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Preface

The purpose of this report is to provide a profile of multidimensional youth poverty in South Africa and to map its distribution at ward level, using data collected by Statistics South Africa through the 100% 2011 Census sample. As such, the report makes use of the recently developed Youth Multidimensional Poverty Index (Youth MPI)\(^2\), which is based on the Alkire Foster method (Alkire & Foster, 2011). The first section of the report describes how the Youth MPI was constructed and outlines some of its limitations. The second section presents the results for South Africa as a whole and then for each province and metropolitan municipality separately.

The strength of the Youth MPI based on the 100% 2011 Census sample is that it allows for fine-grained analysis of multidimensional youth poverty at low levels of disaggregation. By mapping the distribution of youth poverty estimates at ward level, this report offers a resource for identifying the areas of greatest need and for targeting youth-related policies and allocating resources more effectively.

---

\(^2\) See Frame, De Lannoy & Leibbrandt (2016).
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Introduction

Youth form a particularly large part of South Africa’s population, with just over 10.3 million3 (20%) young people between the ages 15-24. Born into a newly democratic society, it was expected that this cohort would be able to access a host of opportunities that were not previously available to their parental generation. They have often been described as a possible “demographic dividend” that could help drive social change and economic growth (Lefko-Everett, 2012). Yet, more than two decades after the end of apartheid, the quality of life and opportunities available to the majority of these young people continue to be shaped by the disadvantages and deprivations experienced by their parents.

While much has improved, the reality is that many youth live in income poverty (Ariane De Lannoy, Leibbrandt, & Frame, 2015). Furthermore, they experience deprivation in multiple dimensions of well-being including limited access to quality education and health care, a lack of employment opportunities, inadequate living standards and high exposure to violence in their direct environments and broader communities (De Lannoy, Swartz, Lake, & Smith, 2015). The National Youth Policy for 2015-2020 (NYP 2020), adopted by Cabinet in May 2015, recognizes this multidimensionality of deprivation among youth and therefore calls for “Integrated, holistic and sustainable youth development, conscious of the historical imbalances and current imbalances and current realities…” (National Youth Development Agency, 2015,p.5). However, effective implementation of the proposals in the NYP 2020 will require a truly comprehensive understanding of these multiple, co-existing imbalances in young people’s lives, especially with regard to how they differ across geographic spaces in the country.

Multidimensional poverty measures are increasingly being used to capture the multiple deprivations experienced by the poor. It is argued that multidimensional measures, in contrast to money-metric measures, lead to a better understanding of poverty and, thus, better policy-making. While various approaches have been developed to assess multidimensional poverty, the Alkire Foster method has gained substantial traction because of its theoretical and conceptual innovations and its particular advantages over other methods (Alkire & Foster, 2011). In South Africa, the Alkire Foster method was recently applied to construct the South African Multidimensional Poverty Index (SAMPI), a measure of multidimensional poverty based on a household’s deprivation in four dimensions of well-being (see box 1).

Importantly, however, analyses that focus specifically on the multiple deprivations within the youth cohort are rare. There is equally limited knowledge of the spatial inequalities that exist for this particular age group. Yet, given the uneven geographies of advantage and disadvantage in the country, aggregated poverty estimates at provincial or municipal level tend to conceal variations that exist at a smaller spatial scale. In particular, gross aggregations often hide important pockets of deprivation, as the estimates in a larger area may average out the presence of smaller areas with especially high estimates.

The current report therefore presents a ward-level analysis of multidimensional youth poverty in South Africa using the recently developed Youth Multidimensional Poverty Index (Youth MPI)4. We use the 100% 2011 Census sample to generate maps for South Africa as a whole, as well as for each province and metropolitan municipality separately. The use of the 100% sample allows us to

---

3 Own calculations based on weighted data from the Census 2011 100% sample. This number will differ from the youth population estimates in the analysis below because it includes youth living in institutions, and transient and tourist hotels as well as individuals whose usual place of residence is not the current household.
4 A detailed description of the Youth MPI can be found in Frame, De Lannoy & Leibbrandt (2016).
accurately estimate the Youth MPI measures at this low level and therefore identify pockets of deprivation that aggregation at larger scales would have disguised. We provide ranks for each ward based on the Youth MPI score to show how each ward compares with others in the country. We also present an examination of the composition of youth poverty, demonstrating which particular indicators or dimensions are driving youth poverty. Together these results can be used to guide policies and interventions, specifically with regard to identifying the geographic areas with the highest levels of youth poverty and determining the kinds of deprivations that need to be prioritized by targeted interventions.

The rest of this report is structured as follows: Section 1 describes how the Youth MPI was constructed, outlining its unit of analysis, components and limitations; Section 2 presents the results, first for South Africa as a whole and then for each province and metropolitan municipality separately; Section 3 concludes and provides policy recommendations.
Box 1: The South African Multidimensional Poverty Index (SAMPI)

In 2014 Statistics South Africa developed the South African Multidimensional Poverty Index (SAMPI), which is a measure of multidimensional poverty among households in South Africa. Applying the Alkire Foster method (Alkire & Foster, 2011), the SAMPI draws on the 2001 and 2011 Census to compare deprivation across the two time periods. It is made up of 11 indicators in the dimensions of education, health, living standards and economic activity. Each of the indicators are associated with a minimum level of satisfaction, or deprivation cut-off, which defines whether a young person is deprived in that particular area. In the overall index, all dimensions are weighted equally and within each dimension, the indicators are weighted equally. The SAMPI’s dimensions, indicators and associated deprivation cut-offs and weights are outlined in table 1.

Table 1: Dimensions, indicators, deprivation cut-offs and weights for the SAMPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Deprivation cut-off</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Child mortality</td>
<td>If any child under the age of 5 has died in the past 12 months</td>
<td>(1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Years of schooling</td>
<td>If no household member aged 15 or older has completed 5 years of schooling</td>
<td>(1/8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School attendance</td>
<td>If any school-aged child (aged 7 to 15) is out of school</td>
<td>(1/8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>Fuel for lighting</td>
<td>If household is using paraffin/candles/nothing/other</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuel for heating</td>
<td>If household is using paraffin/wood/coal/dung/other/none</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuel for cooking</td>
<td>If household is using paraffin/wood/coal/dung/other/none</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water access</td>
<td>If no piped water in dwelling or on stand</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitation type</td>
<td>If not a flush toilet</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwelling type</td>
<td>If an informal shack/traditional dwelling/caravan/tent/other</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asset ownership</td>
<td>If household does not own more than one of radio, television, telephone or refrigerator and does not own a car</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic activity</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>If all adults (aged 15 to 64) in the household are unemployed</td>
<td>(1/4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Statistics South Africa (2014).
The SAMPI assesses multidimensional poverty using household level aggregates, essentially assigning all members in a household the same condition. According to the selected poverty cut-off, a household is identified as multidimensionally poor if it is deprived in a third or more of the 11 (weighted) indicators. If a household is classified as poor then all its individual members are defined as poor as well.

Given the SAMPI’s specifications, the headcount (the proportion of households identified as multidimensionally poor) and the average intensity of poverty (defined as the average proportion of indicators in which poor households are deprived) are calculated. The overall SAMPI score is derived by multiplying the headcount by the average intensity of poverty. These SAMPI measures for 2001 and 2011 are outlined in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census year</th>
<th>Headcount (H)</th>
<th>Intensity (A)</th>
<th>SAMPI (HxA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Statistics South Africa (2014).

