### The interaction between informal land markets and ruralurban migration

**Final report** 

March 2011

Dorrit Posel University of Kwazulu-Natal & Colin Marx University College London

### Table of contents

Introduction	1
Background	2
Research questions	3
Research methods	3
Case study selection	3
Pilot study	4
Survey	4
Context	5
Results	6
Conclusion	15
Appendix 1. Questionnaire	17
Appendix 2. Settlement histories	
Settlement N	57
Settlement SP	
References	60

### Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Informal land markets are widely recognised as the predominant mechanism through which poor individuals and households gain access to urban land. In the Global South, African cities now appear to be confirming a trend that has been well established in other developing countries. In the early 1980s, Angel *et al* (1983) concluded that informal land markets were the most important mechanism for poor people in South East Asian cities. Over a similar period the importance grew in Latin and South American cities (Calderón Cockburn, 1999; de Soto, 1989; de Sousa Santos, 1977; Perlman, 1976). More recently, research in African (Antwi, 2002; Kironde, 2000; Rakodi, 2006) and Middle Eastern cities (Bayat, 1997; Razzaz, 1993) has confirmed the growing importance of informal land markets. Recent work prompted by Urban LandMark suggests that informal urban land markets are also of importance to poor people in South Africa's major cities (Isandla Institute and SBC, 2007).

If accessing urban land through informal markets is one feature that characterises being poor in South Africa's cities, another is migration. In apartheid South Africa, restrictions on the urbanisation of Africans gave rise to patterns of circular or temporary labor migration. Influx Control meant that African migrants mostly were not permitted to settle permanently at places of employment; nor could they migrate with spouses and family members. Consequently Africans, and particularly men, would migrate to places of employment, but they would retain a base in their (predominantly) rural households of origin, to which they would return each year, and which was their permanent "home". Available research on migrant labour, which uses nationally representative household survey data in South Africa, surprisingly suggests that patterns of temporary labour migration have not changed with the lifting of Influx Control and the ending of apartheid (cf. Posel and Casale, 2006; Posel and Casale, 2003). For example, between 1993 and 2002, the number of African households reporting at least one household member as a migrant worker increased from approximately 1.3 million to 1.9 million households (Posel and Casale, 2006). This increase has been driven specifically by the labour migration of women. Furthermore, available data suggest that most migrant workers remit income to their households of origin (Bowles and Posel, 2005; Posel, 2001), and that they visit "home" at least once a year.

Although informal land markets and migration are defining features of South Africa's cities, very little is known about how informal land markets influence migration patterns and how migration patterns shape informal land markets. Findings from the Isandla and SBC (2007) research highlight that certain types of households are more prevalent in some land markets than others indicating interaction between the nature of households and informal land markets. In turn, differential access to urban land markets may help to explain why individuals migrate "temporarily", when this migration becomes "permanent", and whether migrants are joined by other family members in the destination household. The overall study sets out to examine the interaction of informal land markets and migration with the objective of providing new insights on how the processes might constitute and mediate each other. This

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The assistance of Reathe Taljaard and Progressus Research and Development is gratefully acknowledged.

report begins this process by focusing on the migrant's characteristics.

### Background

There is very little research that links urban land markets and migration. To the extent that research has been done, it is generally framed and modelled at a macro-economic level and in very abstract terms. The few attempts to understand the interaction of land markets and labour migration work from the Harris-Todaro model. Harris and Todaro (1970) set out to understand why people in developing countries continued to migrate to cities when urban unemployment remained so high. The model has been used to explain many factors of urbanisation in developing countries (Ingene, 2001). Some of the most well known propositions relate to the seeming irrationality of migrants continuing to move to cities in the face of high unemployment (because migrants focus on expected wages which are defined as including the chance of actual employment) and formal economic growth increasing urban unemployment (because economic growth increases the expectations of wages thereby attracting more migrants). Notwithstanding the widespread acceptance of the Harris-Todaro model, it was not until about twenty years later that research started to incorporate the role of land markets as a factor influencing migration (Brueckner and Kim, 2001; Brueckner and Zenou, 1999; Nakagome, 1989). Work in this vein suggests that as urban economies grow, land rents are bid up, which in turn acts as a brake on rural-urban migration (Brueckner and Kim, 2001).

There has been no research in post-apartheid South Africa which investigates how migrants gain access to urban land markets, and how this affects the nature of migration patterns. One reason for this is because understandings of the operation of informal land markets (as an important entry point for migrants) are only just emerging. Another reason is that from the migration perspective, there is a paucity of data collected at the *destination* household of the migrant. It has therefore been difficult empirically to investigate how conditions in the destination area, including the migrant's access to land markets, affect the nature of migration, and in particular, whether this migration is permanent (involving a permanent change of residence) or temporary (in that the migrant intends returning to the household of origin in the future).

Information on temporary migration in South Africa typically is collected for the household from which the migration has occurred (the household of *origin*). Migrant workers are identified as individuals who are "usually regarded as members of this household, but who are usually away for a month or more because they are migrant workers (Labour Force Survey, September 2003, question 6.1). Because migrant workers are reported as retaining membership in their household of origin, this migration is interpreted as "temporary" or circular migration. However, it may be that what is identified as temporary migration in household surveys in fact signals the permanent out-migration of individuals (Posel and Casale, 2006). In a case-study of migration between the Eastern and Western Cape areas in 1997-8, for example, Bekker (2001) found that few migrants were reported to have returned permanently to rural sending areas. While many new migrants expressed their intention to return, this desire weakened with length of stay in the destination area (see also van der Berg et al (2004) on Eastern-Western Cape migration patterns). One of the key factors that may

influence whether migration is temporary or permanent, and whether it involves the migration of individuals or families, is the ability of migrants to transact in urban land markets and the types of claims they are able to create and maintain.

The collection of data from the perspective of the migrant in the destination household provides an opportunity to interrogate migration patterns in South Africa, and to study the interaction between informal urban land markets and migration. In contrast to the macro-economic models of the interaction of migration and land markets, the mobilisation of more qualitative research findings also offers the potential to shed new light on important issues.

### **Research questions**

The overall study explored how migration processes and urban informal land markets interacted. The first part of the study interrogated the "temporary" nature of migration within informal land markets. Using information collected from the perspective of the migrant, rather than the household of origin, we investigated whether migrant workers themselves see their migration as temporary, whether they continue to identify themselves as members of their household of origin and what factors influence their stated intention to return to this household at some point in the future. In the second part of the study (to be undertaken in 2011), we will use the information collected to explore the mechanisms by which migrants gain access to informal land markets.

### **Research methods**

The research collected quantitative data from poor households in two informal settlements in the north of central Durban. An initial scoping exercise was used to identify research areas through fieldwork and consultation with officials in eThekwini Municipality. The latter generated brief qualitative settlement histories.

### **Case study selection**

As one of the major cities in the country Durban attracts migrants from within and beyond its province (Cross et al., 1994; Smit, 1998; Todes et al., 2010). Historically, there have been significant shortages in low-cost housing in the Durban metropolitan areas (Freund and Padayachee, 2002; Kuper et al., 1958; Makhathini et al., 2002). Consequently, many urban-bound migrants find accommodation in informal settlements in and around cities, either renting or buying a shack through informal land markets (Isandla Institute and SBC, 2007). While informal settlements are not the only way in which migrants to the cities obtain places to live they are an option utilised by many people. Calculations suggest that about 25 per cent of the population of the eThekwini Municipality reside in informal settlements with the vast majority of informal settlement residents being African (SACN, 2006).

Within Durban, discussions were held with Municipal Housing officials to identify potential survey sites. The criteria that were identified are listed below:

- Size: Informal settlements were identified that had between 400 and 750 households. The aim was to be able to interview at least one in three households.
- Age: At least 2 years old to ensure that the settlements would have been mature enough for informal land markets to have formed.
- Language: the dominant language was used as a proxy for ethnicity and migrant's original locations.
- Location: The aim was to keep the locational effects constant by selecting informal settlements that were relatively close together and shared relatively similar locational features.
- Informal settlement establishment dynamics: This criterion refers to the extent to which the selected settlements were established by rural-urban migrants or 'over-spill residents' from existing nearby settlements. Although by definition it is extremely difficult to operationalise this criteria, Municipal staff involved in 'squatter control' have a good sense of settlement dynamics and were able to offer informed opinion.

Two informal settlements were selected on the basis of their best fit to these criteria. Settlement SP and Settlement N (the names of the settlements have been changed to ensure the confidentiality of the respondents).

### **Pilot study**

The survey was piloted on twenty households (ten from each settlement) and this led to a number of modifications to the initial questionnaire. Changes were made for the interviewers to code the household members more clearly; the skip patterns of questions were adjusted and made clearer; and questions relating to definitions of households and land rights were clarified.

### Survey

At the time of the research, there were approximately 600 shacks located in each of the two informal settlements. To select households for the study, random sampling techniques were applied by cluster. Each informal settlement was divided into four clusters with approximately 150 households in a cluster. In each cluster, approximately 63 households were selected using a sample interval of two or three households. In the event that respondents were not available, the household was visited at least three times before being replaced. The result was that 502 households and 1,432 individuals, 936 of whom are adults aged 18 years and older is available.

