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“We are all in the gutter, but some of us are looking at the stars.” - Oscar Wilde

Introduction

This paper investigates the extent to which young South Africans are likely to over-estimate their chances of finding permanent full-time employment. It proposes that any persistence of inflated expectations despite evidence to the contrary may, in part, be explained by the inability to recognize their competence in this narrow domain, and argues that the existing search models used to explain unemployment may not be applicable to the labour market for young people in this country. The paper is, to the best of the author’s knowledge, the first attempt to frame the youth unemployment problem in South Africa as a deviation from a ‘rational actor’ model, which is surprising since as Beaulier and Caplan (2007:1) argue, the poor generally “deviate from the rational actor model to an unusually high degree.”

Youth unemployment in South Africa

Freeman and Wise (1982) identify several dimensions of the youth unemployment problem that distinguish it from the generally problem of unemployment. Younger workers are more likely to switch between searching for work and ‘non-economic’ activities such as education, and they are prone to being discouraged or less active job seekers. Furthermore, in their study, youth unemployment is generally concentrated among “a small group, who lack work for extended periods of time,” which has different characteristics from those that are employed. They also provide several explanations for the causes of youth unemployment, including the general level of aggregate demand in the economy and the proportion of young people in the population. There is a positive correlation between education and both employment and the wages young people earn, and they find that there are characteristics associated with youth unemployment that are not related to wages, including evidence which suggests that young workers from poor families experience higher rates of unemployment. They believe that the youth unemployment problem is a concern not only because of the immediate effects of inactivity (e.g. crime, alcohol and drug abuse, and other social and psychological problems) but also because, while a long spell of unemployment following the completion of school has no effect on employment more than three years later, such unemployment is associated with a sizable negative effect on the wages.

In one of the most widely cited academic studies to specifically look at the characteristics associated with youth unemployment in this South Africa, Mlatsheni and Rospabe (2002) define young people as those aged 15 to 30, since entry in the labour market in South Africa is thought to occur later than in developed countries (Mlatsheni and Rospabe, 2002). They use the 1999 OHS and find that “large amounts of the differences in employment of youth and older participants are attributable to disparities in observable characteristics such as experience and education in the case of wage employment and family characteristics in the case of self-employment. The latter is also likely to be greatly influenced by differences in access to credit.” Furthermore, unemployment is highest among African youth, young females and those with less education. Lam, Leibbrandt, and Mlatsheni (2007) extend the definition even further to 35.

1 They want to work but do not actively search for work
2 The National Youth Policy in South Africa extends the definition of young people as those aged 14 to 35 (Government of the Republic of South Africa, 1997).
3 O’Higgins (2003) points out that even though 15-24 is generally used in most developed countries, it is arbitrary and the definition may be specific to the economy.
However they acknowledge that the different groups in this range are not homogenous, and therefore propose that there three cohorts within this group that have similar properties: 15-19, 20-24, and 25 to 35. Using data from the Cape Area Panel Study (CAPS), they find that “by age 20, only 20% of African females and 31% of African males have ever done any paid work, using a very broad definition. In contrast, 86% of white females and 90% of white males have done paid work, with only slightly lower percentages for coloured youth.” They also find that while African and Coloured youth experience a sharp jump in labour force participation immediately after leaving school, Coloured youth find work much more quickly. Among African youth, there is a “steady increase in the percentage searching for work during the first 20 months after leaving school.” However, “by the 20th month after leaving school, only about 30% of African males and 20% of African females are working.” Lam at al. (2007) find that, while there is a high correlation between completed Grade 12 (Matric) or higher education and the probability of finding employment in the first 20 months after leaving school, this impact is halved when they include scores from a literacy and numeracy exam that was administered to the CAPS respondents. This, they argue, may “indicate that employers do not use schooling alone as a signal, but are also able to discriminate on the basis of ability.”

Table 1 shows that since the first quarter of 2008 the official unemployment rate in South Africa has been increasing for most age groups. Particularly among younger Africans, the rate of unemployment is very high, which suggests that the youth unemployment problem is not necessarily confined to ‘small group’. The figures, while alarming, understate the level of joblessness because they do not include those people who wanted to work but were not searching. Furthermore, they provide no insight into the type of jobs that constitute employment – the narrow definition includes any work in the week before as a job, even if was for just one hour and unpaid. Figure 1 provides an estimate of the population pyramid for African South Africans in 2010. Each cohort is separated by gender into the number of people that are permanently wage-employed, those that are contract wage-employed or self-employed, and those workers that are unemployed or not economically active. They show that the number of permanently employed wage-workers is significantly higher than the number of contract and self-employed workers for the other population groups in South Africa. However, among young Africans aged 20-29 the number of permanently employed wage-workers is lower than the number of contract and self-employed workers. Furthermore, the number of unemployed and not economically active people in this cohort dwarf the number of employed, and is approximately equal to the number of people in this group for the rest of the African population combined. Figure 2 presents a quadratic prediction plot of the proportion of young people in the age-cohorts 20 to 35 in permanent full-time employment, by population group in the third quarter of 2010. This proportion is increasing in age for both population groups. Again, however, the proportion is much higher and increasing at a higher rate for the other population groups (when combined) in South Africa: by age 28 less than 20% of African youth are employed in such jobs. Figure 3 shows the quadratic prediction plot of proportion of these young people that have been in permanent full time employment for six or less months. Less than 1% of the African youth in age-cohort 20 to 34 started a permanent full-time job in the preceding 6 months. While these proportion appears to follow the same general slope, the difference does not converge with age.

