

PHASING IN THE CHILD SUPPORT GRANT

A SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

RESEARCHED FOR

THE DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE

BY THE

COMMUNITY AGENCY FOR SOCIAL ENQUIRY

JULY 2000



Published by: The Community Agency for Social Enquiry (C A S E)

PO Box 32882

Braamfontein

2017

Telephone: +27 (11) 646 5922

Fax: +27 (11) 646 5919

e-mail: director@case.org.za

Web site address: <http://www.case.org.za>

© **Department of Welfare**

Researched for: The Department of Welfare

ISBN:



**Soraya Kola
Susanne Braehmer
Mpapa Kanyane
Rejoice Morake
Zaid Kimmie**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PHASING IN THE CHILD SUPPORT GRANT.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	I
LIST OF TABLES	II
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	VI
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT	1
METHODOLOGY	2
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF CSG HOUSEHOLDS	2
THE ROLE OF THE CSG IN HOUSEHOLD INCOME	3
PROFILE OF PRIMARY CARE GIVERS (PCGs)	4
PROFILE OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES	4
ACCESS TO THE CSG.....	5
INCOME GENERATING PROJECTS (IGPs)	6
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT	7
BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	7
HISTORY OF SOCIAL SECURITY IN SOUTH AFRICA	7
<i>The Lund Committee</i>	8
<i>The Child Support Grant</i>	10
<i>Criticism levelled against the Child Support Grant</i>	11
SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY.....	13
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY	16
SURVEY OF CSG BENEFICIARIES	16
<i>Survey questionnaire</i>	16
<i>Sampling design</i>	16
<i>Fieldwork Procedures</i>	17
IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS	18
CASE STUDIES.....	18
FINDINGS	18
CHAPTER 3: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF CSG HOUSEHOLDS.....	19
DEMOGRAPHICS	19
ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY, TOILETS, TELEPHONES AND WATER	19
<i>Access to electricity</i>	20
<i>Access to toilets</i>	20
<i>Access to telephones</i>	21
<i>Access to water</i>	21
PROFILE OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS	22
HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	23
CONCLUSION.....	26

CHAPTER 4: ROLE OF THE CSG IN HOUSEHOLD INCOME.....	27
METHODOLOGY	27
AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD AND PER CAPITA INCOME.....	28
<i>Conclusion</i>	33
DEPENDENCY ON THE CSG	33
PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE OF THE CSG	39
<i>Conclusion</i>	42
HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE PATTERNS	42
CONCLUSION.....	44
CHAPTER 5: PROFILE OF PRIMARY CARE GIVERS (PCGS).....	45
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE.....	45
<i>Sex</i>	45
<i>Race</i>	45
<i>Age</i>	47
<i>Education status</i>	48
<i>Economic status</i>	51
<i>Marital status</i>	53
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PCG AND CHILD BENEFICIARY	56
<i>Relationship</i>	56
<i>Single parent households</i>	58
<i>Number of PCG's children</i>	59
<i>Conclusion</i>	60
HOUSEHOLD SITUATION OF PCGS.....	61
<i>Years lived in household</i>	61
<i>Ownership of dwelling</i>	62
<i>Contributions in kind</i>	63
<i>Bank accounts</i>	65
<i>Savings</i>	65
<i>Job offers</i>	66
<i>Conclusion</i>	67
CHAPTER 6: PROFILE OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES	68
INTRODUCTION	68
DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES	68
<i>Number of child beneficiaries in household</i>	68
<i>Non-beneficiaries</i>	69
<i>Age</i>	71
<i>Sex</i>	72
<i>Education or care status</i>	73
<i>Conclusion</i>	75
CARE GIVING PATTERNS.....	75
MOBILITY OF CHILD BENEFICIARY	76
SINGLE PARENT PCGS	77
<i>Financial support</i>	77
<i>Beneficiaries' contact with absent parent</i>	80
NON-PARENT PCGS	82
<i>Financial support</i>	82
<i>Conclusion</i>	86
<i>Beneficiaries' contact with the biological parent/s</i>	87

CHAPTER 7: ACCESS TO THE CSG	89
PUBLICITY CAMPAIGN.....	89
<i>Provincial communications strategies</i>	94
<i>NGO and CBO views of provincial communication strategies</i>	96
APPLICATION PROCEDURE.....	97
<i>Proof of household income</i>	99
<i>Proof of personal income</i>	100
STAFF ATTITUDES.....	101
LENGTH OF PROCESS.....	103
KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS.....	106
FACTORS THAT IMPEDE ACCESS TO THE GRANT.....	109
<i>Lack of documents</i>	109
<i>Transport</i>	109
<i>Cost incurred</i>	110
<i>Communication</i>	110
<i>Language</i>	111
<i>Long waiting period</i>	111
<i>Amount too little</i>	112
<i>Attitude of staff</i>	113
<i>Lack of knowledge of the criteria / Use of old criteria</i>	113
CHAPTER 8: INCOME GENERATING PROJECTS (IGPS)	114
<i>Knowledge of IGPs</i>	114
<i>Source of information</i>	115
<i>Presence of IGPs</i>	115
<i>Registered for participation</i>	116
<i>Interest in participation</i>	117
<i>Reasons for non-participation</i>	118
<i>Conclusion</i>	119
CHAPTER 9: RECOMMENDATIONS	120
APPENDIX A: CASE STUDY REPORT (QWAQWA, FREE STATE)	121
BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY.....	121
PROFILE OF CSG BENEFICIARIES AND APPLICANTS.....	122
CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE CSG IS BEING DELIVERED.....	122
<i>Problems experienced by the applicants</i>	122
<i>Problems experienced by officials</i>	124
FACTORS THAT IMPEDE ACCESS TO THE GRANT.....	125
<i>The means test</i>	125
THE ROLE OF THE CSG IN HOUSEHOLD INCOME.....	126
THE CONCEPT OF PRIMARY CARE GIVER.....	126
COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGIES.....	127
CONCLUSION.....	127
APPENDIX B: CASE STUDY REPORT (WAYENI, NORTHERN PROVINCE)	128
BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY.....	128
DESCRIPTION OF SITE.....	128
PROFILE OF CSG BENEFICIARIES AND APPLICANTS.....	129
CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE CSG IS BEING DELIVERED.....	129

Problems experienced by applicants 129

Problems experienced by officials 130

The means test 132

THE ROLE OF THE CSG IN THE HOUSEHOLD INCOME 132

THE CONCEPT OF PRIMARY CARE GIVER 132

COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES DEVELOPED BY THE DEPARTMENT 133

CONCLUSION..... 133

APPENDIX C: THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY BASED HEALTH WORKERS 134

INTRODUCTION 134

PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED 134

KNOWLEDGE OF AND INVOLVEMENT WITH THE CSG 134

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED REGARDING THE CSG 135

Documentation 135

Staff attitudes 135

Waiting periods 135

THE ROLE OF CSG IN POVERTY ALLEVIATION 136

WHO SHOULD BE TARGETED FOR THE CSG? 136

THE CONCEPT OF PRIMARY CARE GIVER 137

APPENDIX D: ANALYSIS OF SOCPEN DATA 138

APPENDIX E: LIST OF IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS 142

REFERENCES 143

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our thanks to the C A S E fieldwork team which has made the fieldwork component of the study possible, especially to Ntombi Ntsele and Steve Motlatla.

We would also like to thank the members of the reference group – Vivienne Bozalek, Marj Brown, Debbie Budlender, Sulina Green, Sandy Liebenberg, Francie Lund, Marie Therese Naidoo and Alison Tilley – for all their help and support.

Thanks to Rehana Ally and Yugen Naidu at the Department of Welfare for their input during the research.

We also thank Ran Greenstein and Sue Marshall for their final edits.

Finally, we would like to thank all the CSG beneficiaries who participated in the survey, as well as the interviewees and participants of the focus groups.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: REALISED SAMPLE, BY PROVINCE.....	17
TABLE 2: PERCENTAGE OF CSG HOUSEHOLDS, BY AREA.....	19
TABLE 3: RACIAL DISTRIBUTION OF PEOPLE/HOUSEHOLDS IN THE SURVEY.....	19
TABLE 4: PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY, BY AREA.....	20
TABLE 5: ACCESS TO TOILET FACILITIES, BY AREA.....	20
TABLE 6: PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH ACCESS TO A PHONE, BY AREA.....	21
TABLE 7: ACCESS TO WATER, BY AREA.....	21
TABLE 8: AGE BREAKDOWN OF PERSONS LIVING IN CSG HOUSEHOLDS.....	22
TABLE 9: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED (ADULTS).....	23
TABLE 10: CURRENT EDUCATION OR CARE STATUS OF CHILDREN, BY AGE.....	23
TABLE 11: NUMBER OF PEOPLE PER HOUSEHOLD.....	24
TABLE 12: NUMBER OF ADULT WOMEN PER HOUSEHOLD.....	24
TABLE 13: NUMBER OF ADULT MEN PER HOUSEHOLD.....	25
TABLE 14: NUMBER OF YOUNG CHILDREN PER HOUSEHOLD.....	25
TABLE 15: PROPORTION OF OLDER CHILDREN PER HOUSEHOLD.....	26
TABLE 16: CATEGORIES OF SOURCES OF INCOME.....	27
TABLE 17: HOUSEHOLD AND PER CAPITA AVERAGE MONTHLY INCOME.....	28
TABLE 18: MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME AFTER TAX, BY AREA.....	29
TABLE 19: AVERAGE MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD AND PER CAPITA INCOME, BY AREA.....	29
TABLE 20: AVERAGE MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD EARNINGS FROM EMPLOYMENT, BY AREA.....	30
TABLE 21: USUAL MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY PROVINCE.....	30
TABLE 22: AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY PROVINCE.....	31
TABLE 23: AVERAGE MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD EARNINGS FROM EMPLOYMENT, BY PROVINCE.....	31
TABLE 24: PCGS USUAL MONTHLY PERSONAL INCOME AFTER TAX, BY AREA.....	32
TABLE 25: PCGS USUAL MONTHLY PERSONAL INCOME AFTER TAX, BY PROVINCE.....	32
TABLE 26: AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD AND PER-CAPITA INCOME, BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD.....	33
TABLE 27: AVERAGE PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME DERIVED FROM SOURCE.....	33
TABLE 28: HOUSEHOLD DEPENDENCY ON CSG AND STATE TRANSFERS.....	34
TABLE 29: CSG AND STATE TRANSFERS AS A PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY PROVINCE.....	34
TABLE 30: HOUSEHOLD DEPENDENCY ON CSG, BY PROVINCE.....	35
TABLE 31: CSG AND STATE TRANSFERS AS A PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY AREA.....	35
TABLE 32: DEPENDENCE ON CSG, BY AREA.....	35
TABLE 33: MAIN SOURCE OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE CHILD.....	36
TABLE 34: MAIN SOURCE OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE CHILD, BY PROVINCE.....	37
TABLE 35: MAIN SOURCE OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE CHILD, BY AREA.....	37
TABLE 36: MAIN SOURCE OF SUPPORT FOR THE CHILD BENEFICIARY.....	38
TABLE 37: MAIN SOURCE OF SUPPORT FOR CHILD BENEFICIARIES AND NON-BENEFICIARIES.....	38
TABLE 38: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THAT THE CSG HAS IMPROVED THEIR ABILITY TO TAKE CARE OF THE CHILD, BY AREA.....	39
TABLE 39: CSG HAS IMPROVED ABILITY TO PAY, BY AREA (N=795).....	39
TABLE 40: THE CSG IS INADEQUATE (N=130).....	40
TABLE 41: DISTRIBUTION OF MONEY IN THE HOUSEHOLD.....	41
TABLE 42: DISTRIBUTION OF MONEY IN THE HOUSEHOLD.....	41
TABLE 43: ITEMS OF EXPENDITURE WITH CSG MONEY.....	42
TABLE 44: ITEMS OF EXPENDITURE WITH CSG MONEY, BY PROVINCE.....	43
TABLE 45: THREE BIGGEST HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES.....	43
TABLE 46: SEX OF PCGS.....	45
TABLE 47: RACE OF PCGS.....	45

TABLE 48: RACE OF PCG, BY AREA	46
TABLE 49: RACE OF PCG, BY PROVINCE.....	46
TABLE 50: AGE OF PCGS.....	47
TABLE 51: AGE OF PCG, BY AREA	47
TABLE 52: AGE OF PCGS, BY PROVINCE.....	48
TABLE 53: EDUCATION LEVEL OF PCGS AND AVERAGE AGE	48
TABLE 54: LEVEL OF EDUCATION, BY AGE.....	49
TABLE 55: EDUCATION LEVEL OF PCG, BY PROVINCE	50
TABLE 56: ECONOMIC STATUS OF PCGS.....	51
TABLE 57: ECONOMIC STATUS OF PCG, BY AGE.....	51
TABLE 58: ECONOMIC STATUS OF PCG, BY PROVINCE.....	52
TABLE 59: MARITAL STATUS OF PCG.....	53
TABLE 60: MARITAL STATUS OF PCGS, BY AGE	54
TABLE 61: MARITAL STATUS OF PCG, BY PROVINCE.....	54
TABLE 62: PCG'S RELATIONSHIP TO CHILD BENEFICIARY	56
TABLE 63: PCG'S RELATIONSHIP TO CHILD BENEFICIARY, BY PROVINCE	56
TABLE 64: PROPORTION OF PARENTAL PCGS, BY AGE.....	57
TABLE 65: INCIDENCE OF SINGLE PARENT ENVIRONMENT	58
TABLE 66: PERCENTAGE OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES LIVING IN A SINGLE PARENT HOUSEHOLD, BY PROVINCE	58
TABLE 67: PERCENTAGE OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES LIVING IN A SINGLE PARENT HOUSEHOLD, BY AREA	59
TABLE 68: NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER PCG, BY AREA	59
TABLE 69: NUMBER OF PCG'S CHILDREN LIVING WITH PCG	60
TABLE 70: YEARS PCG HAS LIVED IN CURRENT HOUSEHOLD	61
TABLE 71: YEARS LIVED IN CURRENT HOUSEHOLD, BY PROVINCE.....	62
TABLE 72: OWNER OF DWELLING	62
TABLE 73: OWNER OF DWELLING, BY AREA.....	63
TABLE 74: PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING CONTRIBUTIONS IN KIND, BY AREA	63
TABLE 75: PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING CONTRIBUTIONS IN KIND, BY PROVINCE.....	64
TABLE 76: SOURCES OF HELP/DONATIONS FOR PCGS	64
TABLE 77: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE A BANK ACCOUNT, BY AREA	65
TABLE 78: ARE YOU EVER ABLE TO SAVE ANY MONEY?	65
TABLE 79: PROPORTION OF UNEMPLOYED PCGS WHO HAD A JOB OFFER IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS, BY AREA	66
TABLE 80: NUMBER OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES IN HOUSEHOLD, BY AREA	68
TABLE 81: NUMBER OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES IN HOUSEHOLD, BY PROVINCE	69
TABLE 82: HOUSEHOLDS, BY NUMBER OF CHILD NON-BENEFICIARIES (N=373)	69
TABLE 83: IS THE PCG OF THE NON-BENEFICIARY A CSG BENEFICIARY? (N=376).....	70
TABLE 84: PROPORTION OF CSG HOUSEHOLDS WITH AT LEAST ONE NON-BENEFICIARY, BY AREA.....	70
TABLE 85: AGE OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES, BY PROVINCE	71
TABLE 86: AVERAGE AGE OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES AND NON-BENEFICIARIES	72
TABLE 87: SEX OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES, BY PROVINCE	72
TABLE 88: EDUCATION STATUS OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES, BY AGE (N=1156).....	73
TABLE 89: BENEFICIARIES AND NON-BENEFICIARIES, BY EDUCATION STATUS.....	73
TABLE 90: REASON CHILD BENEFICIARY DOES NOT ATTEND SCHOOL OR CRÈCHE, BY AGE (N=665).....	74
TABLE 91: IMMUNISATION STATUS OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES (N=1230).....	74
TABLE 92: WHO MAINLY TAKES CARE OF THE CHILD DURING THE DAY? (N=1231).....	75
TABLE 93: WHO MAINLY LOOKS AFTER THE CHILD WHEN S/HE GETS BACK FROM SCHOOL? (N=246)	76
TABLE 94: PROPORTION OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES LIVING WITH PCG/IN HH SINCE BIRTH, BY AGE.....	76
TABLE 95: FINANCIAL SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM OTHER PARENT (N=658)	77
TABLE 96: NUMBER OF BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVE PRIVATE MAINTENANCE (N=15)	78
TABLE 97: HAS THE OTHER PARENT EVER CONTRIBUTED FINANCIALLY? (N=466).....	78

TABLE 98: WHAT IS THE MAIN REASON THE OTHER PARENT STOPPED CONTRIBUTING? (N=147).....	78
TABLE 99: HAVE YOU EVER TRIED LEGAL CHANNELS TO GET THE OTHER PARENT TO CONTRIBUTE? (N=503)	79
TABLE 100: HAVE YOU USED LEGAL MEANS TO GET OTHER PARENT TO CONTRIBUTE, BY DATE APPLIED FOR CSG.....	79
TABLE 101: REASON PCG NEVER TRIED LEGAL CHANNELS TO GET THE OTHER PARENT TO CONTRIBUTE (N=354)	80
TABLE 102: LOCATION OF OTHER PARENT (N=658)	80
TABLE 103: LEVEL OF CHILD BENEFICIARY'S CONTACT WITH OTHER PARENT (N=589)	81
TABLE 104: CONTACT WITH OTHER PARENT, BY LOCATION OF OTHER PARENT	81
TABLE 105: FINANCIAL SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM MOTHER/FATHER (N=130)	82
TABLE 106: HAVE YOU RECEIVED ANY MONEY FROM PARENT LAST YEAR? (EXCLUDING DECEASED PARENTS)	83
TABLE 107: HAS THE MOTHER/FATHER EVER CONTRIBUTED FINANCIALLY?	83
TABLE 108: MAIN REASON THE MOTHER/FATHER HAS STOPPED CONTRIBUTING	83
TABLE 109: HAVE YOU EVER TRIED LEGAL CHANNELS TO GET THE PARENTS TO CONTRIBUTE?	84
TABLE 110: ATTEMPT TO GET MOTHER/FATHER TO CONTRIBUTE, BY DATE APPLIED FOR CSG	85
TABLE 111: REASON PCG NEVER TRIED LEGAL CHANNELS TO GET PARENT TO CONTRIBUTE.....	85
TABLE 112: PCG HAS RECEIVED PERMISSION FROM THE MOTHER/FATHER TO APPLY FOR THE CSG	86
TABLE 113: DOES THE MOTHER/FATHER OF THIS CHILD LIVE IN THIS HOUSEHOLD?	87
TABLE 114: PERCENTAGE OF MOTHERS LIVING IN THE SAME HOUSEHOLD, BY PROVINCE.....	87
TABLE 115: LOCATION OF MOTHER/FATHER OF THE CHILD.....	88
TABLE 116: LEVEL OF BENEFICIARY'S CONTACT WITH THE MOTHER/FATHER DURING LAST YEAR	88
TABLE 117: WAS KNOWLEDGE PUBLICISED ENOUGH? BY AREA	89
TABLE 118: WAS KNOWLEDGE PUBLICISED ENOUGH? BY PROVINCE	90
TABLE 119: SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE CSG	90
TABLE 120: SOURCE OF INFORMATION, BY AREA.....	91
TABLE 121: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO KNEW ABOUT THE TOLL-FREE INFORMATION LINE, BY AREA.....	92
TABLE 122: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAD MADE QUERIES AT THE DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE, BY AREA.	93
TABLE 123: LANGUAGE OF ACCESS	93
TABLE 124: DOCUMENTS RESPONDENTS WERE ASKED FOR	97
TABLE 125: DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED WHEN APPLYING FOR THE GRANT.....	98
TABLE 126: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO WERE ASKED TO PROVE HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY AREA.....	99
TABLE 127: METHOD OF PROVING HOUSEHOLD INCOME	100
TABLE 128: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS ASKED OF PROOF OF PERSONAL INCOME, BY AREA	100
TABLE 129: METHOD OF PROVING PERSONAL INCOME	101
TABLE 130: TREATMENT OF APPLICANTS BY WELFARE STAFF WHEN APPLYING FOR THE GRANT.....	101
TABLE 131: MONTHS WAITED FOR FIRST CSG PAYMENT (N=1181)	103
TABLE 132: NUMBER OF CSG PAYMENTS FOR EACH CHILD, BY MONTHS SINCE FIRST PAYMENT (N=1204)	104
TABLE 133: MANNER IN WHICH GRANT IS RECEIVED	104
TABLE 134: LENGTH OF TIME IT TAKES TO COLLECT THE GRANT.....	104
TABLE 135: TIME TAKEN TO COLLECT THE GRANT, EXCLUDING HAVING TO WAIT IN THE QUEUE	105
TABLE 136: COST INVOLVED COLLECTING THE GRANT.....	105
TABLE 137: HOW MANY CHILDREN CAN YOU APPLY FOR? (N=979)	106
TABLE 138: FOR UP TO HOW MANY CHILDREN CAN A PRIMARY CARE GIVER APPLY FOR A CSG?	106
TABLE 139: A CHILD OF ANY AGE CAN RECEIVE A CHILD SUPPORT GRANT	107
TABLE 140: TO RECEIVE A CSG THE PRIMARY CARE GIVER HAS TO BE THE CHILD'S PARENT	107
TABLE 141: A PCG CAN DRAW A PENSION AS WELL AS RECEIVE THE CSG	107
TABLE 142: COMMENTS ABOUT THE CSG	108
TABLE 143: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WITH KNOWLEDGE OF INCOME GENERATING PROJECTS, BY AREA	114
TABLE 144: SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT IGPs.....	115
TABLE 145: PRESENCE OF IGPs, BY AREA	115
TABLE 146: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHOSE NAME WAS NOT ON A LIST FOR AN IGP, BY PROVINCE.....	116
TABLE 147: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING IN AN IGP, BY PROVINCE	117

TABLE 148: REASONS FOR NOT PARTICIPATING IN AN INCOME GENERATING PROJECT..... 118

TABLE 149: REASONS FOR NOT PARTICIPATING IN AN INCOME GENERATING PROJECT, BY AREA 118

TABLE 150: REASON FOR NOT PARTICIPATING IN AN INCOME GENERATING PROJECT, BY PROVINCE..... 119

TABLE 151: ADULT BENEFICIARIES, BY PROVINCE..... 138

TABLE 152: SEX OF ADULT BENEFICIARIES 138

TABLE 153: SEX OF BENEFICIARIES, BY PROVINCE..... 139

TABLE 154: AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS, PER PROVINCE 139

TABLE 155: AVERAGE AGE OF ADULT BENEFICIARIES, BY PROVINCE 140

TABLE 156: CHILD BENEFICIARIES OF THE CSG 140

TABLE 157: PROPORTION OF NON-BIOLOGICAL CHILD BENEFICIARIES PER PCG, BY PROVINCE..... 140

TABLE 158: AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES PER ADULT BENEFICIARY, BY PROVINCE 141

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CBHW	Community-based health worker
CSG	Child Support Grant
FCG	Foster Child Grant
IDI	In-depth interview
PCG	Primary Care Giver
SMG	State Maintenance Grant

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction and overview of the project

In 1996, the Lund Committee was established to explore policy options regarding social security for children and families. The report of the Committee recommended a new strategy to replace the existing state maintenance grant (SMG). This strategy included a child-linked grant with a lower monetary value than that of the SMG, but targeted at a wider group of beneficiaries, particularly those living in the most disadvantaged areas: rural areas and informal settlements.

The principles for the implementation of the new child support grant (CSG) were as follows:

- The CSG would contribute to the costs of rearing children in very poor households
- The CSG would be linked to an objective measure of need, determined through a means test
- The operation of the CSG would acknowledge the State's fiscal constraints and limitations
- The focus of the grant would be on children, not on the family, thus ensuring that the grant would follow the child regardless of the identity of the care giver
- The CSG would form part of general poverty relief efforts.

The CSG was introduced in April 1998, at a level of R100 per month for each child younger than seven years of age. The money would be paid to the primary care giver (PCG) of the child. Applicants for the grant were required to pass a means test (based on household income), produce certain documents, and demonstrate efforts to secure funds from other sources. The strict nature of the requirements prevented many eligible care givers from applying for the grant, and in June 1999 the rules were changed. The mean test now uses personal rather than household income and the requirements to produce documents and other evidence became less onerous.

In June 1999, the Community Agency for Social Enquiry (C A S E) was awarded a tender to evaluate the implementation of the CSG. The terms of reference for the project were:

- To build a national profile of current CSG beneficiaries
- To assess the role of the CSG in household income
- To assess the conditions under which the CSG is being delivered
- To identify factors impeding access to the CSG and their significance
- To assess the accuracy and implementation of the means test
- To monitor and assess how the concept of 'primary care giver' is being operationalised in accessing the CSG
- To ascertain perceptions of community based health workers as to the role of the CSG in poverty alleviation
- To assess the extent to which the Department of Welfare's Directorate: Communications delivered relevant and timely information regarding the phasing-in of the CSG.

Methodology

The study included three main components:

- A national survey of 999 CSG beneficiaries
- A series of in-depth interviews with stakeholders
- Case studies.

The survey questionnaire was developed in consultation with a reference group and the Department of Welfare, and was tested and refined extensively. The main respondent was the PCG receiving the CSG, who provided demographic and socio-economic information about the household members, including the child beneficiaries and other children, and information on access to and knowledge of the CSG. The PCG interviewees were selected through a multi-stage random sampling design, using the Department of Welfare's database.

A series of in-depth interviews (IDIs) were conducted with government officials, as well as with representatives from non-governmental organisations (NGOs) involved with the CSG. The purpose of the IDIs was to establish the effectiveness of the Department of Welfare's implementation of the CSG, the problems experienced by applicants, as well as the problems faced by officials of the Department of Welfare.

A study of two sites – Monontsha in the Free State and Wayeni in the Northern Province – was conducted to provide a more detailed picture of the impact of social assistance on those who receive the grant. We chose one site in an area with high rates of applications for the CSG and the other in an area with low rates. Case studies included focus group discussions with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, community leaders, NGOs and government officials.

Demographic profile of CSG households

The households were divided roughly equally between urban and rural areas. Within each area formal and informal settlements were included. Most households were African (87%) and coloureds (13%). Households were generally poor with limited access to basic facilities such as water, electricity, telephones and toilets, particularly in rural areas and informal settlements, and in the provinces of Eastern Cape and the Northern Province. A large proportion (40%) of adults included in the survey had some level of secondary education, and a similar proportion had primary education or no formal education (12% in the latter category).

In total the households had 6683 members. At 6.7 members per household, this figure is significantly larger than the average South African household, which has 4.2 members. All households contained at least one adult woman, and the majority more than one. In contrast, 27% of households contained no adult men, particularly in formal urban areas. Over half of the households had only one young child, especially in urban areas. Rural households were generally larger with more children. The majority (59%) of children eligible for the grant stayed at home.

The Role of the CSG in household income

Various sources were included in the calculation of household income: the Child Support Grant, other state transfers (pensions and other grants), earnings, and other sources. The average monthly household income in our sample was R837, and the average monthly per capita income was R131 (less than half the national Minimum Living Level – MLL – for an average household of seven in March 1999). Without the CSG, the average reported income would drop to R714 for the household and to R109 per individual.

The average per capita income is higher in urban areas than in rural areas. However, within both urban and rural areas there is no statistically significant difference between the formal and informal areas. The average household in our sample received R427 per month in earnings from employment. Rural households earned significantly less than urban households, and households in informal areas tended to earn less than households in formal areas.

Households and individuals in the Western Cape had significantly higher income than their counterparts in other provinces. Per capita income in the Northern Province, KwaZulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape (the three poorest provinces) was significantly lower than that in Gauteng, the Northern Cape, the Free State and the Western Cape. Without the CSG, the average per capita income outside the Western Cape would fall to below R100 per month.

Income levels, for both the household and the individual, are significantly affected by whether the PCG is the head of the household. Households where the PCG solely or jointly makes the important financial decisions are poorer than households where the PCG does not participate in the financial decision-making.

On average, households in our sample derive a third of their income from the CSG, a quarter from other state transfers, and just over a third from employment. A significant proportion of households were wholly dependent on the CSG (18%), or on the CSG and other state transfers (36%). Households in the Northern Province, where the CSG accounts for an average of 51% of household income, are the most dependent on the CSG, as are households in informal rural areas. Rural households, particularly in informal areas, are significantly more likely to have the CSG as their only source of income.

Three-quarters of PCGs in the survey said they relied mainly on the beneficiary's grant to support the child. These families would be particularly vulnerable to the discontinuation of the grant when the child reaches the age of seven. PCGs in rural areas generally relied to a greater extent on the grant than those in urban areas. More than three-quarters (79%) of PCGs overall asserted that the CSG had improved their ability to take care of the child, particularly by allowing them to buy food and other basic necessities for the child.

The main complaints of PCGs who said that the CSG had not had an impact on their ability to care for the child, were that R100 was not enough and that the money was used for the entire

household. Most households used the grant for the survival of the household as a whole, rather than to meet the specific needs of the child beneficiary.

Profile of Primary Care Givers (PCGs)

Virtually all PCGs in the survey (99%) were women. The average age of PCGs in the survey was 33 years. This seems to contradict popular assumptions that young children are often taken care of by grandmothers with the help of a pension. However, young mothers may be registered as PCGs, but then leave the task of providing care for the child to their mothers (the child's grandmother). This is particularly likely if the PCG is still at school.

More than half of the PCGs in the survey were unemployed, less than a third were employed in some form, including part-time and casual employment, 7% were students (mostly in school) and only 4% of PCGs were old age pensioners.

More than half (55%) of PCGs in the survey were single and had never been married. This seems to confirm the assumption that often there is no nuclear family unit which could support mother and child, and that such families are particularly reliant on state support. Only about a quarter of PCGs were married or lived with a partner

Eighty-nine percent of the PCGs interviewed were the biological mothers of the child beneficiaries. Fathers represent less than 1% of PCGs in the survey. All other PCGs in the survey were related to the child beneficiary, and in most cases were maternal grandparents. Of the 90% who were biological parents, a large majority were single parents. Sixty-nine percent of child beneficiaries lived in a single parent household. This was least likely in formal rural areas and most likely in formal urban areas.

In most cases, all the PCG's children lived together with the PCG. A relatively great deal of stability of the PCG households was revealed in the survey, with little geographical and household mobility during the child beneficiary's lifetime.

Most households did not receive help (financial or in kind), and for those who did it came mostly from relatives, neighbours and friends. Very few PCGs were ever able to save money, and one can assume that those who did, saved fairly small amounts. Less than a tenth of PCGs had received a job offer in the last six months, and most of accepted the offer.

Profile of child beneficiaries

Most households contained only one child beneficiary, possibly because PCGs are unaware that they can apply for more than one child. Boys and girls were equally represented among beneficiaries. The majority of child beneficiaries were between two and five years old, and there were relatively few younger or older beneficiaries. The majority of beneficiaries below age four

stayed at home during the day, mainly because the PCG felt they were too young to attend day care. Virtually all child beneficiaries had the vaccinations necessary for their age.

The only significant difference between child beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries appears in the current educational status. Beneficiaries were more likely to be in a crèche or day care than non-beneficiaries were.

Mothers were generally more likely to contribute towards the upkeep of the child than fathers. Fathers were less likely to contribute if the child beneficiary lived with a non-parent PCG, than in the cases of single parents (when the child lived with the biological mother).

