

Changing patterns of South African income distribution: Towards time series estimates of distribution and poverty¹

*Paper to the Conference of the Economic Society of South Africa,
Stellenbosch, 17-19 September 2003*

Servaas van der Berg & Megan Louw

Department of Economics
University of Stellenbosch
E:mail: SvdB@sun.ac.za; MeganLouw@yahoo.com

Abstract:

Research on income distribution in South Africa has, for obvious reasons, focused on inter-racial (inter-group) income distribution. Quite dramatic changes have occurred in inter-racial income distribution patterns since the 1970s, with the black share of income rising for the first time and at times exceeding the rise in their population share. This implies a narrowing inter-racial income gap.

Data on income distribution remain scarce, so that it remains difficult to obtain the full picture about changes in income distribution. In particular, widening inequality within the black population has received much attention. Rises in black unemployment and in black wages have had inequality-inducing effects on black incomes. Is maldistribution of income between races now making way for maldistribution of income within race groups? Put differently, is inequality shifting from inter-group to intra-group inequality (from between group to within group inequality)?

This paper pieces together information from various sources of data (censuses, household surveys, marketing surveys, published wage data series, etc.) to inform estimates of inter- and intra-group distribution over a longer time frame, in an effort to improve analysis of income inequality and poverty trends. These income distribution patterns also have considerable implications for the growth and evolution of the South African consumer market.

INTRODUCTION

The heated debate about trends in post-transition racial distribution of income, inequality and poverty has been fed by different perspectives on the policy path followed by the new government, particularly regarding its economic and distributive policies. Unfortunately, this debate has floundered because of uncertain trends in post-transition income, mainly for reasons of poor quality of information. This can be related to the fact that much of our distribution data comes from surveys and censuses, which are in many respects poor information sources – they take place only intermittently, there is poor comparability between different surveys and censuses, the data is subject to long time lags before it becomes available, and results are usually

¹ Acknowledgement: This paper is part of a larger research project on Inequality and Social mobility in South Africa, funded in part by the NRF.

incompatible with National Accounts trends or are not made to be compatible with National Accounts by those who interpret it.

One of the main areas of contention regarding post-transition trends relates to whether poverty has increased or decreased. Confusion was fed by the release of the IES2000 (the Income and Expenditure Survey 2000 conducted by Statistics South Africa) and in particular by a publication by Statistics South Africa (StatsSA 2002) comparing the results of this survey with the IES1995. This comparison concluded that income in South Africa has been declining in real terms between 1995 and 2000 – contrary to all national accounts and demographic statistics also compiled by StatsSA –, that racial income distribution has worsened and that poverty has substantially increased. However, Statistics South Africa has since admitted that this survey is not comparable with the IES1995.²

Despite the uncertainty surrounding analysis of recent trends in poverty, a move towards increasing inequality overall and particularly within the black population group has been noted by several authors. Whiteford and Van Seventer (2000:19) find that from 1991 to 1996 the incomes of the poorest 40 percent of black households dropped by more than 20 per cent, while the wealthiest 10 percent of black households experienced increases in income of almost the same magnitude. They explain this in terms of changing employment patterns: white employment showed the largest decline during the period, and, while black employment figures also reflected a downward trend, there was a rise in the number of blacks employed in skilled jobs coupled with increasing per capita wages for this group of workers. In light of the fact that wages are currently responsible for approximately two thirds of the variation in household income, it is unsurprising that the highest level of inequality per population group is emerging amongst blacks (Leibbrandt, Woolard & Bhorat 2000: 40, 48). Whiteford and Van Seventer (2000: 28) estimate that a striking 67 per cent of overall inequality in South Africa is due to within group dispersion of income. A fairly static level of overall earnings inequality therefore masks this phenomenon of increasing intra-racial inequality, countered by declining inter-racial earnings variation (Moll 2000).

² Those working on the IES2000 have found it to be an exceedingly poor data set, with evidence of sloppy work both in the gathering and in the management of data. For instance, grain expenditure is double counted in total food expenditure and in total expenditure. About 25% of records are useless for many purposes, for instance because recorded food expenditure is zero, or because total expenditure and total income differ (after allowing for savings and dissaving) by more than 30%.

This paper attempts to provide alternative estimates of income distribution in South Africa, utilizing data that allows us to compare income distribution across time, reducing dependence on the vagaries of surveys. In particular, we shall attempt to arrive at racial distribution data as well as data on inequality within race groups, which we then combine to arrive at estimates of overall poverty from 1970 to 2000. However, data for the last few years of this period is suspected to be less reliable than that for the earlier part, thus we purposely choose conservative assumptions to arrive at our estimates for this period so that we can be fairly certain that these estimates are worst case estimates of poverty trends after 1995.

The paper is set out as follows:


- in the next section we discuss the methodology in broad terms;
- thereafter we look at the results of applying this methodology in terms of the inter-racial (*between group*) distribution of income;
- then we apply the intra-racial (*within group*) distribution data to the inter-racial distribution data sets, in order to arrive at overall estimates of inequality and poverty;
- next we discuss the trends in poverty as derived from our data, whilst continually also pointing out the deficiencies and uncertainties in this data; and finally
- in our conclusion we provide some comments about underlying trends ascertainable from these estimates and what these imply for the income distribution debate.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology utilized here consists in the main of decomposing current income from the national accounts into its three major components; estimating the racial distribution and trends therein for these components from alternative sources of information, applying data for distributions within race groups obtained intermittently through censuses and surveys to these results, and then interpolating or forecasting for the rest of the period.

