STATISTICAL RELEASE
P0318.2

General Household Survey,
Selected development indicators
2020

Embargoed until:
2 December 2021
11:30

Dipalopalo tsa Aforikaborwa • Dipalopalo tsa Aforika Borwa • Ezazibalo zaseNingizimu Afrika • Tshitatistika Afrika Tshipembe • Tinhlayo Afrika-Dzonga

Statistieke Suid-Afrika • Dipalopalo tša Aforika Borwa • Telubalo zaseNingizimu Afrika • EzeeNkcukacha maNani zoMzantsi Afrika • Iimbalobalo zeSewula Afrika

IMPROVING LIVES THROUGH DATA ECOSYSTEMS

Contents

List of Abbreviations

EC	Eastern Cape
FS	Free State
GP	Gauteng
KZN	KwaZulu-Natal
LP	Limpopo
MP	Mpumalanga
NC	Northern Cape
NW	North West
WC	Western Cape
RSA	South Africa
ASER	Age-specific Enrolment Ratio
CVs	Coefficient of Variations
DOA	Department of Agriculture
DUs	Dwelling Units
EAs	Enumeration Areas
GHS	General Household Survey
PSUs	Primary Sampling Units
RDP	Reconstruction and Development Programme
UN	United Nations
VIP	Pit Toilet with ventilation
WSA	Water Services Authorities

1 Introduction and methodology

1.1 Background

This report presents selected findings from GHS 2020 on a set of provincial development indicators. The first report was released in early May 2010 as a discussion document.

The current report is the 11th in the series and summarises the data for provinces and nationally as measured by GHS 2020.

1.2 Methodology and fieldwork

Stats SA suspended face-to-face data collection for all its surveys on 19 March 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and restricted movement. This was to ensure that the field staff and respondents were not exposed to the risk of contracting the coronavirus and to contain its spread.

To facilitate data collection, Stats SA changed the mode of collection for collecting GHS 2020 data from Computer Assisted Personal Interviews (CAPI) to Computer-assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). Since Stats SA uses a dwelling unit sample, the GHS 2019 sample was reused and households that provided operational telephone numbers in 2019 were contacted by Survey Officers (SOs). Many households, however, did not provide useable contact numbers in 2019 and many contact numbers were found to be invalid while some calls were not answered. Some households also indicated that they were not residing in the dwelling units they were sampled in during 2019 anymore. All of these were regarded as non-contacts and were adjusted for during the weighting processes. Dwellings that were out-of-scope in 2019 remained so in 2020.

More details of how the adjustment was done are contained in the Technical notes section of GHS 2020 report (P0318).

Given the change in the survey mode of collection and the fact that the GHS 2020 estimates are not based on a full sample, comparisons with previous years should be made with caution.

1.3 Data revisions

Editing and imputation was done using a combination of manual and automated editing procedures. Details about this process can be found in the GHS 2020 report (P0318). Section 3.7 describes the methods used to calculate each indicator value. When calculating percentages, missing and do not know values were discarded from the denominator unless otherwise stated.

Risenga Maluleke
Statistician-General

2 Indicator tables

2.1 Agriculture

Table 2.1: Agriculture indicators by province

Indicators	Province									
	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
% of households who engaged in agricultural activities during the past 12 months	4,1	35,9	14,7	20,9	21,6	10,4	4,6	34,9	37,5	**17,5**
Livestock production	1,0	20,2	6,9	0,9	8,4	3,2	0,0	5,0	8,0	**5,1**
Poultry production	0,4	23,3	3,4	1,9	11,6	4,9	0,1	8,1	7,3	**6,2**
Grains and food crops	0,1	18,7	1,7	3,2	12,6	1,1	0,7	20,5	30,1	**9,0**
Fruit and vegetable production	4,0	20,7	8,3	18,5	8,4	4,7	4,0	27,8	27,8	**11,4**
% of households classified as:										
Food access adequate	76,3	79,5	74,2	73,8	83,2	64,3	81,5	67,2	95,6	**79,4**
Food access inadequate	13,6	14,4	13,5	12,9	11,6	21,9	13,0	15,1	2,3	**12,8**
Food access severely inadequate	10,1	6,1	12,3	13,3	5,2	13,8	5,5	17,7	2,1	**7,8**