The survey instrument for the study comprised four parts. The first part asked demographic questions about all individuals in the household surveyed, including their age, education and marital status. The second part captured basic indicators of household well-being. In the third part, information on the nature of informal land market transactions was collected. The final part explored the nature of migration among adults, whether migrants saw themselves as members of another household, the composition of this other household, the kinds of ties that are maintained with the household, and whether the migrant wanted to return to this household at some point in the future.

In the remainder of the report, we focus on our findings concerning the nature of migration among adults living in the two informal settlements, in particular, on the extent of, and the factors influencing, dual household membership and likely return migration.

### Context

During the decades of apartheid, many families were divided across space by restrictions on the settlement of Africans within the country. The marginalisation of Africans in "homelands" and rural regions of the country where there were few employment opportunities and the levying of taxes, compelled African men, in particular, to migrate to "White" urban areas to find employment. However, influx control regulations typically prevented individuals from migrating with their families or from settling permanently at places of employment. As a result, migration was often circular and individual migrants saw themselves as members of more than one household (cf. Hosegood and Timaeus, 2001; Sharp and Spiegel, 1990). Migrants retained membership in their household of origin, to which they would return at some point in the future (for example, if they lost employment or became ill, and when they retired).

Although families are no longer forced to be divided because of Apartheid restrictions, available household survey data suggest that families remain separated because of the labour migration of individual household members. In both national and regionally specific household surveys conducted over the past decade, significant numbers of households continue to identify individuals who have migrated from the household to work or to look for work, as household members (Collinson et al., 2007; Posel and Casale, 2003; Posel and Casale, 2006). Households which report labour migrants as absent household members are predominantly African households located in rural areas of the country. These findings suggest that migrants remain strongly tied to their households of origin. Furthermore, the migrant's continued membership in the household of origin suggests that this migration is temporary and that patterns of circular migration therefore continue in the post-apartheid period.

The persistence of circular migration in the absence of institutional enforcement is not unique to South Africa and characterises the nature of urbanisation in several sub-Saharan countries post independence (Potts, 1995; Potts and Mutambirwa, 1990). There are a number of factors that may explain why individuals would retain a home base and continue to migrate temporarily, even in the absence of restrictive settlement policies (Bank, 2001; Cox et al., 2002; James, 2001). For example, high levels of unemployment in destination areas would increase the risks and costs of migration, and retaining a home elsewhere may provide insurance, or the opportunity to spread risks, in the context of labour market insecurity (Potts and Mutambirwa, 1990). Higher costs of living a more commodified life in urban areas, and access to housing (Wratten, 1995), may also be important reasons why individuals rather than families migrate, and these factors may help explain why migrants would choose to return to their households of origin, for example upon retirement. It is possible, however, that perceptions differ between the migrant and the sending household, as to whether the migrant continues to be a member of the sending household, and whether the migrant intends returning to this household after a period of migration. For example, members of the sending household, who are reliant on remittances sent by migrants, may be more likely than migrants themselves to assume (or hope) that migrants retain membership in, and therefore a commitment to, the sending household.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, retaining membership in the sending household does not have to mean that migration is temporary and that migrants will return to this household at some point in the future. Rather, what is identified as circular or temporary migration may signal the permanent out-migration of individuals, who while maintaining a strong relationship with the household of origin, may have no intention of returning to this household in the future.

We further investigate dual household membership and temporary migration in South Africa using information collected from the perspective of migrants resident in two informal settlements in Durban, Settlement N and Settlement SP.

### Results

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of all adults in the combined sample surveyed, and by the two informal settlements. For comparative purposes, we also include weighted statistics for the provincial sample of all African adults living in informal dwellings in urban areas of KwaZulu-Natal. These data are drawn from the nationally representative household survey, the National Income Dynamics Study (NIDS), conducted in 2008 by the Southern African Labour and Development Research Unit.

In many respects, the average adult in the combined sample in this study closely resembles the average adult in the provincial sample of informal settlement residents in urban KwaZulu-Natal (described using data collected in NIDS). Average age and education are similar, as is the proportion of adults who are female. The very low marriage rates among adults in the two informal settlements (only seven per cent reported being married) are echoed in the provincial estimates. Urban informal settlement residents in KwaZulu-Natal are significantly more likely to be cohabiting with a partner than to be married, but cohabitation rates in the two informal settlements are even higher than in the provincial estimates. As at the provincial level, the majority of adults in our combined sample are Zulu-speaking. However, by design, our sample includes relatively more Xhosa-speakers, the majority of whom live in Settlement N.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In South African micro datasets, there is evidence to suggest that views about household membership differ between sending households and the migrants themselves. Estimates of labour migration are substantially lower in the one national survey (the October Household Survey 1995) in which labour migrants are identified in the destination household (as individuals who are absent from another household for reasons of employment), compared to estimates obtained from all the other national household surveys, where a labour migrant is identified from the perspective of the sending household (Posel 2003).

Although Xhosa-speakers account for almost half of the Settlement N adult sample, adults in Settlement N are also far more likely than adults in Settlement SP to have been born in the settlement. In comparison to Settlement SP, where less than one per cent of adults reported the settlement as their birth place, approximately 16 per cent of the Settlement N adult sample reported having been born in the settlement. The age of adults born in Settlement N ranges from 18 to 52 years. This suggests that individuals were living informally on the land many years before a more consolidated informal settlement developed. The earliest date of in-migration among the Settlement N residents is 1960, with almost a quarter of adults (not born in the settlement) having in-migrated before 1990. In contrast, the earliest in-migration to Settlement SP is 1974, and less than five per cent of the Settlement SP adult sample had moved into the settlement before 1990.

	Combined	Settlement	Settlement	KwaZulu-
	sample	SP	Ν	Natal
Average age	32.35	30.94	33.60	33.55
	(0.37)	(0.39)	(0.61)	(1.48)
Average years of schooling	8.49	8.80	8.22	8.24
	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.42)
Proportion with at least a matric	0.21	0.20	0.22	0.21
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.05)
Proportion female	0.51	0.48	0.53	0.50
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.06)
Proportion married	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.07
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)
Proportion cohabiting	0.32	0.35	0.29	0.17
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)
Proportion Zulu-speakers	0.59	0.71	0.49	0.87
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)
Proportion Xhosa-speakers	0.38	0.26	0.48	0.13
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)
Dwelling place is owned	0.49	0.64	0.37	
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Proportion not born in settlement	0.91	0.99	0.84	
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.02)	
Proportion with another home	0.81	0.91	0.73	
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	
N =	936	439	497	360,381

#### Table 1. Individual characteristics of adults in informal settlements

Note: Adults are aged 18 years and older. Standard errors are in parentheses. The data for the KwaZulu-Natal sample have been drawn from the National Income Dynamics Study (NIDS) of 2008. These data have been weighted to represent population estimates for all African adults living in informal dwellings in urban areas in the province.

Adults in the Settlement N sample are also almost three years older on average than adults in Settlement SP, a difference which reflects a more extended age distribution among Settlement N residents: almost six per cent of adults in the Settlement N sample are older than 60, compared to less than one per cent of Settlement SP residents. Settlement N therefore appears to be an older and more established

settlement than Settlement SP. However, this does not translate into the greater (informal) ownership of shacks among Settlement N residents. Rather, a significantly larger percentage of adults in Settlement SP are living in shacks which respondents identified as being owned, rather than rented or occupied (64 per cent compared to 37 per cent in Settlement N).

Of particular importance is the finding that in both informal settlements, a clear majority of the adults surveyed reported having "another home somewhere else". As expected, given that a larger percentage of adults were born in Settlement N, the percentage reporting another home is significantly larger in Settlement SP than in Settlement N (91 per cent compared to 73 per cent). However, when considering only migrants (or adults not born in the settlement), then almost 87 per cent of Settlement N residents identified that they are part of another home elsewhere.

Dual household membership is therefore very common among adults living in both Settlement SP and Settlement N. Nonetheless, having access to another home does not mean that individuals want to return to this home. In the questionnaire, all adult migrants who reported being members of another household were then asked to identify whether or not they wanted to "move (back) to this home at some point in the future". In the combined sample, respondents were equally divided between wanting and not wanting to return to this home, with a remaining three per cent being uncertain. However, Figure 1 reveals clear differences between migrants in the two informal settlements: a far larger share of migrants living in Settlement N reported wanting to return to their other household at some point in the future.



### Figure 1. Intention to return to other home

Note: The sample includes all adult migrants living in Settlement SP or Settlement N who also reported having another home somewhere else.

Figure 2 describes the main reasons that were identified by migrants for wanting to return to their other home. For the majority of migrants, return migration was likely if conditions in urban areas deteriorated – if the migrant became ill, unemployed or reached retirement age. A little over twenty per cent of migrants also reported that they intended to return to their other home if employment opportunities increased there, or if they could gain access to improved housing there. In the remainder of the report the factors associated with dual household membership and intended return migration are explored.





Note: The sample includes all adult migrants living in Settlement SP or Settlement N who reported having another home somewhere else and wanting to return to this home.

