Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit

School Enrolment and the Child Support Grant: Evidence from South Africa

by
Katherine Eyal and Ingrid Woolard

Working Paper Series
Number 125

N.i.D.S.
NATIONAL INCOME DYNAMICS STUDY

NIDS Discussion Paper
2013/7

About the Author(s) and Acknowledgments

Katherine Eyal - Southern Africa Labour & Development Research Unit (SALDRU) Aliate. Doctoral Candidate, University of Cape Town. Lecturer, School of Economics, University of Cape Town, Private Bag, Rondebosch 7701, South Africa. Tel: +27 21 650 5784. katherine.eyal@uct.ac.za

Ingrid Woolard - Co-PI: National Income Dynamics Study. PD Hahn Level 7. Southern Africa Labour & Development Research Unit (SALDRU). Associate Professor, University of Cape Town. Private Bag, Rondebosch, 7701, Tel: +27 21 650 5955, Fax: +27 21 650 5403. Ingrid.Woolard@uct.ac.za

Recommended citation

Eyal, K. and Woolard, I. (2013). School Enrolment and the Child Support Grant: Evidence from South Africa. Cape Town: SALDRU, University of Cape Town. SALDRU Working Paper Number 125/ NIDS Discussion Paper 2013/7.

ISBN: 978-1-920517-66-3

Working Papers can be downloaded in Adobe Acrobat format from www.saldru.uct.ac.za.
Printed copies of Working Papers are available for R15.00 each plus vat and postage charges.

Orders may be directed to:
The Administrative Officer, SALDRU, University of Cape Town, Private Bag, Rondebosch, 7701,
Tel: (021) 650 5696, Fax: (021) 650 5697, Email: brenda.adams@uct.ac.za

School Enrolment and the Child Support Grant: Evidence from South Africa

Katherine Eyal*and Ingrid Woolard‡

November 24, 2013

Abstract

The extension of the Child Support Grant in South Africa to all children aged 17 or under gives the opportunity to evaluate this type of social transfer and its effect on school enrolment. Using exogenous variation in the fraction of life exposed to the grant, we find the grant is associated with a higher probability of enrolment, especially for older children. Other methods of identification presented provide supporting evidence for these conclusions.

1 Introduction

In 2008, 48% of learners between the ages of 15 and 19 who were not enrolled cited reasons of either not being able to afford to go to school (the largest percentage at 24%), job search, or current employment. It appears that if the child support grant is used to fund the costs of going to school, we might see a positive effect between receipt and school enrolment, which is what this paper does find. Given that school enrolment rates are fairly high for this group (but lower than other age groups), the on average 6% higher enrolment rates among recipients can possibly be interpreted as a relatively large effect (compared to a mean enrolment of approximately 85% in this group). This effect is invariant to the inclusion of other controls, and persists across the waves. Young women in this age group are approximately 6% less likely to be enrolled, implying the grant could have positive effects to address gender imbalance in enrolment.

This paper reports on the literature surrounding the effects of the child support grant on enrolment and other child outcomes, discusses the data used for our research, and the nature of the roll-out over the years since the grant's inception, examines the impact of the grant on school enrolment for older children, and concludes.

*Southern Africa Labour & Development Research Unit (SALDRU) Affiliate. Doctoral Candidate, University of Cape Town. Lecturer, School of Economics, University of Cape Town, Private Bag, Rondebosch 7701, South Africa. Tel: +27 21 650 5784. katherine.eyal@uct.ac.za

†Co-PI: National Income Dynamics Study. PD Hahn Level 7. Southern Africa Labour & Development Research Unit (SALDRU). Associate Professor, University of Cape Town. Private Bag, Rondebosch, 7701, Tel: +27 21 650 5955, Fax: +27 21 650 5403. Ingrid.Woolard@uct.ac.za

‡School of Economics, University of Cape Town, katherine.eyal@uct.ac.za.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Outcomes associated with the Child Support Grant

The literature on the effects of grant receipt has tended to focus on child outcomes, such as school enrolment and attendance, child hunger, weight and height z scores, and child labour amongst others (Samson et al. 2008, Williams & Samson 2007, Aguero et al. 2009, Budlender & Woolard 2006, Boler 2007, Samson et al. 2004). There are few child outcomes for children below school going age in particular. Other studies have focused on the effect on grade repetition, incidences of illness, and crèche or daycare attendance (Budlender, Burns & Woolard 2007). These studies tend to include many controls in their regression specifications, in an attempt to reduce omitted variable bias. Budlender & Woolard (2006) find the grant is associated with increased grade repetition, and less illness. Budlender & Woolard (2006) find a small positive effect of receipt on attendance, even for children who are non recipients, but reside with grant recipients. Williams & Samson (2007) do not find these co-resident effects. Using KIDS data, Boler (2007) finds pension or CSG receipt does not affect primary school completion rates, but it does appear to protect boys from drop-out. Most studies find increased daycare attendance among beneficiaries (Budlender & Woolard 2006, Boler 2007).

There is a large descriptive literature, from KIDS, GHS, NIDS and other data, informing us as to the nature of child support grant beneficiaries and recipients (Budlender et al. 2007, Aguero et al. 2009, Hunter & Adato 2007, Delany, Ismail, Graham & Ramkissoon 2008). Recipient households are likely to be larger, have less income, obviously higher grant income, have less educated members, fewer assets and employed members, and more likely to be situated in rural areas. Recipients are overwhelmingly African and female (Delany et al. 2008). Grant receipt does have positive poverty alleviating effects (e.g. Samson et al. 2004, Triegaardt 2005, Leibbrandt, Woolard, Finn & Argent 2010). However Hunter & Adato (2007) note a drop in remittances to households after receipt begins. Samson et al. (2004) find that social grants may result in unfortunate household formation which preclude successful job search, however grants may also be used to fund job search

An interesting question is how or whether grant income is shared in the household, and what it is spent on. Delany et al. (2008) find that the CSG is found is pooled with other household income in about half of all cases. The authors find increased spending on food for recipients compared to eligible non recipients, as well as uniforms and school fees.

