708</b>	<b>2 527</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 609</b>	<b>3 481</b>	<b>5 090</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

#### 4. Medical aid coverage

##### 4.1 Medical aid coverage, by province and population group, 2015

Province		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Covered	Black African	176	392	94	271	672	399	1 724	478	395	4 601
	Coloured	562	119	52	10	44	7	126	3	15	936
	Indian/Asian	25	16	*	4	299	3	232	8	17	603
	White	743	182	62	162	250	143	1 559	163	52	3 317
	Total	1 506	709	208	447	1 264	551	3 641	651	480	9 458
Not Covered	Black African	1 778	5 515	543	2 142	8 765	2 980	8 480	3 445	5 080	38 727
	Coloured	2 650	369	402	65	70	54	277	8	18	3 912
	Indian/Asian	15	7	2	3	476	31	190	6	21	752
	White	276	55	25	101	44	56	542	88	22	1 208
	Total	4 719	5 947	972	2 310	9 354	3 121	9 488	3 547	5 140	44 599
Do not know	Black African	*	*	*	*	35	4	11	1	11	62
	Coloured	4	*	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	5
	White	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	1
	Total	4	*	1	*	35	4	12	1	11	68
	Black African	13	37	1	6	27	23	94	31	23	254
Unspecified	Coloured	2	*	1	*	*	*	5	*	*	8
	Indian/Asian	*	*	*	*	5	*	6	*	*	11
	White	2	*	*	*	3	4	21	5	*	35
	Total	16	37	2	6	35	27	126	36	23	308

#### 4. Medical aid coverage

##### 4.1 Medical aid coverage, by province and population group, 2015 (concluded)

Province		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
	Black African	1 967	5 944	638	2 419	9 499	3 406	10 308	3 955	5 509	43 645
	Coloured	3 217	488	455	75	113	60	408	12	33	4 861
	Indian/Asian	39	23	2	6	779	34	429	14	38	1 366
	White	1 022	237	87	263	297	203	2 123	256	74	4 561
Total		6 246	6 693	1 182	2 763	10 688	3 703	13 268	4 236	5 654	54 432

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

#### 4. Medical aid coverage

##### 4.2 Medical aid coverage, by population group and sex, 2015

Population group and sex		Thousands				
		Covered	Not Covered	Do not know	Unspecified	Total
Black African	Male	2 300	18 873	25	128	21 327
	Female	2 301	19 854	37	126	22 318
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4 601</b>	<b>38 727</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>43 645</b>
Coloured	Male	460	1 885	3	4	2 352
	Female	476	2 027	2	4	2 509
	<b>Total</b>	<b>936</b>	<b>3 912</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4 861</b>
Indian/Asian	Male	289	394	*	7	690
	Female	314	358	*	4	676
	<b>Total</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>752</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1 366</b>
White	Male	1 599	595	1	20	2 215
	Female	1 717	614	*	15	2 346
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3 317</b>	<b>1 208</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>4 561</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>4 649</b>	<b>21 746</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>26 584</b>
	<b>Female</b>	<b>4 808</b>	<b>22 852</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>27 849</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9 458</b>	<b>44 599</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>54 432</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.



**4. Medical aid coverage**  
**4.3 Medical aid coverage, by age group, 2015**

Age group	Thousands				
	Covered	Not Covered	Do not know	Unspecified	Total
00–09	1 491	8 803	16	88	10 398
10–19	1 471	8 639	15	68	10 193
20–29	1 151	8 851	17	39	10 058
30–39	1 706	6 844	9	39	8 598
40–49	1 525	4 797	6	29	6 357
50–59	1 104	3 257	1	24	4 386
60+	1 011	3 408	3	21	4 442
<b>Total</b>	<b>9 458</b>	<b>44 599</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>54 432</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 5. Health

### 5.1 General health perception, by province, 2015

Province	Thousands							
	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not sure	Unspecified	Total
Western Cape	2 485	1 008	2 129	436	102	6	79	6 246
Eastern Cape	2 345	2 130	1 407	475	222	*	115	6 693
Northern Cape	428	135	447	119	31	1	21	1 182
Free State	1 037	465	945	231	48	*	38	2 763
KwaZulu-Natal	3 079	1 824	4 419	719	330	2	314	10 688
North West	905	755	1 463	379	108	35	59	3 703
Gauteng	4 203	3 795	3 663	947	213	21	425	13 268
Mpumalanga	1 096	1 003	1 673	315	103	1	44	4 236
Limpopo	1 361	1 364	2 521	260	51	5	91	5 654
<b>South Africa</b>	<b>16 940</b>	<b>12 480</b>	<b>18 667</b>	<b>3 879</b>	<b>1 209</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>1 187</b>	<b>54 432</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 5. Health

### 5.2 People who were ill in the month prior to the interview and who consulted a health worker, by province, 2015

Province	Thousands					Total
	Consulted	Not consulted	Do not know	Not applicable	Unspecified	
Western Cape	361	212	*	5 651	22	6 246
Eastern Cape	524	170	*	5 976	23	6 693
Northern Cape	65	41	*	1 071	5	1 182
Free State	125	150	*	2 482	6	2 763
KwaZulu-Natal	561	249	*	9 847	30	10 688
North West	221	181	*	3 282	19	3 703
Gauteng	1 086	690	2	11 405	84	13 268
Mpumalanga	358	162	*	3 689	27	4 236
Limpopo	225	155	*	5 257	17	5 654
<b>South Africa</b>	<b>3 526</b>	<b>2 011</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>48 660</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>54 432</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 5. Health

### 5.3 People who were ill in the month prior to the interview and whether they consulted a health worker, by population group and sex, 2015

Population group and sex		Consulted	Thousands				Total
			Not consulted	Do not know	Not applicable	Unspecified	
Black African	Male	1 164	748	*	19 325	90	21 327
	Female	1 529	881	*	19 820	87	22 318
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2 693</b>	<b>1 629</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>39 145</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>43 645</b>
Coloured	Male	140	80	*	2 124	8	2 352
	Female	154	85	*	2 260	10	2 509
	<b>Total</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>4 384</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4 861</b>
Indian/Asian	Male	51	23	*	615	*	690
	Female	61	23	*	590	1	676
	<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>1 205</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1 366</b>
White	Male	185	90	2	1 920	19	2 215
	Female	241	80	*	2 006	19	2 346
	<b>Total</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3 926</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>4 561</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>1 541</b>	<b>941</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23 984</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>26 584</b>
	<b>Female</b>	<b>1 985</b>	<b>1 070</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>24 677</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>27 849</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3 526</b>	<b>2 011</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>48 660</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>54 432</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 5. Health

### 5.4 The household's normal place of consultation by province, 2015

Place of consultation		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Public sector	Public hospital	285	121	22	72	196	50	338	63	98	1 246
	Public clinic	698	1 255	206	511	1 980	813	2 589	824	1 182	10 059
	Other in public sector	8	9	1	14	30	*	17	3	5	87
	<b>Total</b>	<b>992</b>	<b>1 385</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>2 206</b>	<b>863</b>	<b>2 943</b>	<b>891</b>	<b>1 286</b>	<b>11 392</b>
	Private hospital	81	12	3	7	55	27	176	7	14	381
Private sector	Private clinic	18	4	5	12	20	16	155	14	42	285
	Private doctor/specialist	659	306	79	271	437	244	1 329	276	167	3 768
	Traditional healer	10	6	*	4	9	6	29	5	8	76
	Spiritual healer's workplace/church	1	*	*	1	3	6	7	4	5	26
	Pharmacy/chemist	8	9	1	9	1	3	22	8	3	64
	Health facility provided by employer	1	*	1	*	3	39	2	*	2	47
	Alternative medicine, e.g. homoeopathist	*	*	*	*	*	*	3	*	*	3
	Other in private sector	*	1	*	*	5	*	1	*	1	7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>777</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>1 723</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>4 658</b>
	Unspecified/Do not know	6	6	1	4	8	11	24	7	6	72
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>72</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 775</b>	<b>1 727</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>2 747</b>	<b>1 215</b>	<b>4 690</b>	<b>1 211</b>	<b>1 532</b>	<b>16 122</b>	

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 5. Health

### 5.5 The household's normal place of consultation and whether at least one member is covered by medical aid, 2015

Place of consultation	Thousands			
	Covered	Not Covered	Unspecified	Total
Public sector	Public hospital	1 103	4	1 246
	Public clinic	555	19	10 059
	Other in public sector	10	*	87
	<b>Total</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11 392</b>
Private sector	Private hospital	301	1	381
	Private clinic	135	1	285
	Private doctor/specialist	2 560	6	3 768
	Traditional healer	5	*	76
	Spiritual healer's workplace/church	5	*	26
	Pharmacy/chemist	11	*	64
	Health facility provided by employer	32	*	47
Unspecified/Do not know	Alternative medicine, e.g. homoeopathist	3	*	3
	Other in private sector	*	*	7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3 052</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4 658</b>
	Unspecified/Do not know	22	2	72
<b>Total</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>72</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3 778</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 5. Health

### 5.6 The respondent's level of satisfaction with the service received during their most recent visit, by kind of health facility used, 2015