#### 1. Dual household membership and intended return migration

In the combined sample from the two informal settlements, more than 90 percent of adults not born in the settlements identified being members of another household. Overall, a little under half of these migrants also reported wanting to move back to this household at some point in the future, signalling that they considered their migration as temporary. However, intended return migration also varied considerably across the two settlements.

There are likely to be a range of economic and non-economic factors that influence whether or not migrants retain a base in another household, and whether dual household membership in turn signals temporary migration. To explore these factors, we investigate differences in the characteristics and circumstances of migrants. First we distinguish migrants according to whether or not they identify also being members of another household. Among migrants who report dual household membership, we then compare migrants according to whether migrants want to return to this household in the future.<sup>3</sup>

Table 2 presents the means and proportions for these samples of migrants across a range of demographic, economic status and migration variables. A number of characteristics are associated with both dual household membership and intended return migration. In comparison to migrants who do not report dual household membership, migrants with another home elsewhere are more likely to originate from the Eastern Cape, their average duration of migration is considerably shorter, and they are significantly less likely to live in a shack which is owned rather than rented or occupied. Similarly, among migrants with another home, a significantly larger share of those who anticipate returning to this home come from the Eastern Cape, their migration duration is significantly shorter on average, and a significantly smaller proportion lives in a shack which is owned. These descriptive findings suggest a relationship between shack ownership and intended return migration (although the direction of the relationship cannot be specified). Migrants who are able to buy shacks may be less inclined to undertake return migration. It may also be that migrants who perceive their migration as permanent may be likely to purchase a shack

In some cases, however, the average characteristics of migrants differ significantly according to the dual household membership of migrants, but not according to whether or not migrants intend returning to their other home. Migrants who report another home elsewhere are significantly younger on average than other migrants and they are more likely to be cohabiting with a partner. One reason for this could be the insecurity of younger household heads associated with starting up a new household. However, there is little difference in the average age or marital status of these migrants according to their intended return migration.

Moreover, for a few variables, the differences between the samples are reversed. A significantly higher proportion of migrants who report another home elsewhere is employed compared to migrants who do not report dual household membership. However, among migrants with another home, a smaller share of those who intend returning is employed compared to those for whom return migration is not expected. Table 2 also illustrates differences between the two informal settlements outlined in the previous section. Migrants living in Settlement N make up a larger share of migrants who do not see themselves as members of another household, but among migrants who report dual household membership, Settlement N residents are more likely to anticipate return migration.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> All migrants who were undecided about whether or not they wanted to return to their other household at some point in the future (approximately three per cent in the combined sample) were coded as missing.

	Has anot	ther home	Among those with		other home Among those with			
	elsev	where	anoth	er home:				
			Intends re	turning to this				
			h	iome				
	Yes	No	Yes	No				
Characteristics:								
Average age	32.22**	39.50	32.55	31.84				
	(0.38)	(1.70)	(0.58)	(0.51)				
Average years of schooling	8.64**	6.78	8.58	8.69				
	(0.12)	(0.42)	(0.16)	(0.17)				
Has at least a matric	0.20	0.17	0.20	0.20				
	(0.01)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.02)				
Female	0.50	0.59	0.48	0.50				
	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)				
Head of household	0.57	0.54	0.61	0.55				
	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)				
Married	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.08				
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)				
Cohabiting	0.35**	0.22	0.33	0.36				
	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.03)				
Employed	0.70**	0.48	0.68	0.73				
	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.02)				
Dwelling place is owned	0.47*	0.60	0.39**	0.54				
	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)				
Total household expenditure	1109	1304	1020**	1185				
	(29)	(113)	(35)	(47)				
Born in the Eastern Cape	0.48**	0.23	0.56**	0.40				
	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.32)				
Born in KwaZulu-Natal	0.48**	0.75	0.41**	0.56				
	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)				
Parent was a migrant	0.80	0.72	0.81	0.80				
	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.02)				
Years since moved	8.96**	18.80	8.17*	9.69				
	(0.29)	(1.18)	(0.41)	(0.44)				
Settlement N dweller	0.47*	0.60	0.56**	0.36				
	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)				
Visits other home			0.99	0.96				
			(0.01)	(0.01)				
Remits to other home			0.59*	0.50				
			(0.03)	(0.03)				
Family lives at other home			0.77**	0.66				
			(0.02)	(0.02)				
Sample size	761	92	365	368				

Table 2. Means and proportions of migrants,	, by dual household membership
and intention to return	

Notes: The sample for the first set of data columns includes all in-migrants to the settlements. In the second set of columns, the sample is restricted to in-migrants who identified being members also of another household. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Means or proportions are significantly different at: \*\*the 95% confidence level; \* the 90% confidence level.

The last three variables identified in Table 2 compare the ties to their other home among migrants who report dual household membership, by the migrant's intention to return to this home. Almost all migrants who report dual household membership also report usually visiting their other household during the year. Importantly however, in comparison to migrants who do not anticipate return migration, significantly larger shares of migrants who see their migration as temporary report sending remittances and that an immediate family member (parent, partner or child) lives at the other household.

We further explore these differences in the characteristics of our samples using multivariate analysis, which allows an analysis of how each variable independently is related to dual household membership and intended return migration, as well as the strength of the relationship. Specifically we estimate two probit models which take the general form:

$$\Pr(y_t = 1 \mid X_t) = \Phi(\alpha, X_t)$$

where  $y_i$  is a binary categorical variable;  $X_i$  is a vector of observed characteristics for individual *i*; and  $\Phi$  is the standard cumulative normal distribution. In the first model, the sample represents all adults who are migrants (not born in the informal settlement) and  $y_i$  equals 1 if the migrant reports being a member of another household. In the second model, the sample is restricted to migrants who report dual household membership and  $y_i$  equals 1 if the migrant intends returning to the other home.

Both models include the same three sets of characteristics of the migrant: individual demographic information (the migrant's age, gender, marital status and education, and whether the migrant is head of household); the migrant's economic status (whether employed; whether the dwelling place is owned, and the total monthly expenditure in the migrant's current household), and a set of migration variables (the number of years since the adult migrated; and whether at least one of the migrant's parent was also a migrant). In the second model, we include an additional set of binary variables which capture the migrant is relationship with the other household (whether a child, partner and/or parent of the migrant lives in this household; whether the migrant usually visits the household during the year; and if the migrant sends or gives remittances to this household).

In the initial models which we estimated we also included a binary variable which distinguished Settlement N residents from Settlement SP residents. However, as the descriptive statistics in the previous section illustrated, three distinguishing characteristics of the Settlement N sample are the relative concentration of Xhosa migrants, the lower ownership of shacks and the older average age of adults living in this settlement. Because these variables will be highly collinear with a variable identifying the migrant's informal settlement, we do not distinguish Settlement N from Settlement SP residents in the analysis.

The results for the two estimations are reported in Table 3. We also report the marginal effects of the variables, which when multiplied by 100, show the percentage point change in the probability that the migrant has another home elsewhere (in Model I), and that the migrant intends returning to this other household (in Model 2).

	Mode	el 1:	Mod	el 2:
	Has anoth	er home	Intends retu	rning to this
	elsewl	here	hoi	me
	Estimated	Marginal	Estimated	Marginal
	coefficient	effect	coefficient	effect
	(standard	(standard	(standard	(standard
	error)	error)	error)	error)
Age	0.01	0.001	0.02*	0.01
-	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Has at least a matric	0.06	0.01	0.09	0.04
	(0.18)	(0.02)	(0.13)	(0.05)
Female	-0.11	-0.01	-0.12	-0.05
	(0.14)	(0.02)	(0.10)	(0.04)
Head of household	0.12	0.01	0.10	0.04
	(0.16)	(0.02)	(0.12)	(0.05)
Married	0.64**	0.06	-0.11	-0.04
	(0.31)	(0.02)	(0.20)	(0.08)
Cohabiting	0.27*	0.03	-0.05	-0.02
_	(0.15)	(0.02)	(0.11)	(0.04)
Employed	0.39***	0.06	-0.37***	-0.15
	(0.14)	(0.02)	(0.13)	(0.05)
Dwelling place is owned	-0.01	-0.004	-0.32***	-0.12
	(0.14)	(0.02)	(0.10)	(0.04)
Household expenditure/100	-0.01	-0.001	-0.01*	-0.01
-	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Born in the Eastern Cape	0.58***	0.08	0.31***	0.12
-	(0.14)	(0.02)	(0.10)	(0.04)
Parent was a migrant	0.06	0.01	0.14	0.06
-	(0.13)	(0.02)	(0.10)	(0.04)
Years since moved	-0.06***	-0.01	-0.02***	-0.01
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Visits other home			0.62*	0.23
			(0.33)	(0.11)
Remits to other home			0.21*	0.08
			(0.12)	(0.05)
Family lives at other home			0.18	0.07
-			(0.12)	(0.05)
$\chi^2$	120.83		73.19	. /
Sample size	860		733	

 Table 3. Estimating the probability of dual household membership and intended return migration

Notes: The sample for the first set of data columns includes all adult not born in the settlements; in the second set of columns, the sample is restricted to migrants who identified being members also of another household. Standard errors are in parentheses. \*\*\* Significant at 1%; \*\* Significant at 5%; \* Significant at 10%.