Access to the CSG

Knowledge about the grant seems to be uneven across the different provinces. In some provinces officials themselves are unclear about the success of their campaign. A number of officials and representatives from the NGO sector are of the opinion that the grant needs to be publicised more effectively, and that rural areas in particular need to be better targeted. There is a feeling that handing out pamphlets or airing an advert on a radio station is not enough, and that a more interactive approach is necessary. Welfare officials have to be present to deal with the queries or uncertainties of prospective CSG applicants. There was also a suggestion that the provincial Welfare Departments should work more closely with NGOs and CBOs to publicise the grant.

The majority of respondents in the survey had been asked for all the required documents when applying for the grant, and most of them had no difficulties in getting the documents (though the survey included only successful applicants). The case studies, which included non-beneficiaries, indicated that many applicants experienced problems accessing documents.

Knowledge of the current qualifying criteria is uneven among officials from the different provinces. A number of officials were uncertain whether the personal income of the applicant should include the income of the spouse. Some officials expressed concern about the application of the means to the joint income of both parents, since fathers often do not contribute towards the upkeep of the child, and this discriminated against married couples.

The majority of respondents in the survey said that Welfare officials had been helpful. In the case studies and interviews, however, a number of criticisms of the attitudes of Welfare officials were made. There was a feeling that when members of staff were not clear about procedure and criteria, the relationship with applicants tended to be strained. In addition, staff were overworked and not always informed about issues relating to the grant.

The average waiting time between the CSG application and first payment was four months, and generally PCGs appear to have received the CSG regularly since their first payment. Most

recipients collected the grant at welfare points or post offices, and only 3% had the grant deposited into their bank or savings account (the majority did not have an account).

Just under half of the respondents said they waited one hour or less in the queue to receive the grant and a further third said they queued for two to three hours. Recipients in KwaZulu-Natal and the Free State complained in particular of long waiting time. Most respondents took half an hour or less to get to the point where they collected their money, and for the majority there were no transport costs involved as they walked there.

When asked if they had any comment about the CSG, the main issue raised was the small amount of the grant. A further complaint was that the age limit of seven years for the CSG was too low, especially since the grant was discontinued just at the time when the child beneficiary started formal schooling with its attendant costs.

To establish the factors that prevented people from applying for the CSG, we conducted a number of interviews with stakeholders including government officials and representatives from the NGO sector, and two case studies. The following points were raised:

- The lack of relevant documents and the time and money it took to get them in order
- Communication difficulties resulting from lack of resources, shortage of staff, and lack of co-ordination between government departments and between them and NGOs and CBOs
- A number of officials felt that the low amount of the grant and the trouble people had to endure to apply were the real factors that impeded access to the grant.

Income generating projects (IGPs)

Most respondents did not take part in income generating projects, largely because they were not available, but expressed interest in taking part in them. The decision of the Department of Welfare to remove participation in IGPs as a requirement for the CSG should remain a short-term measure. If developmental social welfare is to succeed, the role of income generating projects is important, especially since a majority of CSG beneficiaries expressed an interest in them. The establishment of IGPs in all provinces and areas would reduce the number of people who depend mainly on state transfers and social security and offer them access to other means of support.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

Background and context

The aims of this section are:

- to explain the context and provide background information to the introduction of the CSG
- to provide a brief overview of the relevant literature on social security provision for children in South Africa.
- to outline the approach and structure of this report

History of Social Security in South Africa

The history of social security in South Africa is characterised by its origins in apartheid legislation. Social security legislation in South Africa – aimed at assisting both children and pensioners – has always been racially defined. The Children Protection Act of 1913 was one of the first significant laws passed after the creation of the South African State in 1910 and can be seen as the first step in the creation of a South African social security system. The Act was racially discriminatory in that it provided for maintenance grants for white children, and excluded children of other population groups. State pensions were introduced by the Old Age Pensions Act of 1928. This Act provided for old-age pensions for Coloureds and whites, but excluded Africans and Indians. In addition white pensions were higher than Coloured pensions. Social pensions and maintenance grants were thus mainly established as a safety net for poor whites.¹

A means-tested disability scheme was introduced in 1937, and by 1947 disability and state pensions were extended to all race groups. However, differences in the level of assistance to various race groups was still a fundamental component of the welfare system. For example, in 1947, white pensioners were paid five times more than African pensioners, and twice as much as Coloured or Indian pensioners.

The Children Protection Act of 1913 provided the basis for the introduction of the State Maintenance Grant in 1947. In introducing this grant the state relaxed some of the racial restrictions by including Coloured and Indian children. However, social security legislation was still characterised by inequalities, and from 1948 to 1961 the gap between white and African means-tested old age pensions widened steadily. The application of the means test also became increasingly discriminatory:

1 Liebenberg, S & Tilley, A.: Background paper for South African National Non-Governmental Organisation (SANGOCO), the South African Human Rights Commission and the Commission for Gender Equality for the Poverty and Inequality Hearings: Social Security Theme.

*“Administrative delays, corruption and inefficiency, particularly in rural areas, were a form of covert discrimination for disenfranchised communities.”*²

During the 1970’s the slow process of reducing inequality in welfare provision began. African old age pensions as a percentage of white pensions increased from 16% in 1972 to 85% in 1993 and parity was eventually achieved in 1994.³ However, the administration of child maintenance and foster-parent grants remained discriminatory. In 1987 African grants were 17% of white grants.

The extension of state grants to a much larger – and much poorer – population posed a major fiscal challenge to the state. The equalisation of disability grants and old-age pensions between the different race groups was achieved largely by eroding the real value of grants paid to white recipients. The maximum real value of the pension for a White recipient decreased from R430 in 1980 to R234 in 1996, while an African recipient received a real increase from R132 to R234.⁴ A similar, but more drastic, approach aimed at removing the inequalities associated with child grants was required.

The inequalities related to the SMG were, however, of a different nature. Since 1992 there had been no statutory racial discrimination in the allocation of the grant, but access was still highly racially biased⁵ and manifested a poor correlation with poverty.⁶

One of the proposals in the Department of Welfare’s White Paper was the institution of a child maintenance grant that would cater for all population groups in the country. The necessity of extending social security to all those in need – and particularly children – was underlined by Article 37 of the National Plan Action for Children. This Article states that no child shall be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.⁷

The Lund Committee

In 1996, the Lund Committee was established to investigate issues around the extension of child grants, and explore policy options regarding social security for children and families. The report of the Committee recommended a new strategy to replace the existing state maintenance grant (SMG). This strategy included a child-linked grant with a lower monetary value than that of the

² Bhorat, H.: *The South African social safety net: past, present and future*, vol. 12, No. 4 Development Southern Africa (1995) note 4, p 598.

³ Tilley, A. & Liebenberg, S.: op cit.

⁴ Financial and Fiscal Commission, *Public Expenditure on Basic Social Services in South Africa*, An FFC Report for UNICEF and UNDP, p. 89 [hereafter the FFC Report].

⁵ In 1990 - 48 and 40 per 1000 Coloured and Indian children respectively received SMG’s, as compared to 2 grants per 1000 African children. 15 per 1000 White children received the grant which was high given white standards of living: The Lund Report, note 11, p. 12.

⁶ The FFC Report, note 15, p. 91.

⁷ NPA, Dept of Welfare, 1995, p. 11.

SMG, but targeted at a wider group of potential beneficiaries, particularly those living in the most disadvantaged areas: rural areas and informal settlements.

The committee had five terms of reference:

- To undertake a critical appraisal of the existing system of state support in all government departments to children and families.
- To investigate the possibility of increasing parental financial support through the private maintenance system.
- To explore alternative policy options in relation to social security for children and families as well as other anti-poverty, economic empowerment and capacity building strategies.
- To develop approaches for effective targeting of programmes for children and families.
- To present a report giving findings and recommendations.

However, the over-riding limitation for the Lund Committee was that there would be no significant increase in the welfare budget.⁸ In particular the government's commitment to GEAR meant that spending on social welfare would remain static as a proportion of overall government expenditure. In addition, the size of the budget would tend to contract as a proportion of overall economic activity as the deficit was reduced and as revenue from taxation fell, and deracialisation of social welfare would have to take place through reallocations within the existing budget rather than through expansion of the budget.⁹

These constraints were explicitly recognised by the Lund Committee in its report, as noted by Tilley and Liebenberg:¹⁰

“The policy directives [to government Departments] have been: do not ask for too much more; save money through more effective management and through downsizing the bureaucracy; and redistribute within the present envelope...Economically, equalising the grant upwards to its present level, or anything approaching such a level, is not possible.”
[Lund Report, pp. 23 - 24; and p. 84].

The Lund Committee proposed the introduction of a child support grant in the place of the existing state maintenance grant. The new grant would have a much lower value than the existing grant. The Committee proposed that the new grant would be R70 per child, rather than the state maintenance amounts of R430 for the parent allowance and R135 for the child allowance. The grant would also be confined to a much smaller age group – children under seven years rather than those under 18 years. It was hoped, however, that it would reach a much larger number of children and – in particular – that it would reach the African and rural children who were not accessing the state maintenance grant in significant numbers.

⁸ Liebenberg, S & Tilley, p.29

⁹ South African Labour Bulletin, June 2000: 71; J.H. Voster & H. Rossouw, Dept of Sociology, University of Stellenbosch, 1997:315

The draft White Paper for Social Welfare (1995) states that welfare should contribute to the eradication of poverty through a developmental approach which discourages dependency, promotes the active involvement of people in their own development, employs a multifaceted, multisectoral approach and encourages partnership between the state, provincial government and all the other stake holders.¹¹ The basic aim was to make sure that CSG beneficiaries are able to sustain themselves even after the grant is cut. In addition, Tilley and Liebenberg make the following comments:

“the concept of developmental social welfare should not be interpreted to mean that poverty-alleviation in the short term should be neglected in favour of long-term developmental programmes. The danger is that the concept of developmental social welfare can be used as a justification to cut back on social security spending.”

The Child Support Grant

The CSG was introduced in April 1998, at a level of R100 per month for each child younger than seven years of age. While this was somewhat higher than the original Lund proposal, it was still much less than the state maintenance grant. The money would be paid to the primary care giver (PCG) of the child. Applicants for the grant were required to:

- Pass a means test.
- Have a valid identity document
- Have a birth certificate or birth registration certificate for the child
- Provide proof that the child was immunised
- Refrain from refusing to accept employment or participate in an income generating project without good reason
- Make an effort to secure maintenance from the parent/s of the child where applicable.

The means test was based on household income and filtered out applicants who:

- Lived in a formal urban area and whose household income exceeded R800 per month
- Lived in an informal urban settlement or rural area and whose monthly household income exceeded R1100.

The eligibility for the CSG was much lower than expected, and in June 1999 the rules governing the applicability of the grant were changed. The means test would henceforth apply to personal income rather than to household income and the conditions concerning immunisation and job creation projects were scrapped.

Meanwhile the amount received by beneficiaries of the State Maintenance Grant was to be reduced by 25% every year, and phased out completely over a period of five years.

¹⁰ Liebenberg, S & Tilley, p.29

¹¹ Gray, M.: Towards an understanding of developmental social work. 1996, p. 9.

The Department of Welfare estimated that the new CSG would cost an additional R2,7 billion in 1997 once it became fully operational in 2003.

The principles for the implementation of the new child support grant (CSG) were as follows:

- The CSG would contribute to the costs of rearing children in very poor households
- The level of the CSG would be linked to an objective measure of need, determined through a means test
- The operation of the CSG would acknowledge the State's fiscal constraints and limitations
- The focus of the grant would be on children, not on the family, thus ensuring that the grant would follow the child regardless of the identity of care giver
- The CSG would form part of general poverty relief efforts.

Criticism levelled against the Child Support Grant

The Portfolio Committee on Welfare organised the parliamentary public hearings during April 1997 to discuss the Lund recommendations. The hearings were organised to capture inputs from other stakeholders as regard the extension of child benefit. Some of the concerns raised by stakeholders were as follows:

(a) Period between 0-6 years

The state maintenance grant covered children from birth to the age of eighteen while the Lund Committee recommended that the child support grant cater for children from birth to the age of six. The cutoff age was chosen on the understanding that the child at seven will be at school and have access to poverty-oriented measures such as school feeding schemes. Organisations pointed out that feeding schemes do not exist at all schools and that some poor children would thus be excluded. In addition they argued that the child's years at school are a time when additional financial assistance is needed. They appealed to the department to minimise chances of child labour and juvenile delinquency due to poverty by raising the age limit for the CSG. The South African Human Rights Commission made a submission to the portfolio committee stating that the target group had been derived from a reverse logic of affordability, rather than through a forward logic of poverty assessment and reality requirements.¹²

(b) Pay-out System

The Lund Committee proposed that the grant be deposited into the primary caregivers' banking or post office accounts on a quarterly basis. Many organisations indicated that this method of payment would disadvantage a large number of primary caregivers. They argued that in rural areas banking facilities are scarce and that primary caregivers would be forced to travel long distances to places where they might be served. Some organisations raised their dissatisfaction

¹² Voster, J.H and Rossow, H. 1997: *Transforming state support for children and families in South Africa: Single mother households footing the bill?* p. 320.

with the quarterly payment. They indicated the fact that most beneficiaries are desperate and need to budget on a monthly cycle.

(c) *Clinic Card*

The regulations stated that primary caregivers should provide proof that the child had been immunised. Most organisations approved this recommendation with the understanding that the Welfare department would start working closely with the Health department. However, other organisations indicated the problems encountered by applicants in acquiring proof of immunisation. They stated that communities in rural areas do not have access to appropriate health care facilities. According to Liebenberg, institutional-related conditions for gaining access to the benefit are barriers in the path of disadvantaged children particularly as the state is not presently able to guarantee access to health care facilities.¹³

(d) *Participation in Income-Generating Projects*

Applicants for the child support grant were required to make themselves available for participation in income-generating projects. The condition was that they should not refuse to participate if a project was available. The rationale behind this proposal was to ensure that beneficiaries sustain their income after the grant ceased. Most organisations were not happy with this recommendation. They stated that in most villages there are no projects. They indicated that the recommendation would be viable in the urban areas, but would disadvantage people at the rural areas.

(e) *Administrative Capacity*

Organisations argued that Welfare officials needed to be re-orientated towards the developmental approach in social service delivery before such a grant – which proposed that other forms of support would supplement it – could be acceptable. They added that there had been little public consciousness and that the department should build management capacity both at provincial and national level. They argued that officials needed the training in financial, management and information systems. They felt strongly that the Welfare Department should be restructured.¹⁴

(f) *Fiscal Constraints*

Most organisations viewed R100 – and even more the R70 originally proposed – as too little and not appropriate to alleviate poverty. They argued that the cabinet's allocation of 12,1% of the total national budget to social security in 1997/8 was a clear indication of their lack of correct prioritisation. Education, Health and Housing were placed on top as compared to Welfare which was placed fourth. They thought poverty alleviation would be laced on top of the agenda. Some argued that the implementation of the proposal would lead to the redistribution of poverty rather than the redistribution of wealth.¹⁵

¹³ Liebenberg, S.1997: *Comments on the child support benefit workshop on targeting*, p. 19.

¹⁴ South African Institute of Race Relations Survey, 1997/8. *Bird's Eye View*

¹⁵ Voster, J.H. and Rossow, H. 1997: *Transforming state support for children and families in South Africa: Single mother households footing the bill?* p. 320.

Social impact study

The phasing in of the Child Support Grant has not been a smooth process. In addition to the issues highlighted above, further problems were encountered during implementation. In June 1999, the Community Agency for Social Enquiry (C A S E) was awarded a tender to evaluate the implementation of the CSG. The terms of reference for the project were:

- To build a national profile of current CSG beneficiaries
- To assess the role of the CSG in household income
- To assess the conditions under which the CSG is being delivered
- To identify factors impeding access to the CSG and their significance
- To assess the accuracy and implementation of the means test
- To monitor and assess how the concept of ‘primary care giver’ is being operationalised in accessing the CSG
- To ascertain perceptions of community based health workers as to the role of the CSG in poverty alleviation
- To assess the extent to which the Department of Welfare’s Directorate: Communications delivered relevant and timely information regarding the phasing-in of the CSG.

While all these terms of reference are addressed in our report, we have restructured them into a somewhat different order. The contents of the report are organised into the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Methodology

Chapter 3: Demographic profile of CSG households

This chapter provides a demographic profile of the households that who receive the CSG. In the first part of the chapter, we comment on the location of households, their racial composition, size and access to services. We then describe the ages and educational qualifications of the individuals within these households, and look at the number of people per household, and the proportion of adults and children that live in the household.

Chapter 4: The Role of the CSG in household income

In the first part of this chapter, we examine the various sources of household income, including the CSG, other state transfers and earnings. We then investigate some of the variations in household and per capita income, and examine the efficacy of the means test. The second part of the chapter looks more closely at the proportion of household and per capita income derived from the CSG, and uses this as a measure of the dependency of the household on the CSG. The third part of the chapter looks at the general spending patterns of the household, the particular items for which the CSG is used, and the effect that the CSG has had on the household.

Chapter 5: Profile of child beneficiaries

The first part of this chapter outlines some of the demographic details of child beneficiaries, their age, educational status, immunisation status and the number of child beneficiaries per household. In the second part, we look more closely at the environment of the child beneficiary. In particular, we examine the relationship of the child beneficiary to the primary care giver, the mobility of the child beneficiary, as well as the care giving patterns within the household. We look at households in which the PCG is not the parent of the child beneficiary, those where the PCG is a single parent, and those in which where both parents of the child beneficiary live. In the third part, we consider the financial situation of the child beneficiary and the PCG, and in particular whether the PCG has attempted to secure additional financial support for the child beneficiary.

Although the focus of this chapter is on the child beneficiaries, where appropriate we compare the situation of other children in the household who are not CSG recipients but who would potentially qualify, to that of the child beneficiaries.

Chapter 6: Profile of primary care givers

This chapter looks in detail at the primary care givers in the survey. The first part consists of a demographic overview, including sex, race, education levels, as well as the economic and marital status of the PCG. The second part looks at the PCG's relationship to the child beneficiary (including issues surrounding the concept of the PCG), the number of children in the household, and years lived in that household. The third part examines the household situation of the PCG, in particular with regard to financial issues. This profile ought to provide us with a general overview and better understanding of who currently receives the CSG.

Chapter 7: Access to the CSG

The first part of the chapter examines the adult beneficiaries' perceptions of the publicity around the CSG, and the sources from which beneficiaries received their information about it. The second part of the chapter investigates the application procedure for the CSG, and in particular the documents that are needed to apply for the grant and the difficulties which applicants have had in obtaining them. The third part of the chapter assesses beneficiaries' perceptions of staff attitudes, and the fourth part concentrates on the process of collecting the grant, including travel and waiting times, and costs. The fifth part examines awareness of the application requirements, and the final part of this section will look at the factors that impede access to the grant.

Chapter 8: Income generating projects

This chapter looks at the involvement of CSG beneficiaries in income generating projects. In this section we establish if applicants are aware of the existence of income generating projects, their source of information, the extent of their current participation in these projects, as well as their willingness to participate in them.

Chapter 9: Recommendations

Appendix A:

Case study of QwaQwa, Free State.

Appendix B:

Case study of Wayeni, Northern Province.

Appendix C:

Role of community-based health workers.

Appendix D:

Analysis of SOCPEN database.

Appendix E:

List of in-depth interviewees.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

The three main components of this study were:

- A survey of 999 CSG beneficiaries
- A series of in-depth interviews with stakeholders
- Case studies.

Survey of CSG beneficiaries

Survey questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed in consultation with a reference group and the Department of Welfare, and was tested and refined extensively between August and November 1999. The main respondent was the PCG receiving the CSG, who provided the following information:

- Basic demographic data for every person in the household
- Income, from a range of sources, for every person in the household
- Detailed information on every child beneficiary in the household
- Basic information on every non-beneficiary (children younger than 18) in the household
- Detailed information on access to the CSG, including the application procedure, waiting times, collection procedure and a range of knowledge questions.

Sampling design

As our sampling frame, we used the information contained on the Department of Welfare's SOCPEN database as at the end of November 1999. A multi-stage sampling design was used, with province, welfare district, pay point, and beneficiary as the successive selection units. Welfare districts and pay points within districts were chosen with a probability proportional to size. At each pay point, we randomly selected up to five beneficiaries to be interviewed. The provincial distribution of the 999 completed interviews is outlined below.

Province	Realised (N)	% of total sample
Eastern Cape	129	13
Free State	98	10
Gauteng	133	13
KwaZulu-Natal	120	12
Mpumalanga	99	10
North West	89	9
Northern Cape	95	10
Northern Province	136	14
Western Cape	100	10
Total	999	100

Table 1: Realised sample, by province

Fieldwork Procedures

All fieldworkers attended a two-day training session conducted by the research team. Training sessions were held in Johannesburg (three sessions), Cape Town and the Eastern Cape. All the interviews were conducted at the home of the respondent, and in their home language. Fieldwork took place from November 1999 to April 2000.

Fieldwork teams consisted of one to four fieldworkers and a supervisor. The supervisor was responsible for ensuring that the correct respondent was interviewed and that the questionnaire was completed correctly.

As indicated above, the CSG beneficiaries were randomly selected from the SOCPEN database. In particular, we did not filter out those beneficiaries who did not have an adequate home address, and fieldworkers went to a considerable effort to track down the appropriate beneficiary.¹⁶ Substitutions were only allowed after three attempts to complete the interview had failed. Any substitution had to be approved first by the relevant supervisor. Several difficulties with the data collection process should be noted:

In a number of cases the data obtained from the SOCPEN database were incorrect. Some prospective respondents denied that they had ever received a CSG payment, while in other cases the occupants of the identified dwelling denied all knowledge of the CSG beneficiary. In other cases it was not possible, despite the efforts of the fieldworkers, to track down the identified beneficiary.

The floods during February and March 2000 made certain areas in Mpumalanga and KwaZulu-Natal inaccessible. Due to time constraints, the fieldworkers were then not able to complete the allocated interviews in these areas.

¹⁶ The address could be as basic as Village X, District Y, or P.O. Box ###, District Y.

In-depth interviews

A series of in-depth interviews (IDIs) were conducted with government officials, as well as with representatives from non-governmental organisations (NGOs) involved with the CSG. The purpose of the IDIs was to establish the effectiveness of the Department of Welfare's implementation of the CSG, the problems experienced by applicants, as well as the problems officials of the Department of Welfare faced. A total of eleven IDIs were conducted¹⁷.

Case Studies

A study of two sites was conducted to assess the social impact of the phasing-in of the CSG. The purpose of the case studies was to provide a more detailed picture of the impact of social assistance on those who receive the grant. We chose one site in an area with high rates of applications for the CSG and the other in an area with low rates.

Monontsha in the Free State and Wayeni in the Northern Province were chosen as the two case study sites. The case studies included focus group discussions with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, community leaders, NGO representatives and government officials.

Findings

In reporting on the survey result, we focused on findings that are statistically significant. Where possible and relevant, we reported on provincial and area variations. The information from the in-depth interviews and case studies has been incorporated where possible with the survey findings. In addition, the case studies have been written up as separate reports and are presented in an appendix. A number of interviews were conducted with community based health workers, and these will also be presented in an appendix.

¹⁷ See appendix for detailed list of people interviewed.

CHAPTER 3: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF CSG HOUSEHOLDS

This chapter addresses the first of the terms of reference by providing a description of the type of household CSG recipients live in.

Demographics

This section provides a description of the environment in which the household of the CSG beneficiary is situated. In particular, we look at type of area, racial composition of the household, and access to basic facilities such as water, electricity and telephones. The urban–rural breakdown refers to the type of area, rather than the type of dwelling in which people live.

Area	%
Urban formal	39
Urban informal	13
Rural formal	41
Rural informal	8

Table 2: Percentage of CSG households, by area

Slightly over half (52%) of the households in the survey were situated in urban areas. This could indicate that the child support grant (CSG) has an urban bias, since the eligibility of residents in rural areas for the grant is higher. In both urban and rural areas a smaller number of households were situated in informal settlements.

Race	% of people	% of households
African	85	87
Coloured	15	13
Indian	1	0
White	0	0

Table 3: Racial distribution of people/households in the survey

The survey included 999 households consisting of 6683 household members. The majority of households (87%) and people (85%) in the survey were African.

Access to electricity, toilets, telephones and water

We asked respondents a number of questions to establish if they had access to basic facilities such as water, electricity, telephones and toilets, to present a picture of the environment in which they lived.

Access to electricity

Area	%
Urban formal	85
Urban informal	74
Rural formal	66
Rural informal	63
All	74

Table 4: Proportion of households with access to electricity, by area

- Respondents were asked if the dwelling in which they lived had electricity. Almost three-quarters (74%) of respondents had electricity in their dwelling
- Not surprisingly, urban formal areas were more likely to have electricity. PCGs living in rural areas were less likely to have access to electricity
- Respondents living in the Northern Province (37%) and the Eastern Cape (49%) were less likely to have electricity – these were provinces that were predominantly rural and poorer
- Households situated in the Western Cape (88%), the Free State (87%) and Gauteng (83%) were significantly more likely to have electricity.

Access to toilets

We asked respondents if they had toilet facilities and where these facilities were located.

Area	No (%)	In dwelling (%)	Outside dwelling, but on plot (%)	Shared with other households (%)
Urban formal	3	49	42	6
Urban informal	10	23	55	9
Rural formal	9	11	69	2
Rural informal	13	12	72	4
All	11	28	56	5

Table 5: Access to toilet facilities, by area

- Less than a third (28%) of respondents had toilet facilities inside their dwelling (though 54% of respondents in the Western Cape and 52% in Gauteng reported such facilities)
- Respondents living in rural areas were least likely to have facilities inside their dwelling, though the majority had such facilities on their plots
- Respondents living in urban informal areas were more likely to share a toilet with other households
- Respondents in the Eastern Cape (33%) and the Northern Province (20%) were more likely to have no toilet facilities.

Access to telephones

Respondents were asked if they had a telephone, including mobile phones.

Area	%
Urban formal	44
Urban informal	23
Rural formal	12
Rural informal	13
All	26

Table 6: Proportion of households with access to a phone, by area

- Almost three-quarters (74%) of respondents said they did not have a telephone. Respondents in urban areas were significantly more likely to have a telephone, compared to respondents living in rural areas
- Respondents in the Western Cape (41%), KwaZulu-Natal (45%) and Gauteng (37%) were more likely to have a telephone
- In the Eastern Cape (5%) and the Northern Province (13%), respondents were less likely to say they had a telephone in their dwelling.

Access to water

Respondents were asked where they got water for household use.

Area	Tap inside	Tap outside, but on grounds	Communal tap	Other
Urban formal	47	42	10	1
Urban informal	21	50	24	4
Rural formal	5	24	31	40
Rural informal	5	32	41	22
All	25	36	22	18

Table 7: Access to water, by area

- A quarter (25%) of respondents said they had a tap inside their dwelling, and almost a third (36%) reported having a tap outside their dwelling but on the grounds. Just over a fifth (22%) said they used water from a communal tap, while 18% said got their water from other sources
- Respondents living in formal urban areas either had a tap inside their dwelling (47%) or in the grounds of their dwelling (42%)
- Respondents in informal urban areas accessed water mainly from a tap outside their dwelling (50%)

- Respondents in formal rural areas were more likely to access water at a communal tap (31%) or from other sources (40%), whereas respondents living in informal rural areas mainly got their water from a communal tap (41%)
- Respondents in the Western Cape (61%), Gauteng (40%) and KwaZulu-Natal (39%) were more likely to have taps inside their dwellings
- Respondents living in the Eastern Cape (71%) and the Northern Province (27%) were more likely to access water through other means, like a river, tank, borehole or well
- In Mpumalanga (54%), the Northern Cape (48%), and the Free State (48%), respondents were more likely to obtain their water from a tap outside their dwelling, but on the grounds
- Respondents living in the North West province were more likely to use a communal tap (38%).

As would be expected, the survey showed that people living in rural areas had less access to basic facilities. People living in Gauteng, Western Cape and KwaZulu-Natal had better access to such facilities, while people living in the Eastern Cape and the Northern Province had only limited access to basic facilities.

Profile of household members

This section looks at the age distribution of the people who live in CSG households, as well as the education levels of both the adults and the children in these households.

Age in years	%
0-6	24
7-10	9
11-17	15
18-25	16
26-30	9
31-40	11
41-50	6
51-60	5
61+	5

Table 8: Age breakdown of persons living in CSG households

Just under a quarter of the sample consisted of children who were six years and younger. In other words, they were eligible for the CSG. Over half (52%) were eighteen years and older. However, only 5% were 61 years and older.

Respondents were asked about the highest level of education completed by all adult members of the household. Anyone aged eighteen years and above was defined as an adult.

Level of education (Adults)	%
No formal education	12
Primary education	27
Secondary education	40
Matric	17
Post-matric	2
Don't know	2

Table 9: Highest level of education completed (adults)

A large proportion (40%) of adults included in the survey had some level of secondary education, while just over a quarter (27%) had only primary level education. Twelve percent of adults in the sample had no formal education. Although 17% of adults had matric, only 2% had some form of post-matric qualification.

Current education status	0-6 years (%)	7-12 years (%)	13-17 years (%)	All
Day care/crèche	23			12%
Pre-school	9	1		5%
Primary school	9	96	44	41%
Secondary school		1	52	12%
Matric			2	0%
Stays at home/not at school	59	1	2	30%
Total	100	100	100	100%

Table 10: Current education or care status of children, by age

We asked respondents about the current education or care status of all the children living in the household. The majority (59%) of children six years and younger stayed at home. Approximately a quarter (23%) were at day-care or crèche, and 9% each were at pre- and primary school. Of the 59% of children who stayed at home:

- Seventy-two percent stayed at home because they were thought to be too young
- Twenty-two percent could not afford the day care or crèche fees
- Five percent stayed at home because they were ill or for 'other' reasons.

Household composition

This section looks at the number of people in the household, and the proportion of adults and children that make up the household.

Number of people per household	%
Two members	2
Three members	8
Four members	14
Five members	16
Six members	14
Seven members	9
Eight members	11
Nine members	9
Ten members	6
Eleven members	4
Twelve members	8

Table 11: Number of people per household

- Households that received the CSG contained 6.7 people on average. This is significantly larger than the average South African household, which contains 4.2 people¹⁸
- Households in the Western Cape were smaller and contained on average 5.8 members
- Households in KwaZulu-Natal were on average larger with 7.4 members per household
- Rural households were on average larger (7.3 in formal and 6.9 members in informal rural areas) compared to households in urban areas (6.4 in formal urban areas and 5.7 informal urban areas).

Number of adult women	% of households
One adult woman	34
Two adult women	29
Three adult women	21
Four or more adult women	16

Table 12: Number of adult women per household

- There were no households in our survey without at least one adult woman member
- Just over a third (34%) of households had one adult woman

The significant differences in the number of adult women per household in the different provinces were as follows:

- Households in the Western Cape (43%) and Northern Cape (44%) were more likely to have only one adult woman, as opposed to households in the North West which were less likely to have only one adult woman

¹⁸ 1996 Census

- In the Northern Province (27%), households were more likely to contain three adult women, while in KwaZulu-Natal (22%) households were more likely to contain four or more adult women
- Households in urban informal areas were more likely to contain one adult woman.

Number of adult men	% of households
No adult men	27
One adult man	41
Two adult men	18
Three adult men	14

Table 13: Number of adult men per household

Over a quarter of households (27%) contained no adult men, and a further two fifths (41%) contained only one adult man. Households in formal urban areas were more likely to contain no adult men, while households in formal rural areas were less likely to contain no adult men.