Place of consultation	Thousands					
	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Unspecified
Public sector	Public hospital	665	249	56	52	82
	Public clinic	5 308	2 181	762	440	549
	Other in public sector	41	19	10	4	7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6 014</b>	<b>2 449</b>	<b>828</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>638</b>
						<b>87</b>
Private sector	Private hospital	291	36	5	6	3
	Private clinic	221	32	4	6	6
	Private doctor/specialist	3 363	160	25	21	7
	Traditional healer	35	13	7	2	5
	Spiritual healer's workplace/church	22	1	*	*	*
	Pharmacy/chemist	46	7	2	*	*
	Health facility provided by employer	38	2	*	2	*
	Alternative medicine, e.g. homoeopathist	3	*	*	*	*
	Other in private sector	5	*	*	1	*
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4 023</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>21</b>
Unspecified/Do not know						
	Unspecified/Do not know	39	8	*	1	2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total number of households (RSA)</b>		<b>10 076</b>	<b>2 706</b>	<b>872</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>661</b>
						<b>118</b>
						<b>14 967</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 5. Health

### 5.7 The respondent's level of satisfaction with the service received during their most recent visit to a health facility, by population group and sex, 2015

Population group and sex		Thousands						Total
		Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Unspecified	
Black African	Male	4 298	1 270	430	226	286	54	6 565
	Female	3 385	1 150	340	213	261	43	5 394
	Total	7 683	2 420	770	440	548	98	11 958
Coloured	Male	452	70	43	40	53	4	662
	Female	284	66	36	24	39	2	451
	Total	736	136	78	64	92	7	1 113
Indian/Asian	Male	192	38	9	7	6	1	253
	Female	70	21	2	4	2	*	99
	Total	262	59	10	11	9	1	352
White	Male	982	58	11	9	6	9	1 076
	Female	413	32	2	11	6	4	469
	Total	1 395	91	14	20	13	13	1 544
Total	Male	5 924	1 437	492	282	352	68	8 556
	Female	4 152	1 269	380	252	309	49	6 412
	Total	10 076	2 706	872	535	661	118	14 967

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.



## 5. Health

### 5.8 People who were sick/injured and who did not consult a health worker in the month prior to the interview, by the reason for not consulting, and by population group and sex, 2015

Reason for not consulting a health worker	Thousands														
	Black African			Coloured			Indian/Asian			White			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Too expensive	9	25	35	2	3	5	1		1	1	2	3	13	31	44
Too far	10	11	21	1	*	1	*	*	*	1	*	1	12	11	23
Not necessary/problem not serious enough	184	178	363	18	13	31	2	4	7	25	15	40	230	211	441
Self medicated/treated myself	509	643	1 152	56	68	124	20	19	39	61	60	122	647	791	1 437
Fear of stigmatization	3	*	3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	3	*	3
Queues too long	3	1	4	1	*	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	3	1	4
Transportation problems	1	4	6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	4	6
Experiencing difficulty getting a diagnosis	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Do not know	2	*	3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2	*	3
Other	8	5	13	1	*	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	9	5	14
Unspecified	18	12	30	1	1	2	*	*	*	1	3	4	20	15	36
Total	748	881	1 629	80	85	165	23	23	47	90	80	170	941	1 070	2 011

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 5. Health

### 5.9 Population suffering from chronic health conditions as diagnosed by a medical practitioner or nurse, by sex and province, 2015

Chronic health condition		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
	Male	91	55	11	20	83	28	160	31	21	502
	Female	140	73	19	38	115	50	176	57	30	697
	Total	232	128	30	58	198	78	335	88	51	1 199
Asthma	Male	103	66	14	30	112	42	182	35	30	615
	Female	138	137	24	49	230	59	230	50	45	961
	Total	242	203	38	78	342	100	412	85	75	1 576
Diabetes	Male	13	5	1	3	19	6	42	6	6	102
	Female	19	11	2	8	20	5	34	14	2	116
	Total	32	16	4	11	38	11	76	20	9	218
Cancer	Male	30	68	15	38	163	41	89	55	31	530
	Female	50	138	15	60	293	76	138	92	61	922
	Total	80	205	30	98	456	118	227	147	92	1 453
HIV and AIDS	Male	254	156	50	97	199	134	414	95	64	1 464
	Female	391	421	94	212	548	238	713	198	162	2 978
	Total	645	577	144	309	748	372	1 127	293	227	4 441
Hypertension/high blood pressure	Male	31	25	7	11	68	14	60	19	10	245
	Female	110	158	25	68	247	44	184	44	24	905
	Total	141	183	32	79	315	59	244	64	34	1 150
Arthritis	Male	13	13	3	6	17	6	45	8	8	118
	Female	8	22	6	8	29	7	27	10	3	119
	Total	21	34	9	14	45	12	72	18	12	237
Stroke											

## 5. Health

### 5.9 Population suffering from chronic health conditions as diagnosed by a medical practitioner or nurse, by sex and province, 2015 (continued)

Chronic health condition		Thousands									South Africa
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	
Heart attack / Myocardial infarction	Male	29	15	7	7	28	7	52	9	6	159
	Female	33	38	11	33	36	13	50	8	2	224
	<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>383</b>
	Male	28	41	7	13	43	26	51	17	14	241
Tuberculosis	Female	17	45	4	8	32	10	39	14	6	175
	<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>416</b>
	Male	14	44	3	14	37	23	49	12	24	220
	Female	26	16	4	9	27	11	40	12	14	159
Mental illness	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>379</b>
	Male	18	47	8	14	28	19	50	12	13	210
	Female	18	25	6	11	44	23	40	11	9	189
	<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>399</b>
Epilepsy	Male	19	10	1	5	9	8	36	16	5	110
	Female	24	11	1	6	16	6	31	11	*	107
	<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>217</b>
	Male	5	5	*	5	9	4	28	2	5	63
Meningitis and Sinusitis	Female	5	6	1	4	11	2	17	3	1	50
	<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>113</b>
	Male	11	8	2	2	9	5	42	3	5	87
	Female	11	2	2	6	9	8	30	5	1	75
Bronchitis	<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>162</b>

## 5. Health

### 5.9 Population suffering from chronic health conditions as diagnosed by a medical practitioner or nurse, by sex and province, 2015 (concluded)

Chronic health condition		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
High Cholesterol	Male	68	8	5	7	20	13	91	14	4	229
	Female	77	7	4	5	23	17	62	10	1	207
	Total	145	16	9	12	43	30	153	24	5	436
Osteoporosis	Male	7	1	*	1	8	3	26	3	4	53
	Female	18	2	2	4	10	4	33	3	*	74
	Total	25	3	2	5	17	7	59	6	4	127
Other	Male	31	17	4	20	26	10	65	7	17	199
	Female	46	40	11	22	33	12	92	14	10	281
	Total	77	58	15	42	59	22	157	21	27	480
Total population	Male	3 038	3 169	563	1 335	5 142	1 840	6 725	2 070	2 701	26 584
	Female	3 207	3 523	619	1 428	5 546	1 863	6 543	2 166	2 953	27 849
	Total	6 246	6 693	1 182	2 763	10 688	3 703	13 268	4 236	5 654	54 432

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 6. Disabilities

### 6.1 Population aged 5 years and older that have some difficulty or are unable to do basic activities, by province, 2015

Degree of difficulty with which basic activities are carried out		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Seeing	Some difficulty	258	268	79	208	410	208	889	212	166	2 697
	A lot of difficulty	79	50	11	29	68	25	73	38	12	383
	Unable to do	4	6	3	4	7	4	13	6	5	53
	<b>Total</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>974</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>3 134</b>
Hearing	Some difficulty	79	92	25	64	134	69	157	56	55	730
	A lot of difficulty	14	20	4	7	28	14	22	11	6	128
	Unable to do	5	5	1	3	7	3	9	3	2	37
	<b>Total</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>895</b>
Walking	Some difficulty	92	98	18	43	160	52	176	60	104	803
	A lot of difficulty	41	60	12	15	76	23	65	21	29	341
	Unable to do	18	38	5	7	29	15	40	12	7	170
	<b>Total</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>1 315</b>
Remembering and concentrating	Some difficulty	55	202	22	63	180	108	162	38	43	873
	A lot of difficulty	24	85	7	15	71	72	46	11	18	349
	Unable to do	8	24	2	5	28	11	24	5	3	111
	<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>1 332</b>
Self-care	Some difficulty	77	203	27	27	230	61	177	50	144	996
	A lot of difficulty	25	63	11	17	96	34	44	25	66	380
	Unable to do	28	52	10	16	71	38	57	18	34	325
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>1 700</b>

## 6. Disabilities

### 6.1 Population aged 5 years and older that have some difficulty or are unable to do basic activities, by province, 2015 (concluded)

Degree of difficulty with which basic activities are carried out		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
	Some difficulty	24	40	7	4	71	5	50	6	20	227
	A lot of difficulty	6	27	2	5	17	7	13	1	7	85
	Unable to do	6	20	2	3	16	6	24	4	4	85
Communication		36	87	11	13	103	17	88	11	31	397
Total aged 5 years and older		5 701	5 968	1 064	2 514	9 583	3 320	12 272	3 788	5 022	49 231

Totals exclude the 'don't know' and 'No difficulty' options as well as unspecified.

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

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

Only individuals aged five years and older are used for this analysis as children below the age of five years are often mistakenly categorized as being unable to walk, remember, communicate or care for themselves when it is due to their level of development rather than any innate disabilities they might have. These issues are however actively addressed during training of fieldworkers.