2.2 Education

Table 2.2: Education indicators by Province

Indicators	Province									
	WC	**EC**	**NC**	**FS**	**KZN**	**NW**	**GP**	**MP**	**LP**	**RSA**
Age-specific Enrolment Ratio (ASER) expressed as a percentage										
Primary School	94,9	98,7	98,3	98,1	96,1	98,7	98,3	97,8	98,3	**97,5**
All	93,3	96,2	94,6	95,8	94,5	97,3	95,7	97,5	96,8	**95,6**
% of 16-18-year-olds who attend any institution	86,1	92,1	81,6	87,2	87,5	93,1	86,2	95,9	92,2	**89,0**
% of children with special needs aged 7–15 NOT enrolled in educational institutions	7,3	12,0	0,0	10,5	18,7	5,3	2,9	7,9	6,4	**8,0**
% of learners in public schools that do not pay school fees	53,1	78,8	65,6	79,3	72,2	76,5	67,3	65,5	95,6	**73,3**
% of learners in schools receiving social grants	53,0	75,3	62,6	73,0	75,7	69,0	60,8	73,3	73,3	**69,1**
Numbers of learners enrolled (16–18) in any institution N ('000)	245	329	52	131	458	187	447	190	249	**2 289**

General Household Survey, Selected development indicators, 2020

Table 2.2: Education indicators by Province (concluded)

Indicators	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
% of learners in public schools benefiting from the nutrition programme	53,8	87,1	77,0	84,7	83,4	82,8	64,8	88,9	94,5	**79,3**
Adult literacy rates (persons 20 years and older with less than Grade 7 as highest level of education)	5,3	15,3	12,7	10,9	12,7	14,1	5,1	14,8	14,4	**10,2**

2.3 Health

Table 2.3: Health Indicators by Province

Indicators	Province									
	WC	**EC**	**NC**	**FS**	**KZN**	**NW**	**GP**	**MP**	**LP**	**RSA**
% of orphans aged 7–18 years attending educational institutions	90,8	95,9	95,9	95,7	91,4	94,3	95,4	96,0	96,0	**94,3**
% of people 20 years and older with no schooling	0,4	3,4	4,3	2,6	4,1	3,9	1,2	5,1	5,7	**2,9**
% of persons with medical aid coverage	25,1	10,5	18,6	12,2	9,8	17,7	21,3	8,7	7,9	**15,2**
% of households for which the usual place of consultation is a public facility	55,3	79,7	66,4	70,4	79,0	73,6	65,5	81,0	84,5	**71,9**

General Household Survey, Selected development indicators, 2020

2.4 Human settlement

Table 2.4: Human Settlement indicators by Province

Indicators	Province									
	WC	**EC**	**NC**	**FS**	**KZN**	**NW**	**GP**	**MP**	**LP**	**RSA**
% of households who live in an RDP or state-subsidised house	20,1	20,2	23,8	31,3	21,4	22,8	16,3	17,9	16,4	**19,6**
% of households living in informal dwellings/tents/caravans	17,6	6,5	12,3	14,3	2,9	14,3	18,3	6,5	2,8	**11,4**
% of households who pay rent for a state provided/RDP house	13,1	8,4	7,3	3,8	5,8	10,6	6,6	2,9	3,7	**7,0**
% of households who fully own their dwellings	53,9	74,0	70,9	72,9	76,1	76,3	41,1	75,6	83,1	**63,5**