We found the following significant provincial differences in the distribution of adult men:

- Households in the Western Cape (36%) were more likely to contain no adult men
- Households in the Northern Cape (55%) were more likely to contain one adult man
- Households in the Free State (4%) were less likely to contain three or more adult men, while the opposite was true for KwaZulu-Natal (22%) and the Northern Province (23%). In those two provinces, households were significantly more likely to contain three or more adult men.

Number of children (0-6 years)	% of households
One child	55
Two children	32
Three children	10
Four or more children	3

Table 14: Number of young children per household

- Over half (55%) of the households contained only one young child, while only 3% of households contained four or more young children
- Households in formal urban areas (61%) were more likely to contain only one young child
- Households in formal rural areas were less likely (51%) to contain only one young child, and more likely (14%) to contain three young children
- There were no significant provincial differences in the number of young children per household.

Number of older children (7-17 years)	% of households
No older children	24
One older child	28
Two older children	24
Three older children	15
Four or more older children	8

Table 15: Proportion of older children per household

A quarter (24%) of CSG households contained no older children.

- Households in formal urban areas (27%) were more likely to contain no older children
- Households in formal rural areas were significantly more likely to contain four or more older children (14%).

The significant provincial variations were as follows:

- Households in the Western Cape were more likely to contain one older child (37%)
- Households in the Eastern Cape were more likely to contain four or more older children (21%)
- Households in Mpumalanga were more likely to contain two older children (34%).

Conclusion

Using access to basic facilities as an economic indicator, the survey found that CSG households in general could be classified as poor. The survey also established that CSG households tend to be significantly larger than the average South African household. More than a quarter (27%) of these households contained no adult men, particularly in formal urban areas. Almost half (48%) of the household members in the survey were younger than eighteen years, but households in rural areas were significantly more likely to contain a greater number of young and older children than households in urban areas.

CHAPTER 4: ROLE OF THE CSG IN HOUSEHOLD INCOME

In this section, we examine the role of the Child Support Grant in household income. We begin by briefly detailing some of the methodological issues that arise when dealing with reported income, and also provide some justification for our categorisation of the sources of income. The second part of this chapter describes the average household and per capita income of the households in our sample, examines the potential effects of the removal of the CSG, and assesses the accuracy of the means test. The third part attempts to measure the dependency of households on the CSG, using two indicators: the proportion of household income derived from the grant and the proportion of households that depend on the CSG for all or most of their income. In the final part of the chapter, we examine the perceptions of beneficiaries of the role that the CSG plays in household income, and the effect that the CSG has on household expenditure patterns.

Methodology

The selected respondent in each household was asked to indicate the expected monthly income of each member of the household from a range of different sources. The table below lists the sources of income identified in the questionnaire and indicates the categories used to group the various sources of income.

Category	Source of Income
Child Support Grant	Child Support Grant
State Transfers, other than the CSG	State Pensions
	Disability Grants
	Veteran's Pension
	Unemployment Insurance
	Care Dependency Grant
	Foster Child Grant
	State Maintenance Grant
Worker's Compensation	
Earnings	Full-time, Part-time or Casual employment
Other	Private Pensions
	Rental Income
	Maintenance Payments
	Other unclassified income

Table 16: Categories of sources of income

It was necessary to separate state transfers from earnings, because transfers tend to be transitory and linked to a specific person. If the recipient of the transfer reaches a certain age (as with child grants) or dies (in the case of pensioners), household income might be significantly reduced.

Households that depend on this type of income are particularly vulnerable, as they have no or few income opportunities to compensate for the loss of the state transfer.

Relying on reported income is a notoriously precarious exercise. In this case, we depend to a certain extent on the PCG to have knowledge about the financial affairs of every person in the household, as well as running the usual risk that people under-report their income because they are wary of how the information may be used. The reliability of our information is, however, strengthened by the following observations:

- In almost two-thirds (62%) of households, the PCG was also the head of the household. Since our definition of head of household identifies the person who makes the most important financial decisions, we expect the PCG to be able to provide accurate information
- The households in our survey are by definition, poor. In cases such as these, where the household depends on relatively small amounts of money, we can expect the adult members to be well informed about the household's financial affairs.
- In each case the PCG does contribute to the household income, via the CSG.

We would still caution against absolute faith in the levels of reported income, however, since the tendency to under-report income cannot be quantified.

Average household and per capita income

In this section, we report on the average levels of household and per-capita income, and investigate some of the important variations in the data.

	With CSG	Without CSG
Household monthly income	R837	R714
Per capita monthly income	R131	R109

Table 17: Household and per capita average monthly income

The average monthly household income in our sample was R837¹⁹, and the average monthly per-capita income was R131²⁰. The Bureau for Market Research has calculated that the national Minimum Living Level (MLL) for an average household of seven²¹ was R1,842²² in March 1999. This would translate into a per-capita minimum living level of R263, more than twice the per capita monthly income reported in our survey. It is important to note that, without the CSG, the average reported income would drop to R714 for the household, and to R109 per individual.

¹⁹ The 95% confidence interval for this statistic is (R790, R886).

²⁰ The 95% confidence interval for this statistic is (R124, R138).

²¹ The average size of a CSG household is 6.7

²² Figures are for an average black family of seven. A coloured household of seven would have an MLL of R1999

		Urban formal	Urban informal	Rural formal	Rural informal	All
Household income per month	Up to R199	11%	17%	15%	27%	14%
	R200-R399	14%	19%	16%	13%	16%
	R400-R599	8%	13%	8%	6%	9%
	R600-R799	20%	17%	19%	24%	20%
	R800-R999	13%	10%	10%	6%	11%
	R1000+	34%	24%	32%	23%	31%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 18: Monthly household income after tax, by area

Less than one-third (31%) of PCGs lived in a household with a combined income of more than R1000 per month and in 30% of cases the household income was less than R400.

- In formal urban areas, the monthly household income was significantly more likely to be above R1000 per month
- The combined monthly income of households in informal rural areas was significantly more likely to be below R200.

Area	Income (R)			
	Household		Per Capita	
	With CSG	Without CSG	With CSG	Without CSG
Urban formal	901	783	147	125
Urban informal	759	639	131	106
Rural formal	842	713	122	102
Rural informal	667	540	97	76

Table 19: Average monthly household and per capita income, by area

There were no significant differences in *average* household income between urban areas and formal rural areas. However, the average monthly income of households in informal rural areas is significantly lower than that of households in formal urban areas. It is interesting to note that this pattern exists even though households in informal and rural areas were, until June 1999, able to qualify for the CSG with a monthly household income of R1100, compared to the threshold of R800 in urban areas.

The average per capita income is higher in urban areas than in rural areas. However, within both urban and rural areas there is no statistically significant difference between the formal and informal areas. The table above also gives an indication of the substantial contribution of the CSG to household income. In particular it should be noted that in rural informal areas the grant of R100 is more than the average per capita income of households that do not receive the grant.

Area	R per month
Urban formal	458
Urban informal	429
Rural formal	417
Rural informal	337
All	427

Table 20: Average monthly household earnings from employment, by area

The average household in our sample received R427 per month in earnings from employment. Rural households earned significantly less than urban households, and households in informal areas tended to earn less than households in formal areas.

Province	Household income per month						Total
	Up to R199	R200-R399	R400-R599	R600-R799	R800-R999	R1000+	
Eastern Cape	16%	19%	10%	17%	10%	29%	100%
Free State	8%	17%	10%	19%	10%	35%	100%
Gauteng	17%	17%	8%	21%	10%	28%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	16%	15%	9%	19%	9%	32%	100%
Mpumalanga	15%	13%	12%	21%	7%	31%	100%
North West	9%	13%	6%	18%	21%	34%	100%
Northern Cape	5%	21%	6%	25%	11%	32%	100%
Northern Province	30%	16%	7%	19%	6%	22%	100%
Western Cape	6%	9%	12%	16%	17%	39%	100%
Total	15%	16%	9%	20%	11%	31%	100%

Table 21: Usual monthly household income, by province

- Households in the Northern Province (30%) were significantly more likely to have a combined income of less than R200 per month than households in other provinces. This is not unexpected, considering that this province is the poorest in South Africa
- More than one half of the households in the Western Cape and the North West received more than R800 per month.

Province	Average Income (R)			
	Household		Per Capita	
	With CSG	Without CSG	With CSG	Without CSG
Eastern Cape	773	653	128	105
Free State	777	647	118	97
Gauteng	874	754	115	96
KwaZulu-Natal	863	730	133	112
Mpumalanga	840	716	143	119
North West	827	695	119	97
Northern Cape	893	780	152	130
Northern Province	686	560	98	78
Western Cape	1109	992	197	174

Table 22: Average household income, by province

Households and individuals in the Western Cape had significantly higher income than their counterparts in other provinces. Per capita income in the Northern Province, KwaZulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape (the three poorest provinces) was significantly lower than that in Gauteng, the Northern Cape, the Free State and the Western Cape. Without the CSG, the average per capita income outside the Western Cape would fall to below R100 per month.

Province	R per month
Western Cape	657
Mpumalanga	507
Free State	469
Eastern Cape	444
Gauteng	425
KwaZulu-Natal	402
Northern Province	370
North West	317
Northern Cape	275
All	427

Table 23: Average monthly household earnings from employment, by province

There were also significant differences in average household earnings by province. Household earnings in the Western Cape were significantly higher than household earnings in the other provinces, while household earnings in the Northern Cape and the North West were significantly lower than the average household earnings.

Area	<i>Personal income per month</i>						Total
	Up to R199	R200-R399	R400-R599	R600-R799	R800-R999	R1000+	
Urban formal	50%	23%	11%	10%	4%	3%	100%
Urban informal	47%	26%	15%	9%	3%	0%	100%
Rural formal	51%	30%	8%	7%	2%	3%	100%
Rural informal	64%	21%	5%	8%	3%	0%	100%
Total	51%	26%	10%	8%	3%	2%	100%

Table 24: PCGs usual monthly personal income after tax, by area

- Just over half (51%) of PCGs had a personal income of less than R200 per month
- More than three quarters (77%) had a personal income of less than R400 per month
- Only 5% of PCGs had a personal monthly income of more than R800.

Province	<i>Personal income/month</i>						Total
	Up to R199	R200-R399	R400-R599	R600-R799	R800-R999	R1000+	
Eastern Cape	48%	31%	10%	9%	2%	1%	100%
Free State	62%	17%	9%	8%	0%	3%	100%
Gauteng	49%	28%	11%	7%	5%	2%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	50%	22%	10%	14%	3%	0%	100%
Mpumalanga	62%	27%	7%	2%	0%	2%	100%
North West	51%	31%	8%	6%	2%	1%	100%
Northern Cape	28%	30%	16%	17%	6%	3%	100%
Northern Province	70%	24%	2%	3%	2%	0%	100%
Western Cape	31%	23%	20%	11%	6%	8%	100%
Total	51%	26%	10%	8%	3%	2%	100%

Table 25: PCGs usual monthly personal income after tax, by province

- In the Northern Province, Mpumalanga and the Free State, PCGs were significantly more likely to have a personal income lower less than R200
- The Western Cape and the Northern Cape appear to have PCGs who are relatively wealthier, since it was significantly more likely in both those provinces that PCGs had personal incomes above R800 per month.

Income levels, for both the household and the individual, are significantly affected by whether the PCG is the head of the household. Households where the PCG solely or jointly makes the important financial decisions are poorer than households where the PCG does not participate in the financial decision-making. The sex of the head of household does not, however, affect the level of household or per capita income.

	<i>Is PCG the head of household?</i>	
	No	Yes
Total household income	R1099	R680
Per capita income	R150	R119

Table 26: Average household and per-capita income, by head of household

Conclusion

It is clear that the CSG is reaching very poor households and therefore is making a significant contribution to household income. It is also improbable that the grant money would be used solely to maintain the child beneficiary, particularly in cases where the monthly per capita income falls below R100. It is not possible to judge whether the poorest households do indeed have access to the CSG, but we note that for such households the costs of accessing the grant may be prohibitive²³.

Dependency on the CSG

In this section, we use the CSG as a proportion of the average household income as an indicator of household dependence on the CSG. In a similar manner, we can estimate the dependency of the household on state transfers in general. We will use as a benchmark a dependency level of 50% for both the CSG and general state transfers, i.e. we will designate as particularly vulnerable those households that derive more than 50% of their income from either source.

Source of Income	% of household income²⁴
CSG	34%
State transfers, including CSG	57%
Earnings	36%

Table 27: Average proportion of household income derived from source

On average, households in our sample derive 34% of their income from the CSG, a further 24% from other state transfers, and 36% from employment.

²³ See chapter on Barriers to Access.

²⁴ There is, of course, no difference in the proportion of household and per-capita income derived from each source. Throughout the rest of this section we will use the proportion of household income as our preferred indicator.

	<i>Proportion of Income derived from source</i>			
	100%	50% - 100%	Less than 50%	Total
CSG	18%	5%	76%	100%
State Transfers	36%	16%	48%	100%

Table 28: Household dependency on CSG and State Transfers

A significant proportion of households were wholly dependent on the CSG (18%), or on the CSG and other state transfers (36%). A further 5% and 16% respectively derived more than 50% but less than 100% from these sources. The households that are completely dependent on the CSG are in a precarious position since the grant is being used to support the entire household and the grant will cease when the child beneficiary turns seven.

Province	% of Household income	
	CSG	State Transfers
Northern Province	51%	69%
Eastern Cape	37%	58%
Gauteng	35%	56%
Mpumalanga	35%	53%
KwaZulu-Natal	33%	59%
Northern Cape	28%	66%
North West	27%	61%
Free State	25%	46%
Western Cape	23%	44%
All	34%	57%

Table 29: CSG and State Transfers as a proportion of household income, by province

We can group the provinces into three significantly different clusters based on the household dependence on the CSG. Households in the Northern Province, where the CSG accounts for an average of 51% of household income, are the most dependent on the CSG. The second tier, where the CSG accounts for approximately one-third of household income, consists of Eastern Cape, Mpumalanga, Gauteng and KwaZulu-Natal. The final group, which is the least reliant on the CSG, contains Northern Cape, the North West, Free State and the Western Cape. However, households in both the Northern Cape and the North West receive a substantial proportion of their income from other state transfers while in the Northern Province and Mpumalanga the CSG accounts for more than two-thirds of all state transfers.

Province	Contribution of CSG to household income	
	100%	50 % or more
Northern Province	41%	41%
Eastern Cape	21%	26%
Mpumalanga	20%	23%
Gauteng	18%	26%
KwaZulu-Natal	18%	24%
Northern Cape	12%	16%
Western Cape	9%	14%
North West	9%	16%
Free State	7%	17%

Table 30: Household dependency on CSG, by province

The table above provides further confirmation of the important role played by the CSG in households in the Northern Province – 41% of the households interviewed had no other source of income. In the North West, the Free State and the Western Cape, significantly fewer households are completely reliant on the CSG.

Area	% of household income derived from:	
	CSG	State Transfers
Urban formal	28%	53%
Urban informal	37%	55%
Rural formal	36%	60%
Rural informal	45%	66%

Table 31: CSG and State Transfers as a proportion of household income, by area

Households in rural informal areas are the most dependent on the CSG. In these households the CSG accounts for 45% of household income. Households in urban areas are less dependent on the CSG – they obtain only 30% of their income from the CSG.

	Contribution of CSG to household income	
	100%	> 50%
Urban formal	12%	17%
Urban informal	19%	29%
Rural formal	21%	25%
Rural informal	32%	37%

Table 32: Dependence on CSG, by area

Again we find that rural households, and particularly those in informal areas, are significantly more likely to have the CSG as their only source of income. One-third of the households in informal rural areas have no other source of income.

The proportion of households that receive no income other than the CSG is not affected by any of the following factors:

- Whether or not the PCG is the head of the household
- The number of people in the household.

By either measure that we have used we find that a significant proportion of households, particularly in rural areas, are dependent on the CSG. In such cases in particular, it is unlikely that household income could be increased through earnings.

Main source of support	%
CSG	75
Money from another person in the household	10
PCG's earnings	9
PCG's own grant	4
Money from another person not in the household	2
Total	100

Table 33: Main source of financial support for the child

- Three quarters (75%) of PCGs in the survey said they relied mainly on the beneficiary's grant to support the child. These families would be particularly vulnerable to the discontinuation of the grant when the child reaches the age of seven.
- Only 9% of PCGs relied on income from work to support the child.
- Ten percent of PCGs relied mainly on money from other people in the household to support the child.

Province	CSG	Person in household	PCG's earnings	PCG's Grant	Person outside HH	Total
Eastern Cape	80%	6%	7%	7%	0%	100%
Free State	45%	27%	18%	1%	7%	100%
Gauteng	75%	10%	9%	5%	0%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	71%	4%	7%	16%	2%	100%
Mpumalanga	68%	16%	8%	3%	4%	100%
North West	73%	16%	6%	1%	4%	100%
Northern Cape	90%	3%	7%	0%	0%	100%
Northern Province	95%	5%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Western Cape	69%	5%	25%	2%	0%	100%
Total	75%	10%	9%	4%	2%	100%

Table 34: Main source of financial support for the child, by province

There were, however, some significant provincial variations of this pattern.

- In the Western Cape and the Free State, a much higher proportion of PCGs relied mainly on income from work to support the beneficiary (25% and 18% respectively)
- In the Northern Province, only 1% of PCGs relied mainly on income from work
- PCGs in the Northern Province seem to be most vulnerable, since 95% of them mainly rely on the grant to support the child beneficiary, followed by 90% in the Northern Cape
- On the other hand, only 45% of PCGs in the Free State relied mainly on the grant, although they were also much more likely to rely on money from other people in the household to support the child (27%).

Area	CSG	Person in household	PCG's earnings	PCG's grant	Person outside HH	Total
Urban formal	70%	11%	12%	4%	2%	100%
Urban informal	72%	8%	15%	3%	1%	100%
Rural formal	81%	9%	5%	4%	1%	100%
Rural informal	83%	8%	5%	4%	0%	100%
Total	76%	10%	9%	4%	2%	100%

Table 35: Main source of financial support for the child, by area

PCGs in rural areas generally relied to a greater extent on the grant than those in urban areas (71% in urban areas, 82% in rural areas).

- In urban areas, PCGs were more likely to rely on income from work to support the child (14% on average)
- A possible explanation for these figures is the difference in employment opportunities between rural and urban areas.

Source of support	Single parent	Non-parent	Other	All PCGs
CSG	73	78	78	75
PCG's earnings	10	9	7	9
Person in household	10	4	11	10
PCG's own grant	4	8	4	4
Person outside household	2	2	1	2
Other	0	1	0	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	761	134	332	999

Table 36: Main source of support for the child beneficiary

- All PCGs relied mainly on the CSG to support the child beneficiary
- Single parent PCGs were less reliant on the CSG and more likely to rely on earned income to support the child. This might be due to the fact that single parents were more likely to live in an urban area with greater employment opportunities
- Other parental PCGs were significantly more likely to rely on someone else in the household to support the child
- Non-parent PCGs were more reliant on the grant than other PCGs (78% compared to 73%) and their second largest source of support was income earned by the PCG (9%)
- For 8% of non-parent PCGs the main source of support for the child was money they received from their own grants (mostly old age pensions for grandmothers)
- Only 4% of non-parent PCGs derived financial support mainly from other people in the household, compared to 10% of PCGs.

Main source of support	Beneficiary	Non-beneficiary
Money person who looks after the child earns	10%	16%
Money that I earn		7%
Money from another person in the household	2%	49%
Money from another person not in the household	2%	9%
Money that I receive from grants	4%	9%
Money that the child receives from grants	75%	4%
Other (specify)	7%	6%
Total	100%	100%
N	1003	373

Table 37: Main source of support for child beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries

- There were significant differences in the main sources of support for beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. Non-beneficiaries were more likely to be supported by some other person in household (49%)

- Non-beneficiaries were more likely to be supported by grants, particularly if they were cared for by the CSG grant holder. This provides further indication that the CSG is used to support the household rather than a particular child.

Perceptions of the role of the CSG

In this section, we will examine the PCGs' perceptions of the role of the CSG in household income, and the differences that the CSG has made to household expenditure patterns.

Area	Yes
Urban formal	75%
Urban informal	81%
Rural formal	81%
Rural informal	86%
Total	79%

Table 38: Proportion of respondents who feel that the CSG has improved their ability to take care of the child, by area

More than three-quarters (79%) of PCGs asserted that the CSG had improved their ability to take care of the child. PCGs in formal urban areas were significantly less likely to agree with this statement, probably reflects their higher income levels well as higher living costs. In this context, R100 will obviously make a much smaller impact than in a household with virtually no other income.

Improvement to:	Area				Total
	Urban formal	Urban informal	Rural formal	Rural informal	
Food and other ²⁵	21%	17%	31%	43%	26%
Food	10%	20%	24%	29%	19%
Education ²⁶	27%	19%	11%	9%	18%
General improvements	15%	19%	13%	2%	14%
Clothing	10%	8%	11%	12%	11%
Entire Household	11%	11%	8%	6%	9%
Medical expenses	5%	6%	2%	0%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 39: CSG has improved ability to pay, by area (N=795)

²⁵ Food was mentioned as most important. 'Other' consisted mainly of clothes, medical bills, and education

²⁶ Crèche, school, uniform

Respondents who said that the CSG had improved their ability to look after the child were asked in which respect the CSG had made a difference. A quarter (26%) of PCGs said it had mainly improved their ability to pay for food, but in combination with other provisions. A fifth (19%) of PCGs said it had only improved their ability to provide food for the child beneficiary, while 14% of PCGs did not specify how the CSG had improved their situation. A further 9% said the CSG was being used for the benefit of the entire household.

- PCGs in formal urban areas were most likely to say that the CSG had made a difference to their ability to pay for education (27%) and medical bills (55%)
- In rural areas, PCGs were significantly more likely to say the CSG had improved their ability to pay for food in combination with other expenses (37% on average), as well as for food alone (27% on average). Rural PCGs were significantly less likely to mention any improvements to their ability to pay for education (10%).

As with area, there were also significant differences in how the CSG money was being used by province.

- In Mpumalanga (47%), the Northern Province (34%) and the Eastern Cape (41%), PCGs were significantly more likely to say that it had improved their ability to provide for food
- In Gauteng (41%) and the Free State (27%), significantly larger proportion noted improvement in ability to pay for education.
- PCGs in the Western Cape (25%) and KwaZulu-Natal (26%) were most likely to say that the CSG money had improved their situation in general
- In the North West, the CSG money was significantly more likely to be used for the benefit of the entire household (26%).

Inadequate because:	%
Not enough for the child's needs	70
Money is used for entire Household	13
Only pays for food	6
Only pays for education	6
Too early to say	4
Only pays for medical expenses	2
Total	100

Table 40: The CSG is inadequate (N=130)

The main complaints of PCGs who said that the CSG had not had an impact on their ability to care for the child, were that R100 was not enough (70%), and that the money was used for the entire household (13%). Both the PCGs who said that the CSG had improved their situation and those who said it had not, identified the same kind of expenditure for which the CSG was used.

The majority of PCGs particularly in poorest households, felt that the CSG improved their ability to care for the child. In formal rural areas, more than half of PCGs shared this opinion and in informal rural areas this proportion increased to 72%. PCGs who felt that the CSG has not made a significant impact were most likely to claim that the amount was inadequate.

Area	Use of money				Total
	Pooled for HH expenses	Kept for specific use	Used for some HH expenses	Other	
Urban formal	70%	17%	10%	4%	100%
Urban informal	73%	13%	9%	6%	100%
Rural formal	58%	35%	5%	2%	100%
Rural informal	68%	24%	3%	5%	100%
Total	66%	23%	8%	3%	100%

Table 41: Distribution of money in the household

Two thirds (66%) of PCGs said that the money received (including CSG) was being pooled to cover household expenses, and 23% said that money was being kept for a specific purpose, which may include expenditure on the child beneficiary.

PCGs in formal urban areas were significantly more likely to say that money was being pooled (70%), or that it was used for specific household expenses (10%). In formal rural areas, money was significantly more likely to be kept for a specific purpose (35%) and less likely to be pooled for general household expenses (58%).

Province	Use of money				Total
	Pooled for HH expenses	Kept for specific use	Used for some HH expenses	Other	
Gauteng	80%	12%	6%	2%	100%
Northern Cape	79%	17%	4%	0%	100%
Free State	76%	12%	7%	5%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	71%	11%	11%	8%	100%
Northern	68%	20%	10%	2%	100%
North West	59%	26%	11%	2%	100%
Western Cape	57%	26%	10%	7%	100%
Mpumalanga	50%	35%	10%	5%	100%
Eastern Cape	49%	50%	0%	1%	100%
Total	66%	23%	8%	3%	100%

Table 42: Distribution of money in the household

- Money was significantly more likely to be pooled in the Northern Cape (79%), the Free State (76%), and Gauteng (80%)
- In the Eastern Cape (50%) and Mpumalanga (35%), it was considerably more likely to be kept for a specific purpose by the recipient.

Most households did not spend the CSG solely on the child beneficiary. This confirms the finding that, particularly in poorer households, all household income is used to ensure the survival of the household.

Conclusion

The majority (79%) of respondents felt that the CSG had improved their ability to look after the child beneficiary, especially in rural areas. Since rural areas had lower levels of income, this is where the grant is expected to have a greater impact. The main complaint of those who did not agree that the CSG money had improved their situation was that the amount was too small and did not pay for all the child's needs. PCGs said the CSG had had the greatest impact on their ability to provide food, although this response was significantly more likely in rural areas. In formal urban areas, much greater emphasis was placed on its use in paying for education. We also found that the direct effect of the grant on the beneficiary is likely to be reduced, since the CSG is often pooled together with other income to provide for the entire household. This was more likely in urban areas.

Household expenditure patterns

Area	Expenditure					Total
	Food	Clothes	Education ²⁷	Health	Other	
Urban formal	51%	17%	26%	4%	1%	100%
Urban informal	55%	19%	20%	4%	2%	100%
Rural formal	69%	21%	7%	1%	1%	100%
Rural informal	78%	13%	7%	0%	1%	100%
Total	61%	19%	17%	2%	1%	100%

Table 43: Items of expenditure with CSG money

- All PCGs were asked what the CSG money was mainly used for in relation to the child beneficiary. Almost two thirds (61%) of PCGs said that they bought food for the child, and 19% said the CSG was mainly spent on clothes for the child. The third most common expenditure was education (17%)

²⁷ We are not able to verify if this relates to education expenses of the child beneficiary, non-beneficiaries in the household, or the PCG

- PCGs in formal urban areas were significantly more likely to spend the CSG money on education (26%) and medical expenses (4%)
- PCGs in both formal and informal rural areas, on the other hand, were significantly more likely to spend the CSG on food (69% and 78% respectively).

Province	Expenditure					Total
	Food	Clothes	Education	Health	Other	
Eastern Cape	80%	17%	2%	0%	0%	100%
Free State	51%	21%	19%	5%	3%	100%
Gauteng	35%	20%	41%	2%	2%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	71%	8%	17%	3%	0%	100%
Mpumalanga	78%	12%	10%	0%	0%	100%
North West	47%	25%	19%	5%	5%	100%
Northern Cape	67%	19%	10%	3%	0%	100%
Northern Province	57%	25%	16%	1%	1%	100%
Western Cape	63%	22%	9%	3%	1%	100%
Total	61%	19%	16%	2%	1%	100%

Table 44: Items of expenditure with CSG money, by province

- Food was the most common expenditure in the Eastern Cape (80%), KwaZulu-Natal (71%) and Mpumalanga (78%)
- PCGs in Gauteng were significantly more likely to spend the CSG on education (41%).

Expense	%
Food and other groceries	35
Electricity or other fuel	17
Education	14
Clothing	11
Housing	8
Accounts	6
Rates and taxes	3
Household items other than food	2
Transport	2
Medical expenses	1
Other	1
Total	100

Table 45: Three biggest household expenses

- PCGs were asked about their biggest household expenses. More than a third (35%) identified food as the biggest item, followed by fuel (17%), both basic necessities especially for poor households. Education (fees, uniforms) was the third biggest expense overall (14%), followed by clothing (11%)
- Rural households were more likely to spend a higher proportion of income on food and fuel
- Urban households spent a higher proportion of income on education and housing.

The differences in spending patterns between rural and urban households reflect the differences in income: low-income households generally spend a higher proportion of their income on basic necessities.

Conclusion

The majority (61%) of PCGs spent the CSG money on food, particularly in rural areas. PCGs in urban areas were more likely to use the CSG to pay for costs related to education. Accordingly, food was named as the greatest household expense, again particularly in rural areas. PCGs in urban areas were more likely to name education and housing as the greatest household expenses. This leads to the conclusion that PCGs generally use the CSG to help pay for the largest items on their budgets, though the specific type of these items varies by areas.

These findings also highlight the significant differences in living standards between rural and urban areas. In rural areas food is the largest item of expenditure, while urban expenditure on education clearly indicates that other, more basic needs are already being satisfied.

CHAPTER 5: PROFILE OF PRIMARY CARE GIVERS (PCGs)

This chapter looks in greater detail at the primary care givers (PCGs) in our survey. The first part consists of a demographic overview, including sex, race, education levels as well as the economic and marital status of the PCG. The second part looks at the PCG's relationship to the child beneficiary (including issues surrounding the concept of the PCG), the incidence of single parent households, and the number of children in the household. The third part examines the household situation of the PCG, in particular the number of years lived in the current household, ownership of dwelling, and other issues such as savings and bank accounts. This profile ought to provide us with a general overview and better understanding of the recipients of the CSG.

Demographic Profile

Sex

Sex	%
Women	99
Men	1
Total	100

Table 46: Sex of PCGs

- Ninety-nine percent of PCGs in the survey were women.

This predominance of female PCGs may indicate a widespread, though erroneous, belief among CSG applicants that only women are eligible to be PCGs. On the other hand, it might simply be an indication that it is indeed women who generally shoulder the burden of child care.

Race

Race	%
African	85
Coloured	15
Indian	1
Total	100

Table 47: Race of PCGs

There was not a great deal of racial diversity among those who accessed the CSG, reflecting the general prevalence of poverty in South Africa.

- The majority (85%) of those who accessed the CSG were African

- Coloured PCGs represented the second largest group (15%)
- Whites represented less than 1% of those who accessed the CSG.

Area	Race			Total
	African	Coloured	Indian	
Urban formal	81%	17%	2%	100%
Urban informal	76%	23%	1%	100%
Rural formal	90%	10%	0%	100%
Rural informal	94%	6%	0%	100%
Total	84%	15%	1%	100%

Table 48: Race of PCG, by area

Not surprisingly, the different racial groups represented in the survey were predominant in specific areas.

- Coloured and Indian PCGs were significantly more likely to live in urban areas.
- African PCGs were significantly more likely to live in rural areas.

Province	Race			Total
	African	Coloured	Indian	
Eastern Cape	97%	3%	0%	100%
Free State	96%	4%	0%	100%
Gauteng	93%	5%	0%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	92%	1%	7%	100%
Mpumalanga	99%	1%	0%	100%
North West	100%	0%	0%	100%
Northern Cape	33%	67%	0%	100%
Northern Province	100%	0%	0%	100%
Western Cape	36%	64%	0%	100%
Total	85%	15%	1%	100%

Table 49: Race of PCG, by province

There were some significant differences in the racial distribution of PCGs by province, although none of these were particularly surprising.

- Coloured PCGs were significantly more likely to live in the Western and Northern Cape.
- KwaZulu-Natal was the only province with Indian PCGs.