## 6. Disabilities

### 6.2 Population aged 5 years and older that have some difficulty, a lot of difficulty or are unable to do basic activities, by population group and sex, 2015

Thousands																
Degree of difficulty with which basic activities are carried out		Black African			Coloured			Indian/Asian			White			Total		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Seeing	Some difficulty	1 223	756	1 979	128	89	216	42	29	71	230	200	431	1 622	1 075	2 697
	A lot of difficulty	169	104	273	28	26	54	8	3	11	22	23	46	227	156	383
	Unable to do	18	25	44	1	1	2	*	1	1	4	3	7	24	30	53
	Total	1 410	886	2 295	157	115	272	49	33	83	257	226	483	1 872	1 261	3 134
Hearing	Some difficulty	347	208	555	39	26	65	8	9	17	42	51	93	436	294	730
	A lot of difficulty	60	38	98	6	4	10	2	*	2	10	7	18	78	50	128
	Unable to do	12	15	27	*	3	3	*	1	1	3	3	6	15	22	37
	Total	419	261	680	45	33	78	10	10	20	55	62	117	529	366	895
Walking	Some difficulty	389	214	603	45	31	76	13	10	23	57	45	101	504	299	803
	A lot of difficulty	155	98	252	18	19	36	2	4	6	26	21	46	200	141	341
	Unable to do	61	62	123	8	10	18	2	1	3	18	9	26	89	82	170
	Total	605	374	978	71	59	130	18	14	32	100	74	174	793	521	1 315
Remembering and concentrating	Some difficulty	403	327	730	29	25	54	12	12	24	32	32	64	477	395	873
	A lot of difficulty	163	142	305	10	16	27	2	2	5	9	4	13	184	165	349
	Unable to do	34	52	86	2	4	6	1	1	1	11	6	17	48	63	111
	Total	600	521	1 122	42	45	87	15	15	30	52	42	94	709	623	1 332
Self-care	Some difficulty	454	411	866	30	40	70	9	10	19	25	16	41	519	477	996
	A lot of difficulty	169	171	340	12	10	22	2	4	6	6	6	12	188	191	380
	Unable to do	122	153	275	9	12	21	2	2	4	16	8	24	150	175	325
	Total	745	735	1 481	51	62	113	13	16	29	47	30	77	857	843	1 700

**6.2 Population aged 5 years and older that have some difficulty, a lot of difficulty or are unable to do basic activities, by population group and sex, 2015 (concluded)**

Degree of difficulty with which basic activities are carried out		Thousands														
		Black African			Coloured			Indian/Asian			White			Total		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Communication	Some difficulty	97	95	193	12	6	19	4	2	7	7	1	8	121	106	227
		32	43	75	2	3	5	*	1	1	3	2	5	38	48	85
		28	39	67	3	3	6	*	*	*	9	3	12	40	45	85
	Total	157	177	335	17	13	30	4	4	8	19	6	25	198	199	397
Total aged 5 years and older		20 125	19 096	39 221	2 302	2 142	4 443	626	639	1 265	2 219	2 083	4 302	23 959	23 959	49 231

Only individuals aged five years or older are used for this analysis as children below the age of five years are often mistakenly categorized as being unable to walk, remember, communicate or care for themselves when it is due to their level of development rather than any innate disabilities they might have. These issues are however actively addressed during training of fieldworkers.



## 6. Disabilities

### 6.3 Population aged 5 years and older that are using assistive devices, by sex and province, 2015

Assistive devices		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
	Male	498	127	45	91	201	114	838	106	60	2 081
	Female	678	230	74	139	286	169	1 089	143	80	2 889
	Total	1 176	357	119	231	487	283	1 927	249	141	4 970
Eye glasses/spectacles/contact lenses	Male	8	2	2	*	6	2	33	4	*	57
	Female	10	8	1	4	10	3	16	3	3	57
	Total	18	10	3	4	16	5	49	7	3	114
Hearing aid	Male	13	26	3	6	27	17	30	8	9	139
	Female	17	34	6	18	43	22	46	20	18	224
	Total	30	60	9	24	69	40	76	28	27	363
Walking stick/walking frame	Male	10	7	3	2	9	3	20	4	2	61
	Female	9	19	3	2	8	3	21	4	5	73
	Total	19	26	6	4	17	6	41	8	7	134
A wheelchair	Male	405	287	69	153	432	210	448	166	91	2 261
	Female	603	583	108	289	825	339	680	266	158	3 850
	Total	1 007	870	177	442	1 257	549	1 128	431	249	6 111
Chronic medication	Male	3	2	*	2	1	1	6	*	1	15
	Female	*	2	1	1	2	2	6	1	2	17
	Total	4	4	1	2	2	3	13	1	3	33
Other assistive devices											

## 6. Disabilities

### 6.3 Population aged 5 years and older that are using assistive devices, by sex and province, 2015 (concluded)

Assistive devices		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Total aged 5 years and older	Male	2 756	2 808	503	1 208	4 587	1 652	6 234	1 837	2 375	23 959
	Female	2 945	3 160	561	1 306	4 996	1 667	6 039	1 951	2 647	25 271
	Total	5 701	5 968	1 064	2 514	9 583	3 320	12 272	3 788	5 022	49 231

Totals exclude the 'don't know' and 'No difficulty' options as well as unspecified. Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals. Only individuals over the age of five years are used for this analysis as children below the age of five years are often mistakenly categorized as being unable to walk, remember, communicate or care for themselves when it is due to their level of development rather than any innate disabilities they might have. These issues are however actively addressed during training of fieldworkers. Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 7. Social welfare

### 7.1 Population that received social grants, relief assistance or social relief, by population group, sex and province, 2015

Population group and sex		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Black African	Male	231	1 216	116	372	1 793	549	950	669	982	6 878
	Female	245	1 319	136	429	1 968	643	1 130	706	1 164	7 740
	Total	476	2 535	252	801	3 761	1 192	2 079	1 375	2 146	14 618
Coloured	Male	408	66	79	13	11	8	31	1	2	617
	Female	446	72	97	11	12	10	37	2	6	692
	Total	854	137	175	24	23	18	68	2	8	1 309
Indian/Asian	Male	1	2	*	*	53	*	10	*	*	65
	Female	1	4	*	*	75	*	17	*	2	98
	Total	2	6	*	*	128	*	26	*	2	164
White	Male	16	5	3	11	7	2	54	4	2	104
	Female	25	13	7	20	9	7	88	13	4	185
	Total	41	19	9	31	16	9	141	16	7	289
Total	Male	655	1 289	197	396	1 865	558	1 045	673	986	7 664
	Female	717	1 408	239	460	2 063	660	1 271	720	1 176	8 716
	Total	1 372	2 698	437	856	3 928	1 219	2 315	1 393	2 162	16 380

Totals exclude unspecified grant receipt.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.1 Type of dwelling, by number of rooms in the dwelling

#### 8.1.1 All population groups, 2015

Type of dwelling	Thousands				
	1–3 rooms	4–5 rooms	6+ rooms	Unspecified	Total
Dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	1 413	3 161	5 584	19	10 177
Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	378	358	368	2	1 106
Flat or apartment in a block of flats	179	324	134	2	640
Cluster house in complex	5	22	56	*	83
Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	13	92	150	3	259
Semi-detached house	39	115	91	*	245
Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	484	29	28	*	541
Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	813	29	5	2	849
Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	1 200	190	37	1	1 428
Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling servant quarters/granny flat	567	68	17	1	653
Caravan/tent	11	1	1	*	13
Other	108	16	5	1	129
<b>Total</b>	<b>5 210</b>	<b>4 405</b>	<b>6 475</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.1 Type of dwelling, by number of rooms in the dwelling

#### 8.1.2 Black African population group, 2015

Type of dwelling	Thousands				
	1–3 rooms	4–5 rooms	6+ rooms	Unspecified	Total
Dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	1 316	2 755	3 814	12	7 897
Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	376	358	366	2	1 101
Flat or apartment in a block of flats	164	178	47	1	390
Cluster house in complex	5	6	21	*	32
Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	8	33	51	3	95
Semi-detached house	19	35	19	*	73
Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	467	21	26	*	513
Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	774	21	2	2	799
Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	1 171	182	32	1	1 385
Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling servant quarters/granny flat	540	47	10	1	598
Caravan/tent	10	1	1	*	12
Other	88	11	3	1	103
<b>Total</b>	<b>4 936</b>	<b>3 647</b>	<b>4 391</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>12 998</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.1 Type of dwelling, by number of rooms in the dwelling

#### 8.1.3 Other\*\* population groups, 2015

Type of dwelling	Thousands				
	1-3 rooms	4-5 rooms	6+ rooms	Unspecified	Total
Dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	97	407	1 769	7	2 280
Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	2	*	3	*	5
Flat or apartment in a block of flats	15	146	88	1	250
Cluster house in complex	*	16	35	*	52
Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	6	59	98	*	164
Semi-detached house	20	80	72	*	172
Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	17	8	2	*	27
Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	39	8	3	*	50
Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	29	8	6	*	43
Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling servant quarters/granny flat	27	21	7	*	54
Caravan/tent	1	1	*	*	2
Other	20	4	2	*	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>758</b>	<b>2 085</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3 124</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

\*\* Other includes coloured, Asian/Indian and white.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.2 Type of dwelling of households, by province, 2015