---

4 The numbers are the weighted average for the first three QLFS of 2010
5 Labour force participation is endogenous and determined by labour market conditions
6 The majority of those aged 15 to 19 are still in school
Table 1: Official unemployment rate by age group and population group (Source: QLFS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2008 Q1 %</th>
<th>2008 Q3 %</th>
<th>2009 Q1 %</th>
<th>2009 Q3 %</th>
<th>2010 Q1 %</th>
<th>2010 Q3 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-64</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured, Indian or Asian</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-64</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-64</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: The number of working-age Africans by employment and age-cohort in 2010 (Source: QLFS)
Figure 2: Proportion of age-cohort in permanent full-time employment, by population group in the third quarter of 2010 (Source: QLFS)

Figure 3: Proportion of age-cohort in permanent full-time employment for six or less months, by population group in the third quarter of 2010 (Source: QLFS)

7 More than 30 hours a week
Over-confidence, and job search

There is a significant literature dealing with and describing the high level of unemployment in South Africa (Fourie, 2011). Most of the labour discourse examines the characteristic associated with the supply of labour to the market, perhaps because of the relative abundance of this data. This literature generally focuses on age, education and job-specific skill, and to a lesser extent on behavioural explanations, perhaps because behaviour is an endogenous outcome. The most prominent of the latter focus on three issues in particular: labour force participation, the extent to which the search behaviour has an impact on individual outcomes, and the role that reservation wages may play. Kingdon and Knight (2000), for instance, suggest that non-searching unemployed should not be classified as not economically active because they are not distinguishable from the searching unemployed, and may just be “hampered by impediments such as poverty, cost of search, long duration of unemployment, and adverse local economic conditions” (Kingdon and Knight, 2000:1-2). Indeed, Schoer and Leibbrandt (2006) find that “search strategy is an important component of overall job-seeking behaviour for large percentages of searchers” and that “the chosen search strategy is a compromise between the most effective way of finding a job and what is actually feasible for an individual.” Then, while Kingdon and Knight (2001) find that the reservation wages of the unemployed are generally higher than what these people could expect to earn in employment, Nattrass and Walker (2005) find the opposite: that most of the unemployed have reservation wages that are substantially lower than what employed individuals with the same observable characteristics are earning.

The impact of the search behaviour and reservation wages are important since, as Eckstein and van den Berg (2007) point out, “traditional neoclassical labour market models are unable to explain long spells of possible involuntary unemployment.” In these models “the amount of labor that workers supply is exactly equal to the amount of labor demanded by firms at the equilibrium wage,” and in response a body of Search theories have emerged, which are based on the premise that “that finding a good job (or a good worker, in the case of a firm) is an uncertain process” (Fitzgerald, 1998). Search frictions arise as a consequence of imperfect information – both from the perspective of the person searching for a vacancy and from that of the firm looking to fill a vacancy (Eckstein and Van den Beg, 2007).

This imperfect information, however, generally refers to “uncertainty regarding market conditions e.g. the shape of the wage offer distribution” (Falk, Huffman, and Sande, 2007). Falk, Huffman, and Sunde (2006 A) show, using a laboratory experiment, that while “[s]tandard search theory assumes that individuals know, with certainty, how they compare to competing searchers in terms of ability”, they find that searchers are unaware of their relative ability. They develop an equilibrium search model with type uncertainty and non-participation where “unsuccessful search induces individuals to revise their beliefs downwards.” Their model implies that there is a “declining hazard from unemployment to employment, arising due to erosion of self-confidence in search”, since “search outcomes are only a noisy signal about ability, some individuals can become overly discouraged and stop search too early due to wrong beliefs, and that “workers with greater unemployment duration are less confident, and thus have a worse threat point in wage bargaining, consequently they earn lower starting wages even if they are identical in terms of their productivity.” (Falk, Huffman, and Sande, 2006 B). They are unable, however, to investigate the impact of unemployment on subjective beliefs in the field, since this would “require a survey that elicits individual’s beliefs about their relative abilities and job-finding
chances, and their certainty about these beliefs... [which] is currently unavailable.” Despite relaxing the assumption about type certainty, their model maintains that actors are rational in that they update their beliefs when they are given better information. In Falk, Huffman, and Sunde (2006 A), on the other hand, they find that people do not fully update this assessment in a manner that would be consistent with Baye’s law – they suggest this happens because “people find it painful to receive negative information about their relative ability.” In other words, while their model assumes that individuals are uncertain about their relative ability, they are rational optimizers. Furthermore, their model does not allow workers to have a preference for positive beliefs, which is at odds with the psychology literature where there is evidence that people are generally overoptimistic about future life events (Van den Steen, 2004).

Johnson and Fowler (2011: 317) argue that “confidence is an essential ingredient in a wide range of domains ranging from job performance and mental health to sports, business and combat”, and that it may even be that “not just confidence but overconfidence – believing that you are better than you are in reality – is advantageous because it serves to increase ambition, morale, resolve, persistence or the credibility of bluffing, generating a self-fulfilling prophecy in which exaggerated confidence actually increases the probability of success”. However, on the other hand, “over-confidence also leads to faulty assessments, unrealistic expectations and hazardous decisions.”