According to the results, 17.9% of households in South Africa were multidimensionally poor in 2001. This dropped to 8.0% in 2011. The average intensity of poverty decreased slightly from 43.9% of indicators in 2001 to 42.3% in 2011. Finally, the overall SAMPI score fell from 0.08 in 2001 to 0.03 in 2011.

---

5 For a full description of the SAMPI, see Statistics South Africa (2014).
Section 1: Constructing the Youth MPI

The Youth MPI measures a range of deprivations that are experienced simultaneously by young people. As mentioned above, it is based on the Alkire Foster method (Alkire & Foster, 2011), which offers a general framework for creating a multidimensional poverty index. The approach allows for considerable flexibility in the choice of dimensions, indicators, cut-offs, weights and unit of analysis, so that the measure can be adapted and fine-tuned for specific purposes and contexts. While the specifications of the Youth MPI are loosely based on those of the household-level SAMPI (detailed in box 1), various adaptations have been made to create a youth-specific measure.6

Apart from the SAMPI, the decisions regarding the various specifications of the Youth MPI were guided by:

- a review of priorities set out in key national and provincial policy documents7;
- consultations with leading academics;
- an overview of research on the experiences, outcomes and environmental factors that impact on the well-being of young people in South Africa8;
- the results of participatory processes involving young people themselves9;
- findings from existing studies that involved the participation of South Africans in defining indicators for poverty10;
- assumptions based on relevant theoretical work11;
- the data available in the 2011 Census;
- statistical analysis of the 100% 2011 Census sample.

1.1 Data and unit of analysis

The Youth MPI was originally derived using the 2011 10% Census sample. However, given that the purpose of this report is to present Youth MPI estimates disaggregated to the lowest possible geographic unit, we have made use of the 100% 2011 Census sample (Statistics South Africa, 2012a). Census 2011 is the third and most recent census conducted in post-Apartheid South Africa12 and provides demographic, social, economic and household characteristics of the South African population.13 Other survey data available in South Africa are commonly based on smaller samples of the population and therefore do not allow for robust disaggregation below provincial or municipal level. While the SAMPI draws on both the 2011 and 2001 Census, the Youth MPI only uses data from the 2011 Census. This decision was made so that we could make use of the general health and functioning items, which differ significantly between the 2001 and 2011 censuses.

The SAMPI assesses multidimensional poverty using household level aggregates, essentially assigning all members in a household the same condition. By contrast, the Youth MPI was developed with the

6 It is important to note that while the Youth MPI and the SAMPI appear to have similar structures, their estimates cannot be directly compared.
7 This included, but was not limited to: The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Republic of South Africa, 1996); The National Development Plan (National Planning Commission, 2012); The National Youth Policy (National Youth Development Agency, 2015); and The Western Cape Youth Development Strategy (Western Cape Government, 2013).
10 See May (1998) and Wright, Noble & Magasela (2010).
11 This included, but was not limited to: Lerner, Phelps, Forman, & Bowers (2009) and Dawes, Bray, & Van Der Merwe (2007).
12 The first census was conducted in 1996 and the second in 2001.
13 For an extensive overview of Census 2011, see Statistics South Africa (Statistics South Africa, 2012b).
young person as the unit of analysis, focusing exclusively on individuals aged 15-24. Separating the youth out from the household allowed us to assess the individual deprivations each young person experienced, which may have differed from that of other members in the household.

The South African government has adopted a broader definition of youth, which comprises individuals between the ages of 14 and 35 years inclusive (National Youth Development Agency, 2015), while Statistics South Africa defines youth as those between the ages of 15 to 35. It thereby recognizes that transitions to independent adulthood are complex and can be delayed. However, this extended definition can conceal important differences that exist in the needs, experiences, and expectations of individuals that fall within this broader age-range. The Youth MPI therefore applies the more narrow, international definition of youth as those aged 15-24\textsuperscript{14}.

In this report we provide Youth MPI estimates for South Africa’s 4277 electoral wards\textsuperscript{15}, in line with the wards created by the Municipal Demarcation Board for 2011. The analysis is limited to youth (aged 15-24) living in either housing units or converted hostels and whose usual place of residence is the dwelling unit in which they were enumerated. Youth living in other types of living quarters\textsuperscript{16} were not administered the required set of census questions and were thus excluded from the analysis. We also excluded youth whose usual place of residence was not the dwelling unit in which they were enumerated as household information on their usual place of residence was not available. When data from individual records was matched with household records; and non-responses and missing values were removed, the sample yielded data for 8,044,807 youth aged 15-24\textsuperscript{17}.

\section*{1.2 Components of the Youth MPI}

The Youth MPI has 11 indicators in the dimensions of education, health, living environment and economic opportunities, as illustrated in figure XX\textsuperscript{18}. Each of the indicators are associated with a minimum level of satisfaction, or deprivation cut-off, which defines whether a young person is deprived in that particular area. For example, according to the deprivation cut-off for water, a young person is identified as deprived if he or she is living in a household with no piped water on site. As with the SAMPI, each dimension is equally weighted and each indicator within a dimension is also equally weighted\textsuperscript{19}. The indicator’s deprivation cut-offs and weights are outlined in table 3.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Dimension & Weight \tabularnewline \hline
Education & 0.1 \tabularnewline Health & 0.1 \tabularnewline Living Environment & 0.1 \tabularnewline Economic Opportunities & 0.1 \tabularnewline \hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Youth MPI Weights}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{14} See United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (n.d) .
\textsuperscript{15} One exception is ward 74804019 in Gauteng. There are no estimates for this ward as it only contains individuals living in institutions. Since these individuals were not administered the required set of census questions they were excluded from the analysis.
\textsuperscript{16} This included youth living in residential hotels, homes for the aged and institutions as well as youth in transient and tourist hotels.
\textsuperscript{17} Since the 2011 Census recorded an undercount, the true youth population estimate, excluding the aforementioned group of individuals, is likely to be closer to 9,383,726.
\textsuperscript{18} The rationale behind the selection of each indicator can be found in Frame, De Lannoy & Leibbrandt (2016).
\textsuperscript{19} Robustness tests were run for the weights applied in the Youth MPI based on the 100\% 2011 Census Sample. The results indicated that the rankings of the Youth MPI between wards were robust to variations in its weighting structure.
Figure 1: Components of the Youth MPI

11 Indicators

- Educational Attainment (1/4)
- General Health and Functioning (1/4)
- Fuel for lighting, Fuel for heating, Fuel for cooking (1/28 Each)
- Sanitation, Water, Dwelling Type, Assets
- Sanitation, Water, Dwelling Type, Assets
- Economic opportunities (1/4)
- Household Adult Employment (1/8)
- NEET (1/8)
- Education (1/4)
- Health (1/4)
- Living environment (1/4)