Type of dwelling	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	1 061	915	254	660	1 643	807	2 672	937	1 229	10 177
Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	1	481	3	16	486	7	10	58	44	1 106
Flat or apartment in a block of flats	131	43	2	20	134	26	265	11	8	640
Cluster house in complex	11	2	*	1	13	8	47	1	1	83
Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	35	13	1	7	13	11	172	6	*	259
Semi-detached house	153	46	5	12	12	1	14	*	1	245
Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	15	15	3	21	45	47	337	19	39	541
Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	123	29	5	52	28	71	486	23	32	849
Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	182	97	35	92	187	195	481	92	68	1 428
Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling servant quarters/granny flat	30	85	11	21	182	43	112	60	109	653
Caravan/tent	1	*	*	1	3	*	6	1	1	13
Other	30	3	2	2	1	*	88	4	*	129
Total	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.3 Type of dwelling of households, by main source of water, 2015

Type of dwelling	Thousands							
	Piped (Tap) water in dwelling	Piped (Tap) water on site or in yard	Borehole on site	Rain-water tank on site	Neighbours tap	Public tap	Water-carrier/Tanker	Borehole off site/communal
Formal dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	5 712	2 269	210	76	266	993	154	143
Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	25	201	5	35	38	344	32	39
Flat or apartment in a block of flats	562	56	1	*	6	11	1	1
Cluster house in complex	78	2	*	*	*	1	1	1
Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	251	2	*	*	*	3	*	*
Semi-detached house	224	19	*	*	*	2	1	*
Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	88	389	14	*	4	18	8	15
Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	91	627	4	*	23	79	15	4
Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	75	433	13	2	82	718	69	11
Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling servant quarters/granny flat	207	311	13	7	12	63	17	14
Caravan/tent	5	9	*	*	*	*	*	*
Other	68	36	1	*	1	14	7	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>7 385</b>	<b>4 354</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>2 247</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>229</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.



## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.3 Type of dwelling of households, by main source of water, 2015 (concluded)

Type of dwelling	Thousands				
	Flowing water/Stream/ River	Dam/Pool/ Stagnant water	Well	Spring	Other
Formal dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	131	21	56	74	72
Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	231	13	26	108	9
Flat or apartment in a block of flats	*	*	*	1	1
Cluster house in complex	1	*	*	*	*
Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	*	*	*	*	2
Semi-detached house	*	*	*	*	*
Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	2	*	1	1	*
Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	1	*	*	*	4
Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	6	1	5	1	13
Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling servant quarters/granny flat	5	*	1	1	2
Caravan/tent	*	*	*	*	*
Other	2	*	*	*	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>103</b>
					<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.4 Households by type of dwelling, by tenure status, 2015

Type of dwelling	Rented	Thousands							Do not know	Total
		Rented from other	Owned, but not yet paid off to bank /financial institution	Owned, but not yet paid off to private lender	Owned and fully paid off	Occupied rent-free	Other			
Dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	1 156	122	933	137	6 400	1 233	153	43	10 177	
Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	61	2	3	6	904	115	11	4	1 106	
Flat or apartment in a block of flats	374	112	24	4	71	51	5	*	640	
Cluster house in complex	29	2	20	6	24	3	*	*	83	
Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	101	27	57	7	56	5	4	1	259	
Semi-detached house	46	16	24	3	122	28	5	1	245	
Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	410	4	*	1	49	69	8	*	541	
Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	591	4	1	3	99	142	6	4	849	
Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	260	6	2	3	746	376	34	1	1 428	
Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling servant quarters/granny flat	439	34	3	1	31	130	13	1	653	
Caravan/tent	4	1	*	*	1	8	*	*	13	
Other	46	15	*	*	9	54	1	4	129	
Total	3 519	344	1 067	170	8 510	2 213	240	58	16 122	

Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.  
Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.5 Tenure status of households, by province, 2015

Province	Thousands								
	Rented	Rented from other	Owned, but not yet paid off to bank/financial institution	Owned, but not yet paid off to private lender	Owned and fully paid off	Occupied rent-free	Other	Do not know	Total
Western Cape	415	84	204	13	798	246	12	4	1 775
Eastern Cape	262	32	66	7	1 073	282	3	3	1 727
Northern Cape	45	5	10	3	205	50	2	*	320
Free State	175	14	37	13	471	180	14	1	906
KwaZulu-Natal	527	33	106	20	1 754	278	19	9	2 747
North West	257	31	35	4	770	107	6	4	1 215
Gauteng	1 443	115	531	93	1 496	815	163	35	4 690
Mpumalanga	180	11	55	10	816	123	14	1	1 211
Limpopo	214	20	23	6	1 127	133	7	1	1 532
<b>South Africa</b>	<b>3 519</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>1 067</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>8 510</b>	<b>2 213</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.6 Type of ownership of the dwellings of households, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015

Population group and sex			Thousands								
			Rented	Rented from other	Owned, but not yet paid off to bank/financial institution	Owned, but not yet paid off to private lender	Owned and fully paid off	Occupied rent-free	Other	Do not know	Total
	Male	2 025	155	326	65	3 460	1 206	118	27	7 381	
	Female	816	63	132	35	3 699	765	89	17	5 617	
	Total	2 841	218	458	100	7 159	1 971	207	44	12 998	
	Male	137	21	100	8	289	116	6	2	679	
	Female	61	37	27	5	254	67	3	2	457	
	Total	198	58	127	12	544	183	9	4	1 136	
	Male	60	3	62	4	123	10	1	4	268	
	Female	17	6	14	3	58	2	1	*	101	
	Total	77	9	77	7	181	12	2	4	369	
	Male	257	40	327	38	414	37	12	6	1 131	
	Female	146	19	78	13	213	10	9	*	489	
	Total	403	59	406	51	627	47	22	6	1 619	
	Male	2 478	220	815	115	4 286	1 369	137	39	9 459	
	Female	1 041	125	252	55	4 224	844	103	19	6 663	
	Total	3 519	344	1 067	170	8 510	2 213	240	58	16 122	

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.7 Type of dwelling of households, by main source of energy

#### 8.7.1 For cooking, 2015

Type of dwelling	Thousands										
	Electricity from mains	Electricity from generator	Gas	Paraffin	Wood	Coal	Candles	Animal dung	Solar energy	Other	None
Dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	8 592	41	388	154	906	49	12	4	18	4	9
Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	513	3	20	105	442	10	*	8	2	1	1
Flat or apartment in a block of flats	593	11	21	8	3	*	1	*	*	1	1
Cluster house in complex	76	*	4	*	3	*	*	*	*	*	*
Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	245	1	9	*	1	*	1	*	*	*	1
Semi-detached house	224	*	19	1	*	*	*	*	1	*	1
Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	390	95	8	8	19	1	3	*	1	13	2
Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	559	145	15	89	19	2	2	1	2	12	2
Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	730	61	54	469	87	17	1	1	2	1	4
Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling servant quarters/granny flat	556	32	11	29	25	*	*	*	*	*	*
Caravan/tent	13	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1
Other	106	6	11	2		*	*	*	*	3	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 597</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>867</b>	<b>1 505</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>23</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.7 Type of dwelling of households, by main source of energy

#### 8.7.2 For heating, 2015

Type of dwelling	Thousands									
	Electricity from mains	Electricity from generator	Gas	Paraffin	Wood	Coal	Candles	Animal dung	Solar energy	Other
Dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	4 074	24	304	652	932	155	2	6	11	17
										3 998
<b>10 177</b>										
Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	89	2	2	100	531	13	2	4	5	1
<b>1 106</b>										
Flat or apartment in a block of flats	344	8	17	18	5	*	*	*	*	1
<b>640</b>										
Cluster house in complex	42	*	8	*	3	*	*	*	*	1
<b>83</b>										
Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	150	1	36	1	2	*	2	*	*	*
<b>259</b>										
Semi-detached house	95	*	4	21	4	1	*	*	*	*
<b>245</b>										
Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	198	67	5	13	24	2	3	*	*	5
<b>541</b>										
Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	261	107	4	59	38	6	2	1	1	6
<b>849</b>										
Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	179	18	6	178	142	65	2	1	1	2
<b>1 428</b>										
Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling servant quarters/granny flat	231	16	5	42	30	2	1	*	*	*
<b>653</b>										
Caravan/tent	8	*	*	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>13</b>										
Other	60	2	*	1	2	*	*	*	*	3
<b>129</b>										
<b>Total</b>	<b>5 731</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>1 086</b>	<b>1 714</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>16 122</b>										

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 8. Dwellings and services

### 8.7 Type of dwelling of households, by main source of energy

#### 8.7.3 For lighting, 2015

Type of dwelling	Thousands										
	Electricity from mains	Electricity from generator	Gas	Paraffin	Wood	Coal	Candles	Solar energy	Other	None	Total
Dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	9 768	37	6	53	15	2	263	20	3	7	10 177
Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	775	11	*	61	5	*	233	22	*	*	1 106
Flat or apartment in a block of flats	611	9	*	3	*	*	10	2	1	2	640
Cluster house in complex	82	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	83
Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	257	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	259
Semi-detached house	244	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	245
Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	413	94	*	2	*	*	17	1	13	1	541
Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	586	146	2	20	2	*	73	4	13	3	849
Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	789	73	3	153	4	*	384	18	2	3	1 428
Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling servant quarters/granny flat	585	32	*	6	*	*	27	1	*	1	653
Caravan/tent	13	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	13
Other	116	6	*	3	*	*	*	*	3	1	129
Total	14 239	410	11	302	26	2	1 009	68	36	17	16 122

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 9. Water services

### 9.1 Main source of water for households, by province, 2015

Main source of water	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Piped (Tap) water in dwelling	1 382	545	150	416	991	345	2 998	361	198	7 385
Piped (Tap) water on site or in yard	214	250	98	395	760	418	1 232	471	517	4 354
Borehole on site	2	9	3	13	12	48	28	33	111	259
Rain-water tank on site	3	98	1	*	12	1	3	1	1	120
Neighbour's tap	7	19	4	16	90	58	29	88	121	431
Public tap	158	480	58	44	472	226	321	115	372	2 247
Water-carrier/Tanker	1	9	1	3	86	68	52	34	49	304
Borehole off site/communal	1	3	5	16	57	35	17	38	58	229
Flowing water/Stream/River	2	198	*	1	132	*	3	20	22	379
Dam/Pool/Stagnant water	*	2	1	*	27	*	*	1	4	35
Well	*	*	*	*	40	6	*	34	10	90
Spring	2	109	*	*	53	*	*	5	17	186
Other	3	4	*	2	15	11	5	10	53	103
Total	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.