It would appear that, even though over-confidence may lead to desirable outcomes, the preferences associated with this belief can hardly be described as rational if these beliefs lead to “faulty assessments, unrealistic expectations and hazardous decisions”. Sims (2002) points out that there are a number of theories that consider “deviations from the assumption of rational, computationally unconstrained agents.” He proposes an additional extension to this literature: that people have limited capacity for processing information and rationally limit the information they use to make decisions (what he refers to as “rational inattention”). Santos-Pinto and Sobel (2005) even use two models to argue that optimism and positive image are rational and “widespread”, and therefore “may not be a compelling reason to change modeling approaches.” The first, Van den Steen (2004), shows how “rational agents with different priors tend to be overoptimistic about their chances of success”. The premise of the model is that if agents make random errors in their subjective assessment of the probability of success associated with an action, and they generally select the action they believe offers them the highest probability of success, they are more likely to select actions where they overestimated the probability of success, and are consequently overoptimistic. Santos-Pinto and Sobel (2005) then propose a similar mechanism to describe “individuals’ positive self-image in subjective assessments of their relative ability”. While both Van den Steen (2004) and Santos-Pinto and Sobel (2005) model positive self-image for individuals who use “different criteria to evaluate their decisions” and who then make choices, the latter also permit individuals to have different skill endowments (Santos-Pinto and Sobel, 2005). This allows Santos-Pinto and Sobel (2005) to model negative self-image, and to arrive at conclusions that are not possible in Van den Steen’s (2004) model. They acknowledge, nevertheless, that modifying beliefs by suppressing negative signals and overemphasizing positive signals is “outside of our framework.” It follows then that even though over-confidence is pervasive, it may be described as rational only insofar as it is the result of limited information.

Kahneman (2003), in contrast, argues that the central characteristic of agents, in general, is “that they often act intuitively” and that “their behavior is not guided by what they are able to compute, but by what they happen to see at
any given moment” and that findings “about the role of optimism in risk-taking, the effects of emotion in decision weights, and fear in predictions of harm,” amongst others, “all indicate that the traditional separation between belief and preference in analyses of decision making is psychologically unrealistic” (Kahneman, 2003).

Kruger and Dunning (1999) propose that people that are not able to recognize their own skill in a particular domain may have inflated self-assessments within that domain because they are unable to evaluate competence in this domain. This makes e.g. Kahneman’s (2003) “what they happen to see”, Van den Steen (2004) and Santos-Pinto and Sobel’s (2005) “different criteria to evaluate their decisions”, and Sims (2002) “limited capacity to process” / Santos-Pinto and Sobel’s (2005) “skill endowments” all different sides of the same coin, and provides a possible explanation for the limited updating that Sunde et al. (2006 - B) observe: where people with different priors and skill-endowments are given unambiguous information about their relative ability but do not update their beliefs according to this information. It may also provide a ‘systematic’ explanation for the high rate of youth unemployment in South Africa in it may explain why individuals continue to actively search for “a good job” in an extremely slack labour market, and it could also provide insight into a range of other ‘inconsistencies’ such as why people accept jobs at wages that are lower than their stated reservation wages.

It is important to point out that the Dunning-Kruger bias relates to a deficiency in meta-cognitive skill within a particular domain. In the job-search ‘domain’, individuals may overestimate the distribution of wages and /or their employment probability because, at low skill levels, they are unable to recognize ‘competence’ in others and they are unable to gain insight into their estimates using social comparison information. This, in turn, may have an effect on their behavior – along a number of different dimensions including, amongst others, the decision to enter and exit the labour market, how they search for jobs, the jobs they accept, and their tenure in a job. It is also important to point out that this is not a cognitive bias since, as Kruger and Dunning (1999) show, those people that are unskilled and unaware “can gain insight about their shortcomings, but this comes (paradoxically) by making them more competent, thus providing them the metacognitive skills necessary to be able to realize that they have performed poorly.” It differs then from the problem of limited information in that it introduces a non-stationary bias to the unskilled agent’s subjective interpretation of objective data regarding the agent’s relative ability in a domain, even if it is freely available, and distinguishes between this information and skill.

The remainder of this paper, then, shows that a high proportion of workers in a sample of young South Africans appear to be unskilled and unaware in job-search in that they have inflated expectations about their employment prospects and do not update this assessment when they are given objective information.
The Labour Market Entry Survey

To test this, the paper uses data from the Labour Market Entry Survey (LMES). This is the baseline study of the participants in the randomized evaluation of the effectiveness of a targeted wage subsidy on the employment outcomes of young Africans. The study focuses on two samples – a group of approximately 2500 young people who were randomly identified in selected enumeration areas, and a second group of approximately 1500 that were attached to several Department of Labour Labour Centres. In 2010 most of the respondents were between the ages of 21 to 25. Since mobility is crucial to understanding the labour market dynamics of these young people, the survey also followed those enumeration area respondents who had moved out of the original sampling area during the period between the two waves. At the time of writing, approximately 1700 respondents had been surveyed in the 2011 round – 1050 from the original Gauteng sample, and 650 from the Limpopo sample. Of these, 43% were male and 55% were 23 or younger at the beginning of 2011.