4 Dimensions

Table 3: Deprivation cut-offs and weights of the Youth MPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Deprived if...</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Individual is age 15 – 16 and has completed less than primary school; Individual is age 17 – 20 and has completed less than grade 9; or individual is age 21 – 24 and has completed less than matric(^{20}) or matric equivalent</td>
<td>(1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>General health and functioning</td>
<td>Individual experiences difficulty in one or more functions: hearing, vision, communication, mobility (walking or climbing stairs), cognition (remembering or concentrating) or self-care</td>
<td>(1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living environment</td>
<td>Fuel for lighting</td>
<td>Individual is living in a household that is using paraffin/candles/nothing/other for lighting</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuel for heating</td>
<td>Individual is living in a household that is using paraffin/wood/coal/dung/other/none for heating</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuel for cooking</td>
<td>Individual is living in a household that is using paraffin/wood/coal/dung/other/none for cooking</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>Individual is living in a household without a flush toilet</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Individual is living in a household without piped water on site</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwelling type</td>
<td>Individual is living in a household that is an informal shack/traditional dwelling/caravan/tent/other</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>Individual is living in a household that does not own more than two of: radio, television, landline, cell phone or refrigerator AND does not own a motorcar.</td>
<td>(1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic opportunities</td>
<td>Household adult employment</td>
<td>Individual is living in a household where no adults (18-64) are employed</td>
<td>(1/8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>Individual is not in education, employment or training</td>
<td>(1/8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{20}\) In the South African schooling system, the matric year is the final year of high school. Matric also refers to the qualification received when graduating from high school.
1.3 Deriving the Youth MPI measures
Using the deprivation cut-offs and weights outlined above, the number of (weighted) deprivations experienced is added up for each individual young person. A young person is considered multidimensionally poor if he or she is deprived in a third or more of the weighted deprivations\(^\text{21}\).

Using these stipulations, three measures are derived:

- **Headcount** – the proportion of youth defined as multidimensionally poor
- **Intensity** – the average proportion of indicators in which the multidimensionally poor youth are deprived
- **Youth MPI score** – derived from the product of the headcount and intensity measures (ranging from zero to one, where one means all youth are deprived in all indicators)

While the Youth MPI score is not particularly intuitive to interpret, it can be loosely understood as reflecting the concentration of multidimensional poverty in a certain area, that is, the concentration of poverty across young people and for each individual young person (Alkire, Roche, & Seth, 2011).

The strength of the Youth MPI score is that it reflects both the proportion of the youth population that is poor as well as the intensity of their deprivation suffered. Poverty is typically analysed using headcount measures exclusively. However, these do not reflect the magnitude of poverty the poor experience and thus they remain unchanged when the poor become deprived in additional indicators. Information on the intensity of poverty is important for the design of policies and interventions in South Africa. For example, a ward that has a poverty headcount of 40 percent with the poor deprived in an average of seven out of 11 indicators, is clearly worse off than a ward that also has a poverty headcount of 40 percent but where the poor are only deprived in an average of three out of 11 indicators. By combining the headcount and intensity, the Youth MPI score is sensitive to both these aspects of poverty and can therefore provide a more nuanced picture of deprivation than traditional measures.

1.4 Creating ranks
The Youth MPI score can be used to produce meaningful rankings of geographic areas, providing an indication of the concentration of youth multidimensional poverty in one area relative to other areas.

In this report, two sets of ranks are presented, based on the Youth MPI scores for:

- Each province in South Africa\(^\text{22}\)
- Each ward in South Africa\(^\text{23}\)

1.5 Limitations
The selection of dimensions and indicators included in the Youth MPI were constrained by the data available in the 2011 Census. Unfortunately, there was a limited range of youth-specific questions in the census survey instrument. Ideally, a measure of multidimensional poverty for the youth cohort

\(^{21}\) As with the SAMPI, the Youth MPI uses a poverty cut-off of 1/3 or 33.3%. Robustness tests were run for this poverty cut-off applied in the Youth MPI based on the 100% 2011 Census Sample. The results indicated that the rankings of the Youth MPI between wards were robust to variations in its poverty cut-off.

\(^{22}\) These are presented in table 4, column “Youth MPI rank”.

\(^{23}\) These are presented in the appendix tables A1-A9, column “Youth MPI rank”.
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would have included indicators that captured deprivations relating to, for example, safety and violence, quality of social relationships, access to information\textsuperscript{24}, emotional and mental health and so on. However, the census did not have data for these and other relevant youth indicators. We acknowledge that, as a result, the Youth MPI provides a somewhat limited assessment of the well-being profiles of young people in South Africa.

In particular, there was very little data pertaining to the health of young people. Information on nutrition, hunger or food security was not collected by the census survey. While the SAMPI uses child mortality as its single health indicator, this is a household level indicator that does not relate directly to the health of an individual young person and thus was not included in the Youth MPI. The only information relating to health in the youth population was captured in the module on general health and functioning, relating to an individual's hearing, vision, communication, mobility, cognition and self-care. This was the only health indicator included in the health dimension of the Youth MPI.

Another constraint was the use of wards as a small area unit. Although electoral wards represent much smaller geographic units and therefore provide a more fine-grained analysis of multidimensional youth poverty than municipalities, their use also presents certain drawbacks. Firstly, youth population sizes are appreciably different across wards. While the national average in 2011 was around 2 420, population sizes ranged from under 50 youth in some wards to over 18 200 in others\textsuperscript{25}. The difference across provinces was especially notable, with Gauteng averaging around 4 520 youth per ward compared to Northern Cape averaging just over 1 000 youth per ward. These wide variations can be problematic because wards with larger youth populations are likely to be under-represented in the current analysis. Secondly, wards are not always homogenous in terms of youth poverty levels. It is possible that smaller clusters of highly deprived youth within certain wards would be concealed by relatively lower levels of deprivation found in the same area. While we were aware of these limitations, wards were nevertheless the most suitable small area unit currently available to us.

The next section presents the results for the application of the Youth MPI using the 100% 2011 Census data. Findings are given for South Africa as a whole, to provide the broader context, and then for each province and metropolitan municipality separately.

\textsuperscript{24} The 2011 Census included an item on how households mainly access internet. However, since it was a household level question, it didn't necessarily capture whether and how an individual youth within that household had access to the internet and thus it was not included as an indicator in the Youth MPI.

\textsuperscript{25} These values have been adjusted to account for the under estimation recorded in the census.
Section 2: Profiling multidimensional poverty among youth in South Africa

2.1 Provincial estimates of the Youth MPI

Table 4 below presents estimates of the three Youth MPI measures for each province as well as for South Africa as a whole. The last three columns in the table present the rank value by Youth MPI score\textsuperscript{27}, the youth population size and the number of Youth MPI poor, respectively\textsuperscript{28}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Headcount (H)</th>
<th>Intensity (A)</th>
<th>Youth MPI (HxA)</th>
<th>Youth MPI rank</th>
<th>Youth pop.</th>
<th>Youth MPI poor pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1'209'000</td>
<td>600'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>506'000</td>
<td>155'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1'967'000</td>
<td>418'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2'028'000</td>
<td>771'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1'121'000</td>
<td>417'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>806'000</td>
<td>247'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>611'000</td>
<td>226'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>192'000</td>
<td>62'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>947'000</td>
<td>216'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9'384'000</td>
<td>3'110'000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own calculations based on weighted data from the Census 2011 100% sample.
Notes: Pop. = Population, numbers have been rounded up to the nearest thousand. Standard errors for the Youth MPI provincial-level estimates are generally low, ranging from 0.000-0.01, and are available on request.