2.5 Social development

Table 2.5: Social development indicators by Province

Indicators	Province									
	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
Number of persons 60 years and older N('000)	708	697	128	270	899	350	1 211	337	443	**5 044**
Number of households with at least one person 60 years and older N ('000)	497	545	95	232	683	289	916	279	386	**3 921**
% of persons 60 years and older who are disabled (UN definition)	16,1	20,2	27,3	29,2	22,4	15,9	12,2	18,6	16,3	**18,0**
% of persons 60 years and older who are severely disabled	7,5	10,7	17,2	13,6	7,6	6,4	7,5	13,3	8,5	**8,9**
% of people 60 years and older who received old-age grant	100,0	99,8	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	99,6	100,0	99,5	99,8
% of people 60 years and older who received social grants	56,8	79,9	77,6	75,7	79,4	73,9	62,3	80,3	89,1	**72,5**
% of households with persons 60 years and older and classified as:										
Food access adequate	88,7	81,3	84,1	77,4	84,7	76,6	87,2	77,3	98,2	**85,1**
Food access inadequate	8,4	13,9	10,4	11,8	12,7	17,4	9,2	13,3	1,0	**10,6**
Food access severely inadequate	2,8	4,8	5,5	10,8	2,7	6,0	3,7	9,4	0,8	**4,3**
Number of households classified as N ('000):										
Food access adequate	1 497	1 359	263	688	2 518	815	4 217	909	1 569	**13 835**
Food access inadequate	266	246	48	121	350	277	673	204	38	**2 224**
Food access severely inadequate	198	104	44	123	158	175	284	240	34	**1 360**
% of poor households with children aged 7–18 who do not spend money on school fees	75,0	84,2	73,2	89,8	81,9	77,3	78,7	73,0	96,3	**82,9**
Number of households classified as poor using household monthly expenditure of below R2 500 as the cut-off N ('000)	353	773	144	449	1125	660	1645	631	986	**6 767**
Number of households classified as poor using household monthly expenditure of below R2 500 as the cut-off and who have children aged 7–18 N ('000)	135	347	67	230	581	243	628	315	554	**3099**

General Household Survey, Selected development indicators, 2018

2.6 Transport

Table 2.6: Transport indicators by Province

Indicators	Province									
	WC	**EC**	**NC**	**FS**	**KZN**	**NW**	**GP**	**MP**	**LP**	**RSA**
# of passenger trips made per month with each public transport mode N ('000):										
Minibus/taxi	4 909	3 222	566	1 191	10 636	2 600	19 117	3 072	2 069	**47 382**
Bus	793	177	30	372	515	556	480	1 245	135	**4 302**
% of the household's income spent on transport per month:										
1–10%	49,6	58,6	74,0	63,9	51,5	49,0	47,2	52,6	67,0	**52,3**
11–20%	24,8	24,1	12,7	24,3	25,1	18,7	26,2	28,0	15,7	**24,3**
21–30%	5,7	8,8	3,8	4,2	12,7	17,8	12,8	7,6	8,6	**10,9**
30% or more	20,0	8,5	9,5	7,6	10,7	14,6	13,8	11,7	8,8	**12,5**

2.7   Water, sanitation and environment

Table 2.7: Water, sanitation and environment variables by Province

Indicators	Province									
	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
Number of households with water supply infrastructure of RDP standard or higher N ('000)	1 920	1 129	334	856	2 406	1 083	5 043	1 148	1 146	**15 066**
Number of households with water supply infrastructure less than RDP standard N ('000)	41	580	20	75	620	184	131	206	495	**2 352**
Number of households with no water supply infrastructure N ('000)	29	477	29	63	396	161	105	164	471	**1 894**
Number of households using borehole water N ('000)	14	14	21	*	92	79	23	50	217	**513**
Number of consumers who experienced interruptions of 48 hours or more at a time N ('000)	84	484	101	240	924	460	426	623	567	**3 909**
Number of WSAs whose consumers have experienced a cumulative interruption of more than 15 days for the financial year N ('000)	30	365	94	165	677	407	260	586	478	**3 063**

General Household Survey, Selected development indicators, 2018

Table 2.7: Water and sanitation variables by province (concluded)

Indicators	Province									
	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
Number of households with access to a functioning basic sanitation facility (strategic framework) N ('000)	1 840	1 585	308	789	2 457	989	4 676	871	963	**14 478**
% households with access to improved sanitation facilities	94,1	93,9	87,4	85,8	81,3	78,3	90,6	64,4	58,9	**83,4**
Number of households using bucket toilets N ('000)	71	*	*	20	*	*	32	*	*	**131**
Number of households with substandard toilet facility N ('000)	88	73	40	128	514	259	472	482	662	**2 718**
% of households with substandard toilet facility	4,5	4,3	11,4	13,9	17,0	20,5	9,1	35,6	40,3	**15,6**
Number of households with no sanitation facility N ('000)	13	31	*	*	22	15	6	*	11	**106**
Number of households using wood/coal for cooking N ('000)	7	166	*	35	257	93	26	256	609	**1 452**
% of households whose refuse is removed by a local authority or co,	86,9	40,6	61,4	72,8	53,0	56,9	85,0	40,0	21,3	**62,6**

Table 2.8: Basic household and population data used for benchmarking the GHS 2020

Indicators	Province									
	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	RSA
# of persons N ('000)	6 941	6 530	1 263	2 945	11 519	4 070	15 465	4 689	6 015	**59 437**
# of households N ('000)	1 962	1 709	354	931	3 026	1 267	5 174	1 354	1 641	**17 418**

3   Technical notes

3.1   Target population

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.