Current income, the concept closest to the former personal income used in the National Accounts, consists of three major components, viz. remuneration, state transfers and income from property.³ Figure 1 shows the composition of current income from 1970 to the year 2000, from which it is evident that the share of income from property has risen substantially after 1980, mainly at the expense of remuneration income. There has been growth in real per capita income and in each of these components since 1970, and substantial growth since the mid-1990s.

³ There are also some minor components, but these are so small that they can safely be ignored for present purposes and just subsumed under income from property.

Figure 1:

ESTIMATING INTER-RACIAL (BETWEEN GROUP) DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME

The method we follow for arriving at inter-racial income distribution estimates – decomposing current income into its three major components and analysing trends in each of these – has earlier been utilised by Van der Berg (1986; 1987; 1989a & b) for forecasting inter-racial income distribution.


To estimate the racial distribution of remuneration, we turn to two sets of data from official sources. The first relates to the distribution of formal employment by race contained in the Standardised Employment Series, available only up to 1996.⁴ Combining this with average wages paid to the different groups allows us to derive the distribution of remuneration income by race group by simply multiplying employment and relative wages for each group and applying the proportions of the total obtained in this manner for each race group to total remuneration income (compensation) in the National Accounts data. However, wage movements in the primary and non-primary sector differed somewhat in the 1970s, due to the effect of strong mining unions and gold price movements on unskilled mining wages. Furthermore, from 1984 on racial wage levels in the primary sector were no longer published. For these reasons we separated primary from non-primary remuneration. Using the sectoral decomposition of the remuneration component of current income kindly provided by the SA Reserve Bank, we

⁴ This series was originally drawn up by Roukens de Lange and Van Eeghen (1984; 1990) for the Institute of Futures Studies at the University of Stellenbosch, and then later updated and published by Statistics South Africa. Klaasen & Woolard (19xxx) provide a good overview of the sources of employment and unemployment statistics and are quite critical of the Standardised Employment Series. However, it was clearly the best source for our purposes as it provides consistent and racially decomposed estimates of formal employment, which we require for estimating the distribution of remuneration income or labour compensation.

calculated the distribution of both primary and non-primary remuneration separately in the manner described above. From 1984 onwards, however, we assumed that relative wage movements (rather than levels) by race in the non-primary sectors were mirrored in the primary sector. Estimates beyond 1996 are based on a combination of extending trends and various bits of official data containing race-based information, including the various October Household Surveys and Labour Force Surveys. Incompatibility in the methods and definitions used, however, make these surveys a far from ideal source for comparison purposes, as others researchers have already documented (e.g. Borat 2003a)

Our results for remuneration, i.e. the wage bill, are set out in Figure 2. It is apparent that black remuneration has been increasing throughout this period, whilst visually it is not equally clear that the same has applied to other groups.

Figure 2:




The distribution of transfer income was obtained from data on social grants (social pensions, disability grants, child grants, etc.) collected by the Department of Social Development and its predecessors. Again, little racial data is available after the mid-90s, but utilizing the various surveys and a study on fiscal incidence for 1993 to 1997 (Van der Berg 2001) provided enough information to arrive at figures which probably fairly reflect the distribution of transfers across race groups.


Income from property is the most difficult of the three components to derive from the available data sets. We used intermittent surveys by the Bureau for Market Research from the mid-70s to the mid-1980s as well as data from the various StatsSA surveys for more recent periods to estimate racial shares of the distribution of this component of current income and interpolate and forecast these shares for the years for which we do not have direct information. Nevertheless, there is greater uncertainty after 1996. Our estimates, if anything, probably tend to underestimate the black share of income from this source.

These estimates of the inter-racial distribution of the three components of current income make it possible to derive estimates of the distribution of all current income. Figure 3 shows the share of blacks, the largest but also poorest race group, in the total population, all the components of current income, and current income itself. In the case of social transfers, means tested targeting has now ensured that blacks get more than their population share of social grant spending, even before full implementation of the child support grant. But blacks have a far smaller share in remuneration and particularly property income, even though in both these cases the share is rising. Overall, the black income share closely tracked their share in remuneration, which is quite understandable, given the preponderance of the latter in overall current income and the fact that remuneration carries an even larger share in black incomes. But even with conservative assumptions regarding black gains from property income, the non-remuneration components of black income rose substantially over the period from 17% to 30% of all black incomes.

In 1971, Spandau (1971: 185) could still write that "The main distinguishable feature of the distribution of income by race is its relative constancy during the 35 year period 1924/25 to 1960." Indeed, this stability in racial income shares continued until about 1970, despite a rapidly rising black share in population. However, the data below shows that the black share of income has approximately doubled since, bringing an end to a period of mainly widening income inequality between whites and blacks.

Figure 3:

It is now possible to compare these inter-racial income distribution estimates to data obtained from various surveys and censuses by a large variety of authors (most of these are summarised in Borat & Van der Berg 1999 & Leibbrandt, Van der Berg & Borat 2001). Figure 4 shows the relative per capita income of blacks as a percentage of white levels, a measure of the income gap between the two largest race groups. It is apparent that the IES1995 is quite inconsistent with other survey or census based estimates around this date. Fitting a trend line – a second order polynomial – through these estimates shows a moderately upward trend in relative black per capita incomes, a trend that may have further moderated during the latter part of the 1990s. Alarm about the recent evolution of poverty and inequality referred to earlier was based largely upon comparison of the IES1995 and the IES2000, but these two surveys do not appear to be comparable. Moreover, only 83% of current income in the National Accounts was captured in the IES2000 versus well above 95% in IES1995, thus leading to even more misleading conclusions regarding the path of poverty in this period.