Looking at the situation for South Africa as a whole, in 2011 just over one in three (33.4%) youth in South Africa were multidimensionally poor. Thus, out of a youth population of 9.4 million, 3.1 million were multidimensionally poor. The poverty intensity estimate indicates that on average those young people who were multidimensionally poor experienced deprivation in 50.3% of the weighted indicators. The overall Youth MPI score for South Africa, which accounts for both the depth and the severity of multidimensional poverty, was 0.168.

There were substantial differences in poverty headcounts across provinces. The Eastern Cape had the highest headcount, with 49.6% of its youth population identified as multidimensionally poor. This was followed by KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo and the North West, with poverty headcounts of 38.0%, 37.2%...

\textsuperscript{26} It should be noted that the results presented in this report cannot be compared to those of the SAMPI. This is because the Youth MPI differs from the SAMPI with regard to its unit of analysis and its construction of the dimensions of education, health and economic opportunities. And while it uses the same indicators in the living environment dimension as those used in the SAMPI’s living standard dimension, the asset indicator has a slightly different structure.

\textsuperscript{27} The province with the highest score was given a rank of 1.

\textsuperscript{28} The same estimates for each electoral ward in South Africa are presented in the appendix tables A1-A9.
and 37.0% respectively. Gauteng and the Western Cape had the lowest headcounts, with 21.2% and 22.8% of their youth populations classified as multidimensionally poor, respectively.

The poverty intensity estimates varied slightly across provinces, from a low of 47.2% in the Western Cape to a high of 52.9% in the Eastern Cape. Generally, provinces with higher average intensity tended to also have higher headcounts. However, this was not consistently the case. For example, KwaZulu-Natal and Free State had similar average intensities: 50.2% and 50.0%, respectively but their headcounts were 38.0% for KwaZulu-Natal and 30.7% for Free State. This difference resulted in a markedly higher Youth MPI score for KwaZulu-Natal (0.191) compared with Free State (0.153), and consequently a wide disparity in the ranking attributed to these two provinces (2 for KwaZulu-Natal versus 6 for Free State).

Like the headcounts, the Youth MPI scores differed widely across provinces from 0.102 in Gauteng to 0.262 in Eastern Cape. Free State, Mpumalanga and Northern Cape have Youth MPI scores close to the national average. Recall that the Youth MPI score is the product of two measures: the poverty headcount and the poverty intensity. Since these two components are not perfectly correlated, their combination can produce different rankings to those produced by each measure separately. Consider, for example, Limpopo and the North West. Limpopo had a slightly higher headcount than North West: 37.2% and 37.0%, respectively. However, the poverty intensity for North West (51.3%) was higher than Limpopo (50.4%), which resulted in a higher overall Youth MPI score for North West. When ordered by headcount, North West was slightly less poor than Limpopo. However, when ranked by intensity or Youth MPI score, North West is poorer than Limpopo.

With regard to the estimates of the Youth MPI poor population in the last column of table 4, many of the provinces with the highest youth poverty headcounts also had larger numbers of poor youth. However, Gauteng, which had the lowest poverty headcount, had a markedly high number of multidimensionally poor youth relative to other provinces. Additionally, while Eastern Cape had the highest youth poverty headcount, KwaZulu-Natal had the highest number of young people living in multidimensional poverty.

2.2 Composition of youth poverty in South Africa

A key feature of the Youth MPI is that it can be unpacked to look at the contribution of each indicator to overall youth poverty. This can be further decomposed by geographic region to determine whether that region’s Youth MPI score is more or less influenced by indicators in education, health, living environment or economic opportunities. Figure 2 compares the percentage contributions of each weighted indicator to the overall Youth MPI score by province and for South Africa as a whole.  

---

29 The percentage contribution of each indicator to the Youth MPI is calculated as the proportion of youth who are poor and deprived in that particular indicator, multiplied by its weight, divided by the total number of indicators and then multiplied by the overall Youth MPI score.
With regard to the overall situation for South Africa, the largest contributor to the Youth MPI score was deprivation in educational attainment – accounting for over a third of youth poverty (35%) – followed by deprivation in adult household employment (16.4%) and NEET (14.6%). The figure shows that deprivations in the living environment indicators (between 2.3% and 5.1%) as well as deprivation in the health and functioning indicator (7.9%) contributed the least to the Youth MPI.

Naturally, these percentage contributions are influenced by the relative weights assigned to each indicator in the overall Youth MPI score. Educational attainment and general health and functioning have weights of 25% (or 1/4) each, while the economic opportunity indicators and the living environment indicators only have weights of 12.5% (or 1/8) and 3.6% (or 1/28), respectively. However, it is particularly noteworthy when the contribution of an indicator widely exceeds its assigned weight as this suggests that there are relatively higher levels of deprivation in that particular indicator than in others.

In this regard, the contribution of deprivations in educational attainment, adult household employment, fuel for heating and sanitation greatly exceed their assigned weights\(^{31}\), indicating that multidimensionally poor youth in South Africa were more deprived in these indicators than in others. By contrast, the contribution of deprivations in general health and functioning, fuel for lighting and

---

\(^{30}\) It is possible to generate a similar figure comparing the percentage contributions of each ward in a particular region.

\(^{31}\) In other words, deprivation in educational attainment contributed 35.5% to the Youth MPI score while its assigned weight was only 25%. Similarly, deprivations in the household adult employment indicator, the fuel for heating indicator and the sanitation indicator contributed 15%, 4.7% and 5.1%, respectively, while their assigned weights were only 12.5%, 3.6% and 3.6%, respectively.
dwelling type were lower than their corresponding weights, which suggests that there was relatively less deprivation in these areas.\textsuperscript{32}

There were marked differences in the composition of youth poverty across provinces. While deprivation in educational attainment was the biggest contributor to the Youth MPI score in all 9 provinces, its relative importance varied widely. The contribution of deprivation in educational attainment tended to be higher in the provinces with lower Youth MPI scores (less poor), such as Western Cape (46.3%), Northern Cape (40.4%) and Gauteng (39.6%). Contrastingly, deprivation in this indicator contributed relatively less in provinces with higher Youth MPI scores (poorer), such as the Eastern Cape (32.8%) and KwaZulu-Natal (29.8%).

Rather, these poorer provinces had a higher contribution from deprivations in the living environment indicators. The collective contribution of deprivation in the living environment indicators was 31.3% in the Eastern Cape and 31.0% in KwaZulu-Natal, while this contribution was nearly half the size in Gauteng and Western Cape.

The contribution of deprivation in the economic opportunities indicators also tended to correspond with provincial Youth MPI scores. Among the less poor provinces of the Western Cape and Gauteng, deprivation in NEET played a relatively larger role than adult household employment in contributing to poverty. However, in the poorest provinces of Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo, deprivation in adult household employment was a relatively larger contributor than NEET.

In some instances, the composition of youth poverty even varied between provinces with similar Youth MPI scores. Consider, for example, KwaZulu-Natal and North West: their Youth MPI scores were almost identical (0.191 and 0.190, respectively). However, the configuration of their youth poverty was notably different. While deprivation in educational attainment contributed more to the North West’s youth poverty (38.3%) than KwaZulu-Natal’s (29.8%), the contribution of the living environment indicators collectively were significantly higher for KwaZulu-Natal (31.0%) than North West (22.4%).