In the 2010 wave of the Labour Market Entry Survey, the respondents were asked two questions that were similar to each other:

1. How good do you think your chances of finding such a job in the next year are? The ‘such’ a job refers to a job that meets the time and minimum wage requirements of the respondent, which were asked just before this question.
2. On a scale from 0 to 10 - What do you think is the likelihood of you getting employed in the next 12 months? This question was asked directly after the first.

The data shows that a large number of these answers do not overlap – for example, of those that answered “Very good” to the first question, a significant number answered between 0 and 6 in the second question. There are a number of possible explanations for why the answers do not always correspond: The first is that, in the minds of the respondents, they refer to different types of jobs (the first question is more specific). Roberts and Suchecki (2010) show that there is a significant difference in the proportion of people in this sample who believed they are self-reported employed and those that are defined as employed using behavioral characteristics e.g. engaging in unpaid work, or working for someone else for at least one hour a week. This has implications for questions that leave the interpretation of ‘work’ or ‘job’ up to the respondent. The second is that the enumerators measured the answers incorrectly. In the case of the first question the enumerators may have selected the first two available answers more frequently – perhaps because the respondent prompted them before they had completed prompting the respondents. In the case of the second the

8 They visited the centre during the time of the interviews for, amongst other reasons, to process UIF payments, to register on the Department of Labour job seekers database, or to obtain assistance and counselling with regards to searching for employment.

9 H1.6 (days) How many days per week would you be prepared to work? H1.6 (hours) How many hours per day would you be prepared to work? H1.5 What is the absolute MINIMUM amount of money you are prepared to work {{hours}} hour(s) a day for {{days}} day(s) a week for 4 weeks a MONTH - with NO other benefits?
enumerators could have entered in the most common answer, or prompted the respondents to choose an answer. A third explanation is that the respondents did not understand the questions, answers, or the associated probabilities attached to these answers.

Despite these differences, the vast majority of the respondents who answered both questions believed that, in at least one of the questions, their chances were above average. Defining the answers in question 2 of 0, 1 and 2 as ‘Very poor’, of 3 and 4 as ‘Poor’, of 5 as ‘Neither good nor poor’, of 6 and 7 as ‘Good’, and of 8, 9, and 10 as ‘Very good’ allows us to compare these proportions: For both questions over 60% of the respondents believed their chances were “Very good” or “Good”.

**Estimating ‘incompetence’: Hypotheses and questions**

Kruger and Dunning (1999: 1121) suggest that people that overestimate their ability within a particular domain suffer “a dual burden: Not only do these people reach erroneous conclusions, and make unfortunate choices, but their incompetence robs them of the metacognitive ability to realize it.” It is important to note that Kruger and Dunning (1999: 1122) define incompetence as “a matter of degree and not one of absolutes. There is no categorical bright line that separates "competent" individuals from "incompetent" ones. Thus, when [they] speak of "incompetent" individuals [they] mean people who are less competent than their peers.” They have also “focused [their] analysis on the incompetence individuals display in specific domains” and therefore make “no claim that they would be incompetent in any other domains”. In their study, they test four predictions to show this:

1. “Incompetent individuals, compared with their more competent peers, will dramatically overestimate their ability and performance relative to objective criteria.”
2. “Incompetent individuals will suffer from deficient metacognitive skills, in that they will be less able than their more competent peers to recognize competence when they see it—be it their own or anyone else’s.”
3. “Incompetent individuals will be less able than their more competent peers to gain insight into their true level of performance by means of social comparison information. In particular, because of their difficulty recognizing competence in others, incompetent individuals will be unable to use information about the choices and performances of others to form more accurate impressions of their own ability.”
4. “The incompetent can gain insight about their shortcomings, but this comes (paradoxically) by making them more competent, thus providing them the metacognitive skills necessary to be able to realize that they have performed poorly.”

They investigated these predictions in four separate studies. In each study they “presented participants with tests that assessed their ability in a domain in which knowledge, wisdom, or savvy was crucial: humor (Study 1), logical reasoning (Studies 2- and 4), and English grammar (Study 3).” In all the studies they asked participants to assess their ability and

---

10 There are many different ways of mapping the scale to these categorical answers, since there is an overlap. The aim of this mapping is merely to highlight the differences above and below the average – which is 5 or ‘Neither good nor poor’, although this may also reasonably be interpreted as being between 4 and 6.
performance in order to determine whether they would “overestimate their ability and performance relative to objective criteria” - with specific emphasis on the extent to which their estimates diverged. The incompetent (those with the lowest scores) were predicted to greatly overestimate these scores. In the third study they showed the participants the responses to the tests by their peers, and asked them to indicate which of these they believed performed better – predicting that the incompetent individuals would be less accurate. They also asked the respondents to reassess their own ability, and predicted that incompetent individuals would not learn from their peers. Finally, in the fourth study they gave “participants training in the domain of logical reasoning and explored whether this newfound competence would prompt incompetent individuals toward a better understanding of the true level of their ability and test performance.”

To show, then, that the young people in the LMES sample are unskilled and unaware when it comes their assessment of their probability of finding employment, it is necessary to prove that a) they have highly inflated sense of their probabilities of finding employment market when compared to objective criteria – both in absolute and relative terms, and b) that they are unable (unwilling) to revise this self-assessment when they are presented with better information – because they are (remain) unaware that this assessment is inflated (Kruger and Dunning, 1999).