In contrast to a simple comparison of means across the samples, a multivariate analysis suggests that once other observable characteristics have been controlled for, the age of the migrant is not a significant predictor of whether the migrant reports being a member of another household. Instead, of the individual demographic characteristics, only the marital status variables are significant markers of dual household membership. In comparison to migrants who are not married but who are otherwise identical in terms of measured characteristics, those who are married are six percentage points more likely to report being members of another household. However, as the descriptive statistics demonstrated, less than seven per cent of migrants living in the two informal settlements are married, and only about on third of these married migrants (the vast majority of whom are men) reports that their spouse is not resident in the household. As a result, although migrants who are married are more likely than other migrants to report membership in another household, and although almost all of the married migrants with absent spouses are men, the typical migrant in our sample is not a married man who has migrated to the city leaving his wife behind in the household of origin. Furthermore, among migrants who report dual household membership, those who are married are not more likely to anticipate returning to their other household sometime in the future.

Cohabitation rates among migrants living in the two informal settlements are considerably higher than marital rates. These findings are consistent with other research which suggests that in the context of low and declining marriage rates, many African women no longer remain behind in rural areas in anticipation of marriage, but rather are migrating to the city where, with fewer social and cultural restrictions, they are able to form cohabiting relationships with men (Hunter, 2010). Migrants who are cohabiting with a partner are also more likely than other (not married and not cohabiting) migrants to be members of another household, but cohabiting migrants are not more likely to anticipate return migration than other migrants who report dual household membership.

Among all migrants who report also being members of another home, the only individual demographic characteristic which predicts intended return migration in a multivariate context is the migrant's age. As the migrant ages by one year, so the probability of anticipated return migration increases by one percentage point. Further analysis showed that this positive relationship between age and intended return migration is associated particularly with approaching retirement age among migrants. Rather than include a continuous variable which represents the migrant's age in Model 2, we used a binary variable equal to 1 if the migrant was aged 50 years or older. The coefficient on this variable is large, positive and significant – migrants who are 50 years or older are almost eight percentage points more likely than otherwise identical migrants with another home to anticipate returning to this home in the future.

Consistent with the idea of a migrant worker who is absent from the household of origin for employment reasons, migrants who report having another home elsewhere are significantly more likely than other migrants to be employed. However, among migrants who report dual household membership, migrants who are employed are 15 percentage points *less* likely than otherwise identical migrants to report that they would like to return to their other household. These findings suggest that measuring circular labour migration by the share of households which report migrant workers as absent household members, will significantly overstate the scale of temporary labour migration in South Africa. However, our estimations also suggest that migrants who retain active ties with their other home, by remitting income and visiting this home, are significantly more likely to intend returning to this home in the future. In this case,

more robust estimates of the temporary nature of labour migration could be derived by measuring the share of households which report migrant workers who remit income and visit the household during the year.

Greater economic well-being among migrants who retain membership in another household reduces the migrant's intention to return to this household. In addition to employment, ownership of the dwelling place and household expenditure are also negative and significant predictors of intended return migration. Migrants who own their dwelling place and who live in households which are relatively better off may anticipate more opportunity to settle permanently in the city. As noted earlier, the causation in the relationship between shack ownership and intended return migration may also run in the reverse direction: if migrants expect their migration to be temporary, they may be less likely to seek permanence by buying their dwelling place. However, the migrant's intentions may also change as more time is spent in the destination area. Our estimations suggest that as the duration of migration increases, so the probability both that the migrant remains attached to another household, and that the migrant intends returning to this household, declines significantly.

The province of origin of the migrant is also a significant predictor of both dual household membership and intended return migration. Migrants born in the Eastern Cape and having migrated to Durban are considerably more likely than otherwise identical migrants to report both being a member of another household and wanting to return to this household in the future. These findings suggest that circular or temporary migration may be more common at an inter-provincial level, where migration occurs over greater geographical distances, than at intra-provincial level. They also raise important questions for land use management in a province like Gauteng with extensive inter-provincial migration but with different regional economic dynamics(Todes et al., 2010).

### Conclusion

This research has initially investigated the extent of dual household membership and intended return migration, among a sample of approximately 500 migrant destination households drawn from two informal settlements (Settlement SP and Settlement N) in the Durban metropolitan area. There are two key findings that have specific implications for estimating migration flows and that provide insight into how rural-urban relationships mediate broader development approaches.

First, the large majority of adults who have migrated into the settlements see themselves also as being members of another household. This suggests that the governance and development of rural-urban interactions, within and around the province of Kwazulu-Natal, should work with a view of fractured and fragmented households (Mills, 2004; Wheelock and Oughton, 1996). As Rigg (2006, 79-80) observes the fragmentation can take two forms. Culturally, a fragmented household represents the way in which the interests of household members can diverge in response to broader social and economic changes. Spatially, the notion of a household as defined by co-residence no longer holds for a significant proportion of the population. Instead, Rigg (2006) notes, household relations that are increasingly stretched over space and time and mediated by new social processes are held together by the psychology of membership and economics of remittances and monetary flows. In other words, while some households are more fragmented and dispersed, it does not mean that household ties have diminished or that the household is no longer a meaningful social category. The finding is consistent with previous research that draws attention to the role of access to another household as part of a social safety net. Furthermore, there is a dual relationship between the migrant's household of origin and the destination household: at the same time as the household of origin may be reliant on remittances sent by the migrant, it also provides social insurance to the migrant in the face of uncertain urban opportunities. In the context of high unemployment rates, and in the absence of a well-functioning welfare system, particularly relating to old age and health care, membership of another household will remain important to migrants. Therefore, the temptation to introduce policies that divorce migrants' access to another household must be resisted (Potts and Mutambirwa, 1990).

Qualifying the first finding, the second is that dual household membership does not mean that migrants expect their migration episode to be temporary. Less than half the migrants who reported dual household membership in our sample wanted to migrate back to their other household at some point in the future. That the majority of migrants with membership in another household do not intend to return to this household helps explain why the populations of informal settlements in South Africa's cities and towns rarely decline.

Taken together, the findings have implications for the demographic estimation of continued "temporary" migration patterns and approaches to governance and development. In the absence of national surveys which track the movement of migrants between the sending and destination households, the extent of temporary or circular migration in South Africa has been estimated by the number of households which report migrant workers as absent household members. Our study suggests that these measures will considerably overstate the temporary nature of labour migration in particular. Among the migrants in our sample who report dual household membership, those who have employment are significantly less likely to anticipate return migration. However, we find also that migrants who retain active ties with their other household, visiting and remitting income to this household during the year, are significantly more likely to report wanting to return to this household in the future. These findings would suggest that using the available cross-sectional datasets in South Africa, a more plausible estimate of temporary labour migration could be derived by measuring the number of households which report migrant workers who also visit and remit income to the household of origin.

Our empirical analysis identified a number of other significant markers of intended return migration. Migrants who were not born in the province, who are older, and particularly approaching retirement age, and those who do not own their shack are significantly more likely than other migrants to anticipate return migration. The relative concentration of migrants with these characteristics in Settlement N helps explain why a significantly larger share of migrants living in this settlement anticipated return migration in comparison to migrants living in Settlement SP.

Appendix 1. Questionnaire

## **Informal Land Markets and Migration**

# **Survey Questionnaire**

2010

0.1	Interviewer number	Questionnaire ID	+
0.2	Interviewer name		
0.3	Date of interview	/_/	
0.4	Name of informal settlement		
	1 = SIM PLACE		
	2 = NIGERIA		

### CONTENTS

+ Interviewer number	Questionnaire ID		+
SECTION 4: MIGRATION	12 – 21		
SECTION 3: ACCESS TO LAND MARKETS	6 – 11		
SECTION 2: HOUSEHOLD WELL-BEING	4 – 5		
SECTION 1: HOUSEHOLD ROSTER	1 – 3		

## 1. HOUSEHOLD ROSTER

This section should be answered by the household head or a knowledgeable respondent

This section covers particulars of each person in the household

The following information must be obtained for every person who has stayed in this household <u>for at least four nights on</u> <u>average per week during the last four weeks</u>. Do not forget babies. If there are more than 10 persons in the household, use a second questionnaire.