2.3 Mapping multidimensional youth poverty at the sub-provincial level

Youth-specific poverty analyses in South Africa are often based on aggregate national- or provincial-level estimates. While such estimates are valuable for identifying broad trends in the overall progress of the youth cohort, they are not able to capture the large geographic variations in deprivation that exist at smaller spatial scales. Aggregate estimates tend to give the impression that deprivation levels are relatively homogenous. However, numerous historical, social and economic processes have resulted in highly uneven geographies of youth deprivation across the country. Documenting these variations is particularly important for the efficient development of youth-oriented policies and interventions implemented at the small area level.

Our results show that wide geographic variabilities in youth poverty are increasingly apparent at lower levels of aggregation. Maps 1-4 depict multidimensional youth poverty headcounts at provincial, municipal, and ward level. Areas with the highest proportion of multidimensionally poor youth are shaded dark red whilst areas with the lowest proportion are shaded dark green, with a gradation to yellow in between\textsuperscript{33}. At the provincial level (map 1), multidimensional youth poverty headcounts only

\textsuperscript{32} However, the relatively small overall contribution of the health dimension may simply be a reflection of the lack of health indicators to adequately capture the health situation of young people.

\textsuperscript{33} Each map is presented in 10 equal-interval classes, as indicated in the legend.
varied from 21.2% in Gauteng to 49.6% in the Eastern Cape. This variation was wider at the municipal level (map 2), with headcounts ranging from 18.0% to 81.5%. However, the widest variation in headcounts occurred at the ward level (map 3), where estimates ranged from 0% to 100%. In other words, lower levels of aggregation reveal the heterogeneous poverty levels that underlie provincial averages. These smaller areas of deprivation are not discernible at the provincial or even municipal levels, as the estimates in a larger area tend to average out the presence of smaller areas with especially high estimates.

Thus, capturing the geographic variations at the small area level allows for the identification of pockets of high youth poverty that are not discernible at higher levels of aggregation, but that are clearly in need of targeted policy support.

Like map 3, map 4 shows multidimensional youth poverty headcounts at ward level but overlays the former homeland boundaries in blue. This map shows that the wards with the most extreme rates of youth poverty (shaded dark red on the map) corresponded very closely with the rural and former homeland regions of the Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and North West. However, pockets with relatively high concentrations of poor youth also existed within urban areas, for example in parts of Lenasia and Diepsloot in Johannesburg and Inanda and Isipingo in Ethekwini. Even so, while the youth poverty headcounts in these urban enclaves were high, they were considerably higher in the rural and former homeland regions.
Map 1: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount at provincial level, 2011

% Multidimensionally Poor
- 90%-100%
- 80%-90%
- 70%-80%
- 60%-70%
- 50%-60%
- 40%-50%
- 30%-40%
- 20%-30%
- 10%-20%
- 0%-10%
Map 2: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount at municipal level, 2011
Map 3: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount at ward level, 2011
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Map 4: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount with former homeland boundaries at ward level, 2011
2.4 Provincial youth poverty profiles at ward level

This section presents multidimensional youth poverty profiles for each of the 9 provinces separately. Each provincial profile includes:

- An overall headcount, intensity and Youth MPI score for the province;
- Ward-level estimates for the headcount, intensity and overall index as well as the rank value and youth population size of each ward (inserted in the appendix34);
- An analysis of the contribution of deprivations in the indicators to the overall Youth MPI score in the province; and
- A choropleth map depicting multidimensional youth poverty headcounts at ward level35 in the province and a separate map, zooming in on any metropolitan municipalities located within the province.

2.4.1 Youth poverty profile: Eastern Cape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Multidimensional youth poverty measures in Eastern Cape, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, 49.6% of the youth population in Eastern Cape was multidimensionally poor - over 1.5 times higher than the national average of 33.4%. The average multidimensionally poor youth in this province was deprived in 52.9% of the weighted indicators. Combining these two measures results in a Youth MPI score of 0.262 for the Eastern Cape.

Table A1 in the appendix presents the headcount, intensity and overall index as well as the ranking and youth population size for each ward in Eastern Cape.

34 The appendix tables for this report are available for download at [http://www.opensaldru.uct.ac.za/handle/11090/823](http://www.opensaldru.uct.ac.za/handle/11090/823)

35 As with the headcount maps above, these maps depict headcount estimates in 10 equal-interval classes. Wards with the highest proportion of multidimensionally poor youth are shaded dark red whilst wards with the lowest proportion are shaded dark green, with a gradation to yellow in between. These details are indicated in the maps’ legends.
Figure 3 shows the percentage contribution of weighted indicators to the overall Youth MPI score in Eastern Cape. Deprivation in educational attainment was the highest contributor to multidimensional youth poverty in the province, accounting for 33% of its Youth MPI score. The collective contribution of deprivations in the living environment indicators was also particularly high, contributing 31.3% to multidimensional youth poverty. In the economic opportunities dimension, the contribution of deprivation in household adult employment greatly exceeds its specified weight\(^{36}\), suggesting that poor youth in the province were especially disadvantaged in this aspect.

\(^{36}\) Deprivation in household adult employment contributed 18% to the Youth MPI score while its weight was only 12.5%.
Map 5: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Eastern Cape, by ward, 2011
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Map 6: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality, by ward, 2011
Map 7: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality, by ward, 2011
Map 5 depicts the multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in Eastern Cape. The province experienced a large variation in youth poverty levels across its wards, from a high of 94.7% in Ngquza Hill to a low of 2.1% in Buffalo City. The highest levels of youth poverty were concentrated in the densely populated rural settlements in the eastern region of the province, north east of the Great Kei River. These areas mainly fell within the former homeland of Transkei. The lowest levels of youth poverty were located in the wards that formed part of the major urban areas in the province, namely in the municipalities of Nelson Mandela Bay, Buffalo City and Makana.

Map 6 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality. The youth population estimates in this metropolitan were relatively large, with an average of 3000 young people living in each ward. The highest levels of youth poverty occurred in the central region of the metropolitan, covering parts of the former Ciskei homeland. There were also high concentrations of poor youth in the informal settlement areas of Duncan Village, located on the south-eastern periphery of East London. Wards with the lowest youth poverty headcounts were clustered around the major cities of East London, Bisho and King Williams Town as well as the township of Mdantsane.

Map 7 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality. The youth population estimates in this metropolitan were relatively large, with an average of 4000 young people living in each ward. The map shows that the highest levels of youth poverty were located in the south western peri-urban region of the metropolitan, comprising the areas of Boosyen Park, Joe Slovo, Rocklands, Kuyga, Greenbushes and Seaview. There were also pockets of high youth poverty within Port Elizabeth, including parts of Walmer township, Helenvale, New Brighton and KwaZakhele. Youth poverty was lowest in the southern areas of Port Elizabeth and the north eastern areas of Uitenhage.

37 This estimate has been rounded off to the nearest thousand.
38 This estimate has been rounded off to the nearest thousand.
2.4.2 Youth poverty profile: Free State

**Table 6: Multidimensional youth poverty measures in Free State, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcount (H)</th>
<th>Intensity (A)</th>
<th>Youth MPI (HxA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, 30.7% of the youth population in the Free State was multidimensionally poor - slightly lower than the national average of 33.4%. On average, those young people who were multidimensionally poor experienced deprivation in 50.0% of the weighted indicators. Combining these two measures resulted in a Youth MPI score of 0.153 for the Free State.