The original Kruger and Dunning (1999) study included less than a hundred observations, was fairly intensive, and subject to high level of control. While it was not possible to replicate these studies in the 2011 Labour Market Entry Survey, several questions were included in this round of survey to test the extent to which these young people are prone to this ‘bias’ when it comes to the assessment of their probability of finding employment. The questions are intended to test three hypotheses.

- **Hypothesis 1:** Young people dramatically overestimate their probability of including a permanent full-time job that pays them substantially more than the minimum wage they are willing to work for.

- **Hypothesis 2:** Those young people that dramatically overestimate their probability suffer from deficient metacognitive skills in terms of assessing their probability of finding permanent full-time employment, in that they are unable to recognize ‘competence’ – be it their own or anyone else’s.

- **Hypothesis 3:** Those young people who dramatically overestimate their probability are unable to gain insight into the true probability of finding such work.

The paper then tests:

- **Hypothesis 4:** Young people gain insight into their true ‘ability’ with age. In other words, this paper hypothesizes that competence (in terms of application-specific skill and the meta-recognition of this skill) is monotonically increasing in the duration that people spend on an application, and that this duration is monotonically increasing in age within those domains that are universal\(^{11}\) e.g. learning, relationships and search. The hypothesis is specified in this way since both search and expectations are endogenously determined outcomes: People who have higher expectations are more likely to search for work and thus ‘learn’

\(^{11}\) It is also possible that meta-competence increases with age if people learn from their experiences in other domains where the probability of learning (across and within domains) is monotonically increasing with age.
from their experience. If this leads them to revise their expectations downwards, they may as Falk, Huffman, and Sunde (2006) suggest be more inclined to stop searching.

Both the 2009 and 2010 rounds of the LMES include the question “What is the MINIMUM MONTHLY wage you are prepared to work 8 hours a day 5 days a week for?” In addition to this question, the following questions were added to the third round in 2011:

For Hypothesis 1:

• **Question 1:** How good do you think your chances are of finding any PERMANENT FULL-TIME job in the NEXT 3 months that PAYS R{reservation wage (min = R 1500) multiplied by m (=1.3)} A MONTH, if you wanted such a job? – VERY high (VERY good); high (good); average (neutral/neither good nor poor/50-50); low (poor/bad); VERY low (VERY poor/VERY bad). This is intended to determine whether the respondent dramatically overestimates his/her chances of finding such a job. Earlier it was shown that the chances for individuals in this age-group of being in a permanent full-time job (work) are very low (less than 20%). Since the reservation wage is determined by the information that the respondent has, and the aim is to test their assessment of their probability, this amount is multiplied by 1.3 (130%) to ensure that the amount used in the question is an overstatement of what the respondent is willing to work for. Using a percentile scale is not appropriate in this context, since as shown earlier there may be a high variance in the mapping of scale answers to percentiles. Instead, the answers to the questions will map the individual’s subjective assessment to the following quintiles: Above 80% - VERY high (VERY good); Between 60 and 80% - high (good); Between 40 and 60% - average (neutral/neither good nor poor/50-50); Between 20 and 40% - low (poor/bad); and Less than 20% - VERY low (VERY poor/VERY bad). The minimum reservation wage used in the question is set at R 1500 since the minimum monthly wage of domestic workers in this country is set at R 1506.36 for the period 1 December 2010 to 30 November 2011.

To test hypothesis 2 there are two questions.

• **Question 2:** How good do you think YOUR chances of finding SUCH a permanent full-time job are when COMPARED to other young people who LIVE IN THE SAME AREA as you, if you wanted such a job? - Much better (much higher); better (higher); the same (neutral/50-50); worse (lower); much worse (much lower). This question allows us to establish how the respondent views his/her probability relative to the other young people. The question does not include any reference to education or skills, but is more general – and attempts

---

12 In 2009 the median reservation wage for the sample was R 3500. The LMES also asked the respondents what they believed an acceptable wage was – the median for this question was R 4000. The second figure is 115% that of the first. In order to ensure that there is a ‘dramatic’ difference the percentage point difference (15) is doubled.

14 The minimum wage in South Africa is determined by sector/industry, for particular job types. The minimum wage for domestic workers is the lower bound.
to assess to what extent the respondent overestimates his/her ability relative to his/her peers (the “above-average” effect).

- **Question 4:** What do you think the chances of SOMEBODY ELSE with the same education living in your area has of finding a permanent full-time job in the next 3 months that PAYS R\{reservation wage multiplied by n (\(\geq 0.9, \text{min} = R\ 1500\)} A MONTH? - Very high (very good); high (good); average (neutral/neither good nor poor/50-50); low (poor/bad); very low (very poor/very bad). This is a more specific extension of question 2, where the wage is multiplied by 0.9 (90%) in order to determine if the respondent is capable of assessing the competence of others in this domain – in other words, if the respondent is able to see a connection between significantly lower wages and a higher (or at least equal) probability of finding a job.

For hypothesis 3, the enumerators are prompted to relate the following statement:

- "Wits University research shows that the chances of young people with the same education as you and living in your area finding SUCH\(^{15}\) work in the next 3 months are VERY low (VERY poor/VERY bad)."\(^{16}\)

Then, they were asked:

- **Question 3:** NOW that I\(^{17}\) have told you this, how good do you think your chances are of finding any permanent full-time job in the next 3 months that PAYS R\{reservation wage multiplied by \(m (=1.3)\}\ a month, if you wanted such a job? - Very high (very good); high (good); average (neutral/neither good nor poor/50-50); low (poor/bad); very low (very poor/very bad).