## 9. Water services

### 9.2 Households by main source of water, by population group of the household head, 2015

Main source of water	Thousands				
	Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	Total
Piped (Tap) water in dwelling	4 548	943	350	1 544	7 385
Piped (Tap) water on site or in yard	4 189	145	11	10	4 354
Borehole on site	2 15	6	*	38	259
Rain-water tank on site	114	3	*	2	120
Neighbour's tap	423	5	2	1	431
Public tap	2 217	24	3	2	2 247
Water-carrier/Tanker	300	2	1	*	304
Borehole off site/communal	209	1	1	18	229
Flowing water/Stream/River	378	1	*	*	379
Dam/Pool/Stagnant water	34	1	*	*	35
Well	89	*	*	1	90
Spring	184	*	*	2	186
Other	97	3	1	2	103
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 998</b>	<b>1 136</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>1 619</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 9. Water services

### 9.3 Households whose main source of water was supplied by the local municipality, by province, 2015

Main source of water supplied by local municipality	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Yes	1 677	1 230	294	838	2 207	855	4 505	972	1 024	13 603
No	95	489	26	62	451	280	110	224	488	2 225
Do not know	1	1	*	2	82	73	52	9	15	235
Unspecified	1	7	1	3	7	7	23	6	5	58
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 775</b>	<b>1 727</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>2 747</b>	<b>1 215</b>	<b>4 690</b>	<b>1 211</b>	<b>1 532</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

#### 9.4 Households whose main source of water was supplied by the local municipality, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015

Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.  
Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 9. Water services

### 9.5 Households without water in the dwelling or on site, by the distance household members have to travel to reach the nearest water source, and population group of the household head, 2015

Distance travelled to the nearest water source	Thousands				
	Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	Total
Less than 200m	1 987	29	2	12	2 031
Between 201m–500m	1 032	1	2	2	1 036
Between 501m–1km	378	2	*	1	381
More than 1km	172	1	*	1	173
Do not know	6	*	*	*	6
Unspecified	357	6	5	9	377
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 932</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4 004</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 9. Water services

### 9.6 Households' perceptions of water quality, per province, 2015

Perceptions of water quality		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	KwaZulu- Natal	Northern Cape	Free State	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Safe to drink	Yes	1 745	1 427	286	791	2 488	1 102	4 570	996	1 439	14 845
	No	29	295	33	111	250	109	90	200	86	1 205
	Unspecified	1	5	1	3	8	4	29	15	7	72
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 775</b>	<b>1 727</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>2 747</b>	<b>1 215</b>	<b>4 690</b>	<b>1 211</b>	<b>1 532</b>	<b>16 122</b>
Clear	Yes	1 722	1 495	279	742	2 491	1 077	4 562	988	1 429	14 784
	No	51	226	41	162	247	134	104	208	97	1 271
	Unspecified	2	6	*	2	8	4	24	14	6	66
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 775</b>	<b>1 727</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>2 747</b>	<b>1 215</b>	<b>4 690</b>	<b>1 211</b>	<b>1 532</b>	<b>16 122</b>
Good in taste	Yes	1 723	1 386	284	785	2 483	1 077	4 564	981	1 360	14 643
	No	50	334	36	120	253	136	106	212	166	1 413
	Unspecified	2	8	*	1	10	2	20	17	7	66
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 775</b>	<b>1 727</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>2 747</b>	<b>1 215</b>	<b>4 690</b>	<b>1 211</b>	<b>1 532</b>	<b>16 122</b>
Free from bad smells	Yes	1 718	1 543	298	769	2 500	1 092	4 569	1 022	1 433	14 945
	No	54	176	21	135	234	116	94	173	94	1 097
	Unspecified	2	8		2	12	7	27	16	6	81
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 775</b>	<b>1 727</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>2 747</b>	<b>1 215</b>	<b>4 690</b>	<b>1 211</b>	<b>1 532</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 10. Communication

### 10.1 Households' ownership of a cellular phone, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015

Population group and sex of household head		Thousands			
		Yes	No	Unspecified	Total
Black African	Male	7 091	283	7	7 381
	Female	5 423	191	3	5 617
	<b>Total</b>	<b>12 514</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12 998</b>
Coloured	Male	628	51	1	679
	Female	418	39	*	457
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 045</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1 136</b>
Indian/Asian	Male	264	3	1	268
	Female	98	3	*	101
	<b>Total</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>369</b>
White	Male	1 128	3	*	1 131
	Female	484	4	*	489
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 612</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>1 619</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>9 110</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9 459</b>
	<b>Female</b>	<b>6 423</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6 663</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>15 534</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 10. Communication

### 10.2 Households' ownership of a cellular phone, by province, 2015

Cell phone	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Yes	1 692	1 605	284	859	2 661	1 155	4 609	1 185	1 484	15 534
No	81	121	36	46	85	60	76	24	48	577
Unspecified	1	1	*	1	1	1	5	2	1	11
Total	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**10. Communication****10.3 Households with connection of a landline phone, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015**

Population group and sex of household head		Thousands			
		Yes	No	Unspecified	Total
Black African	Male	327	6 987	67	7 381
	Female	205	5 354	57	5 617
	<b>Total</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>12 341</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>12 998</b>
Coloured	Male	133	543	3	679
	Female	75	381	1	457
	<b>Total</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1 136</b>
Indian/Asian	Male	143	120	4	268
	Female	50	51	*	101
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>369</b>
White	Male	591	536	4	1 131
	Female	239	243	6	489
	<b>Total</b>	<b>830</b>	<b>779</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1 619</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>1 194</b>	<b>8 187</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>9 459</b>
	<b>Female</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>6 029</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>6 663</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 764</b>	<b>14 215</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.



## 10. Communication

### 10.4 Households' ownership of a landline phone, by province, 2015

Ownership of a landline phone	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Yes	466	102	35	55	298	66	657	43	42	1 764
No	1 299	1 613	284	848	2 429	1 137	3 979	1 148	1 478	14 215
Unspecified	9	13	1	3	19	12	54	20	12	142
Total	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**11. Source of energy****11.1 Electricity connection to the mains, by population group, sex of the household head and province, 2015**

Population group and sex		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Black African	Male	315	560	86	372	931	535	1 898	543	678	5 919
	Female	192	652	75	318	958	379	1 106	439	710	4 829
	<b>Total</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>1 213</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>1 889</b>	<b>913</b>	<b>3 004</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>1 388</b>	<b>10 748</b>
Coloured	Male	376	73	51	14	17	10	76	3	3	624
	Female	272	43	48	11	10	11	34	1	3	434
	<b>Total</b>	<b>648</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1 058</b>
Indian/Asian	Male	9	4	1	2	155	7	78	3	7	266
	Female	2	*	*	1	62	*	34	*	1	100
	<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>367</b>
White	Male	282	65	24	56	75	53	497	53	19	1 126
	Female	152	22	11	30	35	25	178	20	4	478
	<b>Total</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1 604</b>
<b>Total</b>	Male	<b>982</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>1 179</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>2 548</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>7 935</b>
	Female	<b>618</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>1 065</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>1 353</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>5 841</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 600</b>	<b>1 422</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>2 244</b>	<b>1 021</b>	<b>3 901</b>	<b>1 063</b>	<b>1 424</b>	<b>13 777</b>

## 11.2 Source of energy

### 11.2 Main source of energy used by households, by province

#### 11.2.1 For cooking, 2015

Energy for cooking	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Electricity from mains	1 516	1 263	275	787	2 104	977	3 856	899	921	12 597
Electricity from generator	31	12	1	1	39	51	249	2	7	394
Gas	179	73	17	35	59	22	137	17	21	560
Paraffin	26	174	10	45	100	72	363	47	29	867
Wood	13	192	14	25	419	89	25	193	536	1 505
Coal	1	1	1	7	11	*	5	47	7	80
Candles	1	1	*	1	4	1	8	1	2	20
Animal dung	*	9	*	2	1	1	*	1	*	14
Solar energy	2	2	1	1	5	*	5	2	8	27
Other	*	*	*	*	3	1	32	1	*	36
None	6	*	1	1	1	2	9	2	1	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 775</b>	<b>1 727</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>2 747</b>	<b>1 215</b>	<b>4 690</b>	<b>1 211</b>	<b>1 532</b>	<b>16 122</b>

Totals exclude households that did not specify electricity connections.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**11. Source of energy****11.2 Main source of energy used by households, by province****11.2.2 For heating, 2015**