Table A2 in the appendix presents the headcount, intensity and overall index as well as the ranking and youth population size for each ward in the Free State.

**Figure 4: Contribution of weighted indicators to Youth MPI in Free State, 2011**

Source: Own calculations based on weighted data from the Census 2011 100% sample.

Figure 4 shows the percentage contribution of weighted indicators to the overall Youth MPI score in Free State. Notably, the largest contributors to multidimensional youth poverty in Free State were educational attainment (38%), NEET (16%) and adult household employment (15%). The contribution of these three indicators to the overall Youth MPI score greatly exceeded their assigned weights\(^{39}\), indicating that young people in Free State were relatively more deprived in these areas than in others.

\(^{39}\) The educational attainment indicator contributed 38% to the Youth MPI score while its assigned weight was only 25%. Similarly, the NEET and Adult household employment indicators contributed 16% and 15% respectively, while their assigned weights were each only 12.5%.
Map 8: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Free State, by ward, 2011
Map 9: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Mangaung Municipality, by ward, 2011
Map 8 presents the multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in Free State. The headcount levels for Free State’s 317 wards ranged from 2% for a ward in Mangaung Municipality to 64% for a ward in Phumelela. The map shows higher rates of youth poverty for wards located in the eastern region of the province, particularly in Thabo Mofutsanyana District Municipality. Notably, while the former homeland areas of Qwa Qwa in Maluti, a Phofung municipality, and an enclave of Bophuthatswana in Mangaung Metropolitan municipality showed relatively high levels of multidimensional youth poverty, the most extreme pockets of poverty were located elsewhere in the municipalities of Phumelela, Dihlabeng, Setsoto and Nala.

Map 9 presents the multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in Mangaung Municipality at ward level. Headcount levels in this metropolitan municipality vary largely across wards, from 2% to 52%. The map shows that youth poverty was lower in the small central region of Mangaung, where the Free State’s capital city of Bloemfontein was located. Youth poverty was particularly higher in the periphery areas of Bloemfontein and in the eastern region of the Mangaung Metropolitan Municipality.

### 2.4.3 Youth poverty profile: Gauteng

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Multidimensional youth poverty measures in Gauteng, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headcount (H)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, 21.2% of the youth population in Gauteng was multidimensionally poor - substantially lower than the national average of 33.4%. On average, those young people who were multidimensionally poor experienced deprivation in 48.3% of the weighted indicators. Combining these two measures resulted in a Youth MPI score of 0.102 for Gauteng.

Table A3 in the appendix presents the headcount, intensity and overall index as well as the ranking and youth population size for each ward in Gauteng.
Figure 5 shows the percentage contribution of weighted indicators to the overall Youth MPI score in Gauteng. Notably, the largest contributor to multidimensional youth poverty in the province were educational attainment (40%) and adult household employment (19%). The contributions of these two indicators to the overall Youth MPI score greatly exceeded their assigned weights, indicating that young people in Gauteng are particularly deprived in these two indicators.

The educational attainment indicator contributed 40% to the Youth MPI score while its assigned weight was only 25%. Similarly, the household adult employment indicator contributed 19%, while its assigned weight was only 12.5%.
Map 10: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Gauteng, by ward, 2011
Map 11: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in City of Johannesburg, by ward, 2011
Map 12: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Ekhurhuleni, by ward, 2011
Map 13: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in City of Tshwane, by ward, 2011
Map 10 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in Gauteng. Although Gauteng’s 508 wards collectively covered a comparatively small geographic area, they were densely populated and each contained an average of 5000\(^{41}\) young people. The map depicts relatively low levels of youth poverty across the province. However, pockets of high youth poverty\(^{42}\) were present in the municipalities of Mogale City, Randfontein, Westonaria and Merafong City in the west, Midvaal in the south and in the metropolitan municipalities of City of Johannesburg in the centre and Ekurhuleni in the east. Wards with the lowest youth poverty headcounts were mainly concentrated in the metropolitan municipalities of City of Tshwane, City of Johannesburg and Ekurhuleni. However there were a few outliers in Emfuleni and Midvaal in the south and Mogale City, Randfontein, Westonaria and Merafong City in the west.

Map 11 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in City of Johannesburg. The youth population estimates in this metropolitan were particularly large, with an average of 6000\(^{43}\) young people living in each ward. It is evident from the map that the highest concentrations of poor youth are largely located on the edges of the City of Johannesburg, namely in wards containing Thabo Mbeki Village, Kya Sands and a section of Diepsloot in the north; Leratong Village, Matholesville and Sol Plaatjie (Roodepoort) in the west and Thembelihle Informal and Lawley Station Informal settlement (Lenasia) in the south. Most of the wards with the lowest youth poverty levels were located in corridors extending from the centre of the metropolitan, north to Midrand, west to Roodepoort and east to Bruma. However, there were also areas of low youth poverty in the south eastern region of the metropolitan and in Lenasia and Soweto in the southwest.

Map 12 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality. The average number of youth per ward in Ekurhuleni was 6000\(^{44}\). Pockets of high youth poverty (headcounts between 40% and 60%) were located in Thembisa in the north; Germiston in the west; Katlehong in the south west and Springs and Daveyton in the east. In contrast, areas with the lowest youth poverty headcounts were clustered in the western region of the metropolitan, extending from Benoni and Boksburg in the centre to Germiston, Alberton, Bedfordview, Edenvale and Kempton Park.

Map 13 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in City of Tshwane. Headcounts in this metropolitan municipality varied from 2% for a ward in Pretoria to 45% for a ward in Centurion. The map shows that higher youth poverty was located on the north-western and south-western edges of the metropolitan, namely in Winterveld and the western periphery of Centurion. There was also a higher concentration of poor youth in the centre of City of Tshwane, located on the south-eastern edge of Mamelodi. Wards with the lowest levels of youth poverty were clustered together spatially in the south-west region, covering the areas of Pretoria and Centurion.

---

\(^{41}\) This estimate has been rounded off to the nearest thousand.

\(^{42}\) High youth poverty refers to headcounts between 50% and 90%.

\(^{43}\) This estimate has been rounded off to the nearest thousand.

\(^{44}\) This estimate has been rounded off to the nearest thousand.
2.4.4 Youth poverty profile: KwaZulu-Natal

Table 8: Multidimensional youth poverty measures in KwaZulu-Natal, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcount (H)</th>
<th>Intensity (A)</th>
<th>Youth MPI (HxA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, 38% of the youth population in KwaZulu-Natal was multidimensionally poor - significantly higher than the national average of 33.4%. On average, those young people who were multidimensionally poor were deprived in 50.2% of the weighted indicators. The overall Youth MPI score for the province, accounting for both the headcount and intensity of youth poverty, was 0.191.

Table A4 in the appendix presents the headcount, intensity and overall index as well as the ranking and youth population size for each ward in KwaZulu-Natal.

Figure 6: Contribution of weighted indicators to Youth MPI in KwaZulu-Natal, 2011

Source: Own calculations based on weighted data from the Census 2011 100% sample.