Figure 4:

Our own estimates show less upward movement in relative per capita income of blacks over this latter part of the period under consideration, but these may be an under-estimate, for reasons discussed below. These estimates show a slightly smaller race gap than estimates based on surveys and censuses – particularly earlier in the period–, which conforms with known evidence of survey underreporting of incomes and expenditures of the poor. Even though our estimated relative black income levels may be somewhat too high, however, the trend derived from our data is both compatible with and also more stable than the intermittent evidence largely derived from household surveys and censuses.

However, our estimates do suffer from some known deficiencies:


- As explained above, the post-1996 data that we used was less dependable in various respects than earlier data, mainly because of the discontinuation of certain data series pertaining to racial wage and employment data after 1996.
- Our black employment estimates for this period are highly conservative: They are based on SA Reserve Bank data on employment trends in mining and the non-primary sectors respectively, implying job-losses of more than half a million outside of agriculture, whilst for agriculture we assume a continuation of the trend of the previous five years. Borat (2003a, 2003b), for one, has been very critical of these official employment figures, and indeed StatsSA survey data shows an employment increase outside agriculture of more than 400 000 over the same period (see Devey, Skinner & Valodia 2003: Table 1, p.4).

- Moreover, to be on the conservative side in our estimates of redistribution, we assumed that most employment losses affected blacks rather than other groups.
- The rising black share of property income shown in Figure 4 above probably underestimates the actual trend, due to factors such as black empowerment deals and preferential procurement policies that favoured black entrepreneurs and probably accelerated black access to income earning opportunities of this sort.

Because our data per definition add up to the national accounts magnitudes, the magnitudes of the incomes measured are not as vulnerable to the vagaries associated with survey data as the individual surveys are themselves, usually published or interpreted as they are without adjustment for compatibility with national accounts magnitudes.⁵ As real per capita current incomes have been rising strongly, at 1.8% per annum since 1995, stagnation in black per capita incomes would have required a substantial worsening of inter-racial income distribution – something our estimates, based on conservative assumptions, have shown to be unlikely.

Indeed, Figure 5 confirms a continued though modest rise in black per capita incomes. We can conclude with little fear of contradiction, that black incomes have not regressed between the mid-90s and the year 2000 in real per capita terms, and on the available evidence we have confidence that our estimates are not overly optimistic regarding the path of black per capita incomes.

⁵ See Deaton (2003) for a discussion of how household surveys almost always show much less consumption or consumption growth than national accounts data, implying that this undercount increases over time. This means increasing inaccuracy of household surveys and very limited scope for using surveys for comparison of time trends.

Figure 5:

Interestingly, Table 1 shows that the income per capita of all race groups has been growing more rapidly than the national average – an arithmetical quirk brought about by the fact that the poorest race group (blacks) has been experiencing a relative population increase, dragging down average incomes.

Table 1: Estimates of income and its components, per capita income and population by race, various years

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
Remuneration							
Blacks	R41 957m	R69 760m	R91 541m	R109 287m	R131 737m	R158 813m	R177 326m
Coloureds	R15 528m	R18 479m	R20 593m	R25 510m	R31 145m	R37 628m	R45 163m
Indians	R4 900m	R6 512m	R8 401m	R10 826m	R13 163m	R16 601m	R20 069m
Whites	R111 135m	R137 728m	R146 794m	R166 952m	R168 535m	R163 861m	R180 832m
Total	R173 519m	R232 480m	R267 329m	R312 574m	R344 581m	R376 904m	R423 390m
Transfers from government							
Blacks	R1 574m	R4 301m	R5 623m	R9 215m	R16 014m	R20 079m	R25 228m
Coloureds	R1 077m	R1 249m	R1 458m	R1 860m	R2 690m	R2 959m	R2 832m
Indians	R286m	R332m	R388m	R494m	R715m	R588m	R598m
Whites	R4 379m	R5 195m	R4 464m	R4 430m	R3 500m	R1 855m	R1 222m
Total	R7 316m	R11 077m	R11 932m	R15 999m	R22 919m	R25 483m	R29 880m
Income from property							
Blacks	R6 922m	R8 621m	R10 968m	R14 052m	R22 878m	R33 401m	R49 517m
Coloureds	R908m	R1 271m	R1 803m	R2 066m	R2 948m	R3 830m	R5 115m
Indians	R1 112m	R1 516m	R2 103m	R2 314m	R3 302m	R4 290m	R5 729m
Whites	R36 450m	R46 356m	R60 246m	R64 224m	R88 800m	R111 694m	R144 253m
Total	R45 392m	R57 765m	R75 120m	R82 656m	R117 929m	R153 215m	R204 614m
All income							
Blacks	R50 454m	R82 683m	R108 131m	R132 553m	R170 630m	R212 294m	R252 071m
Coloureds	R17 513m	R20 999m	R23 854m	R29 436m	R36 784m	R44 417m	R53 111m
Indians	R6 298m	R8 361m	R10 892m	R13 635m	R17 181m	R21 480m	R26 396m
Whites	R151 963m	R189 279m	R211 504m	R235 605m	R260 835m	R277 411m	R326 307m
Total	R226 228m	R301 321m	R354 381m	R411 230m	R485 429m	R555 601m	R657 884m
Per capita income							
Blacks	R 3 134	R 4 479	R 5 107	R 5 423	R 6 008	R 6 704	R 7 283
Coloureds	R 8 184	R 8 630	R 8 822	R 9 855	R 11 404	R 12 722	R 14 126
Indians	R 9 595	R 11 244	R 13 296	R 15 113	R 17 637	R 20 592	R 23 938
Whites	R 39 217	R 44 242	R 46 670	R 48 370	R 51 951	R 53 840	R 62 360
Total	R 9 936	R 11 626	R 12 125	R 12 385	R 12 903	R 13 436	R 14 716
Population ('000)							
Blacks	16 097.1	18 462.1	21 171.8	24 442.7	28 401.3	31 665.7	34 609.6
Coloureds	2 140.0	2 433.4	2 704.0	2 986.9	3 225.5	3 491.3	3 759.8
Indians	656.4	743.6	819.2	902.2	974.1	1 043.1	1 102.7
Whites	3 874.9	4 278.3	4 531.9	4 870.9	5 020.8	5 152.5	5 232.6
Total	22 768.4	25 917.4	29 226.0	33 202.7	37 621.7	41 352.6	44 704.6