Energy for heating	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Electricity from mains	533	261	124	323	755	367	2 467	458	444	5 731
Electricity from generator	6	6	*	*	6	31	197	1	*	246
Gas	56	30	7	44	15	7	205	23	4	391
Paraffin	159	529	10	207	28	17	127	4	6	1 086
Wood	83	381	53	83	447	105	101	152	309	1 714
Coal	2	2	1	22	16	4	100	93	5	244
Candles	*	1	*	1	4	1	6	1	*	13
Animal dung	*	4	1	2	4	1	*	1	*	12
Solar energy	1	3	1	1	5	*	5	1	3	18
Other	1	1	*	1	2	*	30	1	*	36
None	934	509	124	222	1 465	683	1 452	476	763	6 628
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 775</b>	<b>1 727</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>2 747</b>	<b>1 215</b>	<b>4 690</b>	<b>1 211</b>	<b>1 532</b>	<b>16 122</b>

Totals exclude households that did not specify electricity connections.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**11. Source of energy****11.2 Main source of energy used by households, by province****11.2.3 For lighting, 2015**

Energy for lighting	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Electricity from mains	1 700	1 460	296	836	2 357	1 055	4 003	1 095	1 437	14 239
Electricity from generator	34	18	1	1	48	51	245	4	8	410
Gas	1			1	5	1	2	*	*	11
Paraffin	12	130	5	14	11	19	91	12	9	302
Wood	*	3	1	1	10	1	5	1	5	26
Coal	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	1	*	2
Candles	22	93	14	47	298	86	286	96	66	1 009
Solar energy	4	22	2	5	12	1	16	1	3	68
Other	*	*		*	1	1	33	*	1	36
None	2	*		*	4	1	6	1	3	17
Total	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

Totals exclude households that did not specify electricity connections.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

# 11. Source of energy

## 11.3 Main source of energy used by households, by population group of the household head

### 11.3.1 For cooking, 2015

Energy for cooking	Thousands				Total
	Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	
Electricity from mains	9 838	1 011	342	1 406	12 597
Electricity from generator	362	16		15	394
Gas	280	74	19	188	560
Paraffin	856	9	1	1	867
Wood	1 483	18	2	2	1 505
Coal	78	2	*	*	80
Candles	16	1	2	1	20
Animal dung	14	*	*	*	14
Solar energy	21	2	1	2	27
Other	36	*	*	*	36
None	14	3	1	5	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 998</b>	<b>1 136</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>1 619</b>	<b>16 122</b>

Totals exclude households that did not specify electricity connections.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

# 11. Source of energy

## 11.3 Main source of energy used by households, by population group of the household head

### 11.3.2 For heating, 2015

Energy for heating	Thousands				Total
	Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	
Electricity from mains	4 117	483	222	910	5 731
Electricity from generator	233	8	*	5	246
Gas	191	16	15	170	391
Paraffin	1 066	17	*	3	1 086
Wood	1 589	70	6	49	1 714
Coal	239	3	*	3	244
Candles	11	*	1	2	13
Animal dung	12	*	*	*	12
Solar energy	13	*	*	5	18
Other	26	1	1	8	36
None	5 501	539	123	466	6 628
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 998</b>	<b>1 136</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>1 619</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

# 11. Source of energy

## 11.3 Main source of energy used by households, by population group of the household head

### 11.3.3 For lighting, 2015

Energy for lighting	Thousands				Total
	Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	
Electricity from mains	11 188	1 085	365	1 602	14 239
Electricity from generator	382	17	*	11	410
Gas	10		*	1	11
Paraffin	299	3	*	1	302
Wood	26	*	*		26
Coal	2	*	*	*	2
Candles	981	28	1	1	1 009
Solar energy	61	2	2	2	68
Other	36		*	*	36
None	14	1	1	1	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 998</b>	<b>1 136</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>1 619</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.



## 12. Sanitation

### 12.1 Sanitation facility used by households, by province, 2015

Type of sanitation facility	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Flush toilet connected to a public sewerage system	1 591	703	210	642	1 164	484	4 083	459	305	9 641
Flush toilet connected to a septic tank	61	44	18	13	117	68	49	66	80	516
Chemical toilet	1	2	*	*	14	1	25	1	1	45
Pit latrine/toilet with ventilation pipe	2	660	31	79	833	253	118	270	436	2 680
Pit latrine/toilet without ventilation pipe	5	173	36	111	465	322	288	343	600	2 343
Bucket toilet (collected by municipality)	57	9	5	17	7	2	46	*	1	144
Bucket toilet (emptied by household)	14	3	2	7	3	2	3	1	1	36
Ecological Sanitation Systems	14	1	1	1	1	2	4	6	1	30
None	28	120	16	33	119	78	25	61	100	580
Other	2	7	1	2	11	1	26	3	1	53
Unspecified	1	6	*	1	13	4	22	2	7	55
Total	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**12. Sanitation****12.2 Sanitation facility used by households, by population group of the household head, 2015**

Type of sanitation facility	Thousands				Total
	Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	
Flush toilet connected to a public sewerage system	6 738	1 019	351	1 533	9 641
Flush toilet connected to a septic tank	376	53	7	79	516
Chemical toilet	43	1	*	1	45
Pit latrine/toilet with ventilation pipe	2 659	15	5	1	2 680
Pit latrine/toilet without ventilation pipe	2 325	14	3	1	2 343
Bucket toilet (collected by municipality)	139	4	*	1	144
Bucket toilet (emptied by household)	26	9	*	1	36
Ecological Sanitation Systems	22	5	*	3	30
None	566	14	*	*	580
Other	51	1	1	1	53
Unspecified	51	2	2	*	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 998</b>	<b>1 136</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>1 619</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**12. Sanitation****12.3 Sanitation facility used by households, by type of dwelling, 2015**

Type of sanitation facility	Thousands					
	Dwelling/house or brick/concrete block structure on a separate stand or yard or on farm	Traditional dwelling/hut/structure made of traditional materials	Flat or apartment in a block of flats	Cluster house in complex	Town house (semi-detached house in complex)	Semi-detached house
Flush toilet connected to a public sewerage system	6 462	33	610	77	254	234
Flush toilet connected to a septic tank	359	4	6	1	2	11
Chemical toilet	9	9	*	*	*	*
Pit latrine/toilet with ventilation pipe	1 608	697	8	2	1	*
Pit latrine/toilet without ventilation pipe	1 434	223	8	1	*	*
Bucket toilet (collected by municipality)	19	*	*	1	*	*
Bucket toilet (emptied by household)	12	1	1	*	*	*
Ecological Sanitation Systems	13	*	*	*	*	*
None	220	132	5	1	*	*
Other	15	1	*	*	*	*
Unspecified	27	6	1	*	2	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>10 177</b>	<b>1 106</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>245</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**12. Sanitation****12.3 Sanitation facility used by households, by type of dwelling, 2015 (concluded)**

Type of sanitation facility	Thousands					
	Dwelling/house/flat/room in backyard	Informal dwelling/shack in backyard	Informal dwelling/shack not in backyard	Room/flatlet on a property or a larger dwelling quarters/granny flat	Caravan/tent	Other
Flush toilet connected to a public sewerage system	434	649	401	352	10	125
Flush toilet connected to a septic tank	12	11	13	93	2	1
Chemical toilet	*	*	26	1	*	*
Pit latrine/toilet with ventilation pipe	38	56	183	86	*	*
Pit latrine/toilet without ventilation pipe	41	82	455	98	*	1
Bucket toilet (collected by municipality)	2	12	110	*	*	*
Bucket toilet (emptied by household)	2	5	13	2	*	*
Ecological Sanitation Systems	*	2	13	2	*	*
None	8	23	172	17	*	2
Other	*	4	33	*	*	*
Unspecified	5	4	8	2	1	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>849</b>	<b>1 428</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>129</b>
						<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**13. Refuse removal****13.1 Households who pay for their refuse removal, by type of refuse removal service and province, 2015**

Refuse removal	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu -Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Removed by local authority/private company at least once a week	1 072	335	134	295	703	257	2 357	307	160	5 620
Removed by local authority/private company less often than once a week	6	48	5	2	11	6	26	9	4	117
Removed by community members, contracted by the Municipality, at least once a week	3	*	*	*	36	12	60	3	20	133
Removed by community members, contracted by the Municipality, less often than once a week	3	3	*	1	3	*	7	*	11	28
Removed by community members at least once a week	4	*	*	*	1	1	3	1	5	16
Removed by community members less often than once a week	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Communal refuse dump	1	*	*	1	1	1	4	*	*	7
Communal container	*	2	*	2	3	4	4	*	3	19
Unspecified	5	5	2	1	11	9	23	6	3	64
Total	1 093	393	141	302	769	289	2 484	326	207	6 004

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**13. Refuse removal****13.2 Type of refuse removal services used by households, by population group of the household head, 2015**

Refuse removal	Thousands			
	Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White
Removed by local authority/private company at least once a week	6 782	987	348	1 450
Removed by local authority/private company less often than once a week	238	27	2	20
Removed by community members, contracted by the Municipality, at least once a week	293	15	5	35
Removed by community members, contracted by the Municipality, less often than once a week	71	5	2	5
Removed by community members at least once a week	38	16	*	11
Removed by community members less often than once a week	4	1	*	*
Communal refuse dump	224	11	1	11
Communal container	192	8	1	7
Own refuse dump	4 287	43	4	58
Dump or leave rubbish anywhere	433	4	*	*
Other	57	7	*	3
Unspecified	380	13	6	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 998</b>	<b>1 136</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>1 619</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**13. Refuse removal****13.3 Households currently paying for the removal of refuse, by province, 2015**