Figure 6 shows the percentage contribution of weighted indicators to the overall Youth MPI score in KwaZulu-Natal. Deprivation in educational attainment and adult household employment contributed most to multidimensional youth poverty in the province (30% and 18% respectively). However, the living environment indicators together contributed 31% to poverty, suggesting that deprivation in this dimension was also particularly acute.
Map 14: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in KwaZulu-Natal, by ward, 2011
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Map 15: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in ETHEKWINI MUNICIPALITY, BYWARD, 2011
Map 14 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in KwaZulu-Natal. Headcounts for KwaZulu-Natal’s 828 wards ranged from 4.1% for a ward in Ethekwini to 89.4% for a ward in Vulamehlo. This wide variation in multidimensional youth poverty levels across the province is illustrated in the map. There were a number of areas with extreme youth poverty, visibly clustering in the densely populated rural areas of Umzumbe, Vulamehlo and Umzimkhulu in the south; Msinga and Nkandla in the centre and Ulundi and Umhlabuyalingana in the north. Many of these areas formed part of the former homeland areas of KwaZulu as well as an enclave of Transkei in the south. Levels of youth poverty were lowest for the wards located in and around the cities of Durban, Pietermaritzburg and uMhlathuze (Richards Bay).

Map 15 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in Ethekwini Municipality. The youth population estimates in this metropolitan were particularly large, with an average of 7000 young people living in each ward. The lowest levels of youth poverty were clustered around the central regions of the metropolitan and along the central coastline from the city centre and north to Umhlanga Rocks. Areas with the highest headcounts were located south of the city centre in Isipingo and in the outer western region of the metropolitan, for instance in Inanda.

### 2.4.5 Youth poverty profile: Limpopo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcount (H)</th>
<th>Intensity (A)</th>
<th>Youth MPI (HxA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, 37.2% of the youth population in Limpopo was multidimensionally poor - significantly higher than the national average of 33.4%. On average, those young people who were multidimensionally poor experienced deprivation in 50.4% of the weighted indicators. Combining these two measures resulted in a Youth MPI score of 0.187 for Limpopo.

Table A5 in the appendix presents the headcount, intensity and overall index as well as the ranking and youth population size for each ward in Limpopo.

---

45 This estimate has been rounded off to the nearest thousand.
Figure 7: Contribution of weighted indicators to Youth MPI in Limpopo, 2011

Source: Own calculations based on weighted data from the Census 2011 100% sample.

Figure 7 shows the percentage contribution of weighted indicators to the overall Youth MPI score in Limpopo. Notably, the largest contributors to multidimensional youth poverty in Limpopo were deprivation in educational attainment (36%) and adult household employment (18%). Additionally, the contribution of deprivation in sanitation (7%) was particularly large relative to the other living environment indicators and relative to the other provinces. The contributions of educational attainment, adult household employment and sanitation to the overall Youth MPI score greatly exceeded their assigned weights, indicating that young people in Limpopo were relatively more deprived in these areas than in others.

46 The educational attainment indicator contributed 36% to the Youth MPI score while its assigned weight was only 25%. Similarly, the adult household employment and sanitation indicators contributed 18% and 7% respectively, while their assigned weights were only 12.5% and 3.57% respectively.
Map 16: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Limpopo, by ward, 2011
Map 16 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in Limpopo. The headcounts for Limpopo’s 543 wards ranged from 3% for a ward in Polokwane to 100% for a ward in Thabazimbi. While this latter ward in Thabazimbi had the highest youth poverty headcount in the country, its estimated youth population in 2011 was only 200. This was significantly small considering that the average youth population size of wards in Limpopo was 2164. The map shows that the highest rates of youth poverty were located in the northern and western peripheries of the province. The southern region of the province also had high levels of youth poverty. Many of these southern wards formed part of the former Lebowa homeland. Youth poverty levels were lowest in the central region of the province around Polokwane and in the eastern region around Phalaborwa.

2.4.6 Youth poverty profile: Mpumalanga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcount (H)</th>
<th>Intensity (A)</th>
<th>Youth MPI (HxA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, 30.6% of the youth population in Mpumalanga was multidimensionally poor - slightly lower than the national average of 33.4%. The average multidimensionally poor youth in this province was deprived in 49.5% of the weighted in indicators. Combining these two measures results in a Youth MPI score of 0.152 for Mpumalanga.

Table A6 in the appendix presents the headcount, intensity and overall index as well as the ranking and youth population size for each ward in Mpumalanga.
Figure 8 shows the percentage contribution of weighted indicators to the overall Youth MPI score in Mpumalanga. Deprivation in educational attainment and adult household employment contributed most to multidimensional youth poverty in the province (38% and 16% respectively), followed closely by NEET (15%). The contribution of deprivation in sanitation was particularly large (6%), relative to the other living environment indicators and relative to the other provinces. Considering that its specified weight was 3.57, this indicates that poor youth in the province were especially disadvantaged in this area.
Map 17: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Mpumalanga, by ward, 2011
Map 17 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in Mpumalanga. The province experienced a large variation in youth poverty levels across its wards, from as high as 70.5% in Mkhondo to as low as 2.9% in Steve Tshwete (Middelburg). High levels of poverty dominated in the south eastern municipalities of Mkhondo, Msukaligwa and Pixley Ka Seme. However, there were a few outliers scattered in the western and eastern region of the province. The lowest levels of youth poverty were concentrated in the wards that formed part of Steve Tshwete (Middelburg), Emalahleni (Witbank) and Mbombela (Nelspruit) municipalities, which contained the three largest cities in the province.

2.4.7 Youth poverty profile: North West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Multidimensional youth poverty measures in North West, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, 37% of the youth population in the North West was multidimensionally poor - higher than the national average of 33.4%. On average, those young people who were multidimensionally poor were deprived in 51.3% of the weighted indicators. The overall Youth MPI score for the province, accounting for both the headcount and intensity of youth poverty, was 0.190.

Table A7 in the appendix presents the headcount, intensity and overall index as well as the ranking and youth population size for each ward in North West.
Figure 9 shows the percentage contribution of weighted indicators to the overall Youth MPI score in North West. Deprivation in educational attainment and NEET contributed most to multidimensional youth poverty in the province (38% and 16% respectively). The contributions of these two indicators to the overall Youth MPI score exceeded their assigned weights\(^{47}\), suggesting that deprivation in these areas was particularly acute.

\(^{47}\) The educational attainment indicator contributed 38% to the Youth MPI score while its assigned weight was only 25%. Similarly, the NEET indicator contributed 16%, while its assigned weight was only 12.5%.
Map 18: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in North West at ward level, 2011
Map 18 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in the North West. The headcounts for the North West’s 383 wards ranged from 3.3% for a ward in the City of Matlosana to 90.5% for a ward in Rustenburg. This wide variation in multidimensional youth poverty levels across the province is illustrated in the map. Wards with youth poverty headcounts above 50% were scattered throughout the province, with some clustering around the municipalities of Kagisano/Molopo and Greater Taung in the east, Ratlou in the north and Tswaing and Ditsobotla in the central regions of the province. In contrast, youth poverty levels tended to be lowest around the major cities and towns of Rustenburg and Brits in the east, Klerksdorp and Potchefstoom in the south-east and Mafikeng in the north.

2.4.8 Youth poverty profile: Northern Cape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcount (H)</th>
<th>Intensity (A)</th>
<th>Youth MPI (HxA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, 32.3% of the youth population in the Northern Cape was multidimensionally poor - slightly lower than the national average of 33.4%. On average, those young people who were multidimensionally poor experienced deprivation in 50.2% of the weighted indicators. Combining these two measures resulted in a Youth MPI score of 0.162 for the Northern Cape.