Some studies have attempted to use matching methods, constructed control groups, or regression discontinuity methods, to identify the true causal effect of grant receipt, with varying degrees of success (Samson et al. 2008, Aguero et al. 2009, Case, Hosegood & Lund 2005, Ranchhod 2006, Williams & Samson 2007). Samson et al. (2008) create a panel data set from General Household Survey waves 2002 to 2004. They compare children who were age eligible, but did and did not receive the child support grant. The grant is found to reduce child hunger and increase school attendance among beneficiaries. Using continuous treatment estimation strategies, Aguero et al. (2009) find a significant and positive effect on height for age during the first three years of life. The estimates condition on a measure for "eagerness" of the mother. Case et al. (2005) use a control group

of older siblings, and find CSG receipt correlated with higher school attendance, but no attempt is made to control for imbalanced treatment and control groups, or the eagerness of mothers. Ranchhod (2006) finds lower labour participation among elderly pension recipients, using a discontinuity approach in the 2000 LFS and IES data. These effects may reflect a simultaneity problem. It is not clear that households on either side of the discontinuity point are similar in characteristics, a key assumption for identification.

A recent survey by DSD, UNICEF et al. (2012) found that the grant is associated with a decrease in absences from school, particularly for boys, and higher grade attainment, particularly for girls.

2.2 School Outcomes

Many outcome variables are available to measure performance at school, some directly and others indirectly. Direct outcomes include enrolment, rate of absenteeism, grade attainments, grade repetition, attainment of senior certificate, reading and writing scores, and others (Case & Deaton 1999, van der Berg 2008, Lam, Ardington & Leibbrandt 2011). More tangentially related outcomes are child labour, reasons for not being enrolled, risky teen behaviour and others. Some of these outcomes are clearly path dependent, such as grade attainment and repetition, while others such as attendance and absenteeism seem to more closely relate to current factors.

Determinants of schooling performance in South African and internationally are many and varied. Those cited in the literature include gender, race, household socio-economic status, cost of school fees, uniforms and books, parental educational outcomes, home language and proficiency in English, household size and expenditure, and province (Case & Deaton 1999, van der Berg 2008, Lam et al. 2011). Others less frequently cited include foreign born status, whether one or both parents are deceased, whether the family has moved in the past five years, and disability status (Fleisch, Shindler & Perry 2012). Other determinants at school level are school quality, distance to school, pupil teacher ratios, no fee status, class size, and the age distribution of one's peers (Cascio & Schanzenbach 2007, Angrist & Lavy 1999) and others. The legal requirement also determines attendance in the younger ages - children are required to begin school in the year they turn 7, and may leave in the year they turn 15, or reach the 9th grade, whichever comes first (Fleisch et al. 2012). In particular, Fleisch et al. (2012) find that those in households eligible to be receiving the grant are more likely not to be enrolled in school.

Using the SALDRU 1993 data, Case & Deaton (1999) find high rates of attendance among the younger grades (although initially lower for ages 6 and 7), which starts to tail off from the age of 15, though whites and Indians/Asians attendance remains high even for these ages. Using the 2007 Community Survey, Fleisch et al. (2012) finds that enrolment of children aged 6 and 7 has improved compared to rates of enrolment in 1997.

Using the 2001 data from the Southern African Consortium on Monitoring Education Quality, van der Berg (2008)

2.3 Cash Transfers and Schooling

Cash transfer programs can be conditional or unconditional. Often conditional grants focus on schooling attendance as the condition of receipt.

3 Child Support Grant Roll-out

Following the Lund Commission in 1996, the state maintenance grant was phased out for 400 000 beneficiaries, and South Africa's child support grant was introduced, with the goal of removing racial and gender inequality in the social support system, effectively targeting poor children no matter their household status, improving nutrition in the critical early years, and being able to scale relatively easily to large numbers of recipients (Lund 2008).

Roll-out began in April 1998, and by 2000 the grant was effectively being distributed for children below the age of 7, subject to a means test, of R800 in urban areas, and R1100 in rural areas. However initial take-up was low, estimated at only ten percent in 2000, but increasing to 63% by 2005 (Samson et al. 2008). Appendix table A.2 contains a summary of these figures.

The grant is paid to the child's primary caregiver, and is intended to "follow the child". It is paid into bank accounts, at post offices, super markets, and welfare pay points. In early 2003 7 and 8 year olds gained access, the following year 9 and 10 year olds, and in 2005 those under 14. Meanwhile the means test remained unchanged, and thus many would be recipients may have lost the grant, or never applied for it, due to inflation. Budlender, Rosa & Hall (2005) calculate that in 2004, to keep pace with inflation, the means test should have been set at R1123 and R1544 rand.

In October 2008 the means test was changed to reflect the effect of inflation, with the new rule setting level at ten times the level of the grant, thus increasing the number of would be recipients. In February 2010 it was announced that all children under the age of 18 would gain access, conditional on the means test. The value of the grant in October 2008 was 220 rand, approximately 50 US dollars at purchasing power parity (Delany et al. 2008).

The changes of interest to us occurred over the years 2008 to 2012, where the age eligibility was increased from recipients being aged below 14 in 2008, under 16 in 2010, and under 18 in 2012. This implies a much larger proportion of older children obtaining the grant in these years, and we expect to see this reflected in the data. Table 3 shows that this is indeed the case - for example, the proportion of 14 year olds receiving the grant increases from 12% in 2008 (potential administrative error or age recollection errors with this non zero figure), to 62% in wave 3 (2012). Some of these older children have never received the grant, or may have only received it for some small proportion of their lives, and thus we do not expect to see take-up as high as for those in the younger age brackets. Those that simply continue to receive due to being past recipients (such as those aged 13 in 2008) are expected to have similarly large means for receipt as younger children in 2012, and they do (for example 64% of 13 year olds are receiving the grant in 2012, compared to 69% of ten year olds). Older children may take longer to apply for the grant, or their parents may not bother to register for only one or two potential years of receipt.