3.2   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 surveys having design requirements that are reasonably compatible with the GHS. The GHS 2019 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 30 000 dwelling units (DUs). The number of PSUs in the current 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.

3.3   Allocating sample sizes to strata[1]

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

Let N be the total # of PSUs in the stratum, and the # 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 $i = 1, 2, 3, ..., N.$ Then, the method for selecting the sample of n PSUs with the Randomised PPS systematic sampling method can be described as follows:

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 #s for the PSUs.

---

[1] Source: Sample Selection and Rotation for the Redesigned South African Labour Force Survey by G. Hussain Choudhry, 2007.

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

$$p_i = x_i \Big/ X; \quad i = 1, 2, 3, ---N,$$ where N is the total # 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 #s $Z_i = n \times p_i \times R; i = 1, 2, 3, ---, N$. It is easy to verify that $\sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_i = n \times R$. Next, round the N real #s $Z_i; i = 1, 2, 3, ..., N$ to integer values $R_i; i = 1, 2, 3, ..., N$ 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 $[.]$ 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 $R_i; i = 1, 2, 3, ..., N$ are also the PSU inverse sampling rates (ISRs) for systematic sampling of dwelling units.

Step 4: Obtain cumulative ISR values

We denote by $C_i; i = 1, 2, 3, ..., N$ 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:

$$C_1 = R_1,$$
$$C_j = C_{(j-1)} + R_j; \quad j = 2, 3, ---, N.$$

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

Step 5: Generate an integer random # r between 1 and R, and compute n integers $r_1, r_2, \overline{---} \, r_n$ as follows:

$r_1 = r$

$r_2 = r_1 + R$

$r_3 = r_2 + R$

.

.

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

.

.

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

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

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

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

.

.

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

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

3.4   Weighting [2]

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.

---

[2] Source: Sampling and Weighting System for the Redesigned South African Labour Force Survey, by G. Hussain Choudhry, 2007

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, 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.

3.5 Bias-adjustment procedure

The GHS 2020 data was collected using Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviews (CATI) due to COVID-19. The data collection was based on the 2019 sample, from which only households that provided contact information (i.e. telephone/cellphone) were enumerated. Therefore, this may attribute biasness in the sample due to differences in the characteristics of households and persons within households that provided contact information and those that did not.

The bias adjustment factors were computed using the GHS 2019 data, and the adjustment was applied to the GHS 2020 calibrated survey weights. The bias adjustment factors were computed for various household level, person level, and demographic characteristics at provincial, and metropolitan and nonmetropolitan area levels within provinces. The bias adjustment factors were computed as the ratio between the estimates for each cell of the selected variables (or cross-classification of the selected variables) for the full sample households (households that provided contact information and those that did not) and households that provided contact information. Bias adjustment factor R^j is given as:

$$R^j = \frac{X^j_{full}}{X^j_{tel}}$$

Where X^j_{full} is the domain estimate derived from the full sample and X^j_{tel} is the domain estimate derived from the households or persons within households that provided contact information.

The GHS 2020 bias adjusted weights were used to compute the GHS 2020 estimates. These GHS 2020 estimates will not be consistent with the demographic population estimates because the bias adjustment factors are non-linear statistics. Therefore, the GHS 2020 estimates that were based on the bias adjusted weights were further adjusted to achieve consistency simultaneously with the known total population, and the internal consistency across all variables (or cross-classification of variables). These adjusted estimates were then used as control totals to compute the final survey weights as described in the next sub-section.