	Person	(respon	dent) nu	mber						
Ask who the <u>head</u> (or the <u>acting head)</u> of the household is and record that person in column 01.	01 <b>Head</b> (or acting)	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10

	Write down the first name or initials of each household member (Note: The head's name goes in block 01)										
1.1	What is's relationship to the head of the household? ( <i>I.e. to the person in column 1</i> ) 1 = The head/acting head 2 = HUSBAND/WIFE/PARTNER 3 = SON/DAUGHTER/STEPCHILD/ADOPTED CHILD 4 = BROTHER/SISTER/STEP BROTHER/STEP SISTER 5 = FATHER/MOTHER/STEP FATHER/STEP MOTHER 6 = GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6									
	7 = GRANDCHILD/GREAT GRANDCHILD 8 = Other relative (e.g. in-laws or aunt/uncle) 9 = Non-related persons	☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9									
1.2	Is a male or a female? 1 = MALE 2 = FEMALE	□ 1 □ 2	☐ 1 ☐ 2	□ 1 □ 2							
1.3	<b>How old is ?</b> (In completed years - In figures only) Less than 1 year = 00										

+	Interviewer number	Questionnaire ID							] [		+
	Person	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
	number										
1.4	What is's present marital status?										
	1 = MARRIED	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2 = LIVING TOGETHER LIKE HUSBAND AND WIFE	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3 = WIDOW/WIDOWER	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4 = Divorced or Separated $\rightarrow$ Go to Q 1.6	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	5 = NEVER MARRIED	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
1.5	If married or cohabiting with partner: What is the person number of the spouse or partner?										
	If the spouse is not resident in the household, write 00										
1.6	Does have any children who live in another household?										
	1 = YES	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2 = No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3= NOT APPLICABLE - HAS NO CHILDREN	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
1.7	Which language does speak most often at home?										
	01 = Afrikaans	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01
	02 = English	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02
	03 = Isindebele/South ndebele/North ndebele	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03
	04 = Isixhosa/Xhosa	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04
	05 = Isizulu/Zulu	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05
	06 = Sepedi/Northern sotho	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06
	07 = Sesotho/Southern sotho/Sotho	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07
	08 = Setswana/Tswana	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08
	09 = SISWATI/SWAZI	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09

10 = TSHIVENDA/VENDA	☐ 10	☐ 10	☐ 10	☐ 10	☐ 10	☐ 10	☐ 10	☐ 10	☐ 10	☐ 10
11 = XITSONGA/TSONGA	☐ 11	☐ 11	☐ 11	☐ 11	☐ 11	☐ 11	☐ 11	☐ 11	☐ 11	☐ 11
12 = OTHER, <i>specify in the space at the bottom</i>	☐ 12	☐ 12	☐ 12	☐ 12	☐ 12	☐ 12	☐ 12	☐ 12	☐ 12	☐ 12

	Person	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
	number										
1.8	What is the highest level of education that has successfully completed?										
	00 = No schooling	00	00	00 🗌	00 🗌	00 🗌	00 🗌	00	00 🗌	00	00 🗌
	01 = GRADE R/0	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01
	02 = GRADE 1/ SUB A	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02
	03 = GRADE 2 / SUB B	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03
	04 = Grade 3/Standard 1	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04
	05 = Grade 4/ Standard 2	05 🗌	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05
	06 = Grade 5/ Standard 3	06 🗌	06 🗌	06	06 🗌	06	06 🗌	06 🗌	06	06	06 🗌
	07 = GRADE 6/STANDARD 4	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07
	08 = Grade 7/Standard 5	08 🗌	08 🗌	08 🗌	08 🗌	08 🗌	08 🗌	08 🗌	08 🗌	08 🗌	08 🗌
	09 = Grade 8/Standard 6/Form 1	09 🗌	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09
	10 = Grade 9/Standard 7/Form 2	🗌 10	10	10	10	10	🗌 10	10	10	10	10
	11 = GRADE 10/ STANDARD 8/ FORM 3	🗌 11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
	12 = GRADE 11/ STANDARD 9/ FORM 4	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
	13 = Grade 12/Standard 10/Form 5/Matric	🗌 13	13	13	13	13	🗌 13	13	13	13	13
	14 = NTC I	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
	15 = NTC II	🗌 15	🗌 15	15	🗌 15	15	🗌 15	🗌 15	🗌 15	15	🗌 15
	16 = NTC III	🗌 16	16	16	🗌 16	16	🗌 16	🗌 16	16	16	16
	17 = CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA WITH LESS THAN GRADE 12/STD 10	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
	18 = CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA WITH GRADE 12/STD 10	🗌 18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
	19 = BACHELORS DEGREE	🗌 19	🗌 19	19	🗌 19	19	🗌 19	🗌 19	19	19	🗌 19
	20 = BACHELORS DEGREE AND DIPLOMA	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
	21 = HONOURS DEGREE	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
	22 = HIGHER DEGREE (MASTERS, DOCTORATE)	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
	23 = Don't know	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
1.9	Does receive a social grant (such as an old age										

pension, a child support grant, or a disability grant)?										
1 = YES	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2 = No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

+ Interviewer number

Questionnaire ID

## 2. HOUSEHOLD WELL-BEING

This section should be answered by the household head or a knowledgeable respondent

### This section collects information on the household

2.1	What is the main source of energy/fuel for this household?			
		Cooking	Heating	Lighting
	01 = ELECTRICITY FROM MAINS 02 = ELECTRICITY FROM GENERATOR 03 = GAS 04 = PARAFFIN 05 = WOOD 06 = COAL	01 02 03 04 05	01 02 03 04 05	□ 01 □ 02 □ 03 □ 04
	07 = CANDLES 08 = ANIMAL DUNG 09 = SOLAR ENERGY 10 = OTHER, SPECIFY 11 = NONE	06 08 09 10 11	06 07 08 09 10 11	☐ 07 ☐ 09 ☐ 10 ☐ 11
2.2	In the past 12 months, did any <u>child</u> (17 years or younger) in this household go hungry because there wasn't enough food? 1 = NEVER 2 = SELDOM 3 = SOMETIMES	1 2 3		

4 = OFTEN	4	
5 = Always	5	
6 = NOT APPLICABLE (NO CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD)	L 6	

+ Intervie	ewer number Questionnaire ID			]	
2.3	In the past 12 months, did any adult (18 years or older) in this household go hungry because there	e wasn't en	ough food?		
	1 = NEVER				
	2 = Seldom				
	3 = SOMETIMES				
	4 = Often				3
	5 = ALWAYS				4
	6 = NOT APPLICABLE (NO ADULTS IN HOUSEHOLD)				5
					6
2.4	What is the main source of income for this household?				
	1 = INCOME FROM EMPLOYMENT				1
	2 = PENSIONS AND GRANTS				
	3 = INCOME SENT FROM ANOTHER HOUSEHOLD (REMITTANCES)				
	4 = OTHER INCOME				
	5 = NO INCOME				<u> </u>
					5

2.5	What was the <u>total household</u> expenditure in the last <u>month</u> ? Include everything that the household and its members spent money on, including food, clothing, transport, rent and rates, alcohol	
	and tobacco, school fees, entertainment and any other expenses.	
	$01 = R \ 0 - R \ 499$ $02 = R \ 500 - R \ 999$ $03 = R \ 1 \ 000 - R \ 1 \ 499$ $04 = R \ 1 \ 500 - R \ 1 \ 999$ $05 = R \ 2 \ 000 - R \ 2 \ 4999$ $06 = R \ 2 \ 500 - R \ 4 \ 999$ $07 = R \ 5 \ 000 - R \ 9 \ 999$ $08 = R10 \ 000 \ \text{or MORE}$ $09 = DON'T \ KNOW$ 10 = REFUSE	□ 01 □ 02 □ 03 □ 04 □ 05 □ 06 □ 07 □ 08 □ 09 □ 10

+ Interviewer number

Questionnaire ID

## **3. ACCESS TO LAND MARKETS**

This section must be completed by the person who owns or who holds the rights to rent, this dwelling place

3.1	Write down the person number of the person who owns, or who holds the rights to rent, this dwelling place	Person number:
	(Go to the first page of the questionnaire to identify this person number)	
3.2	How many rooms are there in this dwelling place?	
3.3	If you calculate all the costs (transport, fees, people you had to pay etc.), how much money did you spend to find this place? (Do NOT include the price you had to pay for this place.)	
	Give answer in Rands	

3.4	How did you get an agreement that this was your place or that you could stay here?	
	1 = THE AGREEMENT WAS MADE IN FRONT OF OTHER PEOPLE WHO LIVE HERE	1
	2 = I WAS GIVEN A RECEIPT/DOCUMENT/LETTER	2
	3 = THE OWNER GAVE ME A VERBAL AGREEMENT	3
	4 = THE AGREEMENT WAS WITNESSED BY THE COUNCILLOR	4
	5 = THE AGREEMENT WAS WITNESSED BY THE POLICE	5
	6 = I WAS GIVEN A TITLE DEED	6
	7 = THE TITLE DEED/PERMISSION TO OCCUPY IS COMING	7
	8 = THERE WAS NO AGREEMENT - THIS WAS AN AVAILABLE SPACE	8
	9 = OTHER – PLEASE SPECIFY	9

+	Interviewer number	Questionnaire ID		
3.5	Which of the following applies to you?			
	01 = YOU OWN THI S PLACE		🗌 1	
	02 = YOU ARE RENTING THIS PLACE		2	
	03 = YOU INHERITED THIS PLACE		3	
	04 = YOU HAVE BEEN ALLOCATED THE PLACE BY THE MUNICAPLITY		4	
	05 = YOU OCCUPIED THIS PLACE		5 🗌	
	06 = YOU ARE LOOKING AFTER THIS PLACE		6	
	07 = YOU ARE SHARING THIS PLACE		7	
	08 = OTHER – PLEASE SPECIFY		8 🗌 8	
3.6	Do you hold the rights (whether to own, rent, inherit, occupy, share etc) to:			
	01 = THE LAND ONLY		□ 1	
	02 = THE DWELLING ONLY		□ □ 2	
	03 = THE LAND AND DWELLING		□ 3	
	04 =don't know		4	
			_	
3.7	How much did you pay for this place initially?			
	Give answer in Rands. If no payment, write 0.			
3.8	How much do you pay for this place monthly?			
	Give answer in Rands. If no payment, write 0.			
<u> </u>				
3.9	At what price would <u>buying</u> a place in this settlement have become unaffordable for you?			
	Give answer in Rands			