There is great variation in potential duration of receipt between older and

younger children, and thus as expected some children have had the potential to receive the grant for a large percentage or 100% of their lives, while older children may have only been eligible for a small portion of their lives. In addition, older children may have had interrupted potential years of receipt, while younger children may have been eligible for all of their lives without interruption. This can been see in table 6, which shows for example that those born in 1993 have had potential exposure which was also interrupted, for only 3 years, while children born in 1996 have had 14 potential years of exposure in 2012. This implies that in 2012, those born in 1993 (19 year olds) were potentially exposed for only 16% of their lives, while those born in 1996 (16 year olds) were potentially exposed for 88% of their lives. This variation in potential exposure is entirely random, and reflects the exogenous nature of the roll-out of the grant to older and older children.

It would be good to check the actual duration of child support grant receipt compared to potential duration, and this is done in table 7. Unfortunately data on duration of receipt is only collected for those aged 14 or under. The quality of data collected is also not very high, as only a moderate number of beneficiaries report their receipt, in years, and even fewer report receipt in years and months. From the table we can see the large differences in duration of receipt for 14 year olds from wave 1 to wave 3. This supports the potential duration of exposure, and the higher age limit in 2012. We cannot check the potential duration against reported duration for older children.

From table 7 it is also useful to note (and this is also corroborated from table 3), that it takes time for mothers to register their children for the grant - only 32% of children aged under 1 year have grant receipt in wave 1 - although this figure is increasing fairly quickly from wave 1 to wave 3, where 44% of this group report receipt. Receipt predictably declines the closer one approaches to the age limit, and there is a sharp cut-off on either side of the age limit, seen in each year. The patterns in past and current receipt are fairly similar - as seen in appendix table A.4 - although given past receipt is also reflected, there is a fuzziness around the age cut-off limit.

In appendix item A.5 the differences in receipt by gender are shown for each wave. There does not appear to be a consistent difference across genders in grant receipt.

4 Data and Descriptive Statistics

This paper makes use of the first three waves of the National Income Dynamics Survey (Brown, Daniels, De Villiers, Leibbrandt & Woolard 2013, SALDRU 2013). The data is a national representative panel undertaken to measure welfare over time, through the survey of wealth creation in terms of changes in income, expenditure and assets, demographic dynamics, social heritage and access to cash transfers and social services (Brown et al. 2013). The rich nature of the data collected on child support grant beneficiaries and recipients, and the fortuitous timing of data collection over periods of change in the grant's eligibility rules make this an ideal data set for our purposes.

Appendix table A shows the sample sizes of these groups. The sample predictably increases in size with each wave, as more continuing sample members are either born or rejoin the sample, and more temporary sample members join

households which contain continuing sample members. Table A.3 shows the size of the age cohorts used in this analysis, giving us sample sizes of just over 2000 in each wave for the sample aged 15 to 19. These sample sizes are corroborated in table 5.

In table 1 we examine descriptive statistics for the sample of children and adults [1]. Average age in the sample is approximately 27 years (similar to weighted means), and does not change over waves. Slightly more females than males are present in the sample, though preliminary weighted means show this proportion is closer to 51.5% in actual fact.

Average education in the sample increases from approximately 6 to 6.34 years from wave 1 to wave 3, as does mother's education from 5.8 to 6.34. Average enrolment (similar patterns for weighted and un-weighted estimates) falls in the total sample from approximately 70% to 40%. This large drop is worthy of investigation, and possibly reflects an older population. It is not entirely useful to us to interpret enrolment figures for the entire sample however - closer attention will be paid to this figure in the sample of children aged 18 or under (seen in table 2).

The race distribution as expected does not change significantly between waves. The number of child support grant (CSG) beneficiaries increases substantially reflecting the higher age of eligibility in wave 3 compared to wave 1. It is important to note that individuals aged 14 and below have data on grant receipt which has been asked of the mother or other caregiver[2]. Those aged 15 and above however have the grant receipt question asked directly to the individual[3]. It is difficult to know whether this causes any differences in data quality between the two questions. Household size appears not to have changed significantly, averaging around 4 over the waves. Average household income has risen to approximately R5,700. A large proportion of households have child support grant beneficiaries residing in the household - approximately 65% in wave 3. Average household grant income is fairly high - in wave 3 it is R1,388, which could reflect the presence of one pensioner and one child support grant recipient on average. The geographical distribution of the sample has not changed over the waves, with approximately 53% of the sample residing in rural or traditional authority areas, and the remainder in urban or urban informal areas. The distribution by province has also not changed, and reflects the national distributions.

Table 2 investigates the differences between grant beneficiaries and non beneficiaries for African children aged 18 or under. From the data we find many of the patterns found in the literature still confirmed, and many of the obvious expected differences are seen. For example, child support grant beneficiaries are significantly younger than non beneficiaries, and thus have lower education lev-

[1] This version of the paper does not make use of the first version of released panel weights and individual weights in each wave - although individual calculations (not reported) have been made. As such descriptive statistics may differ slightly from the true values. Future versions of this paper will make use of these weights. Our regression analysis is not expected to be impacted by using weighted estimates, as we control for the same components which make up the weight calculations, however this of course will be confirmed in future versions of this paper

[2] Does anyone currently receive a child 1 support grant, foster care grant or care dependency grant for this child?

[3] Does anyone currently receive a child support grant, foster care grant or care dependency grant to care for you?

els, live in households with more children, live in households with significantly lower household income, and are much more likely to be located in traditional authority areas than non beneficiaries. Other less obvious patterns are that household grant income appears to be lower for beneficiaries, and importantly enrolment is higher for child support grant beneficiaries. The provincial distribution is the same for the most part, but more beneficiaries live in KwaZulu Natal than non beneficiaries, and fewer in Gauteng. Our sample appears evenly split between beneficiaries and non beneficiaries.