3.6 Final survey weights

In the final step of constructing the sample weights, the calibrated sample weights were raked by applying the raking procedure twice with different sets of control totals at each stage of raking. The person level and household level sample weights were raked independently.
In the first application of the raking procedure, the following control totals were used to compute the intermediate raked weights:

Control totals set for person level weights
- Child Care arrangement (36 cells)

- Attendance of educational institution (9 cells)
- Highest level of education (8 cells)
- Disability by gender (58 cells)
- Medical aid coverage (27 cells)
- Benefit from social grants (3 cells)

Control totals set for household level weights
- Main dwelling type (22 cells)
- Tenure status (45 cells)
- Main source of energy or cooking (30 cells)
- Main source of water (18 cells)
- Access to sanitation (22 cells)
- Access to refuse removal (40 cells)
- Main source of household income (54 cells)
- Vulnerability to hunger (26 cells)

The intermediate raked weights computed above were further raked with the following control totals to compute the final survey weights:

Control totals set for person level weights
- Age by Gender (32 cells)
- Age by Population Group (64 cells)
- Age by Province (54 cells)
- Age by Metro/Non-metro (68 cells)
- Gender by province (18 cells)

Control totals set for household level weights
- Age by Gender (8 cells)
- Age by Population Group (16 cells)
- Age by Province (36 cells)
- Age by Metro/Non-metro (68 cells)

The advantage of applying the raking procedure twice would be that the population estimates would be consistent with the known population totals from Demographic Analysis. Moreover, the second application of raking would introduce variability in the survey estimates while correcting for the bias due to non-coverage of the households that did not provide contact information.

3.7   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 census 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 2001, and there will therefore be slight comparative differences in terms of provincial boundary definitions.

Given the change in the survey mode of collection and the fact that the GHS 2020 estimates are not based on a full sample, comparisons with previous years should be made with caution.

3.8   Definitions of terms

Term	Definition
Household	A household is defined as a person, or group of persons, who 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. Basically, **they live together and share 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	Multiple households occur when two or more households live in one sampled dwelling unit. 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/Acting household head	The head of the household is the person identified by the household as the head of that household and must (by definition of 'household') be a member of the household. If there is difficulty in identifying the head, the head must be selected in order of precedence as the person who: • Owns the household accommodation, • Is responsible for the rent of the household accommodation, • Has the household accommodation as an allowance (entitlement), etc., • Has the household accommodation by virtue of some relationship to the owner, lessee, etc., who is not in the household, • Makes the most decisions in the household. If two or more persons have equal claim to be head of the household, or if people state that they are joint heads or that the household has no head, then denote the eldest as the head.
Formal dwellings	Include a house on a separate stand, a flat or apartment in a block of flats, a townhouse, a room in a backyard, and a room or flatlet on a shared property.
Informal dwellings	Refer to shacks or shanties in informal settlements or in backyards
Piped water in dwelling or on site	Includes 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.
UN disability	Concentrating and remembering are grouped together as one category. If an individual has 'Some difficulty' with two or more of the 6 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.

Term	Definition
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.
Poor household	Poor households have been defined households who spend less than R2 500 per month.
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 is less than 200 metres.
Improved sanitation facility	Flush toilet connected to a public sewerage system or septic tank or a pit latrine with ventilation pipe.

3.9   Specific departmental indicators and question linkages

Table 3.1: Agriculture

Indicator	Annual reporting level	Questions in the GHS	GHS relative to other sources	Definitions and/or formulas
Percentage of households involved in agricultural production activities	National and provincial	AGR_Agri	Main source	# of households option 1 in AGR_Agri/total # of households who responded*100
Percentage of households involved in different agricultural production sectors	National and provincial	AGR_AGRI_TYPE_LIVE-AGR_AGRI_TYPE_GAME	Main source	# of households for each option in AGR_AGRI_TYPE_LIVE-AGR_AGRI_TYPE_GAME /total # of households who responded *100
Percentage of households involved in different crop planting activities	National and provincial	AGR_PLANT	Main source	# of households for each option in AGR_PLANT/total # of households who responded *100
Percentage of households classified as: Food access adequate Food access inadequate Food access severely inadequate	National and provincial	FSD_WORRIED– FSD_WHLDAY	Main source	Adequate: one or no 'Yes' responses for the first part of FSD_WORRIED– FSD_WHLDAY Inadequate: 2–3 'Yes' responses for any of FSD_WORRIED – FSD_WHLDAY Severely inadequate: 4–6 'Yes' responses for any of FSD_WORRIED – FSD_WHLDAY