Pay for refuse removal	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Yes	1 093	393	141	302	769	289	2 484	326	207	6 004
No	620	431	90	416	751	467	1 905	214	218	5 114
Do not know	11	2	2	2	23	5	63	1	*	108
Not applicable	50	902	86	186	1 203	454	238	670	1 107	4 896
Total	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**14. Transport****14.1 Number of trips made by household members per week using each of the following modes of transport, by province, 2015**

Mode of transport and number of trips		Thousands									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
	0-10	1 728	1 727	320	906	2 725	1 213	4 600	1 211	1 532	15 961
	11-20	32	*	*	*	19	1	46	*	1	98
	21-30	10	*	*	*	2	1	6	*	*	19
	31-40	2	*	*	*	1	1	2	*	*	5
	41+	2	1	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	3
Train	Unspecified	1	*	*	*	*	*	35	*	*	35
	0-10	1 659	1 621	303	850	2 530	1 120	4 040	1 133	1 474	14 730
	11-20	92	81	14	40	165	76	487	61	44	1 061
	21-30	14	11	1	8	29	11	80	8	8	170
	31-40	4	4	*	2	3	5	33	2	1	54
	41+	4	4	*	2	13	2	23	4	*	52
Taxi	Unspecified	2	5	1	4	7	1	26	3	6	54
	0-10	1 727	1 718	319	901	2 714	1 194	4 599	1 151	1 523	15 846
	11-20	38	9	1	3	23	16	43	49	8	190
	21-30	5	1	*	*	5	*	7	6	1	24
	31-40	2	*	*	*	1	1	1	3	*	6
	41+	*	*	*	*	1	1	2	1	*	5
Bus	Unspecified	3	*	*	1	2	4	38	2	1	50

Totals exclude unspecified.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.



**14. Transport****14.2 Distance travelled to get to the nearest minibus taxi/sedan taxi/bakkie taxi, bus and train, by population group of the household head, 2015**

Mode of transport	Distance travelled	Thousands				
		Black African	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White	Total
Train	Less than 1 km	209	29	5	*	242
	Between 1km and 3km	127	22	5	*	154
	More than 3km	72	16	6	*	94
Taxi	Less than 1 km	4 516	235	17	38	4 806
	Between 1km and 3km	563	41	5	5	615
	More than 3km	80	10	1	*	90
Bus	Less than 1 km	674	63	18	11	766
	Between 1km and 3km	119	16	5	1	141
	More than 3km	18	2	*	2	21

Totals exclude unspecified.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**14. Transport****14.3 Money spent during the previous calendar week by households per transport mode, by the sex of the household head, 2015**

Mode of transport	Money spent in the previous calendar week	Thousands		
		Male	Female	Total
Train	0–199	368	164	531
	200–399	29	13	42
	400–599	3	3	7
	600–799	2	*	2
	800+	4	2	6
	Unspecified	91	47	138
Taxi	0–199	2 435	2 045	4 480
	200–399	673	430	1 103
	400–599	127	88	215
	600–799	33	30	64
	800+	42	31	74
	Unspecified	139	106	245
Bus	0–199	441	360	801
	200–399	77	58	135
	400–599	17	10	27
	600–799	5	2	7
	800+	10	7	17
	Unspecified	113	84	196

Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.  
 Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**14. Transport****14.4 Time taken to get to the health facility that members of the household normally go to, by transport mode, 2015**

Mode of transport	Thousands					
	Time in minutes					
	Less than 15 minutes	15–29 minutes	30–59 minutes	60 minutes and more	Do not know	Unspecified
Walking	3 034	3 053	1 204	147	9	32
Minibus taxi/sedan taxi/bakkie taxi	1 146	2 264	859	85	12	26
Bus	18	75	60	10	*	3
Train	5	15	15	1	*	*
Own transport	2 107	1 226	245	17	3	20
Bicycle/motorcycle	22	15	1	2	*	1
Other	68	94	71	9		2
Unspecified	50	32	10	1	1	51
<b>Total</b>	<b>6 451</b>	<b>6 774</b>	<b>2 466</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>134</b>
						<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 15. Environment

### 15.1 Environmental problems experienced in the community or neighbouring farms, by province, 2015

Environmental problems experienced	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalan ga	Limpopo	South Africa
Littering	402	517	111	417	959	366	1 557	625	412	5 366
Irregular or no waste removal	116	281	94	368	673	309	668	740	305	3 553
Water pollution	194	342	42	188	557	179	713	198	179	2 591
Outdoor/indoor air pollution	199	739	84	453	664	571	969	790	516	4 984
Land degradation/over-utilisation of natural resources	267	233	45	189	286	189	965	188	333	2 695
Excessive noise/noise pollution	210	279	60	199	506	264	972	373	257	3 119
Other	25	4	3	6	11	3	84	2	8	145
Total number of household (RSA)	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

Households can experience more than one environmental problem

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

### 15.2 Environmental problems experienced in the community or neighbouring farms, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015

Thousands															
Nature of environmental problem	Black African			Coloured			Indian/Asian			White			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Littering	1 634	1 157	2 791	71	54	125	22	12	34	120	49	169	1 846	1 272	3 119
Irregular or no waste removal	2 747	2 023	4 770	164	121	286	49	21	70	167	74	240	3 127	2 239	5 366
Water pollution	1 308	1 062	2 369	67	44	110	16	9	25	63	24	87	1 453	1 138	2 591
Outdoor/indoor air pollution	2 490	2 065	4 555	110	71	181	27	14	41	144	64	207	2 771	2 214	4 984
Land degradation/over-utilisation of natural resources	1 401	970	2 371	92	70	163	22	12	34	94	35	128	1 609	1 087	2 695
Excessive noise/noise pollution	1 868	1 429	3 297	63	33	96	33	10	43	85	31	116	2 050	1 503	3 553
Other	71	38	109	8	4	12	3	1	4	13	8	21	94	51	145
Total number of household (RSA)	7 381	5 617	12 998	679	457	1 136	268	101	369	1 131	489	1 619	9 459	6 663	16 122

Households can experience more than one environmental problem. Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.

**16. Income and expenditure****16.1 Sources of income for households, by province, 2015**

Sources of income	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Salaries/wages/commission	1 362	917	199	547	1 720	746	3 518	769	780	10 560
Income from a business	668	1 032	195	482	1 480	583	1 470	636	903	7 448
Grants	206	421	61	188	537	258	680	257	363	2 971
Pensions	213	166	29	121	314	144	788	189	218	2 181
Remittances	123	63	19	43	79	40	212	79	46	704
Sales of farm products and services	100	18	9	6	24	40	211	17	14	439
Other income e.g. rental income, interest	6	44	10	19	36	31	6	27	39	217
No income	4	11	4	14	29	13	32	13	10	130
Total number of household (RSA)	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

More than one source of income is possible per household.

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

## 16.2 Households' sources of income, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015

More than one source of income is possible per household.  
Due to rounding, numbers do not necessarily add up to totals.  
Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.

**16. Income and expenditure****16.3 Monthly household expenditure category, by province, 2015**

Expenditure category	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
R0	*	9	3	6	17	8	7	2	6	58
R1–R199	2	15	2	11	8	10	33	13	23	116
R200–R399	18	49	8	33	55	39	102	25	78	407
R400–R799	39	180	22	94	205	116	264	114	291	1 326
R800–R1 199	84	214	31	115	376	116	361	158	281	1 736
R1 200–R1 799	138	371	54	131	503	191	478	206	307	2 379
R1 800–R2 499	212	233	43	112	446	180	529	188	191	2 135
R2 500–R4 999	423	309	71	156	462	235	872	219	193	2 939
R5 000–R9 999	341	168	48	119	322	121	754	134	77	2 085
R10 000 or more	504	150	33	110	283	144	1 033	132	65	2 454
Do not know	5	2	1	9	39	49	191	6	6	308
Refuse	2	12	1	5	16	1	25	1	1	65
Unspecified	6	14	2	6	16	4	41	12	12	114
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 775</b>	<b>1 727</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>2 747</b>	<b>1 215</b>	<b>4 690</b>	<b>1 211</b>	<b>1 532</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Values based on three or less unweighted cases are considered too small to provide accurate estimates, and values are therefore replaced by asterisks.



**16. Income and expenditure****16.4 Monthly household expenditure category, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015**

Expenditure category	Thousands														
	Black African			Coloured			Indian/Asian			White			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
R0	43	12	55	2	1	3	1	*	1	*	*	*	46	12	58
R1–R199	82	32	114	2	*	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	84	32	116
R200–R399	247	149	396	3	7	10	1	*	1	1	*	1	252	156	407
R400–R799	699	588	1 286	10	19	30	3	1	4	5	1	6	716	609	1 326
R800–R1 199	817	828	1 645	29	37	65	6	8	14	8	4	12	859	876	1 736
R1 200–R1 799	1 052	1 169	2 221	61	55	116	5	7	12	8	21	29	1 126	1 252	2 379
R1 800–R2 499	998	936	1 934	76	66	142	15	8	23	18	19	37	1 107	1 028	2 135
R2 500–R4 999	1 495	990	2 484	165	118	283	38	21	58	55	58	113	1 752	1 187	2 939
R5 000–R9 999	969	476	1 444	154	98	252	51	26	77	187	124	311	1 361	724	2 085
R10 000 or more	758	300	1 058	163	52	215	130	26	156	784	241	1 025	1 835	619	2 454
Do not know	154	91	246	6	3	8	9	4	12	27	14	42	196	112	308
Refuse	17	3	20	5	*	5	4	1	5	32	3	35	59	7	65
Unspecified	50	45	95	3	2	4	6	*	6	7	2	9	66	48	114
Total	7 381	5 617	12 998	679	457	1 136	268	101	369	1 131	489	1 619	9 459	6 663	16 122

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

Numbers below 10 000 are too small to provide accurate estimates Sensitive cells are indicated by an asterisk.