Our main dependent variable is school enrolment, which can be seen in table 4 for African children aged 18 or under. Over all the waves enrolment is high, especially among the younger ages, but then drops as age increases. This is a pattern which has remained largely unchanged, as seen in the SALDRU data set from 1993 (Case & Deaton 1999). For example in 2008, 13 year olds have 99% enrolment figures, while 18 year olds have 77%. There is an odd jump between enrolment figures from wave 1 to 2, and then to 3. Enrolment falls between wave 1 and 2, and then increases back to the previous levels in wave 3. This is an odd result which bears further investigation, although our analysis does not rely on changes between waves for the most part, which should mean this change should not impact the results dramatically.

5 Methodology

Simple OLS is used to estimate the determinants of school enrolment, with the main determinant of interest being child support grant receipt for children. Table 5 reports the result of the following model, regressed for each wave individually and then altogether, for the sample of African and Coloured children between the ages of 15 and 19.

$$Enrol_{iht} = \beta_0 + \beta CSG_{iht} + \alpha X_{iht} + \gamma HH_{ht} + \epsilon G_{iht} + \delta W_t + u_{iht}$$

Where $Enrol_{iht}$ reflects the enrolment outcome variable for individual i, in household h, and in time t, where time is either wave 1, 2 or 3. CSG_{iht} reflects whether or not a child is a child support grant beneficiary, X_{iht} is a collection of individual level characteristics, including age, gender, years of completed education, mother's education, a binary variable for Coloured, and whether or not the child's mother is present in the household. HH_{ht} is a vector of household characteristics including household income and size. G_{iht} is a vector of geographical binary variables, including those for rural, urban informal, and traditional authority area, where the base comparison is urban formal. G_{iht} also includes a set of binary variables for the provinces, excluding the Western Cape. W_t is a set of binary variables for wave 2 and wave 3, which become void in columns 2, 3 and 4 of table 5.

It is clear that this specification does not make full use of the panel data available. However individual fixed effects do not actually yield useful results in this case, as in this sample, due to the timing a portion of the sample ages out, and is not repeatedly represented in the following waves, and those that are do not have high variation in their receipt status. It is to be hoped that the exogenous nature of receipt for this sample (aged 15 to 19) ensures that we estimate the coefficient without bias. The controls mentioned above are also

included to attempt to reduce the possibility of omitted variable bias on the coefficient on receipt, however it is worth noting that the coefficient remains approximately the same size (a little higher), and the same significance, when all other controls are omitted, implying bias is potentially low.

6 Results

Table 5 contains the main results of interest, for the specification above. Wave 1 is omitted, as in the sample considered (15 to 19 year olds) there is no receipt in wave 1. For the sample, we find the some interesting conclusions. Female students are less likely to be enrolled, as obviously as older students. Coloured students are less likely to be enrolled than Africans, which is interesting and possibly merits the investigation of this group separately. Living in a rural area is associated with lower enrolment, holding other factors constant, over all waves, and in waves 1 and 3. Those students with higher education are more likely to be enrolled. The province effects are not consistent across the waves. Overall, students are less likely to be enrolled in wave 2 and 3 compared to wave 1, which is again an interesting result.

The coefficient on CSG receipt is consistently fairly large, the same magnitude, and significance across the waves, and in the over sample. Recipients have higher average enrolment by between 5 and 8% (significant at the 1% level), which is a large effect, and could almost cancel out the effect of being female for enrolment status. Given the high levels of enrolment in this group, it is interesting to find this strong effect of receipt. We know that students who are not enrolled do often cite a lack of funds, or job search as the reasons for non-attendance, which could possibly imply that the grant is being used to fund the costs of school enrolment, such as fees, books or uniforms. Previous literature has found this to be the case - reports of students using the grant for these costs are common.

The province effects are large and in some cases surprising. Anecdotal evidence has shown that enrolment is low in the Western Cape for coloured boys in particular, and this indicates other provincial level patterns may be in play which should be investigated.

Other specifications (not reported) find similar effects of past or current receipt on school enrolment [4]. The fraction of life spent age eligible for the grant has similarly large effects. A person with no eligibility their entire life has a 25% lower probability of attending school than a child who has been age eligible for their entire life, i.e. comparing our 18 and 19 year olds to 13 and 14 year olds shows much higher enrolment among the younger children which could potentially be attributed to the grant. Regression of the model above for the individual age groups, i.e. 14 year olds, 15 year olds, etc., show that the effect comes primarily from the older children. This makes sense given the very high rates of enrolment for the younger age groups. Other specifications test other educational outcomes as the dependent variable, such as years of education attained, education deficits (the difference between expected grade and actual grade) and others, and find that the strongest effect is on enrolment. Regression of enrolment on actual duration by itself does not yield a significant

[4] This is to be expected as the question only asks about current receipt, and receipt within the last 2 years

effect, which implies that the effect we are seeing may not be cumulative, and is only driven by current receipt being used to fund current school going expenses. However one musty remember this effect can only be estimated for children 14 or younger, who already have very high rates of enrolment. When estimating the impact of potential duration (and not actual duration) of receipt on enrolment, we find a small but significant coefficient. The coefficient implies that comparing children with ten years of potential receipt in wave 1 to those with none, the former will have enrolment rates ten % higher than the latter. This is similar to comparing children born in 1995 to those born in 1993, who are very similar in characteristics, but have large variation in their potential receipt. This effect is even larger in wave 3, even after other controls are introduced. Investigating the CSG effect on households with average income below the mean does not yield a different coefficient on receipt.