This prevalence of specific racial groups in certain areas and provinces reflects the general racial population distribution of South Africa.

Age

Age	%
18-20	4
21-30	46
31-40	31
41-50	12
51-60	3
61+	3
Total	100

Table 50: Age of PCGs

- The age of PCGs in the survey ranged from eighteen to eighty-three years.
- The average age of PCGs in the survey was thirty-three years.
- Half of the PCGs (50%) were between eighteen and thirty years old, and four fifths (81%) were between eighteen and forty years of age.
- Only 6% of all PCGs in the survey were older than fifty-one years.

These findings seem to contradict popular assumptions that young children are often taken care of by grandmothers with the help of a pension. However, it might be the case that young mothers are registered as PCGs, but do not actually provide care for the child. This is particularly likely if the PCG is still at school.

Area	Age						Total	Average age
	18-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61+		
Urban formal	5%	51%	28%	10%	2%	4%	100%	32
Urban informal	6%	37%	37%	17%	1%	3%	100%	34
Rural formal	3%	43%	32%	13%	6%	3%	100%	34
Rural informal	3%	51%	32%	13%	0%	1%	100%	31
Total	4%	46%	31%	12%	3%	3%	100%	33

Table 51: Age of PCG, by area

There were significant differences in the age distribution of PCGs by area, although not necessarily between rural and urban areas.

- The highest average age (34 years) was found in informal urban areas, while PCGs in informal rural areas had the lowest average age (31 years).
- PCGs in formal urban areas were significantly more likely to be between twenty and thirty years.
- Formal rural areas, on the other hand, had a significantly higher proportion of PCGs between fifty and sixty years.

Province	Age						Total	Average age
	18-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61+		
Eastern Cape	2%	31%	39%	18%	7%	4%	100%	37
Free State	7%	58%	25%	7%	2%	1%	100%	30
Gauteng	8%	41%	41%	8%	2%	2%	100%	32
KwaZulu-Natal	3%	40%	31%	14%	3%	10%	100%	37
Mpumalanga	5%	53%	34%	8%	0%	0%	100%	30
North West	2%	53%	25%	13%	5%	2%	100%	32
Northern Cape	2%	50%	25%	15%	5%	3%	100%	33
Northern Province	5%	56%	27%	9%	3%	0%	100%	30
Western Cape	5%	37%	30%	21%	2%	4%	100%	35
Total	4%	46%	31%	12%	3%	3%	100%	33

Table 52: Age of PCGs, by province

The age distribution by province also showed some significant differences. PCGs in Mpumalanga, the Northern Province and Gauteng tended to be younger (below forty years). In the Eastern and Western Cape, however, we found a higher proportion of older PCGs (over forty years).

- KwaZulu-Natal was the province with the highest average age of PCGs (37 years), while in Mpumalanga the average age was lowest (30 years).
- PCGs in the Northern Province were more likely to be between twenty and thirty, and least likely to be over sixty years old.
- KwaZulu-Natal was the only province where the PCGs were significantly more likely to be older than sixty years.

Education status

Education level	PCGs	
	%	Average age
No formal education	8	46
Primary school	28	37
Secondary school	47	31
Matric	16	27
Post-matric	1	27

Table 53: Education level of PCGs and average age

There appears to be an inverse correlation between education levels and age. Younger PCGs are generally better educated than the older PCGs.

- Eight percent of PCGs had no formal education

- Almost half (47%) of PCGs in the survey had at least some level of secondary education
- However, only 17% of PCGs had completed matric.

As can be seen from [Table 53](#), older PCGs were most likely to have no formal education, while younger PCGs had significantly higher education levels.

Age	Education level					Total
	No formal education	Primary school	Secondary school	Matric	Post-matric	
18-20	2%	14%	70%	14%	0%	100%
21-30	1%	18%	52%	27%	2%	100%
31-40	7%	36%	47%	9%	1%	100%
41-50	17%	50%	30%	2%	0%	100%
51-60	39%	32%	29%	0%	0%	100%
61+	38%	52%	10%	0%	0%	100%
Total	7%	29%	46%	16%	1%	100%

Table 54: Level of education, by age

Table 54 serves to confirm the differences in education levels by age, namely that younger PCGs tended to be considerably better educated than older ones.

- PCGs aged between eighteen and thirty were significantly more likely to have at least some level of secondary education (61% on average)
- PCGs who were aged between twenty and thirty were most likely to have a matric (27%) or post-matric (2%) education
- All PCGs over the age of thirty were significantly more likely to have only primary education (43% on average)
- All PCGs over the age of forty were significantly more likely to have no formal education (31% on average).

The relatively high levels of education among younger PCGs seem to contradict the popular notion that young girls become pregnant, abandon their education, and then live on state handouts. However, what is indicated by these findings is that education is not reliable as an insurance against poverty in South Africa.

Education levels did not only vary by age, but also by province and area. This is likely to be linked partly to variations in age distribution between provinces and areas, but also to different educational opportunities and facilities.

Province	Education level					Total	Count
	No formal education	Primary school	Secondary school	Matric	Post-matric		
Eastern Cape	10%	31%	47%	12%	0%	100%	128
Free State	4%	27%	52%	17%	0%	100%	98
Gauteng	4%	20%	54%	20%	2%	100%	133
KwaZulu-Natal	12%	27%	33%	24%	3%	100%	119
Mpumalanga	5%	23%	49%	23%	0%	100%	99
North West	2%	27%	46%	23%	2%	100%	88
Northern Cape	16%	30%	50%	5%	0%	100%	95
Northern Province	8%	28%	46%	17%	1%	100%	135
Western Cape	5%	47%	43%	3%	1%	100%	99
Total	7%	29%	47%	16%	1%	100%	994

Table 55: Education level of PCG, by province

- Northern Cape PCGs were significantly more likely to have no formal education (16%)
- PCGs in the Western Cape were most likely to have only primary education (47%), and were also significantly less likely to have matric (3%)
- PCGs in KwaZulu-Natal (24%), North West (23%) and Mpumalanga (23%) were significantly more likely to have completed matric.

The variations in education levels by area probably reflect differences in access to educational facilities, but also differences in income levels between urban and rural areas.

- PCGs in formal rural areas were significantly more likely to have no formal education (10%), or to have only completed primary school (33%)
- PCGs in formal urban areas were significantly more likely to have completed matric (21%).

Economic status

Economic status	%
Unemployed	56
Employed ²⁸	27
Student (school)	6
Homemaker	6
Pensioner	4
Student (tertiary)	1
Total	100

Table 56: Economic status of PCGs

In addition to education levels, we examined the economic status of PCGs, as this might provide a good indication of the potential self-reliance of PCGs.

- More than half (56%) of the PCGs in the survey were unemployed. This is not unexpected, since the CSG is specifically aimed at those with very limited incomes.
- Less than a third (27%) were employed in some form, including part-time and casual employment. Given the personal income limit of R800 in formal urban areas and of R1100 in other areas, these can be assumed to be fairly low paying jobs²⁹.
- Seven percent of PCGs were students, 6% of these in school (below matric level).
- Only 4% of PCGs were old age pensioners. This was slightly surprising given the popular assumption that grandmothers bear the brunt of child care with their pension money.

Age	<i>Economic status</i>						Total
	Employed	Unemployed	Pensioner	Student (tertiary)	Student (school)	Homemaker	
18-20	12%	40%	0%	0%	49%	0%	100%
21-30	20%	65%	0%	2%	9%	4%	100%
31-40	38%	56%	0%	0%	0%	6%	100%
41-50	36%	50%	3%	0%	0%	11%	100%
51-60	23%	19%	16%	0%	0%	42%	100%
61+	7%	0%	93%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Total	27%	56%	4%	1%	6%	6%	100%

Table 57: Economic status of PCG, by age

As could be expected, the age of the PCG was most significant in determining the economic status of the PCG. The younger the PCGs were, the more likely they were to be students. Older

²⁸ Full-time, part-time, casual or self-employed

²⁹ Refer to income section for more details

(30+) PCGs were more likely to be in the labour force. PCGs older than fifty were significantly more likely to be homemakers or pensioners.

- PCGs between eighteen and twenty years of age were significantly less likely to be either employed (12%) or unemployed (40%), but most likely to be still at school (49%).
- PCGs between twenty and thirty were significantly more likely to be unemployed (65%) or students (11%).
- PCGs between thirty and fifty were most likely to be employed (37% on average).
- Those PCGs who were aged between fifty and sixty were most likely to be homemakers (42%).
- All PCGs older than fifty were significantly more likely to be pensioners, especially those older than sixty (93%).

Province	<i>Economic status</i>						Total
	Employed	Unemployed	Pensioner	Student (tertiary)	Student (school)	Homemaker	
Eastern Cape	29%	42%	5%	1%	2%	21%	100%
Free State	38%	46%	1%	0%	14%	1%	100%
Gauteng	25%	63%	3%	2%	6%	2%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	25%	58%	11%	3%	2%	3%	100%
Mpumalanga	17%	69%	1%	0%	11%	2%	100%
North West	23%	59%	3%	1%	5%	9%	100%
Northern Cape	26%	62%	7%	0%	0%	5%	100%
Northern Province	19%	62%	0%	1%	15%	3%	100%
Western Cape	46%	41%	2%	1%	1%	9%	100%
Total	27%	56%	4%	1%	6%	6%	100%

Table 58: Economic status of PCG, by province

As with education levels, age was again the most significant factor in determining the economic status of the PCG. However, differences by province and area are also of importance here, given the differences in economic infrastructure and employment opportunities that exist.

- PCGs in the Western Cape were most likely to be employed (46%), and least likely to be unemployed (41%), possibly linked to better employment opportunities in the province.
- In both the Northern Province and Mpumalanga, PCGs were least likely to be employed (19% and 17% respectively).
- PCGs in the Eastern Cape were significantly more likely to be homemakers (21%). This might be due to a lack of employment opportunities in that province.

PCGs in formal urban areas were significantly more likely to be tertiary students (2%). While this is related to the younger age of PCGs in this area, it might also indicate better access to

educational facilities. PCGs in formal rural areas were more likely to be homemakers (10%), which might be connected to a lack of formal employment opportunities and to rural tradition.

Marital status

Marital status	%
Single, never married	55
Married (legal/traditional/religious)	22
Widowed	12
Divorced/separated	7
Living with partner	5
Total	100

Table 59: Marital status of PCG

In the past, welfare policies concerning young children were premised on the existence of a nuclear family, with gender specific roles and responsibilities. Reality in contemporary South Africa, however, is that even in cases where the PCG has a stable partner, economic necessity often renders the nuclear model non-viable. This increases the likelihood of female-headed households, and the administration of the CSG has recognised this to some extent. Since the CSG is not only aimed at families with a low income but also at mothers without an additional breadwinner in the family, this is obviously being reflected in the marital status of PCGs.

More than half (55%) of PCGs in the survey were single and had never been married. This seems to confirm the assumption that often there is no nuclear family unit which could support mother and child, and that such families are particularly reliant on state support.

Only about a quarter (27%) of PCGs were married or lived with a partner. It appears, therefore, that single parents are significantly more likely to apply for the CSG, possibly because they have no other way to support their offspring.

Age	<i>Marital status</i>					Total
	Single, never married	Married (legal/traditional)	Divorced/separated	Widowed	Living with partner	
18-20	95%	2%			2%	100%
21-30	73%	14%	3%	4%	6%	100%
31-40	43%	30%	10%	13%	5%	100%
41-50	20%	40%	12%	25%	3%	100%
51-60	26%	26%	7%	39%	3%	100%
61+	7%	21%	10%	62%		100%
Total	55%	22%	7%	12%	5%	100%

Table 60: Marital status of PCGs, by age

As could be expected, age played a determining role in the marital status of PCGs. Young PCGs were more likely to be single, while age increased the probability of the PCG being married, but also of being divorced or separated and eventually widowed.

- PCGs under the age of thirty were significantly more likely to be single and to have never been married. However, this status was significantly less likely if the PCG was over the age of thirty.
- PCGs between the ages of thirty and fifty were significantly more likely to be married (35% on average), but also to be divorced or separated (11% on average).
- If the PCGs were over forty, they were significantly more likely to be widowed, especially those older than sixty (62%).

Province	<i>Marital status</i>					Total
	Single, never married	Married (legal/traditional)	Divorced/separated	Widowed	Living with partner	
Eastern Cape	30%	43%	7%	18%	2%	100%
Free State	63%	14%	9%	7%	6%	100%
Gauteng	71%	10%	8%	8%	4%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	58%	18%	6%	17%	3%	100%
Mpumalanga	60%	20%	4%	7%	8%	100%
North West	73%	9%	3%	7%	8%	100%
Northern Cape	43%	28%	2%	11%	16%	100%
Northern Province	57%	28%	7%	7%	2%	100%
Western Cape	40%	21%	10%	28%	1%	100%
Total	55%	22%	7%	12%	5%	100%

Table 61: Marital status of PCG, by province

Although age seems to be the more important factor, there were some interesting differences in the marital status of PCGs by province and area.

- PCGs in the North West and Gauteng were significantly more likely to be single (73% and 71% respectively).
- PCGs in the Eastern, Western and Northern Cape, on the other hand, were considerably less likely to be single and to have never been married.
- PCGs in the Eastern Cape were significantly more likely to be married (43%) or widowed (18%), while PCGs in the Western Cape were more likely to be divorced or separated (10%) or widowed (28%).
- In the Northern Cape, PCGs were significantly more likely to live with a partner (16%).

The incidence of marriage in urban and rural areas is less likely to be influenced by age, and is more likely to reflect the difference in attitudes and expectations between these two areas.

- PCGs in formal urban areas were particularly likely to be single (65%), and significantly less likely to be married (14%).
- PCGs in formal rural areas, however, were significantly more likely to be married (33%), and significantly less likely to be single (45%).
- PCGs in informal urban areas were significantly more likely to be widowed (21%). These might be cases where the PCG has lost the financial support of the partner and has had to move into informal accommodation.

Conclusion

To summarise the picture that emerged from this demographic profile – the majority of PCGs in the survey were female (99%) and African (85%). The prevalence of female PCGs might be linked to misunderstandings about the concept of a PCG, but also indicates that it is still women who carry the burden of child care. The predominance of African PCGs is related to population size, but also to the economic realities of South Africa. The vast majority (81%) of PCGs were younger than forty years, a finding that challenges the notion that it is often old age pensioners who look after children from poor households. However, this might be due to misinformation about who qualifies as a primary care giver and to the fact that the registered PCG is not necessarily the person who actually looks after the child.

The most common form of education among PCGs was some level of secondary education, although younger PCGs generally had higher levels of education. More than half (56%) of the PCGs were unemployed, but younger PCGs were likely to be students. The survey also found that the majority (55%) of PCGs were single and had never married, which means single parents are particularly reliant on the grant and presumably more vulnerable to its discontinuation.

Relationship between PCG and child beneficiary

Relationship

Relationship	%
Mother	89
Maternal grandparent	8
Father	1
Paternal grandparent	1
Other relative (cousin, spouse's family, etc.)	1
Total	100

Table 62: PCG's relationship to child beneficiary

- Eighty-nine percent of the PCGs interviewed were the biological mothers of the child beneficiaries. Fathers, on the other hand, only represent 1% (four cases) of all PCGs in the survey. These numbers might be due to the misconception that the PCG has to be female, but also confirms the traditional role of women as carers.
- All other PCGs (10%) in the survey were related to the child beneficiary, and in most cases were maternal grandparents (8%).
- The fact that all the PCGs in the survey were related to the child beneficiary may indicate that care givers who are not biologically related to the children in their care have found it too difficult to apply for the CSG. This could be due either to lack of relevant documents, or because of the ignorance of officials. Care givers who are not biologically related may also have been unaware that they were eligible for the CSG.
- Care givers who are not biologically related to a child in their care might have been advised to apply for a Foster Child Grant instead.

Province	Mother	Father	Maternal g'parent	Paternal g'parent	Other relative	Total
Eastern Cape	82%	1%	12%	1%	3%	100%
Free State	96%	0%	4%	0%	0%	100%
Gauteng	91%	3%	3%	3%	0%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	78%	0%	16%	3%	2%	100%
Mpumalanga	98%	0%	1%	0%	2%	100%
North West	82%	0%	14%	0%	3%	100%
Northern Cape	84%	0%	12%	0%	4%	100%
Northern Province	98%	0%	1%	0%	1%	100%
Western Cape	94%	0%	6%	0%	0%	100%
Total	89%	1%	8%	1%	1%	100%

Table 63: PCG's relationship to child beneficiary, by province

- PCGs in Mpumalanga and the Northern Province were most likely to be mothers (98%).
- In KwaZulu-Natal, the PCG was significantly more likely to be a maternal grandparent (16%).
- KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng were the provinces most likely to have a paternal grandparent as the PCG (3%).
- PCGs in formal rural areas were less likely to be mothers (85%, compared to an average of 89%), and more likely to be maternal grandparents (11% compared to an average of 8%). This may indicate that mothers in rural areas have migrated to urban areas in search of work, and that they have left the child with their own mothers.

Age	Parent of beneficiary
18-30	99%
31-40	98%
41-50	74%
51-60	19%
61+	3%
Total	90%

Table 64: Proportion of parental PCGs, by age

Ninety percent of PCGs in the survey were biological parents of the child beneficiary, and together with the fact that 99% of PCGs were female this raises the question of how the concept of PCG is understood. It seems that the common assumption is that the PCG must be a woman, as well as a mother. One of the aims of the CSG was to provide support for the child, regardless of the identity of the care giver. However, the findings of the survey cast doubt on the extent to which this idea has been disseminated and explained to potential CSG beneficiaries.

While 90% of PCGs were parents of the child beneficiary, there were significant differences depending on the age of the PCG. In particular, as might be expected, younger beneficiaries were significantly more likely than older ones to be the parent of the child beneficiary.

- PCGs below the age of forty were significantly more likely to be the biological parent of the child beneficiary (99%).
- The older the PCG was, the less likely it was to be the biological parent of the child beneficiary.

Single parent households

	% of beneficiaries in single parent HH	% of parents PCGs who are single parents
Yes	69	72
No	31	28
Total	100	100

Table 65: Incidence of single parent environment

- Ninety percent of PCGs were the biological parents of the child beneficiaries
- Of these 90%, 72% were single parents.
- Sixty-nine percent of child beneficiaries lived in a single parent household.

Province	Living with single parent
Eastern Cape	47%
Free State	81%
Gauteng	82%
KwaZulu-Natal	80%
Mpumalanga	65%
North West	85%
Northern Cape	49%
Northern Province	64%
Western Cape	71%
Total	69%

Table 66: Percentage of child beneficiaries living in a single parent household, by province

- The greatest proportion of child beneficiaries who live in single parent households was found in the North West (85%).
- Child beneficiaries in Gauteng (82%), the Free State (81%) and KwaZulu-Natal (80%) were also significantly more likely to live with a single parent.
- Child beneficiaries in the Eastern Cape (47%) and Northern Cape (49%), on the other hand, were significantly less likely to be part of a single parent household, compared to the national average (69%).

Area	Living with single parent
Urban formal	78%
Urban informal	72%
Rural formal	57%
Rural informal	69%
Total	69%

Table 67: Percentage of child beneficiaries living in a single parent household, by area

- Child beneficiaries in formal rural areas were significantly less likely to live with a single parent (57%).
- In formal urban areas, however, child beneficiaries were significantly more likely to live in a single parent household (78%).

Number of PCG's children

Area	Number of children				Total
	1	2	3-4	5+	
Urban formal	42%	28%	24%	7%	100%
Urban informal	32%	27%	30%	11%	100%
Rural formal	27%	24%	27%	23%	100%
Rural informal	40%	13%	36%	11%	100%
Total	35%	25%	27%	13%	100%

Table 68: Number of children per PCG, by area

All PCGs in the survey were asked about the number of children (living, biological) they had, regardless of age and whether or not these children were CSG beneficiaries. Although this does not tell us anything about the number of children who would potentially qualify for the CSG, the question nevertheless offers an interesting insight into household size and variations by area and province.

- More than one third (35%) of the PCGs in the survey had only one child.
- Thirteen percent of PCGs had more than five children. However, these children were not necessarily younger than six years.
- PCGs in formal urban areas were significantly more likely to have only one child (42%).
- PCGs in formal rural areas, on the other hand, were significantly more likely to have more than five children (23%).
- PCGs in the Free State and Gauteng were significantly more likely to have only one child (54% and 44% respectively).
- In the Eastern Cape (34%) and the Northern Province (23%), PCGs were significantly more likely to have more than five children.

Number of children living with PCG	Number of children per PCG				Total
	1 child	2 children	3-4 children	More than five children	
1	100%	8%	3%	3%	38%
2	0%	92%	12%	3%	26%
3	0%	0%	54%	1%	15%
4	0%	0%	32%	4%	9%
5+	0%	0%	0%	89%	12%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 69: Number of PCG's children living with PCG

In most cases, all the PCG's children lived together with the PCG. However, with an increasing number of children there was also a greater probability that at least some of them no longer lived with the PCG. These may be older children of the PCG who have left home already. Even though all PCGs can be assumed to be relatively poor, they nevertheless try to stay with their children. This does not confirm the common assumption that children from poor families are more likely to be sent off by their mothers to be cared for by someone else. However, in cases where the child did not live with the PCG (N=80), the main reason for this was that the PCG could not provide for the child (42%). This response was particularly likely in KwaZulu-Natal.

Conclusion

To summarise, 90% of PCGs were the parent of the child beneficiary, mothers in almost all cases. All other PCGs were related to the child beneficiary, mostly maternal grandmothers. The likelihood that the PCG was a parent decreased with the age of the PCG. The greatest number of non-parent PCGs was found in formal rural areas and in KwaZulu-Natal. The predominance of parents among the PCGs raises the question of how well the concept of a PCG is understood by potential recipients, in particular in view of the young age of a great number of PCGs. In this context it is worth noting that in 1995 12% of South African children under seven were not living with either of their parents.³⁰ These children are likely to be excluded from the benefits of the CSG if the concept of the PCG as not being restricted to biological parents is not properly understood and disseminated.

Contrary to popular belief, PCGs in our survey generally maintained responsibility for all their children, regardless of their number.

³⁰ Women and Men in South Africa, 1998

Household situation of PCGs

The third part of this chapter examines the household situation of the PCGs, in particular mobility, ownership patterns, and additional sources of support to the household. In the conclusion, we look at how income is managed, as well as the employment prospects of PCGs.

Years lived in household

Area	Years in Household							Total
	<2	2-3	3-4	5-6	7-10	11-20	20+	
Urban formal	6%	14%	5%	7%	11%	19%	39%	100%
Urban informal	10%	15%	6%	11%	22%	20%	16%	100%
Rural formal	2%	8%	4%	7%	13%	24%	43%	100%
Rural informal	5%	14%	5%	9%	10%	17%	39%	100%
Total	5%	12%	5%	8%	13%	21%	37%	100%

Table 70: Years PCG has lived in current household

A relatively great deal of stability of the PCG households was revealed in the survey.

- Seventy-one percent of PCGs had lived in their current household for at least seven years. If we assume that in most cases they have been the original PCG of the child beneficiary, this means that the child beneficiaries have never experienced changes in household.
- More than a third (37%) of PCGs in the survey had been living in the same household for more than twenty years. This was significantly more likely in formal rural areas (43%).
- PCGs in informal areas were significantly more likely to have lived in their current household for less than two years (8% on average).
- PCGs in informal urban areas were highly unlikely to have lived in their current household for more than twenty years (16%), obviously reflecting the nature of these settlements.

Province	Years in Household							Total
	<2	2-3	3-4	5-6	7-10	11-20	20+	
Eastern Cape	5%	6%	4%	9%	11%	32%	34%	100%
Free State	3%	9%	6%	9%	13%	20%	39%	100%
Gauteng	7%	20%	5%	5%	15%	17%	33%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	8%	13%	8%	8%	11%	16%	37%	100%
Mpumalanga	3%	12%	5%	10%	13%	20%	36%	100%
North West	4%	5%	4%	7%	11%	9%	62%	100%
Northern Cape	7%	17%	5%	8%	11%	21%	32%	100%
Northern Province	2%	7%	4%	10%	16%	24%	38%	100%
Western Cape	6%	16%	2%	7%	18%	24%	26%	100%
Total	5%	12%	5%	8%	13%	21%	37%	100%

Table 71: Years lived in current household, by province

- PCGs in the North West were most settled and most likely to have lived in their current household for more than twenty years (62%).
- In the Eastern Cape, PCGs were significantly more likely to have lived in the current household for eleven to twenty years (32%).
- In Gauteng, PCGs were more likely to have stayed in the current household for shorter periods. This is likely to reflect the largely urban nature of this province, the higher incidence of rentals, and the relatively high rate of migration into the province.

Ownership of dwelling

Owner	%
Household member	51
PCG	24
PCG owns jointly	14
Rented house	6
Someone else rents	3
Rented room	2
Total	100

Table 72: Owner of dwelling

Ownership of dwelling is important as it affects general expenditure of the PCG household.

- Eighty-nine percent of PCGs lived in accommodation which was either owned by someone in the household (51%), the PCG alone (24%), or jointly by the PCG and someone else in the household (14%). This implies relatively high levels of security in terms of accommodation.
- Only 11% of PCGs lived in rented accommodation, and in 3% of these cases someone else in the household paid the rent.

Area	Owner						Total
	PCG	PCG owns jointly	HH member	Rented	Someone else rents	Rented room	
Urban formal	20%	8%	56%	8%	5%	3%	100%
Urban informal	33%	11%	39%	10%	2%	5%	100%
Rural formal	24%	20%	50%	4%	2%	1%	100%
Rural informal	23%	20%	53%	1%	3%	0%	100%
Total	24%	14%	51%	6%	3%	2%	100%

Table 73: Owner of dwelling, by area

PCGs in formal urban areas were least likely to own their dwelling, alone (20%) or jointly (8%). They were, however, significantly more likely to live with someone who owned or rented the accommodation. This is probably related to the younger age of PCGs in formal urban areas, which means they may stay with their parents.

- PCGs in informal urban areas were most likely to own their dwelling (33%). However, it should be considered that this is most likely to be a shack, rather than a brick house.
- PCGs in formal rural areas were most likely to own their dwelling jointly with someone else in the household (20%). They were also least likely to live in any form of rented accommodation.

Contributions in kind

Area	%
Urban formal	16
Urban informal	14
Rural formal	6
Rural informal	4
Total	11

Table 74: Proportion of households receiving contributions in kind, by area

All PCGs were asked if the household received any contributions in kind (food, clothes, etc.), in order to estimate how their income might be supplemented.

- Only 11% of households overall received any contributions in kind.
- Surprisingly, though, this was significantly more likely in urban areas (15% on average), and much less likely in rural areas (5%).

Province	%
Eastern Cape	3
Free State	21
Gauteng	18
KwaZulu-Natal	14
Mpumalanga	11
North West	14
Northern Cape	4
Northern Province	2
Western Cape	11
Total	11

Table 75: Proportion of households receiving contributions in kind, by province

- The incidence of households receiving contributions in kind was significantly higher in the Free State (21%) and Gauteng (18%).
- Contributions in kind were significantly less likely to be received by households in the Eastern Cape (3%) and the Northern Province (2%).

Source	%
Relatives	23
Neighbours	8
Friends	6
Government/local authorities	5
Clinic	3
Church or religious groups	2
Charities	1
Begging	1

Table 76: sources of help/donations for PCGs

All PCGs in the survey were asked if they had received any help (financial or otherwise) from the sources named in [Table 76](#) in the last six months.

- PCGs were most likely to have received help from relatives (23%) neighbours (8%) and friends (6%).

Bank accounts

Area	%
Urban formal	23
Urban informal	22
Rural formal	20
Rural informal	8
Total	21

Table 77: Proportion of respondents who have a bank account, by area

To encourage savings and interaction with financial institutions, the Lund report recommended that the CSG be paid quarterly into a bank account. However, the report itself acknowledged that this precondition might reduce the accessibility of the CSG for some PCGs, and our survey confirmed that such a stipulation would have created severe problems for most PCGs.

- Only one fifth of PCGs in the survey had a bank account (21%).
- However, this was significantly less likely in informal rural areas (8%).
- PCGs in KwaZulu-Natal were most likely to have a bank account (29%).
- PCGs in the Northern Province were significantly less likely to have a bank account (10%).

The suggestion of a bank account as a precondition for the CSG was meant to improve interaction with financial institutions and encourage savings. However, it is questionable how effective such a measure could be, since PCGs are limited by personal as well as household income. Those below a certain income level cannot set money aside for saving because of the need to purchase basic necessities. It is highly unlikely that a contribution of R100 per month would have raised a significant number of PCGs above that income level.

Savings

Area	Every month	Few times a year	Once a year	Less than once a year	Never	Total
Urban formal	5%	13%	1%	2%	79%	100%
Urban informal	5%	11%	2%	2%	80%	100%
Rural formal	4%	8%	1%	2%	85%	100%
Rural informal	0%	3%	1%	3%	94%	100%
Total	4%	10%	1%	2%	83%	100%

Table 78: Are you ever able to save any money?

Our survey found that very few PCGs were ever able to save money, and one can assume that those who did, saved fairly small amounts.

- More than four fifths (83%) of PCGs in the survey said they were never able to save any money.

- Fourteen percent of PCGs were able to save money a few times a year, but only 4% were able to do so on a monthly basis.
- PCGs in formal urban areas were most likely to save money overall, and significantly more likely to do so a few times a year (13%).
- PCGs in informal rural areas were significantly more likely never to save money (94%).
- PCGs in the Western Cape (9%) and Gauteng (8%) were most likely to save money every month.
- PCGs in the Eastern Cape (91%), the Northern Cape (91%) and the Northern Province (89%) were most likely never to save any money.

Job offers

Area	%
Urban formal	12
Urban informal	11
Rural formal	4
Rural informal	4
Total	8

Table 79: Proportion of unemployed PCGs who had a job offer in the last six months, by area

One of the misconceptions about people who rely on state transfers is the notion that these are individuals who often would rather receive handouts than earn a living. We therefore asked the CSG recipients if they had received any job offers in the last six months, and then whether or not they had taken up these offers.

- Eight percent (N=81) of PCGs had received a job offer in the last six months.
- Job offers were significantly more likely in formal urban areas (12%) and significantly less likely in formal rural areas (4%). This again reflects the difference in available opportunities between rural and urban areas.
- PCGs in the Western Cape and Gauteng were significantly more likely to have received a job offer in the last six months (15%). However, these are both relatively prosperous provinces with a high degree of urbanisation.
- Job offers were significantly less likely in the Eastern Cape (2%) and Mpumalanga (1%).

When we asked those PCGs who had received a job offer whether or not they had taken it, we found that virtually all (94%, N=77) of them had accepted the job. Only five PCGs had not taken up the job, two of them because they were still in school, another two because they found the job had already been taken, and one because the employer preferred a male. This indicates that rather than trying to avoid work, most CSG recipients would be keen to do so if they found a viable opening.

Conclusion

In summary, the survey found that most PCGs were fairly settled in their current household. This might be related to the fact that 89% of PCGs lived in a dwelling which was either owned by them, a member of their household, or jointly with another member of the household. So although income levels were very low, the majority of PCGs were at least fairly secure in terms of one basic human need – accommodation. Given the low income levels of CSG households, one might have expected the procurement of contributions in kind by a significant number of them, but this was only the case for 11% of households. Where households received help of any kind from outside, it was most likely to come from relatives, neighbours and friends.