**17. Households assets, 2015****17.1 Number of households owning a particular asset by province, 2015**

Sources of income	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalan- ga	Limpopo	South Africa
TV Set	1 607	1 196	264	761	2 027	948	4 018	961	1 176	12 959
Swimming pool	144	29	6	24	71	32	361	28	15	710
DVD player/ Blu ray player	1 209	755	167	509	1 235	537	2 900	627	827	8 766
Pay TV (M-Net/DSTV/Top TV) Subscription	741	384	126	309	777	334	2 000	468	502	5 641
Air conditioner (Excluding fans)	162	32	28	49	160	38	289	42	55	854
Computer/Desktop/Laptop	608	169	61	146	291	205	1 383	205	177	3 245
Vacuum cleaner/Floor polisher	497	89	41	98	172	80	794	90	37	1 898
Dish washing machine	240	39	15	50	103	46	461	39	30	1 023
Washing machine	1 070	385	169	282	386	389	2 096	376	259	5 414
Tumble dryer	301	53	22	62	170	82	480	105	65	1 340
Deep freezer - free standing	581	179	114	172	469	225	876	295	365	3 275
Refrigerator or combined fridge freezer	1 509	1 055	238	711	1 857	822	3 620	870	945	11 627
Electric stove	1 665	1 369	286	797	2 193	1 021	4 093	1 016	1 174	13 614
Microwave oven	1 338	824	189	588	1 209	555	3 088	569	514	8 873
Built-in kitchen sink	1 243	432	102	354	782	265	2 317	375	180	6 051
Home security service	334	96	20	75	254	68	913	82	51	1 894

**17. Households assets, 2015****17.1 Number of households owning a particular asset by province, 2015 (concluded)**

Sources of income	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalan- ga	Limpopo	South Africa
Home theatre system	278	144	40	167	377	230	1 261	182	129	2 809
Geyser	865	254	70	178	553	200	1 909	206	128	4 363
Solar hot water geyser	21	2	7	11	20	11	71	12	8	163
Solar electrical panel	86	47	17	40	61	12	231	27	12	533
<b>Total households</b>	<b>1 775</b>	<b>1 727</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>2 747</b>	<b>1 215</b>	<b>4 690</b>	<b>1 211</b>	<b>1 532</b>	<b>16 122</b>

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

Numbers below 10 000 are too small to provide accurate estimates Sensitive cells are indicated by an asterisk.

**18. Agriculture****18.1 Number of households involved in one or more agricultural production activity, by province, 2015**

Involved in agricultural production	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Yes	73	575	40	163	555	139	153	343	669	2 710
No	1 698	1 147	279	738	2 185	1 070	4 504	854	860	13 335
Unspecified	4	6	*	5	6	6	32	14	4	77
Total	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

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

Numbers below 10 000 are too small to provide accurate estimates Sensitive cells are indicated by an asterisk.

**18.2 Number of households involved in one or more agricultural production activity, by population group and sex of the household head, 2015**

Involved in agricultural production	Thousands														
	Black African			Coloured			Indian/Asian			White			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Yes	1 136	1 365	2 501	37	19	56	13	5	18	104	30	135	1 291	1 419	2 710
No	6 212	4 219	10 431	641	438	1 079	252	96	349	1 021	456	1 477	8 126	5 209	13 335
Unspecified	33	32	65	1	*	1	2	*	2	6	2	8	42	35	77
Total	7 381	5 617	12 998	679	457	1 136	268	101	369	1 131	489	1 619	9 459	6 663	16 122

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

**18. Agriculture****18.3 Land used for crop production by province, 2015**

Tenure status	Thousands									
	Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu- Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalan- ga	Limpopo	South Africa
Owens the land	53	130	16	137	217	30	98	253	444	1 378
Rents the land	8	*	*	4	5	1	6	1	1	26
Sharecropping	1	1	*	*	5	*	1	1	2	11
Tribal authority	*	289	*	*	156	*	*	11	125	581
State land	*	3	*	*	7	*	3	4	2	19
Other	1	1	1	2	4	1	4	3	1	19
Do not know	1	1	1	*	1	*	7	*	3	13
Not engaged in crop plantation	1 705	1 283	300	754	2 328	1 177	4 516	908	943	13 915
Unspecified	7	19	1	9	22	6	55	30	12	161
Total	1 775	1 727	320	906	2 747	1 215	4 690	1 211	1 532	16 122

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

**18. Agriculture****18.4 Land used for crop production by population group and sex of the household head, 2015**

Population group and sex of the household		Thousands								
		Owns the land	Rents the land	Share-cropping	Tribal authority	State land	Other	Do not know	Unspecified	Total
Black African	Male	1 242	15	10	580	18	19	10	135	2 030
	Female	565	10	3	220	10	12	4	69	894
	Total	677	5	7	360	8	7	6	66	1 135
	Coloured	Male	35	1	1	*	*	*	1	4
Female		21	1	1	*	*	*	1	3	26
Total		14	1	*	*	*	*	*	1	16
Indian/Asian	Male	15	*	*	1	*	*	1	3	19
	Female	11	*	*	1	*	*	*	3	15
	Total	4	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	5
	White	Male	86	9	*	*	*	*	2	19
Female		67	6	*	*	*	*	1	15	89
Total		19	4	*	*	*	*	1	4	28
Total	Male	1 378	26	11	581	19	19	13	161	2 207
	Female	664	17	5	221	10	12	6	90	1 024
	Total	714	9	7	360	9	7	8	71	1 184

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

Numbers below 10 000 are too small to provide accurate estimates Sensitive cells are indicated by an asterisk.

**18. Agriculture****18.5 The number of livestock the household has, per province, 2015**

Number of livestock		Thousand									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Cattle	0	2	117	10	5	64	41	2	19	72	332
	0-10	*	125	4	7	124	31	*	35	57	381
	11-100	2	41	2	4	57	20	*	15	15	156
	100+	1	2	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	13
	Unspecified	6	142	7	18	106	22	8	66	82	457
	<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>1 340</b>
Sheep	0	*	154	8	7	195	70	2	59	131	625
	0-10	*	46	3	1	23	9	1	5	8	97
	11-100	1	71	2	3	6	12	*	2	5	102
	100+	4	6	4	5	1	2	*	2	*	22
	Unspecified	6	151	6	20	127	24	9	69	83	495
	<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>1 340</b>
Goats	0	3	126	6	11	78	48	2	39	59	371
	0-10	*	86	7	1	122	24	1	24	70	335
	11-100	*	79	4	1	45	24	*	7	16	175
	100+	*	*	1	2	1	*	*	*	*	4
	Unspecified	7	137	6	21	107	22	9	65	82	455
	<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>1 340</b>



**18.5 The number of livestock the household has, per province, 2015 (concluded)**

Number of livestock		Thousand									
		Western Cape	Eastern Cape	Northern Cape	Free State	KwaZulu-Natal	North West	Gauteng	Mpumalanga	Limpopo	South Africa
Pigs	0	3	186	14	11	199	90	2	61	130	698
	0-10	*	127	1	3	21	4	*	6	12	173
	11-100	*	4	*	*	3	*	*	1	1	9
	100+	1	*	*	1	1	*	*	*	*	4
	Unspecified	6	110	8	21	127	24	9	68	83	455
	Total	10	428	23	36	352	118	11	136	226	1 340

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

Numbers below 10 000 are too small to provide accurate estimates Sensitive cells are indicated by an asterisk.

## GENERAL INFORMATION

Stats SA publishes approximately 300 different statistical releases each year. It is not economically viable to produce them in more than one of South Africa's eleven official languages. Since the releases are used extensively, not only locally but also by international economic and social-scientific communities, Stats SA releases are published in English only.

Stats SA has copyright on this publication. Users may apply the information as they wish, provided that they acknowledge Stats SA as the source of the basic data wherever they process, apply, utilise, publish or distribute the data; and also that they specify that the relevant application and analysis (where applicable) result from their own processing of the data.

### Advance release calendar

An advance release calendar is disseminated on [www.statssa.gov.za](http://www.statssa.gov.za)

### Stats SA products

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

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

Stats SA also provides a subscription service.

### Electronic services

A large range of data are available via on-line services, diskette and computer printouts. For more details about our electronic data services, contact (012) 310 8600.

You can visit us on the internet at: [www.statssa.gov.za](http://www.statssa.gov.za)

### Enquiries

User information services	Telephone number: (012) 310 8600 Email address: <a href="mailto:info@statssa.gov.za">info@statssa.gov.za</a>
Technical enquiries:	Isabel Schmidt Telephone number: (012) 310 6249 Email address: <a href="mailto:isabelsc@statssa.gov.za">isabelsc@statssa.gov.za</a>
Postal address	Private Bag X44, Pretoria, 0001

*Produced by Stats SA*