3.10	At what price would <u>renting</u> a place in this settlement have become unaffordable for you? Give answer in Rands	□ 1 □ 2
3.11	If you wanted to, could you sell this place? 1 = YES $2 = NO \rightarrow IF NO, GO TO Q3.13$	□ 1 □ 2

+	Interviewer number Questionnaire ID	
3.12	How much could you sell this place for?	
3.13	Did you know the seller/landlord-lady before buying or renting this place?	
	1 = Yes	□ 1
	2 = No	2
	$3 = \text{NOT APPLICABLE}$ $\rightarrow$ <i>IF NO OR NOT APPLICABLE, GO TO Q 3.16</i>	3
3.14	Was the seller/landlord-lady:	
	1 = MALE	□ 1
	2 = FEMALE	2
3.15	In what language did (do) you speak to the seller/landlord-lady?	
	01 = Afrikaans	01
	02 = ENGLISH	02
	03 = ISINDEBELE/SOUTH NDEBELE/NORTH NDEBELE	03
	04 = Isixhosa/Xhosa	04
	05 = Isizulu/Zulu	05
	06 = Sepedi/Northern sotho	06
	07 = SESOTHO/SOUTHERN SOTHO/SOTHO	07
	08 = Setswana/Tswana	08
	09 = Siswati/Swazi	09
	10 = TSHIVENDA/VENDA	10
	11 = Xitsonga/Tsonga	11
	12 = OTHER, specify in the box at the bottom	12

ſ	3.16	Now that you have lived here for a while, do you feel that your rights to this place are stronger or weaker?	
		1 = STRONGER	1
		2 = WEAKER	2
		3 = ABOUT THE SAME	3

+	Interviewer number Questionnaire ID	
3.17	Which feature of this place (your dwelling place) has made the most difference to the amount you paid (or are paying) for this place? List the <u>MAIN</u> FEATURE WHICH YOU THINK INFLUENCED THE PRICE YOU PAID.	
	IF NO PRICE WAS PAID FOR THIS PLACE, WRITE 00	
		01
	01 = THE LOCATION OF THE SETTLEMENT TO JOBS	02
	02 = WHERE THE PLOT IS LOCATED WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT	03
	03 = THE SIZE OF THE PLOT	04
	04 = THE SIZE OF THE DWELLING PLACE	05
	05 = THE QUALITY OF THE DWELLING PLACE	□ 06
	06 = THE SECURITY OF THE DWELLING PLACE	07
	07 = HOW CLOSE THE TAPS ARE	 □ 08
	08 = HOW CLOSE THE ROAD IS	09
	09 = HOW CLOSE THE TOILETS ARE	 □ 10
	10 = A CHANCE TO QUALIFY FOR AN RDP HOUSE	
	11 = OTHER – PLEASE SPECIFY	

3.18	If someone should disagree about whether this place is yours or you have the rights to stay here, who would be the first person you would ask for help?	
	01 = YOUR NEIGHBOURS	01
	02 = YOUR FRIENDS	02
	03 = YOUR FAMILY	03
	04 = THE LANDLORD	04
	05 = THE COUNCILLOR	05
	06 = THE MUNICAPLITY	□ 06
	07 = THE POLICE	07
	08 = LAWYERS	08
	09 = THE COMMITTEE	09
	10 = THE PREVIOUS OWNER	□ 10
	11 = NGOS	11
	12 = OTHER – PLEASE SPECIFY	□ 12

+	Interviewer number	Questionnaire ID			+					
3.19	If you spend time (a few days or longer) away from this dwelling place, who	ooks after your place?								
	1 = YOUR NEIGHBOURS			1						
	2 = YOUR CHILD		□ 2							
	3 = YOUR PARTNER			3						
	4 = ANOTHER FAMILY MEMBER			4						
	5 = A FRIEND			5						
	6 = THE LANDLORD			6						
	7 = THE COMMITTEE			□ 7						
	8= NO-ONE LOOKS AFTER THIS PLACE			8						
	9 = OTHER - PLEASE SPECIFY			9						
3.20	Is there space for more people to live in this dwelling place?									
	1 = YES			1						
	2 = NO			2						

3.21	List the MAIN ADVANTAGE to living in this place:	
	01 = I CAN RUN A BUSINESS FROM HERE	01
	02 = I AM CLOSE TO JOBS	02
	03 = I CAN GROW SOME FOOD	03
	04 = I  AM IN A QUEUE FOR AN RDP HOUSE	04
	05 = I  Have something for my children to inherit	05
	06 = I HAVE AN ASSET THAT I COULD SELL	06
	07 = I HAVE DEVELOPED NEW SOCIAL NETWORKS	07
	08 = MY FAMILY CAN BE TOGETHER	08
	09 = I HAVE SOME INDEPENDENCE FROM MY FAMILY	09
	10 = I FEEL PHYSICALLY SAFE HERE	□ 10
	11 = PROXIMITY TO SCHOOLS, WHICH ARE CLOSE BY	□ 11
	12= OTHER – PLEASE SPECIFY	□ 12

+	Interviewer number	Questionnaire ID		
+ 3.22	Interviewer number         If you were to move away from this settlement, what would be the MAIN REASON why?         01 = YOU RETIRE         02 = YOU LOSE YOUR JOB         03 = ANOTHER MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD LOSES HIS/HER JOB         04 = YOU GET A BETTER JOB         05 = YOU FIND SOMEWHERE CHEAPER TO STAY         06 = YOU ARE FORCED TO LEAVE	Questionnaire ID	□ 01 □ 02 □ 03 □ 04 □ 05 □ 06	
	07 = YOU DO NOT HAVE THE MONEY TO LIVE HERE ANYMORE 08 = YOU ARE GIVEN A HOUSE BY THE GOVERNMENT 09 = YOU GET MARRIED 10 = YOU BECOME SICK 11 = A FAMILY MEMBER (E.G. CHILD OR PARENT) BECOMES SICK OR DIES 12 = YOUR PARTNER OR SPOUSE BECOMES SICK OR DIES 13 = YOU WILL NOT MOVE 14 = OTHER - PLEASE SPECIFY		07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14	
3.23	What will happen to this dwelling place if you should move from here?          1 = NOTHING - I WOULD JUST LEAVE THE PLACE AS IT IS         2 = A FAMILY MEMBER WOULD STAY HERE         3 = A FRIEND WOULD STAY HERE         4 = I WOULD SELL THIS PLACE         5 = I WOULD RENT THIS PLACE OUT         6 = I WOULD GIVE THIS PLACE TO SOMEONE         7 = I WOULD DEMOLISH THIS PLACE		□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7	

8 = OTHER – PLEASE SPECIFY	8

## 4. MIGRATION

### These questions must be answered <u>individually</u> by all ADULTS (aged 18 years and older) in the household.

	Person	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
	number										
	Instruction: Match each adult to the person number given on page 1 of the questionnaire. Fill in responses in the column responding the adult's person number										
4.1	Were you born here in this <u>settlement</u> ?										
	1 = YES → IF YES GO TO Q4.28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2 = NO	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
4.2	If not born here:										
	About how many hours by taxi would it take from here										
	to reach the place where you were born?										
4.3	Where were you born?										
	1 = WESTERN CAPE	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2 = EASTERN CAPE	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3 = NORTHERN CAPE	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4 = FREE STATE	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	5 = KWAZULU-NATAL						5	5	5	5	5
	6 = NORTH WEST PROVINCE		6				6	6	6	6	6
	7 = GAUTENG						7	7	7	7	7
	8 = MPUMALANGA		8				8 🗌	8 🗌	8 🗌	8 🗌	8
	9 = LIMPOPO	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
	If from another country, name of the country										

4.4	In what year did you move here, into this <u>settlement</u> ? If this year, write 2010.					

	Person	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
	number										
4.5	Where did you move from? 1 = WESTERN CAPE 2 = EASTERN CAPE 3 = NORTHERN CAPE 4 = FREE STATE 5 = KWAZULU-NATAL 6 = NORTH WEST PROVINCE 7 = GAUTENG 8 = MPUMALANGA 9 = LIMPOPO	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9
	If another country, name of country										
4.6	About how many hours by taxi would it take from here to reach the place where you moved from?										
4.7	Before you moved here into this settlement, In what type of dwelling did you live?         1 = TRADITIONAL DWELLING IN A RURAL AREA         2 = INFORMAL DWELLING         3 = BACKYARD DWELLING         4 = FORMAL DWELLING         5 = HOSTEL         6 = PRISON	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6									