In the light of the Lund Report's recommendations, and to complete the picture of the PCG's financial situation, we asked about bank accounts and savings. Not unexpectedly, we found that less than a quarter (21%) had bank accounts, which is partly due to access problems but also to the simple fact that the income of most PCGs doesn't justify the existence of a bank account. Moreover, given the income requirements of most banks, it is questionable how many PCGs would actually be able to open a current account. Similar considerations apply to the savings question, and it is not surprising that 83% of PCGs were never able to save any money. The fact is that most of the CSG recipients are simply unlikely to have anything left to save at the end of the month.

However, we found that although only 8% of PCGs had received a job offer during the last six months, virtually all of them had accepted it. This strongly repudiates the assumption that welfare recipients do not want to work and would rather live on state handouts.

CHAPTER 6: PROFILE OF CHILD BENEFICIARIES

Introduction

The first part of this chapter outlines some of the important demographic details of child beneficiaries: age, education status, immunisation status and the number of child beneficiaries per household. We then examine care giving patterns within the household, as well as mobility of the child beneficiary both in terms of the household and the PCG. In the second part, we look more closely at the environment of child beneficiaries who either live with a single parent, or a non-parental PCG. In particular, we examine financial contributions of those absent parents, as well as their contact with the child beneficiary.

Although the focus of this chapter is on the child beneficiaries, where appropriate, we compare it with the situation of other children in the household who are not CSG recipients but would potentially qualify. Note that we will use the term ‘non-beneficiary’ for children below the age of seven who do not receive the CSG.

Demographic details of child beneficiaries

Number of child beneficiaries in household

Area	<i>No of child beneficiaries in household</i>			Total	Count
	1	2	3+		
Urban formal	81%	17%	2%	100%	451
Urban informal	80%	19%	1%	100%	165
Rural formal	72%	25%	3%	100%	443
Rural informal	74%	22%	4%	100%	97
Total	77%	21%	2%	100%	1156

Table 80: Number of child beneficiaries in household, by area

- More than three-quarters (77%) of households in the survey contained only one child beneficiary.
- A further 21% of households contained two child beneficiaries.
- Only 2% of households contained three or more child beneficiaries.

These low numbers of beneficiaries within households might be an indication of the greater need for the grant among small families, for instance in households that contain only mother and child. It might also simply be a reflection of the decreasing biological probability of households containing a greater number of children below age seven. Households in urban areas were more likely to contain only one child beneficiary (81% in formal urban areas, 80% in informal ones),

while households in rural areas were significantly more likely to contain two or more child beneficiaries (28% in formal rural areas, 26% in informal ones).

Province	Number of child beneficiaries in household				Count
	1	2	3+	Total	
Eastern Cape	72%	24%	5%	100%	162
Free State	93%	7%	0%	100%	108
Gauteng	79%	20%	1%	100%	147
KwaZulu-Natal	78%	22%	1%	100%	129
Mpumalanga	75%	22%	3%	100%	123
North West	71%	29%	0%	100%	105
Northern Cape	78%	21%	1%	100%	110
Northern Province	76%	21%	4%	100%	167
Western Cape	76%	20%	4%	100%	113
Total	77%	21%	2%	100%	1164

Table 81: Number of child beneficiaries in household, by province

- The most significant provincial deviation from this pattern was in the Free State, where 93% of households contained only one child beneficiary.
- Households in the North West were significantly more likely to have two child beneficiaries (29%).
- Households in the Eastern Cape (5%), the Western Cape (4%) and the Northern Province (4%) were the provinces most likely to have three or more child beneficiaries.

Non-beneficiaries

No. of non-beneficiaries in HH	No. of HHs	% of HHs
0	719	72%
1	207	21%
2	54	5%
3	18	2%
4	1	0%
Total	999	100%

Table 82: Households, by number of child non-beneficiaries (N=373)

There were 373 children (in 280 households) under the age of seven who did not receive the grant (non-beneficiaries). While the majority of households (72%) did not contain any non-beneficiaries, the fact that in 28% of households there were children who qualified for the CSG yet did not benefit from it, indicates that the requirements for application have not been disseminated or understood properly.

	%
Yes	42
No	58
Total	100

Table 83: Is the PCG of the non-beneficiary a CSG beneficiary? (N=376)

In 42% of the cases, the PCG of the non-beneficiary was also the PCG of a child beneficiary. In 60% (N=93) of these cases, the care giver was the mother of the non-beneficiary. Again, this indicates that significant proportions of CSG recipients are unaware that they may receive the grant for all children in their care who are under the age of seven.

Area	%
Urban formal	25
Urban informal	22
Rural formal	34
Rural informal	27
All	28

Table 84: Proportion of CSG households with at least one non-beneficiary, by area

There were significant variations in the distribution of these non-beneficiaries by type of area.

- Households in formal rural areas were significantly more likely to contain a non-beneficiary. This might merely reflect household size and in particular the larger number of children in rural households, but could also be linked to inadequate information strategies in rural areas.
- There were no significant variations in the distribution of non-beneficiaries by province.

The poor levels of knowledge about the applicability of the CSG may have contributed to the large number of non-beneficiaries. While these issues are discussed in a later section of the report, we note here that:

- Over half (51%) of PCGs did not know for how many children they could apply, and only 4% of them gave the correct answer, that is, that all children under the age of seven qualified for the CSG;
- More than half (52%) of respondents thought that the PCG had to be the parent of the child beneficiary, and
- Only 55% of respondents knew that a PCG could receive an old age pension as well as the CSG.

Age

Province	Age							Total
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Eastern Cape	4%	9%	20%	24%	19%	18%	6%	100%
Free State	1%	20%	18%	14%	20%	17%	11%	100%
Gauteng	1%	17%	15%	19%	21%	19%	10%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	4%	9%	14%	14%	17%	23%	19%	100%
Mpumalanga	0%	19%	19%	16%	19%	19%	9%	100%
North West	4%	9%	21%	12%	30%	10%	15%	100%
Northern Cape	0%	4%	27%	24%	15%	14%	17%	100%
Northern Province	0%	12%	15%	18%	17%	15%	23%	100%
Western Cape	5%	10%	18%	21%	21%	13%	13%	100%
Total	2%	12%	18%	18%	19%	16%	14%	100%

Table 85: Age of child beneficiaries, by province

- The average age of child beneficiaries in the survey was 3.5 years.
- In both the Free State and the Eastern Cape the average age was slightly lower at around 3.2 years.
- KwaZulu-Natal and the Northern Province both had an average age of 3.9 years.
- The Western Cape had the highest average age (5.3 years).

The majority of child beneficiaries in the survey (71%) were between two and five years old. The largest single group was four-year-old beneficiaries (19%). Of particular interest here is the small number of very young beneficiaries (only 2% were younger than one year), as well as the relatively small number of beneficiaries who are close to the cut-off age of seven years. This could be an indication that new parents and carers are not aware of the CSG, or that it takes a long time to obtain documents and complete the application process for the CSG. The low percentages for older beneficiaries might indicate that PCGs find it increasingly difficult to access the grant, and therefore do not consider it worth the effort.

Looking at the age distribution by province and area, there were a few notable deviations from the overall age pattern.

- The Northern Cape had a higher proportion of two to three year old beneficiaries, and a much lower proportion of beneficiaries younger than two.
- In the North West, there was a much higher proportion of four-year-old beneficiaries (30%), and significantly fewer three and five year old beneficiaries.
- Urban informal areas were more likely to have three and four year old beneficiaries (49% of beneficiaries, compared to 37% on average).
- In informal rural areas, there were no beneficiaries younger than one, and a significantly higher proportion of six-year-old beneficiaries (22% compared to 13% on average). The

complete absence of child beneficiaries younger than one year might be linked to difficulties in obtaining birth certificates in informal rural areas.

	Average Age
Non-beneficiary of CSG	3.2
Child beneficiary of CSG	3.5

Table 86: Average age of child beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries

There were no significant age differences between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in the survey, although non-beneficiaries tended to be slightly younger. This might mean that PCGs had applied for the beneficiary initially and were not aware that they could apply for further children. These findings also indicate that welfare officials are unlikely to have enquired after other eligible children in the household.

Sex

Province	Girls	Boys	Total
Eastern Cape	55%	46%	100%
Free State	50%	51%	100%
Gauteng	51%	49%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	52%	49%	100%
Mpumalanga	48%	52%	100%
North West	56%	44%	100%
Northern Cape	50%	50%	100%
Northern Province	40%	60%	100%
Western Cape	48%	52%	100%
Total	49%	51%	100%

Table 87: Sex of child beneficiaries, by province

- There was an almost equal number of male and female child beneficiaries in the survey.
- However, in the Eastern Cape (55%) and the North West (56%), there were slightly more female child beneficiaries.
- In the Northern Province, there were significantly more male child beneficiaries (60%).
- There were no differences in the distribution of sex by area.
- There were also no sex differences between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

Education or care status

Education status	Age				Total
	0-1	2-3	4-5	6	
Day care/crèche	13%	23%	36%	14%	25%
Pre-school	0%	2%	16%	21%	9%
Grade 1	0%	0%	2%	45%	7%
Grade 2	0%	0%	1%	6%	1%
Stays at home/not at school	87%	75%	46%	14%	58%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 88: Education status of child beneficiaries, by age (N=1156)

- More than half (58%) of child beneficiaries stayed at home during the day, while 34% attended a crèche or pre-school. Only 8% of child beneficiaries in the survey had already started formal schooling.
- Beneficiaries younger than two years were significantly more likely to be at home (87%), presumably because the PCG felt they were too young to attend a crèche (see Table 90).
- The same might apply to beneficiaries younger than four years (75% were at home), although this age group was already more likely to attend day care (23%).
- Four to five year old beneficiaries were most likely to attend day care (36%), but almost half of this age group (46%) were still at home.
- Beneficiaries who are six years old were most likely to have started formal education (45% were in Grade 1).
- A fifth (21%) were at pre-school, while just over a tenth (14%) were at either a day-care facility or a crèche.
- However, 14% of six-year olds were not engaged in any form of education or day care.

Education status	Non-beneficiaries	Beneficiaries	Total
Day care/crèche	18%	25%	24%
Pre-school	9%	9%	9%
Grade 1	10%	7%	8%
Stays at home/not at school	63%	57%	60%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 89: Beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, by education status

There were significant differences in the current educational status of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

- Non-beneficiaries were more likely to stay at home while beneficiaries were more likely to be in day care or at a crèche.
- This is a possible indication of the positive impact of the CSG on the child beneficiary. However, another possibility is that the crèche actually informed the PCG about the CSG.
- We also note that this effect appears to be restricted to formal urban areas.

Reason	Age				Total
	0-1	2-3	4-5	6	
Too young	87%	76%	58%	33%	72%
Cannot afford school fees	11%	19%	36%	46%	23%
Too ill to attend school	1%	2%	1%	0%	1%
Does not want to go to school	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Other	1%	3%	5%	21%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 90: Reason child beneficiary does not attend school or crèche, by age (N=665)

In the 58% of cases where the child beneficiary did not attend a crèche or school, the PCG was asked for the main reason.

- In 72% of cases, the PCG thought the child was still too young to attend school or crèche. This response was significantly more likely if the beneficiary was younger than two years old (87%).
- However, in 23% of cases the PCGs claimed that they could not afford the fees to send the child to school or crèche. This was also the main reason (46%) why 6-year old beneficiaries were not yet attending school.

Immunisation status	%
All the vaccines required at his/her age	98
Partially, not all the required ones	2
None at all	0
Total	100

Table 91: Immunisation status of child beneficiaries (N=1230)

Virtually all (98%) of the child beneficiaries in the survey had been immunised with all the vaccines required at their age. This notably high percentage might be due to the free access to immunisations and medical care for children under six. However, it is possible that PCGs gave false answers because they believed that immunisations were still a precondition for receiving the CSG. In addition, they may not have fully understood what full immunisation was. The remaining 2% of beneficiaries (mostly in informal areas) had been at least partly immunised. The

reason was incomplete immunisation was due mostly to ignorance. There were no differences in immunisation status between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

Conclusion

Most households contained only one child beneficiary, possibly because small families are more likely to apply for the grant, or because PCGs are unaware that they can apply for more than one child. Boys and girls were equally represented among beneficiaries. The majority of child beneficiaries were between two and five years old, and there were relatively few younger or older beneficiaries. The majority of beneficiaries below age four stayed at home during the day, mainly because the PCG felt they were too young to attend day care. However, there were also significant numbers of six-year-old beneficiaries who stayed at home, mainly because of the PCG's inability to afford school fees. Virtually all child beneficiaries had the vaccinations necessary for their age.

The only significant difference between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries appears in the current educational status. Beneficiaries were more likely to be in a crèche or day care than non-beneficiaries were.

Care giving patterns

Care of child	%
PCG	57
Child attends day care or school for part of the day	20
Maternal grandparent	9
Child attends day care or school for the whole day	5
Another adult living in the household	4
Paternal grandparent	1
A neighbour	1
A person who gets paid (whether in cash or kind)	1
Total	100

Table 92: Who mainly takes care of the child during the day? (N=1231)

- In more than half of the cases (57%), the PCG looked after the child beneficiary during the day.
- In a further 9% of cases, this task was performed by the maternal grandmother (not PCG).
- Twenty-five percent of child beneficiaries attended school or day care for either the whole day (5%) or part of the day (20%).

Care of child	%
Child is looked after by the primary care giver	61
Maternal grandparent	19
Another adult living in the household except grandparents	7
An older child	6
A neighbour	4
Paternal grandparent	2
A person who gets paid (whether in cash or kind)	1
Other	1
Total	100

Table 93: Who mainly looks after the child when s/he gets back from school? (N=246)

- In those 20% of cases where the beneficiary attended day-care or school for only part of the day, 61% of beneficiaries were cared for by the PCG upon their return.
- The second largest group who took care of the child for the rest of the day consisted of maternal grandparents (19%).

Mobility of child beneficiary

Age of beneficiary	Lived with PCG since birth	Lived in household since birth	N
Less than 1 year	100%	100%	21
1 year	100%	100%	135
2 years	100%	100%	206
3 years	100%	97%	210
4 years	94%	92%	225
5 years	97%	93%	192
6 years	92%	79%	158
Total	97%	94%	1168

Table 94: Proportion of child beneficiaries living with PCG/in HH since birth, by age

When looking at children from poor families, it is often assumed that there will be a high degree of movement because of economic necessity. However, the survey found that the vast majority (97%) of child beneficiaries had lived with their current PCG since birth, or moved in with them shortly afterwards. Those beneficiaries who had not lived with their current PCG since birth tended to be older (four years and above). The reason for this pattern might be that the biological parents have died, moved away to find work, or simply found it too difficult to look after the child beneficiary.

In comparison, the percentage of child beneficiaries who had lived in their current household since birth was slightly smaller (94%), but the figures again indicate that the majority of child beneficiaries had not moved households since birth. One can therefore conclude that most of the younger beneficiaries have lived in the same household and with the same PCG since birth. As beneficiaries get older, this directly increases the likelihood that they have moved households, although they generally appear to have moved with their PCG. Overall, these findings do not confirm the patterns of fluidity commonly associated with beneficiaries of the CSG. However, we have no information about the movement of child beneficiaries once the CSG is discontinued. The lack of money might lead to the break-up of the household.

Single parent PCGs

The survey found that a large proportion (69%) of child beneficiaries lived in a single parent household. This gives rise to a number of questions about parental maintenance and contact. The financial situation of these beneficiaries is of particular concern, because although all recipients of the CSG are by definition poor, the likelihood of there being another breadwinner within a single parent household is significantly smaller.

Financial support

Financial support	%
None	66
None, parent has died	16
Regularly through a private arrangement	7
Irregularly through a private arrangement	7
Regularly based on a court order	2
Irregularly based on a court order	1
Other	1
Total	100

Table 95: Financial support received from other parent (N=658)

- Eighty-two percent of single parents had not received any money from the other parent during the last year. In 16% of cases this was due to the death of the other parent.
- Only 17% of single parents had received some money from the other parent, 9% regularly and 8% irregularly.
- In 3% of cases, the PCGs received money from the other parent because of a court order. The majority of PCGs who received financial support did so through a private arrangement with the other parent (14%).

Private maintenance/month	N
R 50	2
R 100	2
R 115	3
R 120	1
R 150	3
R 200	4
Total	15

Table 96: Number of beneficiaries who receive private maintenance (N=15)

- Only 15 child beneficiaries in the survey received private maintenance payments.
- However, there might have been confusion about what constitutes private maintenance, for instance in relation to court orders or the regularity of the payments.
- PCGs might also deny that they receive private maintenance payments, in order to remain below the personal income limit for the CSG.

	%
Yes	23
No	76
Total	100

Table 97: Has the other parent ever contributed financially? (N=466)

- Three quarters (76%) of absent parents had in fact never contributed financially for the child, although this figure includes parents who have died.

Reason	%
Died	28
Lost his/her job	22
Don't know	20
Moved away	18
Got married	4
Other	8
Total	100

Table 98: What is the main reason the other parent stopped contributing? (N=147)

If the other parent had contributed at some point in the past, the PCG was asked what the main reason for the discontinuation of these payments was.

- The most common reason for the discontinuation of contributions was the death of the other parent (28%).
- However, in 22% of cases the other parent had lost their job, which presumably left them unable to continue their support of the child.
- Nevertheless, in 20% of cases the PCG did not know why the other parent had stopped their support, and in another 18% of cases the other parent had simply moved away.

	%
No	83
Yes, it did not work	12
Yes, it worked for a while	3
Yes, it is in progress	2
Total	100

Table 99: Have you ever tried legal channels to get the other parent to contribute? (N=503)

- Eighty-three percent of single parents had never attempted to use legal channels to force the other parent to contribute.
- In 12% of cases the PCGs had tried but was unsuccessful.
- However, in 3% of cases legal channels had worked, at least for a while.

	Date applied for CSG ³¹	
	Before 6/99	After 6/99
Yes, it worked for a while	59%	41%
Yes, it did not work	63%	33%
Yes, it's in progress	50%	50%
No	44%	54%
Total	47%	51%

Table 100: Have you used legal means to get other parent to contribute, by date applied for CSG

- The percentage of single parents trying legal means to get the other parent to contribute has significantly declined since June 1999.
- Those who had applied prior to the legal changes of June 1999 and who had attempted to use legal methods were significantly more likely to say that the process had not worked. However, the time span between the legal changes and the survey was relatively short, so there had been less opportunity for failure.

³¹ PCGs who could not remember the date they applied for the CSG were excluded from this table (2% overall)

	%
Lost contact with the parent	39
Other parent is unemployed	32
Other parent has no money	16
Don't want to have any contact with the other parent	9
Don't think that courts will help	8
Was not necessary because the other parent was contributing	6
Don't know	5
Afraid to ask the other parent to contribute	3
Other parent is still studying	3
Have no money to go to court	2
No time	2
Other	5

Table 101: Reason PCG never tried legal channels to get the other parent to contribute (N=354)

The 83% of PCGs who had never tried legal channels to get the other parent to contribute were asked for their reasons. PCGs were allowed to give more than one answer to this question.

- The most common reason (39%) PCGs gave as an explanation why they had never tried to use legal channels was that they had lost contact with the other parent.
- Almost a third (32%) of PCGs said that the other parent was unemployed, and 16% said the other parent had no money.

Beneficiaries' contact with absent parent

Location	%
Same town as PCG	25
Far away	23
Deceased	21
PCG does not know	16
Not in same town as PCG but nearby	8
In jail	3
PCG does not know who the parent is	1
Other	1
Total	100

Table 102: Location of other parent (N=658)

- A third of single parent PCGs (33%) said the other parent was living in the same town as them or in a town nearby.

- In almost a quarter of cases (23%) the other parent was living far away.
- Twenty-one percent of the other parents were deceased.
- In 16% of cases the PCG did not know where the other parent was.

Contact with absent parent	%
Once a month and more	22
Once every two months	3
Less than 6 times in the last year	16
Not in last year	59
Other	1
Total	100

Table 103: Level of child beneficiary’s contact with other parent (N=589)

The PCG was then asked how often the child beneficiary had seen the other parent during the last year. The cases where the other parent was deceased or unknown were excluded.

- Almost three fifths (59%) of child beneficiaries living with a single parent had not seen the other parent in the last year. This corresponds roughly to the percentage of other parents who do not live in the same town as the beneficiary or a town nearby.
- Only 21% of beneficiaries had seen the other parent more than once a month in the last year.

Location of other parent	Contact with other parent				Total	Count
	Once a month+	Once/ two months	<6 times last year	Never		
In this town	46%	5%	16%	33%	100%	193
Not in this town but nearby	20%	5%	16%	59%	100%	64
Far away	8%	4%	22%	66%	100%	180
In jail	30%	0%	17%	52%	100%	23
Total	27%	4%	18%	50%	100%	460

Table 104: Contact with other parent, by location of other parent

If we only look at parents who can be assumed to be reasonably accessible, an obvious pattern of contact emerges for the last year.

- If the other parent lives in the same town as the child beneficiary, contact between them at least once a month was significantly more likely, while it was significantly less likely that the child had not seen the other parent during the last year.
- If the other parent lives far away, it was significantly more likely that there had been no contact between parent and child.

Non-parent PCGs

Although there was only a relatively small number of non-parent PCGs in the survey (97 non-parent PCGs, 130 child beneficiaries), they are of interest. As with single parents, their financial situation might be precarious, especially with the added burden of someone else's child. Of particular interest here are permission rates from parents to apply for the CSG, as well as other financial support from the parents.

Financial support

Financial support	Mother	Father
None	69	80
None, parent has died	11	13
Regularly through a private arrangement	12	2
Irregularly through a private arrangement	9	4
Other	1	1
Total	100%	100%

Table 105: Financial support received from mother/father (N=130)

- Eighty percent of PCGs had not received any money from the child's mother in the last year. However, in 11% of cases this was due to the mother being deceased.
- In comparison, 93% of PCGs had not received any money from the father during the last year, but again in 13% of cases this was due to the death of the father.
- Only 12% of PCGs had received money from the mother regularly during the last year, and this was through a private rather than a legal (court order) arrangement.
- Another 9% of mothers had contributed to the upkeep of the child, again through a private arrangement, but not on a regular basis.
- Only 6% of PCGs had received any money (regularly or irregularly) from the father during the last year, compared to the 21% of PGCs who had received money from the mother.

From these figures it is obvious that mothers take greater responsibility in terms of financial contributions than fathers. Moreover, if one compares the contribution rates of these fathers with the ones for single parents, we find that fathers are significantly more likely to contribute if the child beneficiary lives with the mother.

Financial support	Mother (N=116)	Father (N=113)
None	77	92
Regularly through a private arrangement	13	3
Irregularly through a private arrangement	10	4
Other	1	1
Total	100	100

Table 106: Have you received any money from parent last year? (excluding deceased parents)

If one excludes the cases where either parent was deceased, the difference between maternal and paternal contributions becomes more obvious. In 23% of cases, the mother had made regular or irregular contributions, compared to only 6% of fathers. However, the contribution figures might be partly explained by the fact that mothers were more likely to live in the same household as the PCG and the beneficiary (47% of mothers), and that the majority of non-parent PCGs were maternal grandparents.

	Mother (N=107)	Father (N=125)
Yes	22	10
No	78	90
Total	100%	100%

Table 107: Has the mother/father ever contributed financially?

In cases where the parents had not contributed during the last year (including those who were dead), the PCGs were asked if the parents had ever contributed financially. Again, one could observe a significant difference in contribution rates between mothers and fathers.

- While more than three quarters (78%) of mothers had never contributed towards the upkeep of the beneficiary, this figure rose to 90% for fathers.

	Mother	Father
Parent has died	12	7
Lost her job	7	0
Moved away	3	1
Got married	0	2
PCG does not know	0	3
Other	4	6
N	26	19

Table 108: Main reason the mother/father has stopped contributing

If the parents had ever contributed in the past (22% of mothers, 10% of fathers), the PCG was asked why these contributions had stopped.

- In the cases of both mothers and fathers, death proved to be the main reason for the discontinuation of financial support (46% of mothers, 37% of fathers).
- The second most common reason was the loss of a job (27%), which presumably left the mother unable to further support the beneficiary.
- In the case of fathers, 16% of PCGs simply did not know why the father had stopped the contribution, but in 11% of cases the fathers had stopped contributing because they got married (presumably not to the mother of the beneficiary).
- None of the non-parent PCGs gave the loss of a job as a reason for the father's discontinuation of payments. This is interesting to note, since 22% of single parents gave this as a reason that the father of the child beneficiary had stopped previous contributions. It appears that fathers behaved differently if the child beneficiary lives with a non-parent PCG or with the biological mother.
- The obvious conclusion in the case of non-parent PCGs is that mothers are more likely to contribute towards the upkeep of the beneficiary, and that they are also more likely to have a valid reason if they discontinue their financial support.

	Mother (N=112)	Father (N=126)
No	89	88
Yes, it did not work	10	10
Yes, it's in progress	1	1
Yes, it worked for a while	0	2
Total	100	100

Table 109: Have you ever tried legal channels to get the parents to contribute?

If the parents of the beneficiary had not contributed during the last year, the PCGs were asked if they had ever used legal means in order to get the parents to contribute.

- In almost 90% of cases (89% for mothers, 88% of fathers), the PCG had never attempted to obtain money from the parents through legal channels. This includes the cases where the parent/s were deceased.
- In the cases of both mothers and fathers, 10% of PCGs had been unsuccessful in attempting to get them to contribute through legal channels.
- However, in the case of 2% of fathers, such an attempt had been successful at least for a while.
- Compared to single parent PCGs, non-parent PCGs were more likely to have tried to get either of the parents to contribute through legal methods, though none of them received money through a court order.
- Only in the case of 2% of fathers PCGs received money through a court order for a while.

Legal attempt	Date applied for CSG ³²				Total
	Before 6/99		After 6/99		
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	M/F
Yes, it worked for a while	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Yes, it did not work	36%	33%	64%	67%	100%
Yes, it's in progress	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%
No	44%	50%	51%	45%	100%
Total	43%	47%	53%	49%	100%

Table 110: Attempt to get mother/father to contribute, by date applied for CSG

Prior to June 1999, all CSG applicants were obliged to prove they had attempted legal means to get the parent/s to contribute towards the upkeep of the child. However, looking at PCGs who have not used that route, the change in legislation had no impact. This leads to the conclusion that this precondition for the CSG was not really enforced in the past, and that it was the right decision to scrap it. All PCGs who had been successful in receiving parental maintenance at least for a while had applied for the CSG after June 1999.

	Mother (N=102)	Father (N=109)
Parent is unemployed	28	18
Parent has no money	24	7
Parent is still studying	21	2
PCG lost contact with the parent	17	32
PCG does not think the courts will help	5	7
PCG doesn't want any contact with the parent	3	11
PCG does not know	3	6
PCG has no money to go to court	1	2
PCG has no time	1	2
PCG is afraid to ask parent to contribute	0	3
Other	16	28

Table 111: Reason PCG never tried legal channels to get parent to contribute

The PCGs who had never used legal channels to get the parent/s to pay were asked for their reasons. PCGs were allowed to give more than one answer to this question. Again, one can observe notable differences in the responses relating to mothers and fathers.

- In 73% of cases for mothers, the main reason PCGs gave for not pursuing the matter was that the mother was economically inactive or had no money.
- In comparison, only 27% of PCGs had never tried this approach because they thought the father would be unable to pay.

³² PCGs who could not remember when they applied for the CSG were excluded from this table.

- The main reason PCGs had never attempted to use legal channels to get the father to contribute was that they had lost contact with him (32% of cases), though this response accounted for only 17% in the case of the mother.
- 11% of PGCs never pursued the father because they did not want any contact with him, compared to only 3% of PCGs who said the same about the mother of the beneficiary.
- In the case of mothers, virtually all ‘Other’ responses referred to the death of the mother, while responses for fathers included jail sentences and lack of knowledge about paternity.

Permission	Mother (N=132)	Father (N=126)
PCG asked for permission and received it	62	15
PCG does not know where the parent is	17	56
Parent has died	12	14
Parent suggested that the PCG apply	5	2
PCG asked for permission and did not receive it	3	12
Total	100%	100%

Table 112: PCG has received permission from the mother/father to apply for the CSG

- The majority (62%) of PCGs received permission from the mother to apply for the CSG, but only 15% of PCGs received that permission from the father.
- A much larger percentage of fathers (12%) refused permission to apply for the grant compared to the mothers (3%).
- In 17% of cases, the PCG did not know where the biological mother was, compared to 56% of cases in which the father’s location was unknown.
- In 12% of cases, the biological mother had died, and fathers were deceased in 14% of cases.

Conclusion

The picture that emerged from the survey was that mothers were generally more likely to contribute towards the upkeep of the child than the fathers. Fathers were also less likely to contribute if the child beneficiary lived with a non-parent PCG than in the cases of single parents. In cases where the parents no longer contributed, the most common reason was the death of the parent. However, the second most common reason for mothers was job loss, while in the case of fathers the PCG often simply did not know why the father had stopped contributing. Although the majority of non-parent PCGs had never tried to pursue the parents through the courts, they were still significantly more likely to have done so than single parents. If they had not pursued the mother, it was generally because she was economically inactive, while fathers were not pursued because their location was unknown. Fathers whose whereabouts were known were more likely to have refused permission to apply for the CSG than mothers.

Beneficiaries' contact with the biological parent/s

	Mother (N=134)	Father (N=130)
Yes	47	2
No	53	98
Total	100	100

Table 113: Does the mother/father of this child live in this household?

In 47% of cases where the PCG was not the biological parent of the beneficiary, the mother nevertheless lived in the same household. These might be cases of teenage pregnancies where the mother was still a dependent herself. The biological mother might also be too young to apply for the CSG herself. These figures might explain the higher rate of permission to apply for the grant from mothers, compared to that of fathers. Only 2% of fathers lived in the same household as the beneficiary.

Province	Mother lives in HH
Eastern Cape	69%
Free State	0%
Gauteng	20%
KwaZulu-Natal	41%
Mpumalanga	0%
North West	63%
Northern Cape	37%
Northern Province	0%
Western Cape	29%
Total	45%

Table 114: Percentage of mothers living in the same household, by province

- Mothers were significantly more likely to live in the same household as the beneficiary in the Eastern Cape and in the North West.
- In the Free State, Mpumalanga and the Northern Province, none of the biological mothers lived in the same household as the beneficiary.
- In Gauteng and the Western Cape it was also considerably less likely that the mother lived in the same household with the beneficiary.
- This situation was significantly more likely in formal rural areas (63% of mothers living with beneficiary, compared to 45% overall), but in all other areas it was significantly less likely.

Location	Mother (N=72)	Father (N=128)
Far away	25	12
PCG does not know	25	29
Deceased	24	16
Not in same town as PCG but nearby	14	4
In same town as the PCG	11	13
PCG does not know who the father is	0	24
In jail	0	3
Other	1	0%
Total	100%	100%

Table 115: Location of mother/father of the child

- A quarter (25%) of mothers and 17% of fathers lived in the same town as the beneficiary or in a town nearby.
- At least another 25% of mothers lived far away, compared to at least 12% of fathers.
- In the case of 25% of mothers and 29% of fathers, the PCG did not know where they were.
- In addition, 24% of PCGs did not know who the father of the beneficiary was.
- Twenty-four percent of mothers and 16% of fathers were deceased.

Contact	Mother		Father	
	%	N	%	N
Once a month and more	27	15	15	16
Once every two months	6	3	4	4
Less than 6 times in the last year	24	13	8	9
Never	40	22	72	87
Other	4	2	1	1
Total	100%	55	100%	108

Table 116: Level of beneficiary's contact with the mother/father during last year

This question was only asked in cases where the parent/s of the beneficiary did not live in the same household. Cases where the parent was deceased were excluded from the question.