Table 2: Growth of total income, population and per capita income by race, 1970-2000

	Annual growth rate			
	1970-80	1980-90	1990-2000	1970-2000
All income (2000 R'm)				
Blacks	7.9%	4.7%	4.0%	5.5%
Coloureds	3.1%	4.4%	3.7%	3.8%
Indians	5.6%	4.7%	4.4%	4.9%
Whites	3.4%	2.1%	2.3%	2.6%
Total	4.6%	3.2%	3.1%	3.6%
Per capita income				
Blacks	5.0%	1.6%	1.9%	2.9%
Coloureds	0.8%	2.6%	2.2%	1.8%
Indians	3.3%	2.9%	3.1%	3.1%
Whites	1.8%	1.1%	1.8%	1.6%
Total	2.0%	0.6%	1.3%	1.3%
Population				
Blacks	2.8%	3.0%	2.0%	2.6%
Coloureds	2.4%	1.8%	1.5%	1.9%
Indians	2.2%	1.7%	1.2%	1.7%
Whites	1.6%	1.0%	0.4%	1.0%
Total	2.5%	2.6%	1.7%	2.3%

It is necessarily more difficult to obtain accurate estimates for the smaller groups, and therefore not too much confidence should be placed in the accuracy of our estimates for coloureds and particularly Indians. Nevertheless, the broad forces at work seem to be well reflected in the estimates shown here.

The fact that the incomes of all race groups have grown does not, however, address the issue of whether poverty has increased. This may well be possible despite such per capita growth, if inequality has worsened dramatically.

ESTIMATING INTRA-RACIAL (WITHIN GROUP) DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME

Having obtained estimates of inter-racial distribution of income, we now also require intra-racial distribution data at the individual level to estimate the overall distribution of income.⁶ Because such distributions are slow moving, we can use distribution data from the limited number of surveys and censuses and linearly interpolate from these the intra-group distribution estimates

⁶ Distribution data is often expressed in terms of the distribution of households. However, this procedure hides much of the underlying distributional shifts where household size changes. For instance, the interesting comparisons of Whiteford & Van Seventer (2000) of income distribution in the censuses of 1991 and 1996 lose much of their usefulness because household size was largely ignored in their analysis, despite the fact that they found average household size to have declined by 7% between the two datasets. This change in household size is unlikely to be distributed equally across different race and income groups, thus invalidating much of their conclusions as to trends in inequality.

for other years. We used data from various BMR surveys, as also utilized by McGrath and the Urban Foundation, as well as the more recent Income and Expenditure Surveys, usually linked to the October Household Surveys, and the Saldrú Survey. However, rather than accepting the survey means for these distributions, we use our inter-group estimates, for the reasons already mentioned in the introduction, namely that comparability of these means is severely constrained by various quirks in survey design and sampling as well as varying quality of field work. In spite of these limitations, such surveys give us the best possible source of information on intra-group distribution.

Prior to the mid-90s, official data sources must be augmented by information collected by organisations outside of government. To construct the 1975 income distribution, census data pertaining to whites, coloureds and Asians was combined with data for blacks contained in various Bureau of Market Research (BMR) reports, following McGrath's (1983) approach. Given the limited coverage of the black population by the BMR (particularly in rural areas outside of the homelands), the estimates provided for this group are less reliable than one would like them to be. Population estimates provided by Simkins (1983) were used for 1975 and then adjusted to be in line with a consistent set of population calculations provided by the BMR for the entire period under study (Sadie 1993; Van Aardt & Van Tonder 1999). Two qualifications to the usefulness of datasets constructed in this manner must be noted: the varying definitions of income across surveys, and the differing income recipient units surveyed (the BMR collects data for households, while the census data relates to families).

The method used to obtain the intra-group distribution is quite simple. We take the frequency distributions of per capita income of all individuals (allocating per capita household income to all individuals in a household) as derived from the surveys, convert the intervals to a log scale, and then fit Gaussian kernel density functions with a half-bandwidth of 0.40 to this data.⁷ This implicitly assumes a lognormal distribution function as the most likely functional form for the data – indeed the function most often fitted to income distribution datasets. This follows the method used by Sala-i-Martin (2002a; 2002b) in two important studies published under the auspices of the NBER. He estimated world distribution of income for each year over a period by summing across distributions derived for different countries, after applying Gaussian kernel density fits to quintile distributions of income obtained from survey data by country.

⁷ A kernel density function is used to smooth a histogram, in this case of the distribution of individuals across income intervals on a log scale. In his analysis of world income distribution, Sala-i-Martin (xxx) employs a half-bandwidth of 0.35 (his unit of analysis is also the log of income), whilst Moll (2000), analysing South African wage data, applies a slightly greater level of smoothing by using a half-bandwidth of 0.4, the same level as ours.