Other variables were included in these specifications, and discarded. These include variables for the number of children, adults and pensioners in the household, which were too highly correlated with household size, and the amount of grant income in the household, which had too high a correlation with household income. When these variables were removed, the coefficient on beneficiary did not change, but those on household size and income gained in significance. Including the potential duration of receipt or omitting it does not impact on the beneficiary coefficient, and similarly neither does including or excluding years of attained education. Thus we choose to exclude these two variables as in addition they are clearly correlated with age. We do include an educational deficit variable, reflecting the difference between expected grade and actual grade attained, which is not necessarily a function of age, but can be used to proxy for educational ability/achievement up to this point. It is not reported here, but again inclusion or omission does not change the results, and the coefficient is as expected - the larger the deficit, the less likely an individual is to be enrolled (an extra year's deficit is associated with lower enrolment of between 2 and 4 percent).

7 Further Work

A further extensive investigation is required to corroborate the results found in this paper. It appears that separate investigation of the impact of grant receipt by gender and by race group could provide further insight. It is a pity that the nature of the panel cannot be exploited more, but the nature of the timing does help in the identification. A difference in difference methodology could also be used to estimate the impact of moving into receipt, as this does not require us to compare the same participants across the waves. Other identification strategies include using potential duration of receipt as an instrumental variable for actual duration.

8 Conclusions

Using exogenous variation of receipt in older age groups, we are able to estimate the impact of child support grant receipt in South Africa on school enrolment. The fortuitous timing of the National Income Dynamics Survey and the changes

in age eligibility over the years 2008 to 2012 help in the identification of this effect. A a consistent positive impact is found, similar in size to gender and race effects. The effect is invariant to the exclusion of many controls, and to different samples based on income. Child support grant recipients between the ages of 15 and 19 are 6% more likely to be enrolled than non recipients, after controlling for age and other important characteristics.

References

Aguero, J. M., Carter, M. R. & Woolard, I. (2009), The Impact of Unconditional Cash Transfers on Nutrition: The South African Child Support Grant.

Angrist, J. D. & Lavy, V. (1999), 'Using maimonides' rule to estimate the effect of class size on scholastic achievement', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **114**(2), 533–575.

Boler, T. (2007), Facing the Consequences of AIDS: Orphans, Educational Outcomes and Cash Grants in South Africa, PhD thesis.

Brown, M., Daniels, R., De Villiers, L., Leibbrandt, M. & Woolard, I. (2013), National income dynamics study wave 2 user manual. Cape Town: Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit.

Budlender, D., Burns, J. & Woolard, I. (2007), 'Analysis of Survey Data on the Impact of Social Security Grants'.

Budlender, D., Rosa, S. & Hall, K. (2005), 'At All Costs? Applying the Means Test for the Child Support Grant'.

Budlender, D. & Woolard, I. (2006), 'The Impact of the South African Child Support Grant and Old Age Grants on Children's Schooling and Work'.

Cascio, E. & Schanzenbach, D. W. (2007), First in the class? age and the education production function, Working Paper 13663, National Bureau of Economic Research.
*http://www.nber.org/papers/w13663

Case, A. & Deaton, A. (1999), 'School inputs and educational outcomes in south africa', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **114**(3), 1047–1084.

Case, A., Hosegood, V. & Lund, F. (2005), 'The Reach and Impact of Child Support Grants: Evidence from KwaZulu-Natal', *Development Southern Africa* **22**(4), 467–482.

Delany, A., Ismail, Z., Graham, L. & Ramkissoon, Y. (2008), 'Review of the Child Support Grant; Uses, Implementation and Obstacles'.

DSD, S., UNICEF et al. (2012), 'The south african child support grant impact assessment: Evidence from a survey of children, adolescents and their households', *Pretoria: UNICEF South Africa* .

Fleisch, B., Shindler, J. & Perry, H. (2012), 'Who is out of school? evidence from the statistics south africa community survey', *International Journal of Educational Development* **32**(4), 529 – 536.
*http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0738059310000647

Hunter, N. & Adato, M. (2007), The Child Support Grant in KwaZulu-Natal: Perceptions and Experience inside the Household.

Lam, D., Ardington, C. & Leibbrandt, M. (2011), 'Schooling as a lottery: Racial differences in school advancement in urban south africa', *Journal of Development Economics* **95**(2), 121 – 136.
*http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304387810000490

Leibbrandt, M., Woolard, I., Finn, A. & Argent, J. (2010), Trends in South African Income Distribution and Poverty since the Fall of Apartheid. *http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/oecd/content/workingpaper/5kmms0t7p1ms-en

Lund, F. (2008), *Changing Social Policy: The Child Support Grant in South Africa*, Human Sciences Research Council, Cape Town. *www.hsrcpress.ac.za

Ranchhod, V. (2006), 'The Effect of the South African Old Age Pension on Labour Supply of the Elderly', *South African Journal of Economics* **74**(December), 725–744.

SALDRU (2013), National income dynamics study 2012, wave 3, southern africa labour and development research unit. [dataset]. Version 1.0. Cape Town: Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit [producer], 2013. Cape Town: DataFirst [distributor].

Samson, M., Heinrich, C., Williams, M., Kaniki, S., Muzondo, T., Quene, K. M. & Van Niekerk, I. (2008), 'Quantitative Analysis of the Impact of the Child Support Grant'.