- Forty percent of child beneficiaries had not seen their mother during the last year.
- Almost two thirds (72%) had not seen the father.
- Twenty-seven percent of beneficiaries had seen their mother at least once a month, but only 15% of beneficiaries could say the same about their fathers.
- Eighty percent of beneficiaries had seen their father less than six times in the last year.
- In comparison, only 64% of beneficiaries had seen their mother less than six times.
- Mothers therefore are not only more likely to contribute to the financial upkeep of the child, but also more likely to take an active interest in the development of the child, through visits.

CHAPTER 7: ACCESS TO THE CSG

This chapter deals with access to the CSG. In particular, we look at the CSG publicity campaign, the application process, attitude of staff, the time and costs involved in collecting the grant, the length of time applicants had to wait for the grant to be processed, and the factors that impeded access to the grant. Although the survey did not include people whose child support grants were rejected, we may assume that the difficulties experienced by the successful applicants would indicate the types of difficulties experienced by those who applied unsuccessfully for the grant.

Publicity campaign

When the CSG was introduced, the Department of Welfare embarked on a publicity campaign to inform the public about this new grant. The publicity campaign was conducted at both national and provincial levels. The national strategy consisted of using mainstream media such as advertising on radio and TV as well as pamphlets and posters. Provinces were given responsibility for designing a strategy that was suited to their local conditions.

In the survey we asked respondents a number of questions dealing with information about the grant. Questions included where they heard about the grant, in which language they received this information, whether the information was easy to understand, and whether they were aware of the toll-free number they could call to find out more about the grant. It is important to remember that all the survey respondents were successful applicants who actually received the CSG.

Similar questions were asked in the interviews and the focus group discussions that were conducted as part of the case studies, and findings were incorporated here where appropriate.

Area	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Urban formal	56	21	23	100
Urban informal	60	23	17	100
Rural formal	66	15	20	100
Rural informal	83	9	8	100
All	62%	18%	20%	100%

Table 117: Was knowledge publicised enough? By area

Respondents were asked if information about the grant was publicised enough. The majority (62%) of respondents (all CSG beneficiaries) said they thought the grant was publicised enough

- Respondents in urban formal areas (56%) were less inclined to think that the grant was publicised enough compared to respondents living in informal rural areas (83%).

Province	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Eastern Cape	70	22	9	100
Free State	55	15	30	100
Gauteng	60	14	26	100
KwaZulu-Natal	66	17	18	100
Mpumalanga	51	12	37	100
North West	68	16	16	100
Northern Cape	53	4	43	100
Northern Province	90	7	3	100
Western Cape	35	60	5	100
All	62%	18%	20%	100%

Table 118: Was knowledge publicised enough? by province

- Respondents in the Western Cape were significantly more likely to think that the CSG was not publicised enough (60%)
- Respondents in the Northern Cape (43%), Mpumalanga (37%) and the Free State (30%) were significantly more likely to be unsure about the publicity surrounding the grant
- Respondents living in the Northern Province were more likely to think that the grant was not sufficiently publicised (90%).

According to an NGO interviewee from the Eastern Cape, people living in the province were not well informed about the grant. This was particularly the case with regards to the recent changes.

Officials from the Northern Province expressed satisfaction with the efforts made by their department to publicise the grant, though NGOs working in that province were more critical. They said that the Department of Welfare did not do enough to publicise the grant, and that NGOs had been much more instrumental and effective in publicising the CSG.

Heard about the grant for the first time	%
Other recipients	23
Radio	18
Welfare department	16
Other people (who do not receive the grant)	15
Community workers	12
Local clinics	6
Other	10

Table 119: Source of information about the CSG

We asked respondents where they had heard of the grant for the first time. The largest proportion (23%) of respondents said they had heard about it from other people who received the grant. Just under a fifth (18%) said they heard about the grant for the first time on radio. A tenth (10%) said they heard about it from other sources, such as pamphlets, newspapers and TV.

Knowledge of the grant seems to be spreading best by word of mouth. This was confirmed by an NGO representative, who said that most CSG beneficiaries received their initial information about the grant in this manner. Radio seems to be another effective means of informing people of the grant. This is not entirely surprising, since 71% of the respondents in the survey had a radio, but less than half (48%) had access to a TV. In rural areas and informal settlements especially, radio is often the only type of media that is accessible to potential beneficiaries.

Area	Other recipients	Radio	Welfare dept.	Other people	Community workers	Local clinic	Other	Total
Urban formal	24	18	16	14	11	7	12	100
Urban informal	26	15	16	15	8	10	10	100
Rural formal	23	16	17	17	15	4	7	100
Rural informal	13	44	9	9	10	10	5	100
All	23%	19%	16%	15%	12%	7%	10%	100%

Table 120: Source of information, by area

- Respondents in formal rural areas were more likely to have heard about the grant from people working in the community (15%), but less likely to have received information from the local clinic (4%)
- Respondents living in informal rural areas were most likely to have heard about the grant from the radio (44%)
- In informal urban areas were, respondents were more likely to have heard about the grant from the local clinic (10%)
- Respondents living in formal urban areas were more likely to have heard about the grant for the first time from ‘other’ sources (12%)
- Respondents in the Western Cape (25%) and Northern Cape (51%) were significantly more likely to have heard about the grant from the Welfare department. This may be due to the high incidence of SMGs in these provinces and subsequent contact of beneficiaries with the department
- Respondents in Gauteng (6%) and Mpumalanga (8%) were significantly less likely to have heard about the grant from the Welfare department. Gauteng respondents were more likely to have heard about the grant from the local clinic (14%), while respondents living in Mpumalanga were more likely to have heard about the grant from the radio (30%).

The survey findings did not always confirm what welfare officials and representatives from the NGO sector said about the communication strategies adopted by the Department of Welfare,

though such confirmation was evident in the Western Cape and the Northern Cape. Welfare officials in the Western Cape felt that their communication strategy, which included the use of community structures and volunteers, had been successful. Although Northern Cape officials were unsure about the success of their strategy, they seemed to have adopted a more interactive strategy that involved going into communities and informing the public about the grant.

An official from Mpumalanga said that their provincial strategy had been more successful than the national strategy. However, survey respondents in this province were significantly more likely to have heard about the CSG on the radio, although radio was not of the strategy in the province. Placing advertisements on national radio was a strategy adopted by the National Department of Welfare, and it is likely that respondents from this and other provinces heard about the grant as a result of the efforts of the national Department.

Area	%
Urban formal	3
Urban informal	7
Rural formal	8
Rural informal	
All	5

Table 121: Proportion of respondents who knew about the toll-free information line, by area

We asked respondents if they were aware of the toll-free number they could call to find out more about the CSG. Only 5% of respondents said they were aware of this facility. Access to a phone in the dwelling had no statistically significant impact on the response.

- Respondents living in formal urban areas and in informal rural areas were less likely to say they knew about the toll-free number
- Respondents living in formal rural areas were significantly more likely to know about the existence of the toll-free number
- A larger proportion of respondents in the Northern Cape were aware of the toll-free number, compared to respondents living in the Eastern Cape (1%) and Mpumalanga (1%)
- None of the respondents living in the Northern Province had heard about the toll-free number.

Of the 53 respondents (5% of the sample) who were aware of the toll-free number, only nine had called this number to get more information about the grant. Of these nine respondents, five received all the information they needed, and the other four respondents had found it impossible to get through.

Area	%
Urban formal	45
Urban informal	45
Rural formal	27
Rural informal	9
All	35

Table 122: Proportion of respondents who had made queries at the Department of Welfare, by area

We wanted to find out from respondents if they had made any queries about the CSG at the Department of Welfare. Just over a third (35%) said they had made some inquiries about the grant at a Department office.

- Respondents living in urban areas were much more likely to have contacted the Department to make inquiries about the grant than respondents living in rural areas
- A higher proportion of respondents living in the Northern Cape (71%) and the Western Cape (56%) said they had made inquiries at the Welfare Department about the grant
- Respondents in Gauteng (27%), the Northern Province (23%), Mpumalanga (22%), the Eastern Cape (19%) were significantly less likely to have made inquiries about the grant at the Department.

Most of the respondents who made queries at the Welfare Department (94%) received the required information. Four percent did not receive all the information they required, while the other respondents were unable to remember if they received the necessary information.

Language	%
isiXhosa	17
isiZulu	17
Afrikaans	13
Setswana	10
Sesotho	10
siSwati	8
Sepedi	6
Shangaan/Xitsonga	5
English	3
Afrikaans and isiXhosa	2
Other combinations	11

Table 123: Language of access

Respondents were asked in what language they had received information about the Child Support Grant. Respondents were allowed to choose more than one language. The largest proportion of respondents said they received information in isiXhosa (17%) and isiZulu. (17%). None of the respondents accessed information about the grant in Tshivenda or isiNdebele.

Provincial communications strategies

The national Department of Welfare's communication strategy included advertising the grant on national radio stations, as well as producing pamphlets and posters informing the public about the grant. These pamphlets and posters were made available to the provinces to distribute to their regions and districts. In addition, provinces and regions were required to develop strategies that were suitable to their context and conditions. The provincial strategy mentioned most commonly was the use of pamphlets, posters and meetings to disseminate the information.

Officials working in the Department of Welfare as well as NGO representatives were asked what they thought of the communication strategy, how they had been informed about the CSG, and how the general public had been informed. Representatives of government departments were generally more positive about the communication strategy, while representatives of organisations outside of government were less so.

A Gauteng official said that a marketing company had been hired to assist the provincial department with its communication strategy. This resulted in advertisements on railway routes (145 stations) and on 200 taxis. They also made use of community radio stations, and sent training teams to work with community structures, clinics and hospitals. This seems to have been a relatively successful strategy, since survey respondents from Gauteng were more likely to have heard about the grant from local health clinics. Gauteng officials said that there was no link with the national communication strategy, and they felt that their own efforts and approach as a province had been very successful.

An official from the Eastern Cape also said that their provincial communication strategy was very successful. They used radio messages, pamphlets and sent teams into communities to inform them about the CSG. This official felt that the strategy was a success because the number of applications was between 900 and 3000 per month. Another Eastern Cape official, however, when asked whether the strategy had worked, could only say 'more or less'. This official said that many people still did not know about the grant, especially in areas where people had no access to newspapers or other media because they were illiterate or too poor to afford them. According to this official, the CSG take-up rates remained quite low until the grants were 'projectised' in two of the regions. After this, the official claimed, the take-up rate increased.

Two of the three Western Cape officials felt that their provincial communications strategy had been a success, while the third believed that they have been able to identify particularly poverty-stricken areas, which could now be targeted. The Western Cape used local radio stations, free local newspapers and community meetings, in addition to pamphlets and posters. They also used

the Local Transformation Committees and District Transformation Committees to inform communities. One official described how community workers volunteered to help, and held meetings at community halls. This official believed that this method was particularly effective.

An official from the North West felt that the communication strategy had been about '50% successful', as they were more successful in some areas than others. The official said that they had trained social security staff in the new legislation, and used lay counsellors and help desks, social workers, community nurses and local chiefs to help disseminate information.

Officials in the Northern Cape expressed mixed feelings about the communications strategy in their province. One Northern Cape official was quite negative about the process, saying that 'no clear strategies' had been implemented. Pamphlets were distributed at pay points, but there were no meetings to explain the content of the pamphlets to communities. Officials were also reluctant to make announcements over the radio because of communities' lack of access to electronic media. Another Northern Cape official, however, said that they had used loudspeakers and pamphlets, and also made use of primary and pre-primary schools, farmers' groups, churches and the radio to inform communities.

KwaZulu-Natal officials said that there had been an extensive communication strategy in their province. This included visits by the Minister to various rural areas, involvement of staff, traditional authorities and primary health care workers. In addition to this, it was felt that the Department had recognised that its staff would not be able to give the communication strategy the attention it deserved in addition to their usual work. For this reason, two people were appointed to oversee the process of publicising the CSG, one of them with the responsibility of increase take-up rates through an efficient marketing strategy. All of the KwaZulu-Natal officials interviewed were very positive about the effect of the communication strategy, since the take-up rate of the child support grant had increased dramatically.

Officials from Mpumalanga were also positive about the communication strategy they had used, saying that the take-up rate had increased dramatically as a result. The province made use of community meetings, pamphlets, farmers' unions, school meetings, women's groups and political organisations, targeting poverty-stricken rural areas in particular. One official felt that the use of organisations was far more effective than the national department's media strategy. The effectiveness of the media strategy was especially limited in rural areas, where few people had access to media. This official felt that the role of NGOs and CBOs had been crucial.

In the Northern Province, an official said that their strategy had been very successful, and that they had seen an increase in the take-up rate since they had begun marketing the CSG. District officers went to 'most' of the villages in the province to give people information, and collected application forms at the same time. This official believed that this direct contact with people worked very well. The official also mentioned that the communication strategy developed by the regional manager in conjunction with other staff members had been very successful. Other

officials said that community meetings, pension committees, local chiefs and pamphlets in different languages had all contributed to the success of the strategy.

One official from Free State said that they had not placed much emphasis on marketing the CSG, because they expected a flood of applications and did not want to find themselves in a situation where they were unable to cope with the workload. However, other officials from the Free State described a detailed marketing strategy, including community meetings, radio advertisements and the distribution of pamphlets at pay points. Officials held meetings with NGOs, CBOs and other groups in the community, and planned with them how best to reach all sectors of the community. However, take-up rates in the Free State are still very low. According to an official from the province part of the problem is that the region is understaffed and that they are still busy with the re-registration process. It was felt that this was the main reason welfare staff in the province did not have time to deal with the marketing of the grant. The fact that the provincial strategy is dependent on regional officials for implementation has meant a lower rate of success.

NGO and CBO views of provincial communication strategies

While a few representatives of organisations outside of government were satisfied with the communication process, most said that there had been a number of problems. For example, a Black Sash (Eastern Cape) representative said that the dissemination of information had been uneven. While people close to towns had been exposed to information about the child support grant, people in rural areas were not well informed about the changes.

Operation Hunger representatives in the Northern Province and North West felt that the Department's strategy had not been successful, and consequently took it upon themselves to publicise the CSG. They implied that the relationship between department officials and NGOs was strained, and that the bureaucracy within the Department thwarted some of their efforts to disseminate information. For example, they had been told that they were not allowed to take application forms with them to communities, because the forms were 'government property'. One representative said that department officials failed to attend meetings, even when specifically invited. A representative from Operation Hunger at national level said that she had got the impression that some officials were reluctant to publicise the grant, because they were afraid that they would be unable to cope with the increased workload and demand for the grant.

Some representatives from Child Welfare expressed satisfaction with the Department's communication strategy, while others felt more could have been done. Although the Department had discussed the child support grant with Child Welfare, there was a feeling that a large media presentation should have been undertaken to help potential clients.

A Child Welfare representative said that many people heard about the grant through word of mouth, and not through an official channel of communication. Another representative said that, while posters and pamphlets were not available in all areas, and illiterate people were excluded. There should have been more meetings to help ensure no one was excluded.

Knowledge about the grant seems to be uneven across the different provinces. In some provinces officials themselves are unclear about the success of their campaign. A number of officials and representatives from the NGO sector are of the opinion that the grant needs to be publicised more effectively, and that rural areas in particular need to be better targeted. There is a feeling that handing out pamphlets or airing an advert on a radio station is not enough, and that a more interactive approach is necessary. Welfare officials have to be present to deal with the queries or uncertainties of prospective CSG applicants. There was also a suggestion that the provincial Welfare Departments should work more closely with NGOs and CBOs to publicise the grant.

Application procedure

This section examines the application procedure for the grant. In particular, we look at the documents CSG beneficiaries were required to produce when they applied for the grant, and the problems they have experienced in acquiring these documents. We examine whether the change in legislation in June 1999 had any impact on the application procedure.

When the CSG was introduced in 1998, the following official documents were required:

- The identity document of the PCG
- The identity document or birth certificate of the child
- The child's immunisation card.

Since the amendment to the legislation only the identity document of the PCG and the identity document or birth certificate of the child are required. Since this survey included beneficiaries who had applied for the grant before as well as after the change in legislation, we included documents that are no longer required as well.

What documents were you asked for?	%
Child's immunisation card	96
Identity document of the child	73
Your identity document	99
Registration of birth of the child	99

Table 124: Documents respondents were asked for

The majority of respondents had been asked for all the required documents. There were no significant area or provincial variations, except for the identity document of the child. Almost a quarter (73%) of respondents said they had been asked for the child's identity document.

- Respondents living in Gauteng (88%), the Northern Province (98%) and KwaZulu-Natal (93%) were more likely to say that they had been asked for the child's identity document, compared to respondents living in the Eastern Cape (35%) and the North West (46%)

- Respondents in informal urban areas were significantly more likely to have been asked for the child's identity document (81%) compared to respondents in formal rural areas (67%)
- There seemed to be some confusion surrounding the difference between the registration of birth of the child and the child's identity document. To apply for the grant either one of these is sufficient.

The change in legislation does not seem to have had a significant impact on whether or not respondents were asked for the child's immunisation card, although more respondents (53%) had been asked for the immunisation card prior to the change in legislation than after (48%).

Did you experience difficulties in:	Yes	No	Not required
Proving that the child's immunisation is up to date	7	90	3
Obtaining an identity document for the child	6	85	8
Getting an identity document for yourself	5	95	-
Getting the birth of the child registered	7	93	-

Table 125: Difficulties experienced when applying for the grant

We asked respondents if they experienced any difficulties in complying with the requirements and in each case, less than a tenth of respondents said they encountered some difficulty. The area or the province in which an applicant lived had no impact on whether they experienced difficulties in fulfilling any of the above requirements. However, the interviews and focus group discussions identified the lack of relevant documents as one of the major problems facing applicants. It is possible that the interviewees and the focus group participants referred primarily to case of applications that were rejected because of lack of relevant documents.

In spite of the change in legislation the identity document as well as the birth certificates of children remained problematic, because of the high incidence of home births as well as the practice of registering children only once they are ready to start school.

The campaign to issue identity documents prior to the 1999 elections helped ensure that most adults were in possession of documents, though there were reports of young mothers (under 18 years) who did not have these documents. These mothers were unable to apply for the grant and in many cases their own mothers applied instead. The small proportion (10%) of primary care givers who were not the biological mother of the child beneficiary indicates that this is not a common problem.

An NGO representative from KwaZulu-Natal said that the violence in the province had left many people without their documents. She reported that in many cases this forced young grandmothers to register their grandchildren as their own, which would cause problems for the grandmother if at a later stage she wanted to apply for a Foster Child Grant.

Child Welfare representatives from both the Northern Province and the Eastern Cape claimed that a number of officials still referred to the old criteria, and that requirements for the grant were likely to vary from office to office. An ANC Member of Parliament substantiated this by saying that there confusion among Welfare officials and social workers regarding how the State Maintenance Grant, Foster Child Grant, Care Dependency Grant and the Child Support Grant related to each other.

The case studies also indicated that many applicants experienced problems accessing the child beneficiaries' birth certificates, the primary care givers' identity documents, and the clinic card. In both cases people complained about the difficulties of getting documents from the Department of Home Affairs. Many CSG beneficiaries said that they had to wait a long time to receive their documents, travel long distances to get to the Home Affairs office and pay for transport. There was a shared feeling among applicants, officials and NGOs that Home Affairs lacked a sense of urgency when dealing with the documents that which were required to apply for the CSG.

Proof of household income

Findings regarding the application process must be treated with some caution, since they reflect respondents' subjective recollections. In the survey we enquired whether respondents were asked for proof of their household and personal income, as well as how they were asked to prove their income levels.

Area	%
Urban formal	38
Urban informal	48
Rural formal	36
Rural informal	40
All	38

Table 126: Proportion of respondents who were asked to prove household income, by area

- Over a third (38%) of respondents said they had been asked to provide proof of their household income
- Respondents in informal urban areas were significantly more likely to say that they had been asked to provide proof of their household income.
- Respondents in the Northern Province (52%) were more likely to have had to provide proof of their household income, while respondents in the Eastern Cape (14%) were least likely to have had to do that
- The change in legislation seems to have had no significant impact on whether or not a CSG applicant was asked for proof of household income.

Proof of household income	%
Official asked questions and I wrote down the answers	35
Signed a letter explaining the household income	25
Showed them a pay slip or letter from employer	16
Showed them a letter from the bank or post office	5
Other	32

Table 127: Method of proving household income

Of respondents who have been asked to prove their household income, the largest proportion (35%) said they wrote down responses to questions asked by officials, though they may responded verbally. A third (32%) of respondents said they had been asked for other forms of proof, which included signing an affidavit, presenting the husband's disability papers or death certificate, or providing proof of unemployment.

Since the change in legislation, the means test is supposed to use the personal income of the primary caregiver, rather than household income. Almost half (48%) of respondents in our survey applied for the grant after the change in legislation in June 1999. Over a third (38%) of these respondents were still asked to provide proof of their household income. CSG applicants in Mpumalanga (52%) were more likely than were applicants in any other province to be asked for their household income, even though this was no longer a requirement. This confirms that criteria for eligibility may vary between provinces. One reason why applicants are still asked for their household income may be that the application forms have remained unchanged. In addition, some officials have not been informed about the changes and were still applying the old criteria.

Proof of personal income

Area	%
Urban formal	38
Urban informal	45
Rural formal	29
Rural informal	40
All	36

Table 128: Proportion of respondents asked of proof of personal income, by area

We also asked respondents if, in the process of applying for the grant, they had been asked to provide proof of their personal income. Just over a third (36%) of respondents said that they were asked to provide this information.

- Respondents in informal urban areas (45%) were more likely to have been asked to provide proof of their personal income, compared to respondents in formal rural areas (29%)
- Respondents in the Northern Province (42%) and Gauteng (45%) were more likely to have been asked to prove their personal income, compared to respondents in the Eastern (21%) and Northern Cape (22%).

The change in legislation does not seem to have had any significant impact on whether or not respondents were asked to provide proof of their personal income.

Proof of personal income	%
Official asked questions and I wrote down the answers	34
Signed a letter explaining my income	23
Showed them a pay slip or letter from employer	21
Showed them a letter from the bank or post office	3
Other	33

Table 129: Method of proving personal income

Respondents who had been asked to provide proof of their personal income were asked how they had done that. The largest (34%) proportion of respondents said the officials asked them questions and they wrote down the answers. According to the officials interviewed, calculating the means test on personal rather than on household income was a positive move, since this is in line with how most other grants are calculated and is administratively easier to deal with.

However, knowledge of the current qualifying criteria is uneven among officials from the different provinces. A number of officials were uncertain whether the personal income of the applicant should include the income of the spouse. Some officials expressed concern about the application of the means to the joint income of both parents, since fathers often do not contribute towards the upkeep of the child, and this discriminated against married couples.

Staff attitudes

Treated by welfare officials in:	%
Helpful manner	96
Unhelpful manner	5

Table 130: Treatment of applicants by welfare staff when applying for the grant

We asked respondents how they were treated by welfare officials when they went to apply for the CSG. The majority of respondents (96%) said that welfare officials had been helpful. There were no significant area or provincial variations.

In the case studies and interviews, however, a number of criticisms of the attitudes of Welfare officials were made. Some of officials felt that the attitude of staff was problematic. There was a feeling that when members of staff were not clear about procedure and criteria, the relationship with applicants tended to be strained. In addition, staff were overworked and not always informed about issues relating to the grant. There were reports that some of these issues were being dealt with by head office through a staff training programme.

A representative of the Child Welfare office in the Eastern Cape complained officials in rural areas were not helpful, despite the greater need for the grant there. She said that if an applicant did not have the necessary documents, the officials would not assist in accessing the documents. She also felt that the high level of illiteracy in rural areas was an additional problem. In many instances officials dealing with people in this type of situation were not supportive, and there was a feeling that they often follow the law rigidly even if this results in unfairly depriving people of the grant. There were also reports of staff being antagonistic towards the introduction of the CSG, which they saw as replacing the State Maintenance Grant.

There were mixed responses about the attitudes of staff in the two case studies. A number of focus group participants in both sites expressed frustrations with at the way they were treated by staff. They felt they were not treated well and often not helped.

Sometimes these people who work in the offices become very rude, they yell at us, they are not able to explain to us nicely (beneficiary group - Monontsha).

There were also complaints about a lack of continuity at the Welfare Offices. A focus group participant had the following to say:

The problem is that whenever I go to the offices, I would find a new face. These people would tell me different things all the time (beneficiary group – Monontsha)

A number of non-beneficiaries reported that they had received no co-operation from officials at the Department of Welfare. Some had approached the department with old identity documents and could not understand why they had been turned away. Instead of being given an explanation, they were harassed and shouted at by officials. Some said they could not remember the birth dates of their children and as a result some officials lost their tempers and dismissed them:

I am an old woman. I expect to be respected and assisted by my children. I can't tolerate to be shouted at like this (non-beneficiaries focus group – Wayeni).

However, there were also positive reports about the attitudes of staff, and some respondents felt they had been treated with sensitivity and were helped by staff. A number of focus group participants were satisfied with the treatment they had received from Welfare officials, saying that officials were clear about what was required and that they eventually received the grant:

Yes they didn't mislead us, they told us exactly what was needed (beneficiary focus group - Monontsha).

We were satisfied because ultimately we did get the grant (beneficiary focus group - Monontsha).

Although the majority of survey respondents said that staff were helpful, the in-depth interviews and case studies indicate that the attitude of some staff was problematic. It is important to note that all the survey respondents were successful applicants who received the grants, and that this might have influenced their attitude towards welfare officials.

Length of process

This section examines the length of time beneficiaries had had to wait for their first CSG payment, the number of payments they had received, how long it takes them to collect their money, as well as the time and cost involved in collecting their money.

Wait	%
One month	4
Two months	18
Three months	32
Four months	24
Five months	8
Six months	6
Seven months	3
Eight months	2
Nine months	2
Thirteen months	1
Total	100

Table 131: Months waited for first CSG payment (N=1181)

- The average waiting time between the CSG application and first payment was four months
- PCGs who applied for the CSG before 6/99 had to wait an average 4.7 months for payment
- PCGs who applied after 6/99, had to wait 3.3 months on average before payment
- In all cases, three months was the most common waiting time for first payment
- More than three quarters (78%) of PCGs received their first payment within four months
- PCGs in Gauteng and Mpumalanga had the shortest average wait for the first payment (3.4 months).
- In KwaZulu-Natal, PCGs generally had to wait the longest for the first CSG payment (5 months).

Months since first CSG	Number of CSG payments received					All
	1 – 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	15+	Total	
1-6 months	95%	5%	0%	0%	100%	48
7-12 months	7%	84%	9%	1%	100%	37
13-18 months	6%	6%	79%	10%	100%	12
19-24 months	0%	6%	6%	89%	100%	3
More than two years	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	1
Total	49%	34%	12%	5%	100%	100%

Table 132: Number of CSG payments for each child, by months since first payment (N=1204)

Generally PCGs appear to have received the CSG regularly since their first payment.

How do you receive the grant?	%
Cash payment at a welfare point	73
Cash payment at a post office	12
Get deposited into my account	3
Other	11

Table 133: Manner in which grant is received

Almost three quarters (73%) of recipients collected the grant at welfare points, and only 3% of respondents had the grant deposited into their bank or savings account. This is not surprising, since only a fifth (21%) of respondents had a bank account. There were no significant provincial or area variations as to how beneficiaries received the grant.

Length of time to waiting in a queue to collect the grant	%
Less than a ¼ of an hour	11
About a ¼ of an hour	5
About ½ an hour	13
About one hour	17
Two to three hours	29
Most of the morning	11
Most of the day	13
Other	2

Table 134: Length of time it takes to collect the grant

We asked respondents how long they generally had to wait in the queue to collect their money. The largest proportion (29%) of respondents said they queued for two to three hours. Just under half (46%) of the respondents said they waited one hour or less.

- Respondents from formal (22%) and informal (28%) rural areas were more likely to wait about an hour
- Beneficiaries living in the Western Cape (31%) and Northern Cape (22%) were more likely say that they waited the shortest period of time – less than a quarter of an hour
- Respondents in the Free State (27%) were more likely to wait for most of the morning, and in KwaZulu-Natal (33%) to wait for most of the day to collect their money
- In the Northern Province (37%) respondents were more likely to wait for about an hour.

Time taken to get to the Welfare office and back	%
Less than a ¼ of an hour	31
About a ¼ of an hour	32
About ½ an hour	20
About one hour	11
Two to three hours	2
Most of the morning	3

Table 135: Time taken to collect the grant, excluding having to wait in the queue

Respondents were then asked how long it took them to get to and back from the point where they collected their money, excluding the time they waited in the queue. The majority of respondents (83%) said it took half an hour or less to get to the point where they collected their money. There were no significant provincial or area variations.

Area	Nothing	Less than R5	R5 to R9	R10 to R19	Total
Urban formal	64	25	11	1	100
Urban informal	52	25	20	3	100
Rural formal	84	6	6	3	100
Rural informal	83	7	7	3	100
All	70	18	11	2	100

Table 136: Cost involved collecting the grant

The majority (70%) of respondents said it did not cost anything to get to the pay point, since most of them walked. Eighteen percent said it cost them less than R5, while for 13% it cost more than R5 but less than R20. Respondents in formal urban areas were more likely to pay for transport to get to the pay point, while in rural areas it cost nothing to get to the pay point. There were no significant provincial differences.

Knowledge questions and comments

	%
Correct	4
Wrong	46
Don't know	51
Total	100

Table 137: How many children can you apply for? (N=979)

Only 4% (N=34) of PCGs knew that they could apply for all children under the age of seven. Ignorance did not prevent the other PCGs in the survey from receiving at least one CSG, but it raises the concern that many families on the grant may be missing out because of that.

- Forty-six percent of PCGs did not know the exact answer to this question, but did have some knowledge about certain aspects, such as the age limit
- However, more than half (51%) of PCGs simply did not know how many children they could apply for, which means they received no or inadequate information about the matter.

	%
One child only	3
Up to two children	9
Up to three children	7
Up to four children	6
Up to five children	5
Up to six children	10
Up to seven children	2
All the children you have	4
Respondent only knows age limit	1
All children under 6 years	1
All the children under 7 years	4
Don't know	51
Total	100

Table 138: For up to how many children can a primary care giver apply for a CSG?

Looking at the responses to this question in greater more detail, a large proportion of respondents had specific ideas about the number of children they could apply for. Of particular concern is that 12% of respondents thought they could only apply for one or two children. The number of respondents who thought they could apply for up to six children (10%) is also of interest, since it may indicate knowledge based on the age limit for child beneficiaries.

While the number of PCGs who displayed flawed knowledge about the number of children they could apply for is worrying, the even higher percentage of PCGs who have no knowledge of the issue makes one wonder how the dissemination of knowledge about the CSG. In interviews with officials we found that a significant number of them had scant knowledge of the conditions which applied to the CSG, and in many cases they were unable to advise applicants adequately.

	%
Yes	8
No	87
Don't know	5
Total	100

Table 139: A child of any age can receive a child support grant

Only 8% of PCGs were not aware that an age limit is applied to the CSG.

	%
No	41
Yes	52
Don't know	7
Total	100

Table 140: To receive a CSG the primary care giver has to be the child's parent

As we know, 90% of PCGs in the survey were a parent of the child, and the majority of recipients in the survey may assume that this is a precondition for receiving the grant. Two fifths (41%) of PCGs knew that this was not the case. However, if we deduct the 10% of PCGs who were not parents, and who can be assumed to have answered this question correctly, this percentage shrinks to less than a third (31%).