We shift the cumulative density curves derived from the kernel density functions by adjusting the means of these distributions to the mean income per race group that we had estimated earlier. Once we obtain these distribution curves for each of the racial groups, they are weighted by population size and summed across racial groups to arrive at the aggregate distribution of the population in each income interval. At this point, the various poverty and inequality measures can be applied to better analyse the data.⁸

Table 4, and the more summarised Table 3, show the estimates we derived of the distribution of income or, where indicated, expenditure, based mainly on survey and census data. For the 1975 estimates, broken down by various region-type or household type before they were aggregated, we followed as far as possible the methodology employed by McGrath (1983). BMR data for samples of black households in formerly white rural areas, metropolitan areas and homelands was considered representative of the income distribution throughout those regions, and mapped onto the regional population estimates provided by Simkins (1983), excluding blacks in metropolitan areas for whom the population estimate was calculated as a residual.⁹ In the case of whites, coloureds and Asians, census data for 1970 was projected forwards, allowing for growth in population consistent with the annual estimates provided by the BMR as well as growth in real per capita incomes. As we required deciles composed of equal numbers of individuals rather than households, we also had to estimate household size in those cases where such data was not provided in the original published secondary data sources. Here we used the relationships (expressed in a simple linear regression) between household income and size as contained in other similar datasets to estimate household size.

Note from the data that the estimates obtained for intra-group inequality show a fair degree of consistency, as reflected in the Gini coefficients in Table 3, derived from the various sources. It is unfortunately not possible to distinguish what part of the differences in the Gini coefficients result from real shifts in distribution and what part is measurement error. However, as income distribution is slow moving, we can probably discard the 1996 census¹⁰ as a data source providing comparable data, and the same probably applies to the 1993 expenditure data from the

⁸ We use Stata 7 for fitting of the Gaussian kernels the Stata programme, whilst for the analyses of the poverty and inequality trends we made limited use of the programme DAD, a dedicated poverty analysis programme freely made available by the University of Laval in Canada.

⁹ No data for blacks in towns was available, so it was assumed that these households received 20 per cent less income than black households in metropolitan areas (given a finding to this effect in BMR Report 65, and the fact that the average household sizes across these regions were similar), assuming the same distributional shape.


¹⁰ Woolard (2001: 40) notes that there was a major undercount of the white population group in this census.

LSDS survey. For 1985, our black income distribution does not include the rural farm population outside homelands, but as the individual components for various region types seemed suspect, we discarded the 1985 data in any event.¹¹ The other data sources are, however, relatively similar in both the magnitude of the Gini coefficients and the shape of the distribution curves (see for instance the Lorenz curves for blacks in Figure 6), thus we accept them as a basis for our further estimates.

Table 3: Gini coefficients estimated from various surveys and censuses for intra-group distribution (income or expenditure per capita)

	Blacks	Coloureds	Indians	Whites
1970	..	0.53	0.42	0.43
1975	0.49
1993	0.56	0.47	0.50	0.47
1993 (expenditure)	0.48	0.44	0.42	0.38
1995	0.57	0.52	0.49	0.47
1995 (expenditure)	0.58	0.52	0.49	0.47
1996	0.68	0.57	0.53	0.52
2000	0.59	0.55	0.51	0.49

Figure 6:



The 1993, 1995 and 2000 surveys show a very similar pattern of within group distribution, with the possible exception of the coloured estimate for 1993.

¹¹ For instance, the Gini for the black non-farm population was 0.49 in 1975 and had risen to 0.61 by 1985. If these estimates were true, black inequality severely increased from 1975 to 1985, then dropped substantially by 1993, and thereafter again increased. This seems highly unlikely. Thus the 1985 data were not used, leading to a smoother and more usual path of black inequality growth from 1975 to 1993 that was then continued into the 1990s.

Table 4: Cumulative income and population share and Gini coefficient as derived from various data sources by race group and year