Samson, M., Lee, U., Ndlebe, A., Gandhi, V., Harigaya, T., Abrahams, C., Quene, K. M. & Niekerk, I. V. (2004), 'The Social and Economic Impact of South Africa's Social Security System'. *http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0001041/index.php

Triegaardt, J. (2005), 'The Child Support Grant in South Africa: a social policy for poverty alleviation?', *International Journal of Social Welfare* **14**, 249–255.

van der Berg, S. (2008), 'How effective are poor schools? poverty and educational outcomes in south africa', *Studies in Educational Evaluation* **34**(3), 145 – 154. *http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191491X0800031X

Williams, M. J. & Samson, M. (2007), 'The Social and Economic Impacts of South Africa's Child Support Grant'.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

National Income Dynamics Survey
Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Wave 1 2008	Wave 2 2010	Wave 3 2012
Age	27.1	27.5	27.9
Female	0.51	0.51	0.51
Years of Completed Educatio	6.85	7.05	7.25
Mother's Education	6.57	6.77	6.89
Enrolled	0.65	0.56	0.34
African	0.79	0.79	0.80
Coloured	0.09	0.09	0.09
Indian/Asian	0.03	0.03	0.03
White	0.09	0.09	0.09
CSG Beneficiary	0.43	0.52	0.59
Duration of CSG Receipt	3.99	5.17	5.43
Household Size	3.44	3.53	3.30
Household Income	6,133	8,609	7,984
Number of Children in HH	1.28	1.29	1.18
Number of Adults	1.92	1.98	1.87
Number of Pensioners	0.34	0.51	0.44
HH has CSG beneficiaries	0.52	0.59	0.65
Number of CSG Recipients ir	0.57	0.70	0.73
Household Grant Income	817	1,068	1,233
Rural Formal	0.07	0.07	0.07
Traditional Authority Area	0.32	0.32	0.33
Urban	0.50	0.50	0.50
Urban Informal	0.11	0.11	0.11
Western Cape	0.11	0.11	0.11
Eastern Cape	0.13	0.13	0.13
Northern Cape	0.02	0.02	0.02
Free State	0.06	0.05	0.05
KwaZulu Natal	0.20	0.20	0.20
Gauteng	0.23	0.23	0.24
Mpumalanga	0.08	0.08	0.08
Limpopo	0.11	0.10	0.10
North West	0.07	0.07	0.07
# Observations	28,279	34,979	38,192

Descriptive Statistics, full sample, National Income Dynamics Survey. Estimates presented are weighted using the sample weights from each wave.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Child Support Grant Beneficiaries vs. Non Beneficiaries

Individual Descriptive Statistics (Children Aged 18 and under)
by CSG Beneficiary Status in Wave 1

Variable	All	CSG Beneficiary	Non Beneficiary
Age	8.94	6.75	10.6
Female	0.50	0.50	0.50
Years of Completed Education	3.54	1.79	4.88
Mother's Education	8.84	8.51	9.11
Enrolled	0.96	0.99	0.94
African	0.84	0.94	0.76
Coloured	0.09	0.05	0.11
Indian/Asian	0.02	0.01	0.03
White	0.06	0.00	0.10
CSG Beneficiary	0.43	1.00	0.00
Duration of CSG Receipt	3.99	3.99	
Household Size	4.81	5.19	4.56
Household Income	6,328	2,543	8,884
Number of Children in HH	2.26	2.58	2.05
Number of Adults	2.29	2.29	2.30
Number of Pensioners	0.33	0.37	0.29
HH has CSG beneficiaries	0.52	1.00	0.21
Number of CSG Recipients in Household	1.01	1.98	0.38
Household Grant Income	802	774	848
Rural Formal	0.06	0.06	0.05
Traditional Authority Area	0.40	0.51	0.32
Urban	0.43	0.29	0.53
Urban Informal	0.11	0.14	0.09
Western Cape	0.09	0.04	0.13
Eastern Cape	0.15	0.18	0.13
Northern Cape	0.02	0.02	0.02
Free State	0.06	0.05	0.06
KwaZulu Natal	0.23	0.26	0.21
Gauteng	0.18	0.15	0.21
Mpumalanga	0.08	0.08	0.08
Limpopo	0.12	0.15	0.10
North West	0.06	0.07	0.06
# Observations	12,103	5,549	6,422

Descriptive Statistics of Child Support Grant Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries. National Income Dynamics Survey Data. Estimates presented are weighted using the sample weights from each wave.

Table 3: Child Support Grant Receipt

CSG Receipt by Age Category - All
National Income Dynamics Survey

Age	Wave 1 2008	Wave 2 2010/2011	Wave 3 2012
Upper Age Limit	**14**	**16/17**	**18**
0	0.30	0.35	0.43
1	0.53	0.62	0.66
2	0.56	0.64	0.60
3	0.59	0.71	0.73
4	0.62	0.63	0.70
5	0.66	0.69	0.73
6	0.65	0.67	0.70
7	0.64	0.65	0.71
8	0.61	0.71	0.72
9	0.65	0.62	0.74
10	0.56	0.62	0.65
11	0.60	0.61	0.66
12	0.51	0.62	0.67
13	0.48	0.54	0.66
14	0.11	0.55	0.60
15	0.01	0.33	0.44
16	0.00	0.15	0.45
17	0.00	0.03	0.34
18	0.00	0.00	0.00

CSG receipt by Age Category (0-18), For e.g. in wave 2, 32% of 15 year olds were Child Support Grant beneficiaries. The boundary lines indicate the age limits – above the line is the highest age eligible for receipt, and ages below are ineligible. National Income Dynamics Survey, July 2013 Release. Estimates presented are weighted using the sample weights from each wave.

Table 4: School Enrolment Rates by Age

School Enrolment: Africans Aged 18 or under
by Age Category
National Income Dynamics Survey

Age	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3
7	1.00	1.00	1.00
8	0.99	1.00	1.00
9	0.99	1.00	1.00
10	0.98	1.00	1.00
11	1.00	0.99	0.99
12	1.00	1.00	1.00
13	0.98	0.99	1.00
14	0.99	0.99	0.99
15	0.97	0.86	0.96
16	0.95	0.86	0.93
17	0.86	0.82	0.91
18	0.76	0.65	0.76
19	0.53	0.53	0.53
20	0.42	0.46	0.35

This table shows the distribution of mean school enrolment by Age. The boundary lines indicate the age limits – above the line is the highest age eligible for child support grant receipt, and ages below are ineligible. National Income Dynamics Survey, July 2013 Release. Estimates presented are weighted using the sample weights from each wave.