Since unemployment is high, particularly among young people, those young people who believe that their chances of finding such a job are very low, given the high rate of unemployment in this country, are the most ‘competent’ in the domain of assessing their probability of finding employment. It follows that even naïve but competent individuals will update their assessment with this information; provided that they understand the statement and that they believe the enumerator and/or Wits University research. Since the respondents had been part of this Wits University study for two years by the time they were asked this question, this paper argues that they have very little reason to ‘rationally’ doubt the credibility of the statement unless there are unobservable characteristics associated with these individuals that significantly improve their probability.

---

\(^{15}\) Statement follows directly after question 1 and 2

\(^{16}\) By using the reservation-wage multiplied by 1.3, and the permanent and “in the next three months” qualifications, this paper argues that the information should not be ‘painful’. While it would have been better to test this expectation for a job where not everyone had roughly the same (very low) objective probability, for ethical reasons this was not considered.\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\) The enumerator

\(^{18}\) Only 7% of the respondents indicated that they did not believe the research and 20% indicated that they do not believe the research applies to them.
Analysis

Reservation wages for full-time employment

Figure 4 presents a linear prediction plot of the minimum wages and both the actual and predicted monthly wage in permanent full-time wage-employment for each age-cohort in the sample. There are two additional measures of the minimum wage that add qualifiers to the original question: the second, which is “What is the MINIMUM MONTHLY wage you are prepared to work 8 hours a day 5 days a week for NEAR to where you live?”, and the third, which is “What is the MINIMUM MONTHLY wage you are prepared to work 8 hours a day 5 days a week if you were DESPERATE for a job.” All three are increasing in age, and the first is approximately R 1000 higher than the second, which is approximately R 1000 higher than the third. Both the observed and predicted monthly wage for full-time wage employment are increasing in age but, more importantly, both are significantly lower than the average for the first and this amount multiplied by a 1.3, and the latter is between R 1500 and R 2500 greater than the observed monthly wages. The predicted monthly wage is estimated using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) with education (having a Matric; and then, separately, having a certificate, a degree or diploma, or any ‘tertiary’ qualification that took less than six months to complete), a dummy variable if the respondent has more than six months of full-time work experience, one for if the respondent has more than six months of part-time work experience, and the respondents score out for six basic math questions19.

Figure 4: Minimum wages, and both the actual and predicted monthly wage in permanent full-time employment, by age

---

19 The regression also controls for the sample groups (Enumeration area or Labour Centre, treatment or control) and sample cluster standard errors
Probability of being in permanent full-time wage employment

At the time they were interviewed, approximately 45% of this respondents in the sample were wage or self-employed, 29% searching unemployed, 8% discouraged job-seekers and 19% were not economically active (NEA). Of the employed, only 36% were in permanent full-time employment (which includes indefinite informal employment). Figure 5 presents the linear prediction plots of the proportion of respondents who are in permanent full-time wage employment, those that are in permanent full-time wage employment and earning more than R 1950 a month, those that having been working in such jobs since the beginning of 2011, and the predicted probabilities for the same characteristics used in the wage specification. It shows that less than 20% of the respondents in the sample are employed in permanent full-time wage jobs, and that less than 5% have recently been employed in jobs that pay more than R 1950. While these proportions are also increasing in age, these two figures confirm that the probability of any one of the respondents finding a job that pays their stated minimum wage in three months is likely to be very low, regardless of their age, and that for most the likelihood of finding such a job paying 30% more than their stated minimum wage is closer to zero. Table 3 shows, however, that only 19% of the sample used in this paper believed their chances of finding such a permanent full-time job that pays significantly more than their reservation wage in the next three months was “Very low”.

Figure 5: Proportion of respondents in permanent full time employment and the predicted probability of being in full-time employment, by age
Hypothesis 1: Young people dramatically overestimate their probability of including a permanent full-time job that pays them substantially more than the minimum wage they are willing to work for.

In addition to the high proportion who did not regard their chances as low, approximately 53% believed that their chances were better or much better than the other young people living in the same area. These results are not, as the models on over-optimism (Van den Steen, 2004; Santos-Pinto and Sobel, 2005) argue, unexpected and do not by themselves imply the respondents are ‘irrational’. However, Table 3 presents evidence to support the argument that a significant proportion of these respondents may be regarded as ‘unskilled and unaware’ since they are unable to recognize their own relative probability, unable to recognize competence in others in that they do not associate lower reservation wages with a higher or an equally very low probability, and because they are unable to gain insight into true probability even when they are given reliable information about the objective probability of young people with the same education and skills.