	Decile no:										Gini
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Blacks											
- Urban 1975	2.5%	6.5%	11.7%	18.0%	25.5%	34.3%	44.7%	57.3%	73.3%	100%	0.35
- Towns 1975	2.9%	7.6%	13.5%	20.6%	28.9%	38.3%	49.2%	61.9%	77.5%	100%	0.30
- Rural 1975	2.5%	6.5%	11.5%	17.3%	24.0%	31.6%	40.5%	50.8%	64.0%	100%	0.40
- Homeland 1975	1.4%	3.6%	7.0%	11.5%	17.3%	24.6%	33.8%	46.1%	63.7%	100%	0.48
- Single hholds 1975	2.9%	7.2%	12.6%	19.1%	26.6%	35.6%	46.1%	58.8%	74.7%	100%	0.33
- Urban (single & multiple hholds) 1975	2.1%	5.5%	9.9%	15.4%	21.9%	29.8%	39.4%	51.5%	67.8%	100%	0.41
Total 1975	1.0%	3.1%	6.3%	10.6%	16.3%	23.6%	33.2%	45.8%	63.6%	100%	0.49
Total excluding rural 1975	0.9%	2.9%	5.9%	10.2%	15.9%	23.5%	33.3%	46.1%	63.9%	100%	0.49
- Urban 1985	1.6%	4.9%	9.3%	14.8%	21.6%	29.8%	39.7%	52.0%	68.1%	100%	0.42
- Towns 1985	2.1%	6.1%	11.2%	17.4%	24.9%	33.8%	44.5%	57.5%	73.9%	100%	0.36
- Homeland 1985	0.4%	1.5%	3.2%	5.7%	9.0%	13.5%	19.6%	28.0%	42.3%	100%	0.65
- Single households 1985	1.9%	5.7%	10.7%	16.8%	24.0%	32.7%	42.9%	55.3%	71.3%	100%	0.38
Total excluding Rural 1985	0.5%	1.8%	3.8%	6.9%	10.9%	16.4%	23.5%	33.5%	50.2%	100%	0.61
1993	0.7%	2.4%	5.0%	8.6%	13.3%	19.4%	27.5%	38.8%	56.0%	100%	0.56
1993 (expenditure)	1.5%	4.2%	7.8%	12.3%	18.0%	25.2%	34.1%	45.9%	62.6%	100%	0.48
1995	1.0%	2.7%	5.2%	8.4%	12.7%	18.2%	25.7%	36.2%	52.9%	100%	0.57
1995 (expenditure)	1.0%	2.7%	5.1%	8.3%	12.5%	18.1%	25.5%	36.1%	52.8%	100%	0.58
1996	0.3%	1.0%	2.1%	4.0%	6.8%	10.9%	17.1%	26.8%	43.3%	100%	0.68
2000	0.9%	2.6%	5.0%	8.1%	12.1%	17.3%	24.2%	34.0%	49.8%	100%	0.59
Coloureds											
1970	0.6%	2.3%	5.1%	9.0%	14.3%	21.3%	30.5%	43.1%	61.3%	100%	0.53
1993	1.2%	3.7%	7.3%	12.1%	18.1%	25.6%	35.1%	47.5%	64.8%	100%	0.47
1993 (expenditure)	1.8%	4.8%	8.8%	14.0%	20.4%	28.2%	37.8%	50.0%	66.5%	100%	0.44
1995	1.2%	3.4%	6.5%	10.5%	15.7%	22.3%	30.8%	42.2%	58.9%	100%	0.52
1995 (expenditure)	1.2%	3.4%	6.4%	10.3%	15.3%	21.7%	30.1%	41.3%	57.9%	100%	0.52
1996	0.5%	1.9%	4.3%	7.7%	12.3%	18.4%	26.7%	38.1%	55.6%	100%	0.57
2000	1.0%	2.8%	5.4%	8.9%	13.4%	19.4%	27.4%	38.8%	56.5%	100%	0.55
Indians											
1970	1.2%	3.9%	8.0%	13.4%	20.2%	28.8%	39.5%	53.1%	71.1%	100%	0.42
1993	1.2%	3.6%	7.0%	11.4%	16.9%	23.8%	32.7%	44.3%	60.4%	100%	0.50
1993 (expenditure)	2.1%	5.5%	9.9%	15.2%	21.6%	29.3%	38.7%	50.5%	66.6%	100%	0.42
1995	1.4%	3.9%	7.4%	11.8%	17.3%	24.2%	32.8%	44.0%	59.9%	100%	0.49
1995 (expenditure)	1.5%	4.1%	7.7%	12.2%	17.8%	24.8%	33.5%	44.7%	60.8%	100%	0.49
1996	0.6%	2.5%	5.4%	9.4%	14.6%	21.3%	30.1%	41.8%	58.8%	100%	0.53
2000	1.3%	3.5%	6.7%	10.8%	16.0%	22.8%	31.5%	43.3%	60.8%	100%	0.51
Whites											
1970	1.5%	4.8%	9.1%	14.5%	21.0%	28.9%	38.3%	49.9%	65.5%	100%	0.43
1993	1.4%	4.2%	8.0%	12.8%	18.7%	26.0%	35.0%	46.4%	62.2%	100%	0.47
1993 (expenditure)	2.3%	6.0%	10.9%	16.8%	23.8%	32.1%	42.1%	54.3%	70.1%	100%	0.38
1995	1.4%	4.1%	7.8%	12.5%	18.4%	25.7%	34.8%	46.3%	62.2%	100%	0.47
1995 (expenditure)	1.4%	4.2%	8.0%	12.8%	18.7%	26.1%	35.2%	46.7%	62.7%	100%	0.47
1996	0.6%	2.5%	5.6%	9.8%	15.3%	22.3%	31.2%	43.0%	59.7%	100%	0.52
2000	1.3%	3.7%	7.2%	11.7%	17.4%	24.5%	33.4%	44.9%	61.0%	100%	0.49

POVERTY: WHAT THE DATA TELLS US


Accepting the distribution from the 1970s (1975 for blacks, 1970 for other groups) and also those for 1993, 1995 and 2000, it is possible to interpolate the Lorenz curves for years in between, or to project the 1975 black distribution backward. This assumes a relatively smooth path of inequality. This assumption allows us in principle to estimate overall distributional inequality and also poverty at any given poverty line for each race groups, and thus also for the country as a whole, for any year within this period, once the intra-group distribution is applied to the estimated group mean income. The poverty line we use here is R3000 per capita per year in 2000 currency value, which is broadly in line with the suggested lines used by Woolard & Leibbrandt (2001: Table 2.5).

Table 5 summarises our results for five-yearly intervals (the 1993 data is also shown because it is one of our anchor data points). According to these estimates, poverty declined sharply in the 1970s, particularly the first half of that decade. That is quite understandable, given the rapid growth rate achieved until 1975 and the rapid rise in black wages that occurred in that period. The poverty headcount ratio has remained largely unchanged from the mid-80s, with more recent movement cancelling out an initial improvement (see also Figure 7). This indicates that the net effect of rising per capita incomes for all race groups has just cancelled the effect of rising inequality in most groups, though the headcount itself has increased quite markedly as a result of population increase. This conclusion, however, could be more optimistic if black incomes have grown more rapidly than we have estimated, which we have indicated may be quite possible. Thus we may conclude that money-metric poverty, in terms of the headcount ratio, has changed very little in the last decade and a half, despite worsening within group inequality.