Table 5: Determinants of School Enrolment

Determinants of School Attendance
African & Coloured Children between the ages of 15 and 19

	All Waves	Wave 2	Wave 3
Child Support Grant Beneficiary	0.06 ***	0.05 **	0.08 ***
Female	-0.03 ***	-0.04 **	-0.02
Age	-0.06 ***	-0.06 ***	-0.05 ***
Mother's Education	0.01 ***	0.01 **	0.01 ***
Coloured	-0.07 **	-0.01	-0.10 **
Mother Resident in Household	0.05 ***	0.07 ***	0.02
Household Income	0.00	0.00	0.00
Household Size	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rural Formal	-0.09 ***	0.00	-0.11 ***
Traditional Authority Area	0.01	0.04	0.01
Urban Informal	-0.05 *	0.00	-0.09 **
Eastern Cape	0.08 *	0.20 ***	0.00
Northern Cape	0.08 **	0.15 **	0.03
Free State	0.10 **	0.17 **	0.05
KwaZulu Natal	0.08 **	0.15 **	0.03
Gauteng	0.05	0.14 **	-0.01
Mpumalanga	0.09 **	0.10	0.09 *
Limpopo	0.11 ***	0.11	0.11 **
North West	0.04	0.15 **	-0.05
Wave 2	-0.09 ***		
Wave 3	-0.03 **		
Number of Observations	5,251	1,752	1,917

Notes: School enrolment is regressed on a number of variables, including child support grant receipt, in each wave, and for all waves, for African and Coloured Children. Other control variables such as number of children, adults and pensioners, household grant income did not change the coefficients of the included controls, but were highly correlated with variables such as household size and income, and were thus omitted. Robust standard errors are reported, corrected for clustering. * implies p value < 0.10, ** implies p value < 0.05, and *** implies p value < 0.01.

Table 6: Potential Duration of Child Support Grant Receipt by Year of Birth

National Income Dynamics Survey **Potential** Years of Exposure to the Child Support Grant				
Year of Birth	Wave 1 2008	Wave 2 2010	Wave 3 2012	Age Limit
1992	0	0	0	-
1993	3*	3*	3*	-
1994	6*	6*	6*	-
1995	6*	11*	13*	-
1996	9	12	14	-
1997	9	12	14	-
1998	9	12	14	-
1999	9	12	14	7
2000	8	11	13	7
2001	7	10	12	7
2002	6	9	11	7
2003	5	8	10	9
2004	4	7	9	11
2005	3	6	8	14
2006	2	5	7	14
2007	1	4	6	14
2008	0	3	5	14
2009	-	2	4	15
2010	-	1	3	16
2011	-	-	2	17
2012	-	-	1	18

Potential Years of Exposure to the Grant in each Wave. For example, an individual born in 2001, in wave 2 (2010) would have had a potential 10 non-interrupted years of grant receipt. *s indicate interrupted receipt. Those born in 1995 miss out on receipt in 2002. Those born in 1994 miss out on years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2008. Those born in 1993 only have receipt in years 1999, 2005 and 2006.We assume that 1999 is the first full year of exposure, as the grant was introduced in October 1998 and was initial take-up was low. We calculate figures based on the simplifying assumptions that individuals are born on the 1st of January, and that field work was undertaken in January (true for wave 1) and in each wave year, we add that entire year to the total count, i.e. in wave 1, 2008, an individual born in 2007 is assumed to have 2 years of potential exposure.

Table 7: Duration of Child Support Grant Receipt by Age Category

Average Duration of CSG Receipt by Age Category for Current Recipients

National Income Dynamics Survey

Upper Age Limit Age	Wave 1 2008 14	Wave 2 2010/2011 16/17	Wave 3 2012 18
0	0.4	0.3	0.2
1	1.1	0.9	0.9
2	1.8	1.8	1.8
3	2.6	2.6	2.7
4	3.4	3.5	3.5
5	4.0	4.4	4.3
6	4.6	5.2	5.1
7	5.1	6.0	6.1
8	5.3	6.8	6.8
9	5.5	7.5	7.6
10	5.7	7.7	8.1
11	5.4	8.5	9.0
12	4.8	8.6	9.4
13	4.9	8.9	9.9
14	4.7	8.5	9.8

Average Duration of CSG receipt by Age Category (0-18), For e.g. in wave 2, average duration of receipt for 13 year olds was 8.9 years. Unreasonable figures above the maximum possible years of duration were capped – i.e. in 2012, it is impossible to have more than 13 years of grant receipt, hence those reporting above – 14 or 15, were capped at 13. These numbers were few however. The numbers in grey show poor quality data, with very few responses. National Income Dynamics Survey, July 2013 Release.

Appendix Item A.1: Sample Sizes

National Income Dynamics Survey Sample Sizes			
File	**Wave 1 2008**	**Wave 2 2010/2011**	**Wave 3 2012**
Link File	0	35 124	41 479
Household Questionnaire	7 296	9 134	10 241
Individual Derived	28 226	34 104	37 447
Household Roster	31 144	36 187	42 242
Household Derived	7 296	9 134	10 241
Adult	16 875	22 837	22 491
Child	9 601	11 163	12 235
Proxy	1 750	1 124	2 721
Dead	0	1 020	730

Sample Sizes for the National Income Dynamics Survey, July 2013 Release.

Appendix Item A.2 : Child Support Grant: Dates, Amounts, and Age Limits

Child Support Grant: Dates and Amounts			
Date	**Amount**	**Age Limit**	**Means Test**
October 1998	R 100	7	R800 in
July 1999	R 100	7	Rural Areas
July 2000	R 100	7	R1,100 in
July 2001	R 110	7	Urban Areas
April 2002	R 130	7	
October 2002	R 140	7	No change in
April 2003	R 160	9	Means Test
April 2004	R 170	11	Until 2008
April 2005	R 180	14	
April 2006	R 190	14	
April 2007	R 200	14	
April 2008	R 210	14	
October 2008	R 220	14	R 2 300
January 2009	R 240	15	R 2 400
April 2010	R 250	16	R 2 500
April 2011	R 260	17	R 2 600
January 2012	R 280	18	R 2 800
April 2013	R 290	18	R 2 900

Source: Compiled from National Treasury Reports from various years. The Age Limit referred to is the upper age limit, for e.g. in 2011, those aged 16 and under received the grant. In 2008, the means test was changed to 10 times the grant amount, i.e. in 2009 when the monthly grant amount was R240, the means test was R2400. For married couples, the means test amount was exactly double, i.e. R4800 per month.