Table 2: Answers to the questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much worse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Proportion of respondents that overestimate their probability, are unable to recognize their own competence, are unable to recognize competence in others, and who are unable to gain insight into their true probability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 1: Question 1 (Not low or very low)</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2: Unable to recognize own competence</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 Higher</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 Unable to recognize competence in others</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3: Question 3 Changed to very low</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower but not very low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started and stayed at very low</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to gain insight into true probability</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2: Those young people that dramatically overestimate their probability suffer from deficient metacognitive skills in terms of assessing their probability of finding permanent full-time employment, in that they are unable to recognize ‘competence’ – be it their own or anyone else’s

Unable to recognize own competence

To test the second hypothesis, this paper assigned the respondents in each general area to one of three groups in the order of their predicted probability of being in employment given their education, work experience, and a measure of their mathematical ability. Similarly, each was assigned to one of three groups based on their answer to question 2 – Low, Average and High. They were then classified as ‘competent’ if these groups coincided or if their answer to question 2 suggested they had underestimated their relative chances. 43% of the respondents strictly over-estimated their relative
probability, and significantly (at 1%) more of those who did also believed their probability of finding such a job (question 1) was not low or very low. It is important to point out that the reservation wage does not feature as a determinant of this probability, since the probability is only used as a relative ranking. In other words, the paper assumes that a young person with more education, work experience and ‘ability’ is more likely to find any such employment, regardless of her reservation wage, if she wanted such a job.

**Unable to recognize competence in others**

Those respondents who indicated that the probability of other young people with the same education finding a job (paying less than their reservation wage) was either equally very low or at least higher, were also more likely to have answered low or very low to the first question. Again, surprisingly, 20% of the respondents stated that probability of young people with the same EDUCATION finding a job earning less than the respondent’s reservation wage was LOWER than the answer they had given for question 3.

**Hypothesis 3: Those young people who dramatically overestimate their probability are unable to gain insight into the true probability of finding such work**

When the respondents were told that the chances of other young people with the same education and skills living in their area were very low, only approximately 10% revised their expectation to very low, in addition to the approximately 16% (from the original 19%) that started and stayed at low. Approximately 14% lowered their initial expectation, but not to very low, and almost half (48%) did not revise their answer. Rather surprisingly, 10% revised their estimate upwards. While 25% of those who answered “Low” for the Question 1 revised their answer to “Very Low” for question 4, proportionally more stayed at “Low” than those who answered “Average” to “Very high” and did not revise their expectations, even though proportionally fewer of the latter revised their expectation to “Very low”.

Nevertheless, more than half the respondents who answered “Average”, “High” or “Very high” for question 1 did not revise their expectation.

Table 4 summarizes these findings: proportionally more of the respondents who answered average, high or very high to the first question were unable to recognize their own relative probability of finding permanent full-time wage employment, or recognize that other young people with the same education were more likely to find such employment (earning less than the respondent’s reservation wage). In particular, 90% of this group did not revise their expectation to very low when they were told that the objective probability of other young people with the same education and skills was very low. One explanation for this is that their reservation wages were much lower than they could reasonably ‘expect’ to earn. However, significantly more than half of this group had reservation wages that were higher than what they could reasonably assume to earn, if they were in employment – almost 70% of those who answered “Very low” for question 1 had reservation wages that were higher than what they could ‘reasonably’ expect to earn. This raises an interesting paradox – while this group may be regarded as more competent in terms of their assessment of finding permanent full-time wage employment in their area, they are also less likely to recognize that other young people with the same education are more likely to find such employment.

---

20 The question was asked after question 3

21 This highlights the shortcomings of the “Very low” objective probability – those who answered “Low” initially have a smaller range of ‘reasonable’ options to choose from, and it follows then that relative competence is more likely to beget competence
employment in the next three months than those who believed their probability was higher, their stated reservation wages are significantly higher than what those young people with similar characteristics are earning in such employment, and this difference is greater than for those respondents who believed their chances were better. One possible explanation for this is that this stated reservation wage reflects an average of the wage offer distribution, and not the expected wage. This explanation is supported by the data which shows that less than 5% of the respondents had reservation wages that were lower than what they could expect to earn when selection into employment is considered in the wage estimation, and only 10% of the 225 respondents that were in full-time employment at the time of the survey (less than 1% of the sample) were earning more than their reservation wage multiplied by 1.3. Furthermore, only 20% of the permanent full-time employed were earning more than their stated reservation wage.

**Hypothesis 4: Young people gain insight into their true ‘ability’ with age**

Hypothesis 4 is tested by defining two measures of ‘competence’: Individuals are competent if they do not overestimate their relative chances when compared to their peers, they are able to make the connection between lower wages and a higher (or at least equally poor) probability of finding employment, and they update their initial assessment of their probability when they are given information about the true probability (of people with the same education and skills). Unskilled and unaware individuals are those who ‘fail’ on all three measures, and there is a group that falls between these two.

Approximately 1 in 4 of the young people in this sample can be described as unskilled and unaware when it comes to assessing their probability of finding permanent full-time wage-employment in the next three months, and fewer than 1 in 5 of the respondents are competent in this regard. While this measure of this ‘incompetence’ is significantly (at 1%) decreasing in age and competence is significantly (at 1%) increasing in age – as illustrated in Figure 7, this appears to be almost entirely due to the fact that relatively older young people have a relatively better probability of being in full-time permanent wage employment – as illustrated in Figure 6. Indeed, it appears that there is a positive relationship between the other measures and age – which disappears once the probability of being in permanent full-time employment is included in the specification. Since the equation used to determine this probability does not include age, the difference is attributed to work experience (as a proxy for skill, but also inadvertently for selection on unobservable characteristics).

The difference in age is, however, maintained even when the predicted probability relates to those young people who found such a job over the past six months, and continues to hold when those who are 25 or older are used to determine the relative ranking of the younger respondents but are excluded from the age estimation (one problem with assigning young people to groups according to their relative probability is that the that the oldest people in the sample are the upper bound).