Table 3.2: Education

Indicator	Annual reporting level	Questions in the GHS	GHS relative to other sources	Definitions and/or formulas
Age-specific Enrolment Ratio (ASER)	National Provincial UNESCO	EDU_GRDE, D	Main source	# (persons aged 7–13 attending educational institutions)/ # persons aged 7–13 * 100 # (persons aged 7–18 attending educational institutions)/ # persons aged 7–18 *100
Enrolment for 16–18-year-olds	National Provincial	EDU_GRDE, EDU_EDUI	Validation Data confrontation	# aged 16–18 who are enrolled in any institution # who attend any institution/(# 16–18 years old) *100
Percentage of children with special needs aged 7–15 not enrolled in educational institutions	National Provincial	EDU_ATTEND, EDU_RSNN	Main source	(# of persons aged 7-15 with disabilities[3] not enrolled)/#aged 7-15 yrs with disabilities)*100
Percentage of learners in public schools that do not pay school fees	National Provincial	EDU_TOTFEES	Validation Data confrontation	# persons attend public school who do not pay school fees/# of persons attending public schools*100
Percentage of learners in schools receiving social grants	National Provincial	EDU_EDUI, SOC_GRANT SOC_GRANT_TYPE	Main source Data confrontation	# persons attending school who receive any grant/# of persons who attend school and answered the question*100
Percentage of learners in public[4] schools benefiting from the nutrition programme	National Provincial	EDU_EATFOOD	Validation source	# persons options 2–4 in EDU_EATFOOD/# of persons attending Grd 0–Grd 12*100

---

[3] Un definition of disabilities
[4] Question on public and private school

General Household Survey, Selected development indicators, 2020

Table 3.3: Health

Indicator	Annual reporting level	Questions in the GHS	GHS relative to other sources	Definitions and/or formulas
% of orphans aged 7–18 years attending educational institutions	National and provincial	HHC_FATH_ALIVE, HHC_MOTH_ALIVE, EDU_EDUI, D	Main source	# of children aged 7–18 years who lost one or both of their biological parents attending school/ # of children aged 7–18 who lost one or both of their biological parents*100
% of people 20 years and older with no schooling	National and provincial	D, Education	Main source	# of persons 20 years and older with no schooling/# of persons 20 years and older*100
% of persons with medical aid coverage	National and provincial	HLT_MEDI	Main source	# of persons who responded 'Yes' in HLT_MEDI/# of persons who responded to the question*100
% of households for which the usual place of consultation is a public facility	National and provincial	HHW_HLTFAC	Descriptive/ interpretive One of the sources	# of persons who responded 'Yes' to options 1–3 in HHW_HLTFAC/# of persons who responded to the question*100

Table 3.4: Human settlement

Indicator	Annual reporting level	Questions in the GHS	GHS relative to other sources	Definitions and/or formulas
Percentage of households who live in an RDP or state subsidised house	National and provincial	HSG_RDP	Main source	# of households who replied 'Yes' in HSG_RDP/# of households who answered the question*100
Percentage of households who pay rent for a state provided/ RDP house,	National and provincial	HSG_TENURE, HSG_RDP	Main source	# of households 'Yes' in HSG_RDP and option 1 in HSG_TENURE
Percentage of households who fully own their dwellings	National and provincial	HSG_TENURE	Main source	# of households options 5 in HSG_TENURE/# of households who answered the question*100

Table 3.5: Social development

Indicator	Annual reporting level	Questions in the GHS	GHS relative to other sources	Definitions and/or formulas
% of persons 60 years and older that are disabled	National and provincial	D, DSB	Only source	# of persons aged 60 years and older who are disabled UN definition/# of persons who answered the question *100
% of persons 60 years and older that are severely disabled	National and provincial	D, DSB	Only source	# of persons aged 60 years and older who are severely disabled/# of persons who answered the question *100
% of people 60 years and older who received old-age grant	National and provincial	D, SOC_GRANT_OAG	Only source	# of persons aged 60 years and older who received an old-age grant/# of persons who answered the question *100
% of people 60 years and older who received social grants	National and provincial	D, SOC_GRANT	Only source	# of persons aged 60 years and older who received a social grant/# of persons who answered the question *100
% of households with persons 60 years and older with: Food access adequate Food access inadequate Food access severely inadequate	National and provincial	D, FSD_WORRIED - FSD_WHLDAY	Descriptive/ interpretive Validation	# of persons aged 60 years and older who answered 'Yes' to FSD_WORRIED - FSD_WHLDAY/# of persons who answered the question *100

Table 3.5: Social development (concluded)