Appendix Item A.3: Child Cohort Sizes

Age Cohort Sample Sizes National Income Dynamics Survey			
Age	**Wave 1 2008**	**Wave 2 2010/2011**	**Wave 3 2012**
0	665	523	666
1	654	620	688
2	666	735	774
3	641	829	817
4	624	798	924
5	621	822	888
6	535	741	917
7	631	771	861
8	631	691	834
9	631	701	832
10	626	740	721
11	660	725	823
12	669	767	816
13	672	751	788
14	669	748	827
15	584	794	815
16	664	803	832
17	634	711	819
18	593	766	849

Age Category (0-18) Sample Sizes for the National Income Dynamics Survey, July 2013 Release.

Appendix Item A.4: Current or Past Child Support Grant Receipt for Africans

Are you a current or past CSG recipient?: Africans National Income Dynamics Survey			
Age Upper Age Limit	**Wave 1 2008** **14**	**Wave 2 2010/2011** **16/17**	**Wave 3 2012** **18**
0	0.35	0.42	0.47
1	0.67	0.70	0.75
2	0.72	0.74	0.76
3	0.77	0.78	0.81
4	0.75	0.77	0.83
5	0.78	0.82	0.80
6	0.76	0.81	0.79
7	0.76	0.83	0.83
8	0.76	0.83	0.82
9	0.76	0.82	0.81
10	0.71	0.80	0.81
11	0.72	0.80	0.81
12	0.65	0.78	0.78
13	0.62	0.78	0.79
14	0.41	0.73	0.76
15	0.02	0.61	0.70
16	0.00	0.39	0.64
17	0.00	0.09	0.48
18	0.00	0.00	0.12

Past and Current CSG receipt by Age Category (0-18), but including correction to include the wave 1 and wave 2 receipt data when correcting wave 2 and wave 3 past and current receipt variables. For e.g. in wave 2, 61% of 15 year olds either were Child Support Grant beneficiaries, or had ceased to receive the grant in the past 2 years. The boundary lines indicate the age limits – above the line is the highest age eligible for receipt, and ages below are ineligible. National Income Dynamics Survey, July 2013 Release.

Appendix Item A:5 : Child Support Grant Receipt by Gender and Age Category

CSG Receipt by Age Category For Africans
National Income Dynamics Survey

Upper Age Limit	14		16		18	
	Wave 1: 2008		Wave 2: 2010		Wave 3: 2012	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
0	0.36	0.33	0.40	0.43	0.43	0.50
1	0.68	0.67	0.70	0.71	0.72	0.75
2	0.71	0.71	0.77	0.69	0.71	0.75
3	0.73	0.76	0.72	0.69	0.76	0.73
4	0.74	0.76	0.68	0.66	0.82	0.73
5	0.79	0.74	0.70	0.71	0.74	0.72
6	0.76	0.74	0.67	0.71	0.69	0.75
7	0.75	0.73	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.75
8	0.74	0.72	0.77	0.69	0.75	0.74
9	0.75	0.75	0.67	0.70	0.72	0.71
10	0.66	0.70	0.71	0.68	0.75	0.69
11	0.69	0.70	0.66	0.67	0.73	0.72
12	0.62	0.59	0.67	0.67	0.68	0.71
13	0.53	0.58	0.64	0.64	0.72	0.68
14	0.16	0.12	0.60	0.55	0.66	0.67
15	0.00	0.01	0.35	0.37	0.57	0.52
16	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.20	0.49	0.49
17	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.34	0.41
18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

CSG receipt by Age Category (0-18), by Gender in each Wave. For e.g. in wave 2, 35% of 15 year old boys were Child Support Grant beneficiaries. The boundary lines indicate the age limits – above the line is the highest age eligible for receipt, and ages below are ineligible. National Income Dynamics Survey, July 2013 Release.

southern africa labour and development research unit

The Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit (SALDRU) conducts research directed at improving the well-being of South Africa's poor. It was established in 1975. Over the next two decades the unit's research played a central role in documenting the human costs of apartheid. Key projects from this period included the Farm Labour Conference (1976), the Economics of Health Care Conference (1978), and the Second Carnegie Enquiry into Poverty and Development in South Africa (1983-86). At the urging of the African National Congress, from 1992-1994 SALDRU and the World Bank coordinated the Project for Statistics on Living Standards and Development (PSLSD). This project provide baseline data for the implementation of post-apartheid socio-economic policies through South Africa's first non-racial national sample survey.

In the post-apartheid period, SALDRU has continued to gather data and conduct research directed at informing and assessing anti-poverty policy. In line with its historical contribution, SALDRU's researchers continue to conduct research detailing changing patterns of well-being in South Africa and assessing the impact of government policy on the poor. Current research work falls into the following research themes: post-apartheid poverty; employment and migration dynamics; family support structures in an era of rapid social change; public works and public infrastructure programmes, financial strategies of the poor; common property resources and the poor. Key survey projects include the Langeberg Integrated Family Survey (1999), the Khayelitsha/Mitchell's Plain Survey (2000), the ongoing Cape Area Panel Study (2001-) and the Financial Diaries Project.

www.saldru.uct.ac.za
Level 3, School of Economics Building, Middle Campus, University of Cape Town
Private Bag, Rondebosch 7701, Cape Town, South Africa
Tel: +27 (0)21 650 5696
Fax: +27 (0) 21 650 5797
Web: www.saldru.uct.ac.za