---

22 There is anecdotal evidence for another explanation: some of the respondents regarded the survey as an interview, and some may have believed the research team would match them with firms at some point in the future – even though they were explicitly told that this would not happen.

23 Again, for ethical reasons the respondents were also not told “Your chances… are very low.”

24 Another approach would be to assign these individuals to groups based on their probabilities from a dataset such as the StatsSA QLFS that includes workers aged 15 to 64. However, this precludes defining these groups according to the
area the respondent lives in – which is important since these young people can hardly be expected to assess their relative probability against that of other young people who live far away.
Figure 7: Proportion of ‘unskilled and unaware’ and ‘competent’ respondents, by age
Discussion

The implications of these measures are ambiguous in that inflated expectations may have both positive and negative consequences: On the one hand young people who overestimate their probability may be more inclined to continue searching or take certain risks for which the realized payoff could ultimately be higher than for those who have more ‘realistic’ expectations. On the other hand, unskilled and unaware young people could also make “unfortunate choices”. This may include the investment they make in education and work-experience, or the extent to which they revise their reservation wage or do not search for or transition out of employment because of these investments or their perceived benefit.

The data shows that unskilled and unaware individuals were more likely to classify themselves as risk-loving, which may explain the rather counter intuitive finding that the unskilled and unaware respondents were more likely say that they would accept a permanent full-time job that pays only R 1500, but at the same time proportionally more of this group had turned down a job offer at some point. The data also points to another counter-intuitive result: the discouraged employed, in this sample, were more likely to be unskilled and unaware and less likely to be competent when compared to the searching unemployed – although this is again almost entirely due to the fact that proportionally more of the discouraged over-estimated their relative probability. Nevertheless, 54% of the ‘discouraged’ believed their chances of finding permanent full-time employment were “Average” to “Very high” and 68% of the ‘discouraged’ did not revise their chance to “Very low” when they, like everyone else in the sample, were told indirectly that it was. This finding in particular appears to be incongruous with Falk, Huffman, and Sunde’s (2006) search model with type uncertainty, and with the notion of ‘discouragement’ in job-search. Finally, and perhaps more importantly, the data shows that those respondents who were searching for employment are less likely to be “Happy” or “Very happy” with their lives in general when compared to those that were employed, discouraged or NEA; and that those respondents who were competent in terms of assessing their probability of finding permanent full-time wage employment were also less likely to be “Very happy” or “Happy” than their unskilled and unaware peers.

A cross-section of data and the explicitly endogenous nature of this measure of competence (their “dual burden”), however, make it very difficult to identify any effect, and are therefore not the focus of this paper. In particular, there is no way to identify how the duration in unemployment is correlated with skill, and the indirect method of using age does not yield elegant results over the narrow range available in the data. It’s also not possible to determine, with certainty, if those respondents who changed their probability to “Very low” actually meant and internalized what they said: for either the first or fourth question, nor is it possible to assess if there is a proportionate mapping between any ‘behavior’ and beliefs, as expressed (measured) using quintiles.

Nevertheless the findings in this paper lead to one unambiguous conclusion in that they place the labour market dynamics for the young people in this sample outside the scope of the existing search models. Even though the sample

25 These will be explored when the data from future rounds of the LMES panel becomes available. Despite the obvious selection problems, it would be interesting to see how incompetent unskilled and unaware individuals behave when compared to those ‘competent’ individuals with the same observable characteristics. Furthermore, the author of the paper may have overestimated to the extent to which such a narrow range of age would be sufficient to identify ‘wisdom’ as increasing with age.
is not representative of all young people in South Africa, and does not include older workers, there is no reason to believe that these findings would not be consistent in the broader population\textsuperscript{26}. Developing a search model that incorporates this ‘persistence’ of inflated expectations may provide policymakers with new insights into how these contribute to the South African unemployment outlier and how these expectations may mitigate the effect on employment of proposals such as reduced labour regulation and job-skills development, for all but the most desperate workers.

**Conclusion**

The proportion of young South Africans in employment and permanent full-time wage-employment in particular is low, and while these proportions are increasing in age, the latter is increasing at a very low rate. Search models may be used to explain high levels of possibly involuntary unemployment. These models, however, assume that even if workers are unsure about their relative ability, they revise both their expectations and this assessment when they are given objective information. This paper finds that this is not the case among a sample of young South Africans, and therefore argues that these search models are not able to fully explain the high rate of youth unemployment among the cohort from which the sample was drawn. This argument is, however, predicated on the author’s limited information on and understanding of these search models, psychological biases, and the unemployment problem in South Africa.

---

\textsuperscript{26} Heine and Lehman (1995) reveal that there may however be differences that can be attributed to cultural variation between groups: “Levels of unrealistic optimism were compared for Canadians (a culture typical of an independent construal of self) and Japanese (a culture typical of an interdependent construal of self). Across 2 studies, Canadians showed significantly more unrealistic optimism than Japanese, and Canadians' optimism bias was more strongly related to perceived threat. Study 2 revealed that Japanese were even less unrealistically optimistic for events that were particularly threatening to interdependent selves. The authors suggest that self-enhancing biases (such as unrealistic optimism) are, for the most part, absent from the motivational repertoire of the Japanese because the consequent attention to the individual that self-enhancement engenders is not valued in interdependent cultures”
References