Just over half (51%) of respondents agreed with this statement, indicating that the requirements for the CSG have not been advertised properly. It may mean that many young PCGs are not the care givers of the beneficiary, and only register as such in order to receive the grant.

	%
Yes	55
No	26
Don't Know	20
Total	100

Table 141: A PCG can draw a pension as well as receive the CSG

Despite the fact that there were relatively few pensioners in the survey, more than half (55%) of respondents were aware that the CSG did not preclude one from receiving a pension as well. This would make it unlikely that a different member of the household registers as the PCG when in fact a grandmother provides the child care. However, since such a large proportion of respondents believed that the PCG had to be a parent, some of these respondents might simply believe that this applies to pension recipients who are also parents.

	%
R100 not enough to take care of child	43
CSG has helped	37
Seven years is not long enough	8
Difficult to apply for/receive CSG	1
Other	11
Total	100

Table 142: Comments about the CSG

When asked if they had any comment about the CSG, the main issue raised was the small amount of the grant. Two fifths (43%) of PCGs complained that R100 per month was not sufficient to provide for the child beneficiary and a significant number of them asked for the grant to be increased.

A further 37% of PCGs were grateful for the provision of the grant, and said that it had made their life easier. However, even of these a significant proportion said that the grant money was too little, but that it was still better than nothing.

A further complaint was that the age limit of seven years for the CSG was too low (8%), especially since the grant was discontinued just at the time when the child beneficiary started formal schooling with its attendant costs. Only 1% of the respondents commented on the difficulties they had had applying for or receiving the grant, but this might simply be due to the fact that the size of the CSG is of much greater concern for them.

Respondents whose answers did not fall into any of these categories mainly commented on their desire to work, and asked the government to provide them with more employment opportunities or income generating projects.

Factors that impede access to the grant

To establish the factors that prevented people from applying for the CSG, we conducted a number of in-depth interviews with various stakeholders including government officials and representatives from the NGO sector. In addition, two case studies were conducted in the Northern Province and the Free State, which included focus group discussions with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, community-based organisations and again officials from the different government departments. A number of the issues that were identified in the survey as factors that impeded access to the grant were also identified in the case studies and were raised by officials and NGO representatives. These issues will therefore not be dealt with in detail here as they have already been dealt with in the section that covers the problems experienced by CSG applicants.

Lack of documents

The lack of all the relevant documents was one of the main problems facing CSG applicants. Discussions with rejected applicants, representatives from government departments as well as representatives from the NGO sector made it clear that many respondents did not have the documents needed to apply for the grant. Some also claimed that applicants often were not aware which documents were required.

Transport

Lack of transport was another area identified by officials as being problematic. Many applicants had to travel long distances to the Welfare and the Home Affairs offices to have their applications processed. The lack of adequate public transport and the high cost involved prevented many people from applying for the grant. An official from the North West stated that most people who should be applying for the grant do not, because they have no money for transport as the majority of them are unemployed. An official from Gauteng expressed similar sentiments, saying that people living in the surrounding townships do not have money for transport and that this prevents them from applying for the grant.

Officials also reported that applicants sometimes become victims of crime. Many of the roads, especially in rural areas, were deserted and numerous incidents of crime were reported but the problem has not been solved.

The problems related to transport differ from area to area. People living in urban areas generally complained about the cost involved, whereas people living in rural areas complained about the lack of transport.

According to one official, the lack of co-ordination between the various government departments was a stumbling block and thwarted any attempt to solve this problem.

Cost incurred

A number of officials mentioned that the cost incurred in applying for the grant was preventing some people from doing so. The costs involved included travelling to the various government departments to access the relevant documents, as well as paying for these documents. An official reported that most of the applicants were unemployed and could not afford these costs. In some cases applicants were expected to make repeated trips to the Welfare offices to query the status of their application. An applicant in the Northern Province stated that she ended up paying more than R100 making these trips.

I went four times to the Welfare District office, two times to the clinic and three times to the department of Home Affairs. I spent more than R100 for travelling. I got lift from cars everyone charging different amount (Beneficiary, Wayeni)

Government officials confirmed that applicants incurred huge costs to secure the relevant documents. In addition to the required official documents applicants were often required to obtain a letter from the local chief to prove that they were residents in the area. They were often expected to pay for these letters. An official from the Northern Province mentioned that the number of immigrants from Mozambique with false documents had forced the Welfare office to adopt a very strict attitude. In some cases, this may result in innocent individuals being treated unfairly. The official regarded this as one of the factors that impeded access to the grant.

Communication

Officials generally agreed that the publicity surrounding the grants was uneven across the different provinces. Lack of resources and shortage of staff were often cited as reasons for the information not filtering down to the communities. Often officials had to service huge areas and claimed to be working under pressure. They had had limited time to publicise and explain the grant. Even in provinces that had adopted a fairly comprehensive publicity campaign, there were claims that information did not always reach far.

Officials reported that the division between the different departments hampered an effective publicity campaign. They felt that all government departments service communities in one way or another, but instead of working together they approach communities as separate departments. Resources are thus used inefficiently. They gave an example of how community health workers could play a role in informing the public about the various grants that were available.

NGO representatives were less positive and more scathing of the publicity campaign, and felt that this could account for the low take-up rates of the grant. They claimed that many people had heard about the grant through word of mouth, as confirmed by the survey findings. A publicity strategy which uses print and electronic media is likely to exclude illiterate people and those that do not have access to radio or TV. NGO representatives suggested that community meetings and having face-to-face interaction with potential applicants would be a better strategy.

Language

An official in the Northern Province complained that officials generally spoke Sepedi, while many applicants were Xitsonga speakers. This made it difficult for officials to explain the grant and often resulted in confusion about eligibility and requirements for application. The same applies to Mpumalanga, where most of the officials are again Sepedi speakers, while applicants are mainly isiNdebele, Xitsonga and siSwati speakers. One official from the Northern Cape raised the same issue. He stated that he found it difficult to interact with Setswana speakers and Afrikaans speakers since he himself spoke isiXhosa.

The group of unsuccessful applicants in the Northern Province expressed similar sentiments:

Officials explain everything in Tsonga and we do not understand them. I speak Venda and I want to understand everything so that I do not make mistakes in filling in the forms (Non-beneficiary, Wayeni)

Many applicants become disillusioned and stopped applying for the grant. Officials recognised that this was a complex issue and admitted that it was difficult to resolve, because in most provinces a number of different languages were spoken.

Long waiting period

Having to wait long periods for applications to be processed was mentioned as a problem during the focus group discussions in both Wayeni and Monontsha. Many focus group participants said they had waited for more than six months to get a response from the Welfare Department. They felt that this discouraged others from applying for the grant. They also mentioned that they had never been given the reasons that led to the rejection of their applications.

Government officials confirmed this and reported that in some cases applications take long to be approved. In some instances district officials claimed that since the applications were processed at regional or provincial level, they were unaware of applications being rejected. At the Wayeni district office, the co-ordinator was not aware of any applications that had been rejected and was surprised when he was presented with such a list. This demonstrates the disjointed nature of the management system in some provinces. According to the co-ordinator at Wayeni, the manner in which the Department functioned caused delays and discouraged people from applying.

Mention was made by a number of officials that application forms often disappeared when they are moved between the different offices. This further delayed the process and discouraged applicants.

Shortage of staff was also a factor that caused numerous delays. Regional officials stated that they were understaffed and unable to respond to thousands of applications within a short period

of time. They mentioned lack of or inadequate maintenance of resources such as computers. They stated that this caused delays, which were difficult to explain to applicants.

We are always off-line and cannot respond to applications within a required period. People should understand our position and bear with us. Again, we have a lot of applications at a time and we are very few in the office. (Welfare official, Northern Province)

One official, however, suggested a workshop for staff on work ethics, as this might change the attitude of staff and encourage them to behave in a more responsible manner.

Amount too little

An official from the Free State claimed that many people thought the amount of R100 was too low and not worth the effort of applying. He said that parents whose children were five or six years felt that it was a waste of time to apply for the grant. According to him, these were some of the factors that impeded access to the grant.

Interviews with community-based health workers (CBHWs) support these sentiments. Almost all the CBHWs interviewed said that the amount was too little. One of the CBHWs said:

What can you do with R100? It does not buy a bag of meal these days. The department should try and increase the amount if they are serious about alleviating poverty. The amount is too little for medication. It cannot even buy clothes for kids. It is high time that the government should look at this seriously and address it (Community based health worker, Gauteng)

Another CBHW stated that people refuse to apply for the grant because it is too little. She said that in the past they had referred people to the grant, but now they felt that it was a waste of time. She claimed that this was more common in the townships where people found alternative ways to raise money to survive. Most people preferred to be hawkers than to rely on the grant.

CSG beneficiaries in the focus group discussions also reported that the amount was too low. They stated that one could not rely on the grant for survival, unless the amount supplemented other income. They also indicated that most people in their community qualified for the grant, but did not apply because the amount was considered to be too low and they would only receive the money until the child reached the age of seven.

A number of officials felt that the low amount of the grant and the trouble people had to endure to apply were the real factors that impeded access to the grant. A number of people were also used to the amount they had received from the State Maintenance Grant, and the huge monetary difference between the two made the CSG less attractive. This, however, happened mostly in Gauteng, the Northern Cape, the Eastern Cape and the Western Cape.

In addition to the low amount there were complaints regarding the age limit. There was a general feeling that children cost more as they got older. There were numerous recommendations that the age limit be increased, since there would be a greater need for the grant once children attended school. The fact that the grant only covered children up to their seventh birthday was a factor that prevented some people from applying for the grant, especially considering the length of time it took for applications to be processed and for people to access all the relevant documents.

Attitude of staff

An official from Free State mentioned that the attitude of some staff intimidated applicants, and often resulted in them dropping their applications. He further stated that some officials tended to be impatient and harassed the applicants. There were accusations that some officials were not doing their jobs properly. A representative from an NGO in the Free State said:

You will find them playing cards during working hours .Again you will find them chatting with colleagues and friends instead of attending to the clients. People used to complain and that did not help. As an organisation we reported the matter to the regional office, but we got a poor response (NGO, Free State).

CSG beneficiaries as well as rejected applicants raised the same concerns during the focus group discussions. They indicated that some people were turned away and given no proper explanation. They also accused Welfare officials of being rude and harassing them. They raised this as a matter of concern and appealed to the government to resolve the matter speedily.

An official from the Eastern Cape felt that the lack of training among officials was the reason they behaved in this manner. According to him, officials who were unclear about how the grant worked tended to be less helpful to the applicants. He felt strongly that officials should be informed properly about the grant and trained in public relations. He further stated that if the matter did not receive attention, then many people would be reluctant to apply for the grant.

Lack of knowledge of the criteria / Use of old criteria

There were complaints that staff were not always aware of what the criteria for eligibility were, and that in many cases they still applied the old criteria. Some officials stated that they had not been told of the changes, and that therefore they had continued to use outdated requirements. In some cases, applicants were still expected to submit clinic cards and the means test was still being calculated on the household income rather than the personal income of the primary care giver. There was a suggestion that the old application forms be amended to avoid confusion.

CHAPTER 8: INCOME GENERATING PROJECTS (IGPs)

Prior to the amendments of the regulations in June 1999, CSG applicants had to prove that they had made some attempt to find a job, and that they had not refused to participate in an income generating project without a good reason. Given the high unemployment rate in South Africa (30-40% depending on the definition) and the difficulty of finding formal employment, setting up income generating projects has been an attempt on the part of the government to provide a form of employment, even if in many instances it is only short-term.

We asked respondents a number of questions relating to income generating projects. Although this was not included as a research objective, we nonetheless looked at this area because it is an important component of developmental social welfare, which provides the context within which the CSG and other grants are located.

Knowledge of IGPs

We asked respondents if they had heard of any income generating projects that were run by the government, by community based organisations or by non-governmental organisations.

Area	%
Urban formal	31
Urban informal	26
Rural formal	44
Rural informal	55
All	37

Table 143: Proportion of respondents with knowledge of income generating projects, by area

- Just over a third (37%) of all respondents said that they had heard about an income generating project.
- However, respondents in urban areas were significantly less likely to have heard about an income generating project than those in rural areas.
- Respondents in the Eastern Cape (61%) and Mpumalanga (57%) were more likely to have heard about such projects, compared to respondents living in KwaZulu-Natal (28%), Gauteng (26%), the Western Cape (18%) and the North West (18%).

The survey showed that very few CSG applicants had received any information about income generating projects. In interviews with representatives of provincial Departments of Welfare, we tried to establish what strategies had been used to inform CSG beneficiaries about these projects and if they had been encouraged to participate in them. A number of officials admitted that they did not inform applicants about these projects, and that one of the reasons this criterion was not

applied was the absence of viable projects to which CSG beneficiaries could be referred. Other officials said they were not aware that they were expected to encourage CSG applicants to participate in such projects. In addition, a number of interviewees claimed that they felt unable to refer applicants to projects since many of these projects were not under their jurisdiction.

We asked respondents who claimed to have heard about income generating projects where they had obtained their information.

Source of information

Where did you hear about these projects?	%
Family /friend	30
NGO/community/political organisation	20
Media	11
Welfare staff	6
Local clinic	4
Through own initiative	3
Staff from other departments	3
Combination of sources	23

Table 144: Source of information about IGPs

- The largest proportion (30%) of respondents claimed to have heard about income generating projects from friends or family members. As with information about the CSG, for many beneficiaries such interaction often appears more fruitful than official sources of information.
- Just over a fifth (23%) had heard about the projects from a combination of sources, for example from friends and the Welfare Department, the Welfare Department and the local clinic, and so on.
- Neither province nor area had any influence on the sources of information about income generating projects.

Presence of IGPs

Area	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Urban formal	47	41	12	100
Urban informal	60	35	5	100
Rural formal	45	53	2	100
Rural informal	21	77	2	100
All	44%	50%	6%	100%

Table 145: Presence of IGPs, by area

If the respondents had heard about income generating projects, we asked them if there were any of these projects in their community or area. Half (50%) of these respondents said that there were no income generating projects where they lived, while 6% did not know if there were any projects in their communities. While there were no significant provincial variations to this pattern,

- Respondents living in formal urban areas were significantly more likely to have no awareness of the existence of income generating projects in their communities (12%);
- Respondents in informal urban areas were more likely to say that there were income generating projects in their areas or community (60%), and
- Respondents in informal rural areas were significantly more likely to claim that there were no income generating projects in their area or community (77%).

Ninety percent of the respondents who knew about IGPs said that they were not involved in any of them. There were no significant variations to this response by either area or province. However, an important reason why respondents were not involved in these IGPs was probably that their skills were not suitable for those specific projects.

Registered for participation

We asked respondents who were not involved in any of the income generating projects if their name was on a list to participate in a project.

Province	%
Eastern Cape	88
Free State	97
Gauteng	94
KwaZulu-Natal	97
Mpumalanga	93
North West	96
Northern Cape	91
Northern Province	96
Western Cape	97
All	94

Table 146: Proportion of respondents whose name was not on a list for an IGP, by province

- Ninety-four percent said that their name did not appear on any list.
- The area or province in which a respondent lived had no statistically significant impact on whether or not their names appeared on a list to participate in an income-generating project.

Interest in participation

Despite the low rates of knowledge of and participation in IGPs, the majority (87%) of respondents claimed to be interested in becoming involved in income-generating projects.

Province	%
Eastern Cape	78
Free State	77
Gauteng	95
KwaZulu-Natal	87
Mpumalanga	97
North West	81
Northern Cape	82
Northern Province	92
Western Cape	91
All	87

Table 147: Proportion of respondents interested in participating in an IGP, by province

- In all provinces, the majority of respondents claimed to be interested in participating in income generating projects.
- However, respondents in Mpumalanga (97%) and Gauteng (95%) were more interested in IGP participation, compared to respondents in the Eastern Cape (78%) and the Free State (77%).
- Respondents living in informal rural areas were significantly more likely to be interested in IGP participation (96%) than respondents in any other areas.

Reasons for non-participation

We then asked respondents who had never participated in an income generating project what prevented them from becoming involved. Respondents were allowed to give any number of responses.

Reason	%
There is no project in my area	68
I haven't heard of an income generating project	52
Nothing is preventing me from participating	46
I don't have any skills that will be of use to the IGP	24
There will be no one to look after my children	15
There is nothing useful that I can do	9
Other	16

Table 148: Reasons for not participating in an income generating project

The main reason (68%) why respondents had never participated in an IGP was the fact that there were no projects in their area. This goes some way to explaining the discrepancy between the high number of respondents who expressed interest in participation and the number of respondents who are actually involved in IGPs.

Area	No project	Haven't heard	No skills	No childcare
Urban formal	66	57	16	12
Urban informal	65	61	19	24
Rural formal	68	47	34	16
Rural informal	85	37	34	15
All	68%	52%	24%	15%

Table 149: Reasons for not participating in an income generating project, by area

- In informal rural areas, the main reason (85%) for not participating in an income generating project is the absence of a project.
- Respondents in urban areas were significantly less likely to have heard of any income generating projects in their area/community (59% on average), and this prevented them from participation.
- Respondents in rural areas were more likely to claim that they could not participate in IGPs because of their lack of skills (34%).
- Respondents from informal urban areas cited the lack of childcare as a reason for not participating in income generating projects (24%).

Province	No project	Haven't heard	No skills	No childcare
Eastern Cape	70	37	37	19
Free State	61	60	18	15
Gauteng	69	56	18	7
KwaZulu-Natal	74	57	22	21
Mpumalanga	78	42	47	4
North West	64	41	11	16
Northern Cape	55	59	11	11
Northern Province	64	47	32	18
Western Cape	78	79	13	26
All	68%	52%	24%	15%

Table 150: Reason for not participating in an income generating project, by province

- Respondents in the Western Cape and Mpumalanga were most likely to say that the absence of an income generating project in their area prevented them from participating in one (78%)
- Western Cape respondents were also significantly more likely than respondents from any other province to say that the lack of childcare (26%) and the fact they had not heard of a project prevented (79%) them from participation.
- Respondents in Mpumalanga (47%), the Eastern Cape (37%), and the Northern Province (32%) were more likely say that their lack of skills prevented them from participating in an income generating project.

Conclusion

The absence of income generating projects is an obvious reason why respondents are not participating in them. However, while it may explain why this criterion was not applied in the past, the decision of the Department of Welfare to remove participation in IGPs as a requirement for the CSG should remain a short-term measure. If developmental social welfare is to succeed, the role of income generating projects is important, especially since a majority of CSG beneficiaries expressed an interest in taking part in them. The establishment of IGPs in all provinces and areas would reduce the number of people who depend mainly on state transfers and social security and offer them access to other means of support.

CHAPTER 9: RECOMMENDATIONS

- The CSG reaches a very poor population and is welcomed by most families who benefit from it. The low monetary value of the grant, however, limits the benefit to the point that many potential beneficiaries do not bother to apply for it. Consideration must be given therefore to the need to increase the value of the grant and extend it to cover poor children beyond the age of seven. Obviously, this would require a political decision involving a trade-off with other grants and budgetary items, which is beyond the brief of this study.
- Increasing the value of the grant would help in reducing the proportion of administrative costs as part of the total budget allocated to the Grant. Because of the low value of the Grant, a relatively large part of the budget is spent on the machinery used to administer it. The same machinery could be used for no additional cost to administer a bigger grant
- Interviews and focus group discussions raised issues regarding the capacity and competence of Welfare officials. To overcome these problem a training programme must be set in place to ensure that staff are familiar with the application criteria for the CSG, the definition of a PCG, the number of children a PCG can apply for, the required documents, and the correct application of the means test (using personal rather than household income). Such training should be done in conjunction with training staff in other departments (Home Affairs, Health) to ensure consistency in government approach to the grant and its requirements.
- Staff must also be trained to ensure responsiveness to the concerns raised by applicants. Many applicants see indifferent and even hostile attitudes on the part of Welfare staff as a problem. This should be addressed to ensure that applicants are not being turned away or are becoming reluctant to face the officials because of the expected negative attitudes.
- CSG application forms should be updated to include the June 1999 changes in legislation. The requirements for the application must be advertised clearly. The advertising campaign used so far should be re-assessed. In particular:
 - The use of methods appropriate to inform poor communities with high levels of illiteracy and limited access to electronic media must be investigated
 - Emphasis should be placed on direct contact with communities likely to access the grant
 - Closer co-operation with NGOs and CBOs to inform the public about the grant
- Income generating projects form an important strategy in poverty alleviation. Successful as well as unsuccessful applicants for the CSG should be informed about their existence and referred to them in order to be able to supplement their income. The link between and information about grant applications and other funding sources must be established clearly as part of an inter-departmental strategy (involving Welfare, Labour, Trade and Industry, etc.)
- The SOCPEN database should be updated to provide more accurate, comprehensive and user-friendly information and all past and present grant recipients should be included on the system in order to monitor their progress. Research to evaluate the administration of the grants and find solutions to problems that arise may be needed on a regular basis, to identify problems and develop appropriate strategies.
- More research needs to be undertaken into rejected applications – presently there is insufficient information on the numbers of rejected applicants and reasons for their rejection.

APPENDIX A: CASE STUDY REPORT (QWAQWA, FREE STATE)

Background and methodology

The study involved 18 in-depth interviews with community members, representatives of community-based organisations and government departments, and other community stakeholders, and four focus group discussions in Monontsha. All interviews and focus group discussions were conducted in the language of the respondents. Three of the focus group discussions were held with CSG beneficiaries, and the fourth was held with people who had applied for the CSG but were still awaiting the outcome of their application. Recruiting focus group participants was very difficult, since the SOCPEN data from which the addresses were extracted was extremely unreliable. As a result, most of the focus group participants had to be recruited at pay points. It proved impossible to recruit unsuccessful applicants, as there were no records of these people at the local Welfare office (applications were processed in Bloemfontein).

The district of Monontsha in the Free State consists of six villages that are approximately 15 kilometres apart from one another. Community structures in the region have remained largely unchanged since 1994. The majority of chiefs and the individuals occupying top positions in the various structures are men. Most come from one family and allegations of nepotism are rife.

Monontsha combines urban and rural characteristics. Most dwellings are traditional mud huts, but there are also brick houses and shacks. The majority of people in the area do not have electricity. Communal taps are used by most people, except for the few who can afford paying R20 a month to have piped water delivered to their homes. Each of the villages has a satellite clinic, shops and schools. There are, however, no government offices in any of the villages that make up Monontsha. People must travel to Phuthaditjaba, approximately 50 kilometres away, for other services.

There are few formal jobs in the area except for a small number of clothing factories, many of which closed down in the last few years. The people who work in the remaining factories are mainly young to middle-aged women, who earn between R200 and R300 a month. Most employees at the factories live in constant fear of being dismissed. They nevertheless continue to work under these conditions, since the prospect of finding other forms of employment are slim.

The job prospects for men in the area are even more limited. Men largely depend on piecework offered by farmers. They get these jobs by waiting outside the Department of Labour office, which serves as a pickup point for casual labour. There are numerous complaints about exploitation by farmers, who pay between R150 and R300 a month, and sometimes fire workers without pay.

The crime rate in the area is high. This has been attributed to the high level of unemployment. Young men seemed to have developed a reputation of stealing anything from telephone equipment to clothing and livestock, and even from their grandparents. One woman said that:

A lot of men pretend that they are mad, because they are running away from responsibility and because they cannot find jobs so they cannot face their families. They are also hungry so they would rather pick food from the rubbish bins. They are not mad, it is poverty (beneficiary group).

According to the chief councillor of Monontsha, there is a high level of literacy in the area because of the number of schools built by the previous government. However, a number of people complained that they could not afford to send their children to school. Those who managed to complete matric did not have the money to continue their education further.

Profile of CSG beneficiaries and applicants

Beneficiaries in this area are made up of grandmothers, middle-aged single mothers, teenage mothers and married women whose spouses are unemployed. Some of the single mothers said they were unaware of the whereabouts of the fathers of the children.

The majority of primary care givers (PCGs) did not have any means of income except for the CSG, though pensioners received grants. A number of the pensioners said they also sold fruits and vegetables, but that this did not provide much income. People in the area generally live in extended families. The only source of income for most of these families is the grandmother's old age pension. General living conditions in the area are poor. It is common for large families of four to six members to live in two-roomed mud houses. A number of people said they often went to bed without having had anything to eat.

Conditions under which the CSG is being delivered

Problems experienced by the applicants.

A number of applicants expressed frustration with the manner in which their applications were handled. They often had to wait in long queues, sometimes spending up to two days there. Applications took between two and three months to process. Many Welfare officials attributed the problems to computers being down for most of the week, as well as to staff shortages at the Welfare office. Some CSG applicants reported that although their applications had been successful, they were unable to collect their money for three months (due to work obligations), the grant was cancelled and they were then forced to re-apply.

Some applicants in the focus groups expressed frustration at the way they were treated by Welfare staff, which often was quite unhelpful:

Sometimes these people who work in the offices become very rude, they yell at us, they are not able to explain to us nicely (beneficiary group).

Some focus group participants complained about frequent changes in staff at the Welfare Offices, and that they received conflicting information as a result:

With me the problem is that whenever I go to the offices, I would find a new face. These people would tell me different things all the time (beneficiary group).

However, a fair proportion of focus group participants was satisfied with the treatment they received from the Welfare officials. They said that the officials were quite clear about what was required and that they eventually received the grant:

They didn't mislead us, they told us exactly what was needed (beneficiary group).

We were satisfied, because ultimately we did get the grant (beneficiary group)

Having the relevant documentation was a problem for many people. Informants said that many children in the area did not have birth certificates, clinic cards or identity documents. People complained about the service they received at the Department of Home Affairs. Most applicants welcomed the change in legislation that specified that they now no longer required a clinic card and proof of having applied for private maintenance. A number of applicants said they did not have clinic cards for their children, and that having to apply for maintenance from the father of the children was a painful process. Some explained that it was virtually impossible:

I had a problem when they said I have to ask for maintenance from the father. I told them how could I claim when I don't know where the father is? (non-beneficiary group).

Many focus group participants said they had been asked to show proof of employment. Some expressed surprise at this, as they believed – correctly – that being employed was not a criterion:

When I went there to apply, the people who work there told me that they only want people who are employed. So that's when I went to Phuthaditjaba because there were no vacancies at the firms. They said that I couldn't just sit and wait for their money without doing anything for myself, I must also try to make ends meet (beneficiary group).

With me, I was surprised when one of the officers from the office told me that they only assist people who are working, and if you are not working they cannot assist you (beneficiary group).

Showing willingness to participate in an income generating project was a criterion prior to the change in legislation in June 1999. It is not clear if officials or beneficiaries were being confused here between employment and willingness to participate in an income generating project.

Both the Department of Welfare and the Department of Home Affairs have offices in Phuthaditjaba. Transport to these offices presented a problem, especially for people living in mountainous villages. In some of these areas, buses only run three times a week and the fares are quite high. Many people mentioned that they had to make numerous trips to the Welfare Department and Home Affairs, because often they were not assisted on their first visit and had to return on another day. They were also forced to visit these offices regularly to check on the status of their applications. They complained about the cost involved in making these numerous trips. A Welfare official suggested that:

There should be a mobile unit so that people from Pitseng could be attended to. These people have a bus going there only three times a week and some of them don't even have the money to come to this office (welfare official).

Problems experienced by officials

Officials complained of an overall lack of resources. They said that a new computer system had been installed but was not fully functioning yet. Staff at the QwaQwa office had to share two cars. This caused particular problems for the public relations officer who has to go to different villages to publicise the grant. Officials requested a mobile unit to travel to areas from which people were unable to come due to distance, lack of money or transport. Staff felt that not having access to these resources hampered their ability to perform their tasks well.

The premises of the Welfare office are very small and unable to accommodate the large numbers of people who require its services. Often people are forced to queue outside in sun or rain.

Most of the officials complained about the shortage of staff. A number of staff members were retrenched in 1998 and none of them has been replaced. With the implementation of the CSG the workload of the office has increased, while the number of staff has decreased.

Officials said that the re-registration process for the disability grant and the old age pension had affected the time it took CSG applications to be processed. There were numerous complaints of re-registration being a painful and time-consuming process for both officials and applicants.

Some officials expressed unhappiness about the three-month waiting period applicants had to endure after submitting their application forms. The officials in QwaQwa recommended that application forms be processed locally, rather than in Bloemfontein, to cut down on the waiting period. They felt that mistakes would be more easily rectified if the applications were processed locally, and thus save people the need to re-apply and start the process from scratch.

Having to check applicants' income level posed a big problem for some officials. Officials reported that employers often felt government was spying on them, probably because they were underpaying their employees. Because employers were unwilling to provide employees with documentation indicating their income, officials were forced to rely on CSG applicants to disclose their income. This, they realised, opened the door to fraud.

A number of officials complained that applicants were not aware of the process involved in and requirements of applying for the grant. Since applicants were mostly older and illiterate people, it took a long time to explain the application process repeatedly to them.

Some officials welcomed the June 1999 change in legislation, saying that it had had a positive impact on the take-up rates of the grant. They nevertheless felt that requiring a birth certificate for the child created a problem and hampered access to the grant. Many people still had 'homeland' documents, which were not recognised under current regulations.

A number of social workers, however, were not pleased that the clinic card was no longer a requirement. They said that by scrapping the clinic card, many people would not recognise that immunising their children was important.

Factors that impede access to the grant

A number of factors impeded access to the grant according to CSG beneficiaries. People with children older than five but younger than seven felt that it was not worth going through all the trouble for a grant that was low and would be discontinued once the child reached the age of seven. Other factors that impeded access to the grant were the lack of proper documentation, the cost involved in travelling long distances to access these documents, and the length of time it took to process the documents.

Lack of knowledge of the grant was identified as one of the main reasons why people eligible for the grant were not applying for it.

The means test

Many welfare officials perceived the means test as a way to ensure that only people who deserved the grant actually received it, by disqualifying those earning a decent salary. There were, however, a few officials who felt that the means test was a waste of energy in an area like QwaQwa where a majority of people were unemployed and had no other source of income.

Even though most officials were supportive of the concept of the means test, they were not sure whether the correct target was being reached. They were particularly concerned about applicants who qualified in terms of the means test, but did not receive the grant because their children were older than six years.

The role of the CSG in household income

According to most CSG beneficiaries, the grant played an important role in the household's income. Many stressed that although the grant was meant for the child, it was used for the entire family, since in most cases households had no other source of income.

We buy food, so the problem is that we also have children who are not beneficiaries of this grant. They are still our dependants, and they need to eat as well. So this money is not sufficient to cater for the needs of all these children (beneficiary group).

As is evident in the quote above, beneficiaries complained that the R100 they received from the CSG was too little to support one child, let alone an entire family. However, many felt that in spite of this the money helped to buy some food for the household, and minimised the reliance on handouts. A number of the beneficiaries reported that they used the money for their school-going children, rather than for the younger children.

Some women in the focus groups said that often money received from the grant was used to buy medication. They said that although treatment at clinics was free, parents were forced to use private doctors since clinics were ill-equipped and did not have the necessary medication.

An official expressed dissatisfaction with what a grant of such a small size could achieve:

Alleviating poverty means attaining a better standard of living. R100 will never play such a role, even if the child was the only one considered. People remain poor and remain living in very questionable conditions even in the midst of a R100 (Welfare official).

The concept of Primary Care Giver

The focus group discussions, as well as the in-depth interviews, highlighted disagreements regarding the term Primary Care Giver. Some participants used the term to refer to the person who took care of and provided for the child. In many cases, they said, it was the grandmother who performed this function, often with the help of her old age pension. Other people thought the term referred to the biological mother, irrespective of who took care of the child.

