

## APPENDIX A

**Table A1: Mediation results when the social grants variable is the mediator**

Type	Variable	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		$\beta$	Z	p	
				Lower	Upper				
Indirect	Household size	0.006	0.002	0.002	0.011	0.010	3.001	0.003	***
	Indigency	0.006	0.002	0.002	0.011	0.003	2.920	0.004	***
	Age	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.006	3.006	0.003	***
	Medical aid	-0.018	0.006	-0.031	-0.006	-0.007	-3.003	0.003	***
	Transport exp	-0.002	0.001	-0.004	-0.001	-0.004	-2.970	0.003	***
	Gender	0.007	0.002	0.002	0.011	0.003	2.934	0.003	***
	Population group	-0.002	0.001	-0.004	-0.001	-0.002	-2.795	0.005	***
	Members under18	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.002	2.559	0.011	**
Direct	Household size	-0.023	0.010	-0.044	-0.005	-0.035	-2.271	0.023	**
	Indigency	-0.088	0.021	-0.128	-0.045	-0.035	-4.197	0.000	***
	Age	-0.068	0.004	-0.075	-0.061	-0.167	-19.248	0.000	***
	Medical aid	-0.635	0.027	-0.685	-0.587	-0.232	-23.226	0.000	***
	Transport exp	-0.094	0.005	-0.105	-0.083	-0.163	-17.713	0.000	***
	Gender	0.100	0.020	0.062	0.139	0.042	4.956	0.000	***
	Population group	-0.067	0.010	-0.085	-0.050	-0.062	-6.443	0.000	***
	Members under18	0.087	0.014	0.059	0.115	0.096	6.223	0.000	***
Total	Household size	-0.016	0.010	-0.039	0.001	-0.025	-1.667	0.096	*
	Indigency	-0.081	0.021	-0.122	-0.040	-0.032	-3.906	0.000	***
	Age	-0.066	0.003	-0.072	-0.059	-0.161	-19.068	0.000	***
	Medical aid	-0.654	0.027	-0.701	-0.606	-0.238	-24.512	0.000	***
	Transport exp	-0.096	0.005	-0.107	-0.086	-0.167	-18.312	0.000	***
	Gender	0.107	0.020	0.065	0.145	0.045	5.312	0.000	***
	Population group	-0.070	0.010	-0.089	-0.053	-0.064	-6.660	0.000	***
	Members under18	0.089	0.014	0.063	0.119	0.098	6.352	0.000	***

Source: Authors

\*\*\*, \*\*, \* denote 1%, 5% and 10% significance level, respectively.

*Note that the dependent variable (poverty status) was coded as 0 = no poverty, 1 = vulnerable non-poor, 2 = moderate poverty, and 3 = severe poverty.*

As shown in Table A1, the indirect effects represent the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable through the mediator. All the variables had significant indirect effects, though they were small. In terms of indirect effects, household size (0.006), indigency (0.006), age (0.003), gender (0.007), and skipping a meal (0.002) had small but significant indirect effects on poverty status through the mediator, social grants. However, medical aid (-0.018),

transport expenditure (-0.002), and population group (-0.002) had small but significant negative indirect effects.

On direct effects, household size (-0.023), indigency (-0.088), age (-0.068), medical aid (-0.635), transport expenditure (-0.094), and population group (-0.067) had small but significant negative direct effects on poverty status. Gender (0.100) and skipping a meal (0.087) had small but significant positive direct effects on poverty status.

Table A2 shows the mediation analysis for several variables, with the population group as the mediator.

**Table A2: Mediation results when the population-group variable is the mediator**

Type	Variable	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		$\beta$	Z	p	
				Lower	Upper				
Indirect	Transport exp	-0.003	0.001	-0.004	-0.002	-0.005	-4.631	0.000	***
	Public transp prox	-0.003	0.001	-0.005	-0.001	-0.002	-3.240	0.001	***
	Medical aid	-0.042	0.009	-0.057	-0.028	-0.015	-4.908	0.000	***
	Food parcel	0.004	0.002	0.002	0.007	0.001	2.758	0.006	***
	Education	-0.007	0.001	-0.010	-0.004	-0.006	-4.665	0.000	***
	Age	-0.004	0.001	-0.006	-0.003	-0.011	-4.881	0.000	***
	Household size	-0.005	0.001	-0.007	-0.003	-0.007	-4.523	0.000	***
	Members under18	0.009	0.002	0.006	0.012	0.010	4.700	0.000	***
	Social grant	0.007	0.002	0.004	0.010	0.003	3.911	0.000	***
Direct	Transport exp	-0.084	0.005	-0.096	-0.073	-0.146	-15.458	0.000	***
	Public transp prox	0.072	0.014	0.043	0.101	0.041	5.042	0.000	***
	Medical aid	-0.563	0.028	-0.615	-0.512	-0.205	-19.836	0.000	***
	Food parcel	0.131	0.029	0.067	0.187	0.038	4.542	0.000	***
	Education	-0.089	0.012	-0.113	-0.064	-0.076	-7.711	0.000	***
	Age	-0.077	0.004	-0.085	-0.070	-0.189	-21.040	0.000	***
	Household size	-0.027	0.010	-0.047	-0.007	-0.042	-2.726	0.006	***
	Members under18	0.098	0.014	0.071	0.127	0.107	7.050	0.000	***
	Social grant	0.054	0.024	0.008	0.101	0.023	2.279	0.023	**
Total	Transport exp	-0.087	0.005	-0.099	-0.077	-0.152	-16.132	0.000	***
	Public transp prox	0.069	0.014	0.042	0.097	0.040	4.868	0.000	***
	Medical aid	-0.605	0.027	-0.652	-0.554	-0.220	-22.325	0.000	***
	Food parcel	0.135	0.029	0.072	0.194	0.039	4.688	0.000	***
	Education	-0.096	0.011	-0.118	-0.072	-0.082	-8.366	0.000	***
	Age	-0.082	0.004	-0.089	-0.075	-0.200	-22.906	0.000	***
	Household size	-0.032	0.010	-0.051	-0.010	-0.050	-3.228	0.001	***
	Members under18	0.107	0.014	0.078	0.132	0.117	7.762	0.000	***

	Social grant	0.061	0.024	0.015	0.113	0.026	2.570	0.010	**
--	--------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	----

Source: Authors

\*\*\*, \*\*, \* denotes 1%, 5% and 10% significance level respectively.

Several independent variables had small but significant negative indirect effects as mediated by the population-group variable: transport expenditure (-0.003), public transport proximity (-0.003), medical aid (-0.042), education (-0.007), age (-0.004), and household size (-0.005). Food support (0.004), skipping a meal (0.009), and social grants (0.007) had significant small indirect effects.

Transport expenditure (-0.084), education (-0.089), medical aid (-0.563), age (-0.077), household size (-0.027), and skipping a meal (-0.098) had small and significant direct effects. Food support (0.131), public transport proximity (0.072), and social grants (0.054) had small positive significant effects.