Annual reporting level	Questions in the GHS	GHS relative to other sources	GHS relative to other sources	Definitions and/or formulas

# of households classified as: 	
    Food access adequate
    Food access inadequate
    Food access severely inadequate
	National and provincial	FSD_WORRIED - FSD_WHLDAY	Inputs towards indicator calculation	# of households who answered 'Yes' to FSD_WORRIED - FSD_WHLDAY

# of households classified as poor using household monthly expenditure of below R2 500 as the cut-off	National and provincial	FIN_EXP	-	# of households whose total monthly expenditure is below R2 500
# of households classified as poor using household monthly expenditure of below R2 500 as the cut-off and who have children aged 7–18	National and provincial	FIN_EXP	-	# of households with children aged 7-18 and total monthly expenditure is below R2 500
% of poor households with children aged 7–18 who do not spend money on school fees	National and provincial	D, EDU_EDUI, FIN_EXP	Main source	# of households with children aged 7–18 and monthly expenditure below R2 500 who did not spend any money on school fees for at least one of their children/# of households that are poor and have children aged 7–18 years

General Household Survey, Selected development indicators, 2020

Table 3.6: Transport

Indicator	Annual reporting level	Questions in the GHS	GHS relative to other sources	Definitions and/or formulas
# of passenger trips made per month with each public transport mode: Minibus/taxi Bus	National and provincial	TRA	Validation	Only calculated for household members who made trips using public transport
% of the household's income spent on transport per month: 1-10% 11-20% 21-30% 30% or more	National and provincial	TRA, FIN_INC	Main source	Only calculated for households with valid income and expenditure on transport data

Table 3.7: Water and sanitation

Indicator	Annual reporting level	Questions in the GHS	GHS relative to other sources	Definitions and/or formulas
# of households with water supply infrastructure of RDP standard or higher	National and provincial	WAT_DRINK WAT, WAT_DIST	Validation and data confrontation	On or above RDP is piped water in dwelling or yard or borehole in the yard (options 1,2&3) or tap less than 200 meters from yard (options 5,6&9) and option 1 WAT_DIST; all others are below,
# of households with no water supply infrastructure	National and provincial	WAT_DRINK WAT	Validation and data confrontation	'No water supply' is options 3, 4, 7–13,
# of consumers who experienced water supply interruptions of 48 hours or more at a time	National and provincial	WAT_INTE_ 2days	Validation and data confrontation	# of households option 'Yes' in WAT_INTE_2days/# of households who answered the question*100
# of consumers who have experienced a cumulative interruption of more than 15 days for the financial year	National and provincial	WAT_INTE_ 15DAYS	Supply data towards its calculation	# of households option 'Yes' in WAT_INTE_15DAYS/# of households who answered the question*100

Table 3.7: Water and sanitation (concluded)

Indicator	Annual reporting level	Questions in the GHS	GHS relative to other sources	Definitions and/or formulas
# of households with access to a functioning basic sanitation facility (strategic framework)	National and provincial	SAN_TOIL – SAN_LOCAT ION	Main source	'Basic facility' is defined as options 1, 2, 3 and 5 in SAN_TOIL
% households with access to a functioning basic sanitation facility (strategic framework)	National and provincial	SAN_TOIL – SAN_LOCAT ION	Main source	# of households with basic facilities/# of households*100
# of households with substandard toilet facility	National and provincial	SAN_TOIL – SAN_LOCAT ION	Main source	'Substandard' is defined as options 4, 6, 7 & 9 in SAN_TOIL
% of households with substandard toilet facility	National and provincial	SAN_TOIL – SAN_LOCAT ION	Main source	# of households with substandard facilities/# of households*100
# of households using bucket toilets	National and provincial	SAN_TOIL – SAN_LOCAT ION	Main source	# of households who chose option 7
# of households with no sanitation facility	National and provincial	SAN_TOIL	Main source	# of households who chose option 11
# of households using borehole water	National and provincial	WAT_DRINK WAT	Supply data towards its calculation	# of households options 3 and 9 for WAT_DRINKWAT
# of households using wood or coal for cooking	National and provincial	ENG_COOK	Main source	# households option 5, 6 for ENG_COOK
Percentage of households whose refuse or rubbish is removed by a local authority or private company	National and provincial	SWR_RUB	Main source	# of households options 1–2 in SWR_RUB/# of households who answered the question*100