+	Interviewer number		Questionna	ire ID					+		
	Person	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
	number										
4.8	What was the <u>MAIN</u> REASON why you moved away from the previous place where you lived?										
	01 = THERE WERE NO JOBS	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01
	02 = I LOST MY JOB	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02
	03 = MY work transferred me to durban	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03
	04 = I  got pregnant and was forced to move	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04
	05 = I  NEEDED TO REDUCE MY COSTS	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05
	06 = There was a conflict with the landlord/landower	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06
	07 = I was forced to move away from the place	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07
	08 = I WANTED TO BE INDEPENDENT	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08
	09 = THERE WAS TOO MUCH CRIME	 □ 09	□ □ 09	 □ 09	 □ 09	□ □ 09	 □ 09	□ □ 09	 □ 09	 □ 09	 □ 09
	10 = THERE WAS TOO MUCH POLITICAL VIOLENCE	□ 10	□ 10	□ 10	□ □ 10	□ 10	□ 10	□ □ 10	☐ 10	□ 10	□ 10
	11 = I WAS ALLOCATED THIS PLACE									 □ 11	
	12 = I WAS INVITED TO LIVE HERE	□ □ 12	□ □ 12	□ □ 12	□ □ 12	□ □ 12	□ □ 12	□ □ 12	□ □ 12	 □ 12	□ □ 12
	13 = MY PARTNER/PARENTS MOVED HERE	□ □ 13	□ □ 13	□ □ 13	□ □ 13	□ □ 13	□ □ 13	□ □ 13	□ □ 13	□ □ 13	□ □ 13
	14 = I INHERITED THIS PLACE	□ 14	□ 14	□ 14	$\square$ 14	□ 14	$\square$ 14	□ 14	□ 14	□ 14	□ 14
	15 = OTHER – PLEASE SPECIFY	 □ 15	 □ 15	 □ 15	 □ 15	 □ 15	 □ 15	 □ 15	 □ 15	 □ 15	 □ 15

+	Interviewer number				Questionna	ire ID			]		+
	Person	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
	number										
4.9	Before you moved into this settlement, from whom did you hear about it?										
		01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01
	02 = SPOUSE/PARTNER/BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND 03 = FRIEND	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02
	04 = NEIGHBOUR	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04
	05 = WORK COLLEAGUE	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05
	07 = RADIO		06		06		06	06	06	06	06
	08 = NEWSPAPER	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08
		09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09
	11 = COUNCILLOR										
	12 = MUNICAPL OFFICER	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
		13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	□ 13
	14 = NO-ONE - TMOVED AROUND UNTIL TFOUND THIS PLACE $15 = OTHER - PLEASE SPECIFY$	☐ 14 ☐ 15									
4.10	At the time of moving here, into this settlement, did you know other people living here?										

1 = YES	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2 = No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

+	Interviewer number				Questionna	ire ID					+
	Person	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
4.11	At the time that you moved into this settlement, where else could you have moved to?										
	<ul> <li>1 = A PLACE IN A RURAL AREA</li> <li>2 = A PLACE IN A TOWNSHIP</li> <li>3 = A PLACE IN THE CITY</li> <li>4 = A PLACE IN A HOSTEL</li> <li>5 = OTHER HOUSING PROJECT</li> <li>6 = OTHER COUNCIL PROPERTY</li> <li>7 = OTHER INFORMAL SETTLEMENT</li> <li>8 = NO OTHER OPTION</li> <li>9 = OTHER – PLEASE SPECIFY</li> </ul>	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9	□1 □2 □3 □4 □5 □6 □7 □8 □9
4.12	In what year did you move here, into this <u>household</u> (this <u>dwelling place)</u> ? If this year, write 2010.										
4.13	Did you move into this household with your partner? 1 = YES 2 = No	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2								
4.14	Did you move into this household with your child or										

	children?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	1 = YES	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	2 = No										
4.15	Did you move into this household with your parent/s?										
	1 = YES	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2 = No .	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

+	Interviewer number				Questic	onnaire ID					
	Person number	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
4.16	Do you have another "home" somewhere else?         1 = YES         2 = No       → IF NO, GO TO Q 4.28	□ 1 □ 2									
4.17	About how many hours by taxi would it take from here to reach your other home?										
4.18	Does your mother/father live at this home? 1 = YES 2 = NO	□ 1 □ 2									
4.19	Does your spouse or partner live at this home? 1 = YES 2 = NO	□ 1 □ 2	☐ 1 ☐ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2					
4.20	Does your child (children) live at this home? 1 = YES 2 = No	□ 1 □ 2									
4.21	Do other family members (other than partner, parents or children), live at this home? 1 = YES 2 = No	□ 1 □ 2									

+	Interviewer number Questionnaire ID											
	Person number	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	
4.22	Do you usually visit this home every year?											
	1 = Yes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2 = No → IF NO GO TO Q4.24	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
4.23	If yes, how often do you usually visit this home?											
	1 = ONCE A YEAR	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2 = 2 - 5 TIMES A YEAR	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	3 = 6 - 11 TIMES A YEAR	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
	4 = ONCE A MONTH	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
	5 = MORE OFTEN THAN ONCE A MONTH	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
4.24	Would you like to move (back) to this home at some point in the future?											
	1 = YES	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	
	2 = No → IF NO GO TO Q4.26	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	3 = don't know	□ 3	3	3	□ 3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
4.25	What would be the <u>main</u> reason why you would move back to this home at some point in the future?											
	01 = I LOSE MY JOB	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	
	02 = I RETIRE FROM MY JOB	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	02	
	03 = I GET MARRIED	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	03	
	04 = ONE OF MY PARENTS DIES	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	04	
	05 = MY PARTNER/SPOUSE DIES	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	05	
	06 = I BECOME ILL	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	
	07 = MY PARTNER/CHILD/OTHER FAMILY MEMBER BECOMES ILL	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	07	
	08 = i could afford to build a new house there	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	
	09 = I COULD AFFORD TO IMPROVE AN EXISTING HOUSE THERE	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	09	

10 = NEW SCHOOLS ARE BUILT THERE FOR MY CHILDREN 11 = I HAVE ANOTHER CHILD 12 = I AM FORCED TO LEAVE BECAUSE OF VIOLENCE/CRIME	☐ 10 ☐ 11 ☐ 12	□ 10 □ 11 □ 12	☐ 10 ☐ 11 ☐ 12							
13 = OTHER – PLEASE SPECIFY	 □ 13	13	13	 □ 13	13	 □ 13	13	13	13	13

+	Interviewer number Questionnaire ID											
	Person number	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	
4.26	Do you give money, food or any other items to people at this home?											
	1 = YES 2 = No → IF NO, GO TO Q 4.28	☐ 1 ☐ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	☐ 1 ☐ 2	☐ 1 ☐ 2	☐ 1 ☐ 2	☐ 1 ☐ 2	□ 1 □ 2	☐ 1 ☐ 2	
4.27	What is the total <u>monthly</u> value of the money, food or other items that you give to people at this home? Give answer in Rands											
4.28	Do you give money, food or other items to people living in <u>another household</u> ?											
	Note: This other household is not seen as the respondent's other "home"											
	1 = YES	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	□ 1 □ 2	
4.29	What is the total <u>MONTHLY</u> value of the money, food or other items that you give to this household?											
4.30	What is the <u>MAIN</u> reason why members of your immediate family (e.g. your children or partner/spouse) have not moved with you into this settlement?											
	<ul> <li>1 = IT IS NOT SAFE HERE (TOO MUCH CRIME OR VIOLENCE)</li> <li>2 = NOT ENOUGH SPACE IN THIS DWELLING PLACE</li> <li>3 = IT IS TOO EXPENSIVE TO LIVE HERE</li> <li>4 = THE SERVICES HERE (WATER, ELECTRICITY) ARE NOT GOOD</li> </ul>	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5									

5 = THE SCHOOLS HERE ARE NOT GOOD	5 🗌	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
6 = THEY NEED TO LOOK AFTER THE HOUSE THERE	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	□7	7	7
7 = I AM WORKING AND I HAVE NO-ONE TO LOOK AFTER MY CHILD	7	8 🗌	8 🗌	8 🗌	8 🗌	8 🗌	8 🗌	8 🗌	8 🗌	8 🗌
8 = NOT APPLICABLE - NO IMMEDIATE FAMILY ELSEWHERE	8 🗌	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
9 = OTHER - PLEASE SPECIFY	9									

#### Interviewer number +

+	Interviewer number										
		01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
	Person number										
4.31	At some point in the future, would you like your immediate family to move here (to Durban)?										
	1 = YES	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	1	□ 1	1
	2 = No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3 = don't know	3	3	□ 3	□ 3	□ 3	□ 3	□ 3	3	□ 3	3
	4= NOT APPLICABLE	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
4.32	Over the past <u>month</u> , how many nights did you sleep here under this roof?										
4.33	Over the past <u>month</u> , have you done any work for which money or goods were received? (Report "yes" even if worked only for one or a few days in the month.) 1 = YES $2 = NO \rightarrow If NO, GO TO Q4.36$	□ 1 □ 2									
4.34	How many hours in total do you usually work in a <u>week</u> ?										
4.35	Is this regular employment? (Do you work regularly for a number of days a week?) $1 = YES \rightarrow If YES GO TO Q4.38$ 2 = NO	□ 1 □ 2									
1											

| 4.36 | Would you like to find a regular job?<br>1 = YES<br>2 = No                | ☐ 1<br>☐ 2 | ☐ 1<br>☐ 2 | □ 1<br>□ 2 | ☐ 1<br>☐ 2 | □ 1<br>□ 2 | ☐ 1<br>☐ 2 |
|------|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 4.37 | Have you looked for a job in the <u>past month</u> ?<br>1 = YES<br>2 = NO | □ 1<br>□ 2 |