Table 5: Estimates of poverty headcount and poverty headcount ratio by race, selected years from 1970 to 2000 (poverty line at R3 000 per capita per annum)

	Blacks	Coloureds	Indians	Whites	Total
Poverty headcount ratio (% in poverty):					
1970	64.6%	34.1%	17.9%	2.7%	49.8%
1975	52.9%	30.2%	15.3%	2.3%	43.7%
1980	49.3%	28.3%	12.5%	2.1%	38.9%
1985	49.1%	22.9%	10.6%	1.8%	38.8%
1990	45.9%	17.4%	8.7%	1.5%	35.3%
1993	48.0%	14.8%	7.8%	1.5%	38.2%
1995	48.4%	17.3%	5.2%	1.2%	38.8%
2000	47.4%	19.0%	4.7%	1.4%	38.6%
Poverty headcount ratio (number in poverty):					
1970	10 397 430	729 291	117 653	103 391	11 349 734
1975	9 761 669	735 241	735 241	99 401	11 333 527
1980	10 427 844	735 241	102 322	93 716	11 361 103
1985	12 003 438	685 275	95 828	87 997	12 874 522
1990	13 026 970	85 024	85 024	76 652	13 273 670
1993	14 614 503	502 091	79 107	74 008	15 269 709
1995	15 311 490	605 010	54 638	62 810	16 033 948
2000	16 400 691	713 164	51 971	73 885	17 239 710

Figure 6:



While focus in this paper has been on money-metric poverty, this does not detract from the fact that other factors also play an important role in poverty. Earlier work has shown that increasing resources have been made available to the poor by the state, leading to an improvement in other aspects of their socio-economic situation since the political transition, despite poor service

delivery and particularly concerns regarding the quality of services (e.g. education and health) available to the poor. (Van der Berg & Burger 2003)

CONCLUSION

Rising black per capita incomes over the past three decades have narrowed the inter-racial income gap, although increasing inequality within the black population seems to have prevented a significant decline in aggregate inequality and poverty in the latter part of this period. But analysis also reveals that it is unlikely that rising intra-racial inequality has been sufficiently large to increase the proportion of the population living in poverty, given the upward trend in per capita incomes. At least by money-metric measures, poverty appears to have been relatively stable in terms of the poverty headcount and using a poverty line of R3 000 per capita per year in 2000 Rand values. The number in poverty has increased with the growing population.

This paper has shown that a fuller picture of the course of inter-racial income distribution is possible by estimating racial shares of the three major components of current income. This has the advantage above surveys that the results arrived at are more directly comparable and in particular that they agree with national accounts magnitudes. However, the quality of this data is weaker after 1996, because of the failure to continue certain race-based data series, and further work is required to improve the post-1996 estimates. As indicated, however, any revision is likely to be more optimistic than our estimates about narrowing of the racial income gap, given the assumptions we have made.

Obtaining intra-racial distribution data which is comparable across time remains more problematical, particularly for earlier periods where only published data from surveys rather than individual data records were available. Nevertheless, we believe that the method applied here yields good returns and the data series can be expanded as more survey data becomes available. Thus our final conclusions still use surveys, but confine their use to providing a picture of inequality within race groups.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bhorat, Haroon. 2003a. *Employment, earnings and vulnerability in the South African labour market: An empirical investigation based on official survey data*. Unpublished PhD-Thesis. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- Bhorat, Haroon. 2003b. *The post-apartheid challenge: Labour demand trends in the South African labour market, 1995-1999*. DPRU Working Paper 03/82. Cape Town: Development Policy Research Unit.
- Bhorat, Haroon; Murray Leibbrandt; Muzi Maziya; Servaas van der Berg; & Ingrid Woolard,. 2001. *Fighting poverty: Labour markets and inequality in South Africa*. UCT Press: Cape Town
- Bhorat, Haroon and Van der Berg, Servaas. 1999. *The present as a legacy of the past: The labour market, inequality, and poverty in South Africa*. DPRU Working Paper no. 99/29. Cape Town.
- Bureau of Market Research. Report No's 31, 50.1, 50.2, 50.3, 50.4, 50.10, 50.11, 50.13, 50.15, 64, 65, 66, 82, 90, 113, 117, 128, 130.1-130.19, 143, 151, 163, 188. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Deaton, Angus. 2003. *Measuring Poverty in a Growing World (or Measuring Growth in a Poor World)*. NBER Working Paper 9822. Cambridge, Mass.: National Bureau for Economic Research.
- Devey, Richard; Skinner, Caroline; & Valodia, Imraan. 2003. *Informal economy employment data in South Africa: A critical analysis*. Paper to the TIPS/DPRU Forum. Johannesburg. 8-10 September.
- Klasen, Stephan & Woolard, Ingrid. 1999. Levels, trends and consistency of employment and unemployment figures in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* 16(1): 1999: 3-35.
- Leibbrandt, Murray; Van der Berg, Servaas; & Bhorat, Haroon. 2001. "Introduction." In: Leibbrandt, Murray; Maziya, Muzi; Van der Berg, Servaas; & Woolard, Ingrid (eds.). 2001. *Fighting poverty: Labour markets and inequality in South Africa*. UCT Press: Lansdowne: 1-20.
- Leibbrandt, M & Woolard, I. 1999. A comparison of poverty in South Africa's nine provinces. *Development Southern Africa* 16(1).
- Leibbrandt, M., Woolard, I. and Bhorat, H. 2000. Understanding Contemporary Household Inequality in South Africa. *Studies in Economics and Econometrics* 24(3): 31-52.
- Leibbrandt, M; Woolard, C; & Woolard, I 1996. *The contribution of income components to income inequality in South Africa*. LSMS Working Paper 125. Washington, D.C.: World Bank
- May, Julian (ed.). 2000. *Poverty and inequality in South Africa: Meeting the challenge*. David Philip: Cape Town.
- McGrath, Michael D. 1983. *The distribution of personal income in South Africa in selected years over the period from 1945 to 1980*. Ph.D. thesis. Durban: University of Natal.
- McGrath, Michael D. & Whiteford, Andrew. 1994. *Inequality in the size distribution of income in South Africa*. Occasional Papers 10, Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch Economic Project.
- Moll, P. 2000. Discrimination is declining in South Africa but inequality is not. *Studies in Economics & Econometrics* 24(3): 91-109.
- Nattrass, Jill. 1977. Narrowing wage differentials and income distribution in South Africa. *South African Journal of Economics* 45(4).
- Poverty and Inequality Report. 1998. *Poverty and inequality in South Africa*. Report prepared for the Office of the Executive Deputy President and the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Poverty and Inequality. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- RDP Office (1995), *Key Indicators of Poverty in South Africa*, Pretoria: RDP office