Officials tended to have a 'by the book' view of the concept. One official explained that a primary care giver was a person who took care of the child for at least six hours a day. Officials pointed out problems with implementing the concept, as in where the grandmothers were unable to get permission to apply for the grant from the parents of the child, especially fathers. These fathers would then apply for the CSG and keep the grant for themselves. They also mentioned a few cases of mothers applying for the grant and then moving off to the city, leaving the grandmother to provide for the child, thus highlighting loopholes in the definition of the concept.

Communications strategies

According to the Welfare officials, a range of communication strategies had been employed. These included the use of radio, distribution of pamphlets and posters, meetings with communities as well as informing school principals and village chiefs.

Most of the focus group participants said they heard about the grant on a local radio station. However, other than the people who were already receiving the grant, many people in the community are probably unaware of the grant. Despite reports from Welfare officials that they contacted most of the relevant people, including all the schools and churches, two principals who were interviewed said they had never heard about the grant. A nursing sister at a local clinic also did not know about the grant. The chief of Monontsha had only been informed about the grant at the time of the case study, and had yet to call a meeting to inform his community.

Conclusion

PCGs in the area generally were grandmothers, middle-aged single mothers, teenage mother as well as mothers whose partners were unemployed. The majority of PCGs claimed to have no other source of income, and often the CSG was used to sustain entire families.

The inefficient Welfare administrative system, the lack of relevant documents, the attitude of staff and the lack of transport were some of the problems identified by beneficiaries as well as applicants who were still awaiting the outcome of their application. Welfare staff in the area felt that lack of human and material resources, the re-registration process, and the applicants' lack of knowledge were some of the major problems they had to deal with.

The low take-up rates of the grant in the area of study could be due to the following:

- Lack of relevant documents
- Cost involved in travelling long distances to process the grant
- Length of time it takes to receive payment
- The seven year age limit of the child beneficiary
- Lack of awareness of the grant.

APPENDIX B: CASE STUDY REPORT (WAYENI, NORTHERN PROVINCE)

Background and methodology

The case study used material from 17 in-depth interviews with representatives of community structures and government institutions, as well as four focus group discussions, two with CSG beneficiaries and two with rejected applicants (referred to below as ‘non-beneficiaries’.) All interviews and focus group discussions were conducted in the language of the respondents.

Take-up rates of the CSG have been very uneven across the different provinces, and most provinces have not reached the targets set at national level. However, the Northern Province has been characterised by a high rate, and Wayeni was chosen as a case study site to try and establish the reasons for this rate, and its social impact.

Description of site

Wayeni is a village in the Hlanganani district of the former Gazankulu homeland. The community consists of about 600 families. According to the local chief, people at Wayeni were forcibly removed by the apartheid government from their original land, where most of them used to be subsistence farmers, and given a small plot of land for each family on which to build their homes. These plots cannot produce enough food to meet their needs, let alone have a surplus to sell. The main source of employment, as a result, has been work on (white-owned) farms and factories in the area. However, there are not nearly enough jobs for everyone and even those able to find work earn very low wages. With wages averaging R300 per month it is difficult for many families to support themselves.

The community consists mainly of women, old people and others who are unable to find work in the towns and mines in the Northern Province or beyond. Many of the men are working – or looking for work – in Gauteng.

The village has one school that covers learners from grade 1 to grade 7. There are no pre-schools. When learners have completed grade 7 and wish to continue, they are forced to travel approximately 40km to the next village.

The Wayeni community is divided into two conflicting groups, one supporting the chief while the other does not. Young men and women in particular belong to a civic association, which opposes the establishment of tribal offices. They would prefer to be governed in the same way as people staying in the townships. One of them said:

There is a lot of nepotism in the chiefs' kraal. He is a dictator. We want someone who will negotiate rather than impose issues on the community. These are some of the old institutions that have to be eradicated (member of a civic organisation).

Profile of CSG beneficiaries and applicants

All the CSG applicants, both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, are women. Applicants include middle-aged single mothers, teenage mothers and grandmothers. A number of the teenage mothers are at school. Many of the older single mothers work on farms where they earn low wages averaging R300 a month. One stated that the wage is scarcely enough to buy groceries, let alone other necessities. The unemployed, including the pensioners, depend largely on food they manage to grow on their small plots.

Conditions under which the CSG is being delivered

This section discusses the problems experienced by applicants and officials with the current conditions under which the grant is being delivered.

Problems experienced by applicants

Lack of transport is one of the major problems experienced by Wayeni residents. The Welfare District office is situated at Bongeni, which is approximately 40km away. There is no regular public transport, and people have to walk the entire distance. The road is dangerous and difficult and a number of rape cases of women have been reported. One of the women said:

The bad thing about it is that I had to wake up at 02h00 because there is no transport and there are many people coming for the grant (beneficiary group).

Applicants said that they experienced problems in acquiring the documents needed for the grant. When the grant was introduced, applicants had to produce proof of household income, clinic cards and (if married) the identity document of their spouse. Some applicants reported that their partners (who live in the same village but do not share the household) refused to give them their identity documents, suspecting that they might be taken to the maintenance office.

Applicants who did not have an identity document and the birth certificate of the child had difficulties getting these documents from the Department of Home Affairs. Many of them did not have the money to travel to Bongeni and experienced long delays in having their applications processed.

Applicants had problems with having to establish the household income because other people living in the household often did not want to disclose their earnings. Most of the applicants were unaware of the change in legislation, which asks for the personal income of the primary care giver rather than for the household income. However, in the case of a married couple the income

of both partners is still required. This was a problem because husbands frequently were reluctant to tell their wives how much they earn.

A number of focus group participants also complained of the time and cost it took them to get a required letter from the tribal authority proving that they were residents of Wayeni.

Documents such as identity documents, birth certificates and so on have to be photocopied and certified so that applicants can give copies to Welfare. To do that applicants have to travel to Elim, which is approximately 30 kilometers away. This is inconvenient and expensive. A number of CSG beneficiaries also complained about the Welfare Department losing their application forms. Thus a process that would take three months under normal circumstances is prolonged even further. It also means that applicants must continuously visit the Welfare office to find out the status of their applications. The absence of telephones and electricity makes the task of communicating with the Welfare District office all the more difficult.

Non-beneficiaries complained about the treatment received from government officials at the Departments of Home Affairs and of Welfare. Some used old identity documents and could not understand why they were turned away. They felt they were owed a proper explanation, but were instead harassed and shouted at by officials. Some said they could not remember the birth dates of their children, and as a result officials lost their tempers and dismissed them:

I am an old woman. I expect to be respected and assisted by my children. I can't tolerate to be shouted at like this (non-beneficiaries group).

Applicants also reported that nepotism was a problem among officials. They said that Welfare officials used their own discretion in approving applications, giving preferential treatment to their relatives. They quoted examples where applications from working professionals and from well-to-do families had been approved. One example involved a teacher and another a nursing sister. A non-beneficiary said:

I don't understand why people working for the government get the grant. Those people are working and we are not working. They should not get the money at all (non-beneficiaries group)

Problems experienced by officials

Local government officials complained that they did not have sufficient resources to perform their day-to-day tasks. At the Hlanganani district office there is no computer or a photocopier and typewriters are used for government correspondence. Officials at the provincial office, which is better equipped, are much more effective. Hlanganani staff felt strongly that if computers were installed they would be able to serve the community better, and without them their ability to speed up the process and provide a good service would continue to be hampered.

Most of the applicants' forms must be made in triplicate. Government officials have to travel approximately 40km to their regional office in Thohoyandou for photocopying, and this is time consuming, costly and inconvenient. Welfare officials have applied for a mobile office to address some of these problems as well as problems faced by applicants. They reported that co-operation from their regional office was not forthcoming as yet.

The regional office at Thohoyandou is unable readily to produce statistics on the uptake of the CSG. Staff at the Hlanganani district office felt that a proper management information system would greatly enhance the ability of both the regional office and the district office to deliver a better service to their clients.

Several welfare officials mentioned a breakdown in communication between the regional and the district office. They stated that often they received their information from the provincial office:

We thought the regional office would update us on current development with regard to the CSG, but instead we get more help from the provincial office. The regional office is competing rather than working with us (District Official).

A number of officials from the Department of Welfare complained about the lack of co-operation between the different government departments in the area. For example, Welfare officials reported that they sent CSG beneficiaries to participate in the income generating projects initiated by the Department of Agriculture. Most of these people were turned away, because the projects already had enough people. The informant said that issues such as this could not be addressed, and that a forum for joint planning should be introduced.

Proper training and co-ordination was needed before the CSG was introduced, since officials had been understaffed and unable to manage their workload even before the introduction of the CSG, and the workload has increased substantially since then. They claim they are forced to work after hours and over weekends, in order to process all the applications that they receive.

Officials also said they did not always have easy access to communities in order to disseminate information because of the need to get permission from the local chief, which was not always granted. This complicated matters, as many applicants could not be made aware of requirements and the process involved in applying for the CSG. Having to explain the process to people took up time and delayed the process even further. Officials also spoke about the problems they encountered with applicants who did not have the required documents, and were unwilling to realise that this made it impossible for officials to process their applications.

Particular problems emerged with CSG beneficiaries working on farms. Many farmers do not release their workers to collect the payments regularly. Instead, they are released only every three to four months. A number of such beneficiaries have never turned up for payment since approval, as a result, and attempts to negotiate with farmers have proved fruitless.

The means test

Government officials were aware of what the means test entailed. They regarded it as appropriate instrument in assessing eligibility for the grant. They said that the test helped to establish who the most deserving people were. However, some officials claimed that the test was not succeeding in combating fraud, since applicants could cheat in order to qualify for the grant.

The role of the CSG in the household income

Most CSG beneficiaries stated that the grant played an important role in alleviating poverty, and helped them in buying basic necessities (food, groceries, etc). One of the women in the group described her situation in the following way:

To me there are great changes because the money that I was receiving from begging was very small to look after my child. After receiving this R100 I am able to buy food and clothes for my child (beneficiary focus group).

Another focus group participant said:

I fetch wood from the bushes and sell them to my community and I am telling you this is a very difficult job because sometimes I stay in the bushes for the whole day and collecting is a very hard job indeed. Things became better after receiving money from the government (beneficiary focus group)

Most of the focus group participants claimed that the money they received from the CSG was used to support the entire family. Many said that the money was used to buy food, clothes and pay school fees.

I don't even open it until I get home. I sit down with my children's father and we decide on what to do with it together. He really leaves everything up to me. I have to decide on buying things like salt, sugar, washing powder, etc. I buy all the groceries and with the little change that I get, I buy relish or a loaf of bread so that they eat in the morning when they go to school (beneficiary focus group).

CSG beneficiaries said that they had organised a meeting to discuss ways of supplementing their income, and to address the fact that the CSG would be discontinued once their children reached the age of seven. They explained that these discussions were still in the initial stages.

The concept of Primary Care Giver

The term Primary Care Giver is understood differently by the various stakeholders and members of the community. Most CSG applicants understand the concept to refer to the mother of the child, rather than the person who is primarily responsible for the well-being of the child. Most people in the area are under the impression that the CSG should be paid to the mother of the

child, even if the mother is not the person who takes care of the child. For example, a number of applicants at Wayeni are not staying with their children but rather on the farms where they work. In addition, the school principal said that many of his students were CSG beneficiaries and that on pay day his school is disrupted because many of his students leave to collect their CSG money.

Communication strategies developed by the department

The district co-ordinator at Hlanganani District reported that communication strategies have been designed and are being implemented jointly with the provincial and regional staff personnel. The strategies adopted by Welfare officials in this area included:

- Design of posters and their placement at strategic points
- Pamphlets in local languages
- Presentations at schools and local churches
- Door-to-door information campaign
- Liaising with various community-based organisations
- Use of traditional structures, for example involving the local chiefs.

Applicants as well as representatives of community-based structures reported that the existence of the Child Support Grant had been well advertised in their community. This could account for the high take-up rate. However, applicants claimed that they had not been given sufficient information about the requirements for application, and that they had been turned away for not producing the relevant documents.

Conclusion

The beneficiaries in this area tend to be grandmothers, middle-aged single mothers, and teenage mothers. A number of these women were unemployed, and those who had some form of employment earned very low wages. All the CSG beneficiaries said that the grant was used for the benefit of the entire household, and not just to support the child for which it was received.

Applicants identified the lack of relevant documents, lack of transport, the welfare administrative system and staff attitudes, as problems they experienced when applying for the grant. Welfare officials cited as problems the lack of resources, lack of communication and co-operation between the various departments and within the Department of Welfare, and lack of training.

Wayeni has relatively high take-up rates of the CSG. According to various community members, this high rate can be attributed to the effective communication strategy that has been adopted in this area, as well as the commitment of staff working in the Welfare Department. There was also a feeling that the change in legislation has helped increase the rates.

APPENDIX C: THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY BASED HEALTH WORKERS

Introduction

A total of eleven in-depth interviews were conducted with community based health workers (CBHWs). All interviewees were volunteers. They worked for various NGOs in KwaZulu-Natal, Gauteng and the Northern Province. Financial compensation for these volunteers was often dependent on the availability of funding at the organisations with which they were associated.

The CBHWs described their jobs as educating the community about issues such as HIV/AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases, family planning, nutrition, hygiene and other health related issues. They also helped people in their community to gain skill in income generation (for example, gardening or sewing), and visited schools to identify problems of malnutrition and to supply malnourished children with food parcels.

Problems experienced

The most pressing problem CBHWs reported was poverty and unemployment in communities. Malnutrition and other related problems were also common. Moreover, there were complaints about a number of children not attending pre-school. This was because parents, or in many cases grandmothers, with whom these children lived, were unable to afford school fees.

CBHWs from KwaZulu-Natal and the Northern Province claimed that a number of children in their communities had been orphaned through the death of both parents from AIDS or AIDS-related illnesses. Because of the high levels of poverty in these areas, relatives and other community members proved reluctant to take care of these children, and they had been abandoned.

Knowledge of and involvement with the CSG

Apart from two CBHWs from the Northern Province, all CBHWs claimed to have some knowledge of the CSG. However, most of them admitted that they did not completely understand all the issues relating to the grant. The CBHWs had heard about the grant from a variety of sources, including the organisations they worked with, welfare officials, and members of their communities.

The involvement of CBHWs with the grant included informing the public about it, and making potential beneficiaries aware of the application requirements. A number of these health workers said that they accompanied people to the welfare offices, to help them with the grant application.

“I took an old lady to the Rissik Street welfare because she didn’t seem to understand what to do.” (Community based health worker, Gauteng)

In addition to making information about the grant available to the public, CBHWs also said it was part of their role to educate recipients how to use the grant, for instance for the benefit of the child. One health worker said that it was their job to educate people about all government grants, and the CSG was merely one of them.

Problems encountered regarding the CSG

Documentation

Some health workers reported that people trying to access the CSG were faced with the problem of lack of correct documentation. This was especially the case with birth certificates and identity documents. The CBHWs felt that it took applicants much longer to apply for these documents once the children were older. There were also reports that mothers were not able to apply because they were too young to have identity documents.

“Some of these mothers are young girls of 13 to 14 years who do not even have ID books so they struggle to get the grant.” (CBHW, KwaZulu-Natal)

“The documentation is a serious problem because these young girls dump their children with grandmothers without any documents, so where are the grannies supposed to get the documents from?” (CBHW, Gauteng)

Staff attitudes

A number of CBHWs accused staff from the Departments of Welfare and of Home Affairs of having a negative attitude towards their clients. There was even an allegation that some staff in KwaZulu-Natal demanded money to speed up the application process. To speed up the processing of the grant:

“They [applicants] pay R5 upwards, depending on what they can afford. The poor people are being treated badly, compared to those who can afford. If you are poor you are being disregarded” (CBHW, KwaZulu-Natal)

The same health worker mentioned that applicants in KwaZulu-Natal were required to have two passport photos before their CSG applications would be considered. These photos cost R10 and this was a serious problem for some applicants, who could not afford to pay and were turned away. It is not clear what these photos were used for, but they are not a requirement for the grant.

Waiting periods

According to the CBHWs, people had to wait a long time for their grant to be approved, and many of them lost hope of ever being paid. One CBHW had the following to say:

“I know one lady who applied for a grant and had to wait for a year and six months and then she got R600. I know because I once went with her while she was busy going to and from the offices with no hope. Another lady waited for eight months and got R300” (CBHW, Gauteng)

Applicants had to visit the welfare offices repeatedly to check on the status of their grant applications, and also to visit different departments to sort out their documents. These trips cost money, often resulting in applicants having to borrow money for this purpose:

“By the time they get the grant they have [borrowed] so much credit that when they have to pay nothing is left of the R100” (CBHW, KwaZulu-Natal)

The role of CSG in poverty alleviation

Most of the CBHWs said that the CSG money is generally used to provide for the entire family, and is spent on primarily on food, education and clothing. Some CBHWs expressed concern that young mothers were not using the money appropriately. They claimed that these mothers tended to buy clothing for themselves and tended to support their boyfriends rather than the child.

All the health workers agreed that the R100 which CSG beneficiaries receive is not enough to alleviate poverty, but that it brought some relief to the households that receive it. A community health worker from Gauteng said:

“One of my clients saved this money to buy her own shack.” (CBHW, Gauteng)

Who should be targeted for the CSG?

According to some health workers, children who have been orphaned and their care givers should be targeted. When asked why these people were not applying for the Foster Child Grant, a health worker said that she was unaware of this grant and thought that this was probably the case for many other people.

Most of the CBHWs felt that the age limit should be raised because children become more expensive as they grow older and parents have to start paying for their education. One CBHW though, felt that the target was correct since children needed good nutrition when they are young.

A health worker from KwaZulu-Natal suggested that the poorest of the poor, meaning people without any means of support, should also be considered, even if they do not have any children younger than 7 years:

“There are families that are poverty stricken, who do not have food to eat and do not have a child that can qualify. Those people should be targeted too” (CBHW, KwaZulu-Natal)

“The poorest of the poor are not being reached, people who have money to travel to and from the offices, and who can afford to pay the officers are the ones who eventually get the money. This also goes with affordability, if you cannot afford to give an officer some money it means your application might not be considered.” (CBHW, KwaZulu-Natal)

There was no consensus among the CBHWs whether the correct target was being reached. Some felt that the right target group was being reached since a lot of people were receiving the grant (although many others were not aware of it). Others felt that the correct target was not being reached because the primary care givers, who were often grandmothers, were not getting the grant; rather, ‘irresponsible’ mothers, and young schoolgirls were collecting the grant money.

The concept of Primary Care Giver

Until recently, most CBHWs were under the impression that only mothers could be regarded as PCGs. They claimed that officials and the public had a similar understanding. Very few were aware that all primary care givers could apply for the grant:

I never knew that people who are not biological parents can apply, I only heard about that recently (CBHW, Gauteng). I understand now that the grannies can apply (CBHW, Gauteng).

A number of CBHWs said they did not trust young mothers because they felt these mothers abused the grant, and left the children with the grandmothers who should be the ones receiving the grant:

I do not trust these mothers at all. They abuse the grant, but with the grandmothers, they are always there to maintain their grandchildren. I think the money should be given to them (CBHW, Gauteng). Other people do not deserve the money because they open clothing accounts (CBHW, Gauteng).

Other CBHWs said that many mothers were taking care of the children, but fathers were less likely to be primary care givers of the children:

A lot of mothers are now taking care of their children (CBHW, Gauteng). I am really happy because I see lots of changes when I go into those houses. It shows that the mothers are doing something with the money (CBHW, Gauteng)

The CBHWs had very little information about rejected applicants. Most CBHWs indicated that they knew people were being turned away if they did not have the required documents. Some reported knowing people who had been rejected, but they were not sure for what reasons.

APPENDIX D: ANALYSIS OF SOCPEN DATA

The SOCPEN database is incomplete and contains numerous inaccuracies and inconsistencies. It has therefore been difficult to conduct meaningful analysis on this data, and to a large extent it has not been possible to integrate the SOCPEN data with the survey data. A few basic demographic trends contained in the database are summarised below.

	Frequency	Percent
Eastern Cape	29912	16
Free State	9769	5
Gauteng	31727	17
KZN	36468	20
Mpumulanga	15702	9
Northern Cape	7404	4
Northern Province	30670	17
North West	14642	8
Western Cape	7229	4
Total	183523	100

Table 151: Adult beneficiaries, by province

According to the SOCPEN database, there are currently 183,523 adult CSG beneficiaries. The majority of these beneficiaries are in KwaZulu-Natal, Gauteng, Northern Province and Eastern Cape. The uptake for the grant is much lower in Western Cape, Northern Cape and Free State. This is not entirely unexpected, since the Western Cape and Northern Cape have had a substantial uptake of the State Maintenance Grant. Some of the reasons for the lower uptake in the Free State are discussed in the body of the report.

	Percent
Male	1
Female	99
Total	100

Table 152: Sex of adult beneficiaries

Nationally, almost all primary care givers are female, with only one percent of adult beneficiaries being male.

	Male	Female	Total
Eastern Cape	3%	97%	100%
Free State	2%	98%	100%
Gauteng	1%	99%	100%
KZN	1%	99%	100%
Mpumulanga	1%	99%	100%
Northern Cape	1%	99%	100%
Northern Province	1%	99%	100%
North West	1%	99%	100%
Western Cape	1%	99%	100%
All	1%	99%	100%

Table 153: Sex of beneficiaries, by province

The proportion of male adult beneficiaries is low in each of the provinces, with the Eastern Cape and Free State having the largest proportion of male PCG's.

Province	Average
Eastern Cape	6.5
Free State	4.7
Gauteng	5.1
KZN	6.0
Mpumulanga	6.1
Northern Cape	5.4
Northern Province	6.4
North West	6.2
Western Cape	4.9

Table 154: Average number of household members, per province

The average CSG household contains 5.8 people. Some provinces, such as Western Cape and Free State have smaller households, while households in the Eastern Cape, Northern Province and North-West are significantly larger than households in other provinces.

Province	Percent
Eastern Cape	36
Free State	32
Gauteng	32
KZN	35
Mpumulanga	33
Northern Cape	34
Northern Province	31
North West	34
Western Cape	33

Table 155: Average age of adult beneficiaries, by province

The average age of adult beneficiaries ranges from 31 in Northern Province to 36 in Eastern Cape.

Child beneficiaries	Sum	%
Number of own children for CSG	213960	96%
Number of other children for CSG	9815	4%
Total number of CSG beneficiaries	223775	100%

Table 156: Child beneficiaries of the CSG

SOCPEN distinguishes between child beneficiaries who are the biological offspring of the primary care giver, and those who are not. The database reflects that almost all child beneficiaries are the biological offspring of the PCG, with only 4% of CSG beneficiaries being children other than the biological offspring.

Province	Percent
Eastern Cape	2.2%
Free State	3.1%
Gauteng	2.5%
KZN	9.6%
Mpumulanga	5.1%
Northern Cape	12.3%
Northern Province	0.4%
North West	9.3%
Western Cape	2.2%
Total	4.6%

Table 157: Proportion of non-biological child beneficiaries per PCG, by province

The proportion of non-biological child beneficiaries showed slight provincial variations, with the Northern Cape, KZN and the North-West having the largest proportion of child beneficiaries who are not the biological children of the PCG. In the Northern Province almost all the child beneficiaries are the biological children of the PCG.

Province	# of child beneficiaries	Average # of children per adult beneficiary
Eastern Cape	41533	1.4
Free State	10972	1.1
Gauteng	34480	1.1
KZN	46058	1.3
Mpumulanga	19590	1.2
Northern Cape	8600	1.2
Northern Province	37446	1.2
North West	17514	1.2
Western Cape	7582	1.0
Total	223775	1.2

Table 158: Average number of child beneficiaries per adult beneficiary, by province

The majority of PCGs (71%) have only one child beneficiary and a further 21% have 2 child beneficiaries. The Eastern Cape and KZN have the largest number of child beneficiaries per PCG, with an average number of children per adult beneficiary of 1.4 and 1.3 respectively.

APPENDIX E: LIST OF IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

	Name	Department / organisation	Position
1	Rehana Ali	National Department of Welfare	National co-ordinator of child support
2	Trudi Thomas	ANC member of parliament	Chair of public participation
3	Celiwe Cewu	Black Sash (Grahamstown)	Case worker
4	Josephine	Legal Resource Centre (Johannesburg)	Paralegal worker on State Grants
5	Boitumelo Seabe	Rural Women's Movement	Welfare co-ordinator
6	Marie Therese Naidoo	Black Sash (Durban)	Welfare Case Worker
7	Liz Clarke	Office of the Premier (KwaZulu Natal)	Poverty reduction and Gender equality
8	Hazel Alexandra	Department of social services (Gauteng)	Assistant Director
9	A. Grobelaar	Social Service & Population Development	Assistant Director (Gauteng)
10	Pumla Madlingosi	Black Sash (East London)	Case Worker
11	Farhana Williams	Social Welfare & Population Development	Administrative Officer (Northern Cape)
12	Lerato Modise	Social Services & Population Development	Assistant Director (Northern Cape)
13	Simon Wonga	Welfare and Social Security	Administrative Officer (Northern Cape)
14	R. Khahlienyane	Department of Welfare (Free State)	Head of Social Security
15	Mr. Sewela	Welfare (Northern Province)	Regional Manager
16	Richard Sekonya	Operation Hunger (Northern Province)	Co-ordinator
17	Felicity Gibbs	Operation Hunger	National Manager
18	Lebogang Bogopa	Operation Hunger (North West)	Co-ordinator
19	Pricilla	Child Welfare (Johannesburg)	Supervisor
20	Julie Todd	Child Welfare (Pietermaritzburg)	Director
21	Annelie van Rooyen	Child Welfare (North West)	Senior Area Manager
22	Evelyn Skosana	Child Welfare (Free State)	Senior Area Manager
23	Dr. Groenewald	Child Welfare (Northern Cape)	Senior Area Manager
24	Linda Smith	Child Welfare (Gauteng)	Regional Director
25	Tia Wessels	Child Welfare (Eastern Cape)	Regional Director
26	Mrs. N. Sofika	Health and Welfare (Eastern Cape)	Deputy Director
27	Mrs. Tywadi	Welfare and Social Security	Assistant Director (Eastern Cape)
28	Mrs. Mayor	Social Security (Eastern Cape)	Administrative Officer
29	Pearl Mhlongo	Health and Welfare (Northern Province)	Co-ordinator
30	Walter Segooa	Health and Welfare (Northern Province)	Communication Officer
31	Mr. Monama	Social Security (Northern Province)	Regional Manager
32	van Staden	Welfare (North West)	Acting Director (Social Security)
33	Trudie Fourie	Welfare (Free State)	Assistant Director
34	Isaac Ntho	Welfare (Free State)	Communication Officer
35	Mr. Jordan	Social Security (Free State)	Head of the Department
36	Mr. Nkosi	Social Welfare & Population Development	Co-ordinator (KwaZulu-Natal)
37	Diane Dunkerly	Social Welfare & Population Development	Deputy Director (KwaZulu-Natal)
38	Pumie Manqele	Welfare (KwaZulu-Natal)	Project manager
39	Mr. Zungu	Social Security (KwaZulu-Natal)	District Supervisor
40	Gladys Banda	Social Service & Population Development	Assistant Director (Mpumalanga)
41	Mr. E. Mahlalela	Social Service & Population Development	District manager (Mpumalanga)
42	Andre Brink	Health and Social Services	Assistant Director (Western Cape)
43	Ms. Daniels	Social Services (Western Cape)	Administrative Clerk
44	Mr. Biscombe	Welfare and Social Security	Head of department (Western Cape)
45	Mr. Millar	Welfare (Western Cape-George)	Senior Administrative Officer
46	Stephen Selesele	Social Services, Arts, Culture & Sports	Assistant Director (Northern Cape)
47	Goodwill Shipalana	Health and Welfare	Co-ordinator (Northern Province)
48	Bernard Momezulu	Welfare (Gauteng)	Chief administrative Clerk
49	Pinky Rabotapi	Welfare (Free State)	Community Liaison Officer

REFERENCES

Alderman, H.: *Information as an input into food and nutrition policy formation* (Pretoria, Welfare Department).

Budow, M.: *Research report: A review of the law and practice of the maintenance of children in South Africa* (Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand, 1994).

Committee for restructuring of social security (1996).

Freedom Charter (Kliptown, 1955).

Gray, M.: *Towards an understanding of developmental social work* (University of Natal, Department of social work, 1996).

Haarmann, C.: *A contribution towards a new family support system in South Africa* (University of the Western Cape, 1996).

Haarmann, C.: *The role of a community fund as a means of enhancing the new child support grant system in South Africa: Analysing the policy context and process and the case for an involvement of civil society in developmental social welfare* (University of Western Cape, 1998).

“Harare Declaration.” *ANC Political School: History Reader* (Johannesburg, 1998).

Kruger, J.: *Social security in the context of the human development framework* (University of Port Elizabeth, 1994).

Liebenberg, S. and Tilly, A.: *Poverty and social security in South Africa* (University of the Western Cape, 1998).

Loffell, J.: *Children and social security* (1995).

Lund committee report for child and family support (Durban, 1996).

Lund committee for child and family support – minutes (1996).

Lund Committee: *Child and family support – linkages between different forms of provision, weaknesses and gaps in the system, and potentials* (1996).

Lund, F., Ardington, S. and Harber, M.: *Welfare*.

- Mazibuko, F.N.M.: *Transforming the social welfare system in South Africa* (1995).
- Martins, J.H. and Maritz, M.E.: *Minimum and supplemented living levels in the main and other selected urban areas of the RSA* (Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1999).
- Midley, J.: *The developmental perspective in social welfare: Transcending residual and institutional models* (Louisiana: Louisiana State University, 1996).
- Midley, J.: *International social work: Learning from the Third world* (National Association of social workers, 1990).
- Neilson, D. and Gray, M.: *Integrating social development into child welfare services* (1997).
- NPA Sectoral Committee: *National Plan of Action for children* (Pretoria: Department of Welfare).
- Olivier, M.: *Some Trends and Critical issues in South African social security* (Centre for international and comparative labour law, Rand Afrikaans University, 1998).
- Orkin, F.M.: *Women and Men in South Africa* (Pretoria: Central Statistical Services, 1998).
- South African Institute of Race Relations' survey. 1997/8: *Bird's Eye View* (Braamfontein, 1998).
- South African Labour Bulletin* Volume 24 (2000).
- South African NGO Coalition: *Development update – Quarterly Journal of the SANGOCO*.
- South African NGO Coalition: *SANGOCO submission to the portfolio committee hearings on the Lund report* (1997).
- Thamm, M.: *Winning the maintenance war* (1996).
- The Black Sash Trust: *Annual report* (1999).
- The child health policy group of the child health unit: *Child Health Unit* (Cape Town: University of Cape Town, 1995).
- Van der Berg, S.: *Social security and the alleviation of poverty* (Department of Economics, University of Stellenbosch, 1994).

Van der Berg, S.: *South Africa after apartheid: A welfare state in the making* (Department of Economics, University of Stellenbosch, 1997).

Van Esterik, P.: *Care, caregiving, and Caregivers* (1995).

Voster, J., Rossouw, H., Raubenheimer, W. and Muler, G.: *State Maintenance Grants and Coloured households in the Western Cape* (Department of Sociology, University of Stellenbosch, 1996).

Voster, J. and Rossouw, H.: *Transforming state support for children and families in South Africa: single mother households footing the bill?* (University of Stellenbosch, 1997).

UNICEF South Africa: *Children in especially difficult circumstances programme plan of operation* (1997).

White Paper for Social Welfare (Pretoria: Department of Welfare, 1997).