Table A8 in the appendix presents the headcount, intensity and overall index as well as the ranking and youth population size for each ward in Northern Cape.
Figure 10: Contribution of weighted indicators to Youth MPI in Northern Cape, 2011

Figure 10 shows the percentage contribution of weighted indicators to the overall Youth MPI score in Northern Cape. Notably, the largest contributors to multidimensional youth poverty in the province were educational attainment (40%) and NEET (17%). The contributions of these two indicators to the overall Youth MPI score greatly exceeded their assigned weights\textsuperscript{48}, indicating that young people in Northern Cape were particularly deprived in these two indicators.

\vspace{1cm}
\textsuperscript{48} The educational attainment indicator contributed 40% to the Youth MPI score while its assigned weight was only 25%. Similarly, the NEET indicator contributed 17%, while its assigned weight was only 12.5%.
Map 19: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Northern Cape, by ward, 2011
Map 19 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in the Northern Cape at ward level. The areas with the highest proportion of poor youth were located in the municipalities of Joe Morolong in the north east; and Sol Plaatjie, Phokwane and Dikgatlong in the east. It is evident from the map that wards in the Kamiesberg, Karoo Hoogland, Kareeberg, !Kheis and Mier areas also experienced high levels of youth poverty. However, it should be noted that these wards, although they covered comparatively large geographic areas, had relatively small youth populations (all less than 600 youth).

2.4.9 Youth poverty profile: Western Cape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13: Multidimensional youth poverty measures in Western Cape, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, 22.8% of the youth population in the Western Cape was multidimensionally poor - considerably lower than the national average of 33.4%. On average, those young people who were multidimensionally poor were deprived in 47.2% of the weighted indicators. The overall Youth MPI score for the province, accounting for both the headcount and intensity of youth poverty, was 0.108.

Table A9 in the appendix presents the headcount, intensity and overall index as well as the ranking and youth population size for each ward in Western Cape.
Figure 11 shows the percentage contribution of weighted indicators to the overall Youth MPI score in Western Cape. The most striking feature about this figure is the substantial contribution of educational attainment deprivation to overall youth poverty. Deprivation in educational attainment contributed 46% to the Youth MPI in this province, exceedingly higher than its assigned weight of 25%. Also notable is the large contribution of the NEET indicator (20%) and the relatively small contribution of the indicators in the living environment dimension (15%).

Source: Own calculations based on weighted data from the Census 2011 100% sample.
Map 20: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in Western Cape, by ward, 2011
Map 21: Multidimensional youth poverty headcount in the City of Cape Town, by ward, 2011
Map 20 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in the Western Cape which range from 0% - 58.6%. The map depicts relatively low levels of youth poverty across the province. However, pockets of high youth deprivation existed in the municipalities of Breede Valley, Stellenbosch and the Cape metropole, with headcount levels between 50% and 60%. Importantly, while a selection of wards in the Central Karoo and Eden districts had higher youth poverty headcounts and sometimes covered large geographic areas, many had relatively small youth populations.

Map 21 presents multidimensional youth poverty headcounts for each ward in the City of Cape Town. The youth population estimates in this metropolitan were particularly large, with an average of 6000 young people living in each ward. It was evident from the map that many of the wards where youth poverty was highest were clustered towards the south-eastern periphery of the city. Youth poverty was also especially high in parts of the northern and south-western peripheries of the city, including parts of Khayelitsha, Crossroads, Nyanga, Philippi, Gugulethu, Mfuleni, Manenberg, Langa and Delft. Youth poverty was also especially high in parts of the northern and south-western peripheries of the city, namely in the areas of Doornbach, Dunoon and parts of Hout Bay. As expected, the lowest levels of youth poverty were concentrated around the city centre and areas close to the centre as well as in Somerset West on the south-eastern outskirts of the metropolitan.

Conclusion

To date, little coherent understanding exists about the multiplicity of deprivations experienced by the youth cohort in South Africa. There has been equally little analysis of youth-specific poverty data showing the extent to which deprivation varies from one small, local area to another. However, improving our understanding of these multiple forms of deprivation and developing youth-specific poverty measures that are disaggregated to the small area level is key to development efforts directed at young people.

This report has therefore provided multidimensional poverty profiles for youth aged 15-24 in South Africa and mapped the spatial distribution of multidimensional youth poverty at ward level. To measure multidimensional poverty among youth, the report has made use of the recently developed Youth MPI, an index that essentially integrates a number of dimensions of deprivation into an aggregate measure. The dimensions, indicators and deprivation cut-offs of the Youth MPI were selected specifically to reflect the unique experiences of the youth cohort in the context of post-apartheid South Africa. In order to provide an analysis of the Youth MPI at the ward level, the estimates in this report were derived from the 100% 2011 Census sample.

At the national level, the results indicated that in 2011 one in three (33.4%) youth in South Africa were multidimensionally poor, in an average of 50.3% of the weighted indicators, which resulted in a Youth MPI score of 0.168. Analysis of the composition of the Youth MPI showed that educational attainment, adult household employment and NEET were the three largest contributors to the Youth MPI score at the national level. These findings confirm the critical role that low educational outcomes and limited economic opportunities play in contributing to poverty among youth in South Africa and suggest the need to focus efforts and resources of governmental and non-governmental organisations on improving these aspects of youth people’s lives.

49 Levels of youth poverty were slightly lower (between 40% and 50%) in the Bitou, George, Oudtshoorn, Matzikama, Overstand, Kannaland, Drakenstein and Theewaterskloof areas.

50 See table A9 in the appendix for the youth population sizes for wards in these areas.

51 This estimate was rounded off to the nearest thousand.
At the provincial level, the Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, North West and Limpopo had the highest Youth MPI scores, each with multidimensional youth poverty headcounts above the national average. In contrast, Gauteng, Western Cape and Mpumalanga, had the lowest Youth MPI scores. Importantly, however, the composition of youth poverty across the provinces varied noticeably, suggesting that provinces should direct their policies and efforts at differing deprivations, depending on the extent to which they are contributing to youth multidimensional poverty.

The mapped results indicated the highly unequal spatial distribution of multidimensional youth poverty across wards, within all 9 provinces and within each of the 8 metropolitan municipalities. These ward-level analyses were able to capture the geographic variations in deprivation that aggregation at higher levels would have disguised. More specifically, the analyses allowed for the identification of several pockets of extreme youth poverty across the country.

Together the results presented in this report illustrate the usefulness of the Youth MPI as a tool for informing and targeting policies and interventions directed at youth. At all levels of governance, the Youth MPI measures, along with the ward rankings, can be used to identify the geographic areas of greatest need and to target youth-related policies and allocated resources more effectively. Additionally, the analyses of the composition of the Youth MPI, showing which particular deprivations contributed the most to multidimensional poverty among youth, can be used to direct efforts at the deprivations that constitute the most pressing needs among the youth.

The fine-grained picture that these results provide of the needs of young people within particular areas or communities will allow for a more accurate translation of youth development policies into local level interventions and programmes. However, further sub-group analyses of the Youth MPI are needed. Future analysis will focus on decomposing the Youth MPI along gender, racial and rural-urban divides. These results should offer useful insights into the unequal experiences of deprivations for different sub-groups within the youth population.
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