- Roukens de Lange, A. & Van Eeghen, P.H. 1984. Employment in South Africa: evaluation and trend analysis. Report to the National Manpower Commission. Stellenbosch: Institute for Futures Research.
- Roukens de Lange, A. & Van Eeghen, P.H. 1990. Standardised employment series for South Africa's formal economy. *Studies in Economics and Econometrics* 14(2).
- Sadie, J.L. 1993. *A projection of the South African population, 1991-2011*. Bureau of Market Research, Research Report No.195. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Sala-i-Martin, Xavier. 2002a. *The world distribution of income (Estimated from individual country distributions)*. NBER Working Paper No. 8933. Cambridge, Mass.: National Bureau for Economic Research.
- Sala-i-Martin, Xavier. 2002b. *The Disturbing "Rise" of World Income Inequality*. NBER Working Paper 8904. Cambridge, Mass.: National Bureau for Economic Research.
- Saldru. 1994. *South Africans Rich and Poor: Baseline Household Statistics*. Cape Town: Saldru.
- Simkins, Charles. 1998. *On the durability of South African inequality*. Macarthur Foundation Working Paper. Princeton: Macarthur Network on Inequality and Poverty
- Simkins, Charles. 1991. *The Urban Foundation income distribution model: Phase One*. Mimeo. Johannesburg: Urban Foundation.
- Simkins, Charles. 1983. *Four essays on the past, present and possible future of the distribution of the black population of South Africa*. Cape Town: Saldru.
- Simkins, Charles. 1979. *The distribution of personal income among income recipients in South Africa, 1970 and 1976*. Durban: University of Natal.South Africa, Central Statistical Service. 1970. *Population Census 1970*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- South Africa, Central Statistical Service. 1985. *Report No. 01-11-02 (1985): Survey of Household Expenditure*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- South Africa, Central Statistical Service 1996. *October Household Survey 1995*. Statistical Release P0317. Pretoria: Central Statistical Service
- South Africa, Central Statistical Service. 1997. *Earning and spending in South Africa. Selected findings of the 1995 income and expenditure survey*. Pretoria: Central Statistical Service.
- South Africa, Central Statistical Services. 1998a. *Living in South Africa: Selected findings of the 1995 October household survey*. Pretoria: Central Statistical Services
- South Africa, Central Statistical Service/Statistics South Africa. Various years. *South African Labour Statistics*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- South Africa, Central Statistical Service/Statistics South Africa. Various years. *South African Statistics*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- South Africa, Central Statistical Service/Statistics South Africa. 2002. *Earning and spending in South Africa. Selected findings and comparisons from the income and expenditure surveys of October 1995 and October 2000*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa
- South African Institute of Race Relations Various years). *South Africa Survey (formerly Race Relations Survey)*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.
- Spandau, A.M.K.M. 1971. *Income distribution and economic growth in South Africa*. Doctoral thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Terreblanche, Sampie. 2002. *A history of inequality in South Africa, 1652-2002*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press
- Van Aardt, CJ & Van Tonder, JL. 1999. *A projection of the South African population, 1996-2021*. Bureau of Market Research, Research Report No.270. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Van der Berg, Servaas. 1986. *Forecasts of interracial income distribution to the year 2000*. Stellenbosch: Institute for Futures Research.
- Van der Berg, Servaas. 1987. *Die verband tussen die aard en omvang van ekonomiese groei en die bevrediging van basiese behoeftes in Suid-Afrika*. Unpublished Ph.D.-thesis. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch

- Van der Berg, Servaas. 1989a. On inter-racial income distribution in South Africa. *South African Journal of Economics* 57(1)
- Van der Berg, Servaas. 1989b. Long term economic trends and development prospects in South Africa. *African Affairs* 88(351): 187-203.
- Van der Berg, Servaas. 2001. Redistribution through the budget: Public expenditure incidence in South Africa. *Social Dynamics* 27(1):140-164
- Van der Berg, Servaas & Burger, Ronelle. 2002. *The stories behind the numbers: An investigation of efforts to deliver services to the South African poor*. Background report for the World Bank's World Development Report. Mimeo. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- Whiteford, A. & McGrath, M. 1994. *The distribution of income in South Africa*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council
- Whiteford, A. & Van Seventer, DE. 2000. South Africa's changing income distribution in the 1990s. *Studies in Economics & Econometrics* 24(3): 7-30
- Whiteford, A.; Posel, D.; & Kelawang, T. 1995. *A profile of poverty, inequality and human development*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Woolard, I. 2001. *Income inequality and poverty: methods of estimation and some policy applications for South Africa*. PhD thesis. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- Woolard, Ingrid & Leibbrandt, Murray. 2001. Measuring poverty in South Africa. Ch.2 in: Borat, Haroon; Murray Leibbrandt; Muzi Maziya; Servaas van der Berg; & Ingrid Woolard. 2001. *Fighting poverty: Labour markets and inequality in South Africa*. Cape Town: UCT Press: 41-73