#### + Interviewer number

#### Questionnaire ID

		01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
	Person number										
4.38	Did your father ever leave his home to look for work in a town?										
	1 = YES	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1
	2 = No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3 = don't know	3	3	3	3	□ 3	3	3	3	3	□ 3
	4 = NOT APPLICABLE	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
4.39	Did your mother ever leave his home to look for work in a town?										
	1 = YES	1	1	□ 1	1	□ 1	1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1
	2 = No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3 = don't know	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4 = NOT APPLICABLE	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
4.40	Did your father (eventually) return to this home?										
	1 = YES	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2 = NO	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3 = don't know	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4 = NOT APPLICABLE	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
4.41	Did your mother (eventually) return to this home?										
	1 = YES										
	2 = NO	<u>□</u> 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	3 = don't know	∐ 2				12					
	4 = NOT APPLICABLE	□ 3 □ 4									

### **Appendix 2. Settlement histories**

### Settlement N

- **1. When was this Settlement established?** 1989 (late 80s), it was a sugar cane farm which belongs to the Mfeka family.
- **2.** How many people are currently living in this settlement? 1500
- **3.** Who first moved here and why? Xhosas (Pondos) to be specific because they were fighting with people from the Mbokodweni area south of Durban.
- **4. Where did they come from?** From farms south of Durban but they are originally from the Eastern Cape.
- 5. Did they experience any problems/resistance from the surrounding community when moving here, describe? No resistance because the land was vacant and they were brought in here by the then Zulu government as part of stabilizing the situation since there was also political violence between the Zulus and the Xhosas.
- 6. What was the council's response to the settlement when they first moved here?

They had no problem because the government was involved in this move.

- 7. What is the Council's plan with this Settlement in future? No plan in place yet but there has been ongoing negotiations between the council and land owners but there hasn't been anything solid thus far that the council has committed to.
- 8. What are the main challenges facing this settlement?
  - The council sees the land owners as a threat and as a result they haven't been involved in most of the meetings that are being held in this community.
  - The land owners want to develop this place by building low cost houses but the challenge at the moment is to secure funding because this area is wet due to its agricultural background.
  - The residents as well do not view this place as their permanent home, they still want to go back to the Eastern Cape when they grow old, retire or become sick.
  - The council does not want to commit itself to helping in the development of this area because they want to over its ownership without paying for it and they also do not want to establish a partnership with the owners.
- 9. Have there been different groups of people that have moved in over time, who are these different groups? (so that we can try to get a sense of whether there has been different waves of settlement) Yes the South Sothos from Matatiele, Shangaans from Mozambique and other people from neighboring countries like Lesotho, Zimbabwe but there has

never been any conflict.

### 10. Are there any committees in the settlement and who are they?

Yes there are but I am not sure how many they are because I am not involved in any new developments that have been taken by these committees as they are very politically oriented.

# **11.** How often do the different committees get involved in people in or out of the settlement?

The landowners do not want any new dwellings to be built and if somebody decides to leave, they should demolish the place so that they can have control of the land back.

### **Settlement SP**

12. When was this Settlement established?

In the 1980s and by 1992, there were about 97 people living here.

**13. How many people are currently living in this settlement?** About 2000

### 14. Who first moved here and why?

It was Mr. Mthiyane and others such as Mr. Dlamini and Mr. Khoza. Mr. Mthiyane was working at a nearby sugar cane farms and he erected a shack in the idle bush area to make easier to get to work, the others erected shacks as well for the same reason. The females were employed in nearby Indian homes and so they settled at Settlement SP for easy access to work.

### 15. Where did they come from?

Mr. Mthiyane came from Zululand the others who followed came from Matatiele, Transkei and other parts of KZN.

# **16.** Did they experience any problems/resistance from the surrounding community when moving here, describe?

Yes there was a lot of resistance from Indians from the surrounding communities as they felt that:

- Shacks would reduce the market value of their houses.
- People living in the shacks would bring about criminal activities in the area
- There were also worried about where and the people living in the shacks would get water and access to proper toilets
- The police were called to evict the dwellers and destroy the shacks but the dwellers would always come back and erect new shacks. The Democratic Party was in charge of the municipality at the time and was not happy when blacks occupied Settlement SP.

# **17.** What was the council's response to the settlement when they first moved here?

The Democratic Party was in charge of the municipality at the time and was not happy when blacks occupied that piece of land. After that, there was no more resistance from the Police and the surrounding community hence the shack dwellers could invite their relatives to come and live with them and try to find jobs. As a result, more and more people came and more shacks were erected.

### 18. What is the Council's plan with this Settlement in future?

People in Settlement SP were told that the council would develop the area but the problem was that only 60% of the land belonged to the municipality and the 40% belonged to different stakeholders and this caused difficulties for the municipality to develop the land. There was about 700 people staying in Settlement SP by the year 2000 and the plan was for the municipality to buy the 40% from the other stakeholders but this did not materialize.

- The municipality wanted to provide electricity to shack dwellers but Eskom found that the soil was not stable for electricity poles.
- The council's plan was to move all the people in Settlement SP to RDP houses in Quarry heights and Mount Moria areas and 300 were people were indeed moved to Quarry heights by 2003 and 400 were moved to Mount Moria RDP houses.
- The plan was to demolish all the after all the people would have been moved to RDP houses but the problem was that as people moved out, others would occupy those vacant shacks. These would either be relatives or people that would have bought the shacks from the previous owners.
- People were allocated numbers on their doors so that they would follow that order when being allocated RDP houses in ascending order.
- The challenge was that 700 people who were allocated numbers were moved to RDP houses but there were still a large number of people who occupied the shacks and others were allocated numbers illegally by corrupt officials. It was therefore difficult for the council to move all the people to RDP houses as there were no budgeted funds for more houses.

### 19. What are the main challenges facing this settlement?

- No electricity
- No toilets
- High alcohol and drug abuse
- High rate of HIV/AIDS due to lack of education
- High crime rate
- Shacks burn a lot during weekends as a lot of people are drunk and irresponsible and candles are a major cause of these fires.
- 20. Have there been different groups of people that have moved in over time, who are these different groups? (So that we can try to get a sense of whether there has been different waves of settlement)

There have been no different groups of people who have moved in over the years except that those who already live at Settlement SP keep inviting their families to come and live with them.

### 21. Are there any committees in the settlement and who are they?

There are committees such as the Development Committee, the ANC area committee, SACP committee, the community policy forum, all but the community policy forum are dysfunctional.

The only committee that is functional now at Settlement SP is also known as the Volunteers it is made up of different from different political inclinations and community members. The aim of this committee is to make sure that the needs of the community are met and they also aim to reduce crime in the area.

# 22. How often do the different committees get involved in people in or out of the settlement?

The Volunteers' role is to make sure that there are no new comers in this area and that the shacks of all those who have moved or have been allocated an RDP house have their shacks demolished, and that they will be no new shacks erected.

### References

- ANGEL, S., ARCHER, R. W., TANPHIPHAT, S. & WEGELIN, E. A. (Eds.) (1983) Land for housing the poor, Singapore, Select Books.
- ANTWI, A. Y. (2002) A study of informal land transactions in Accra, Ghana. *Our common estate*. London, RICS Foundation.
- BANK, L. (2001) Living together, moving apart: Home-made agendas, identity politics and urban-rural linkages in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. *Journal of contemporary African studies*, 19, 129-147.
- BAYAT, A. (1997) Un-civil society: the politics of the 'informal people'. *Third World Quarterly*, 18, 53-72.
- BRUECKNER, J. K. & KIM, H. A. (2001) Land markets in the Harris-Todaro model: a new factor equilibrating rural-urban migration. *Journal of regional science*, 41, 507-520.
- BRUECKNER, J. K. & ZENOU, Y. (1999) Harris-Todaro models with a land market. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 29, 317-339.
- CALDERÓN COCKBURN, J. A. (1999) Considerations on illegal and informal urban land markets in Latin America. Cambridge, MA, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- COLLINSON, M. A., TOLLMAN, S. M. & KAHN, K. (2007) Migration, settlement change and health in post-apartheid South Africa: Triangulating health and demographic surveillance with national census data. *Scandinavian journal of public health*, 33, 77-84.
- COX, K. R., HEMSON, D. & TODES, A. (2002) Urbanisation in South Africa and the changing character of migrant labour. University of Natal.
- CROSS, C., BEKKER, S. & CLARK, C. (1994) Migration into DFR informal settlements: An overview of the trends. IN HINDSON, D. & MCCARTHY, J. (Eds.) *Here to stay.* Durban, Indicator Press.
- DE SOTO, H. (1989) *The other path: The invisible revolution in the third world*, New York, I.B. Tauris.
- DE SOUSA SANTOS, B. (1977) The law of the oppressed: The construction and reproduction of legality in Pasargada. *Law and society review*, 12, 5-126.
- FREUND, B. & PADAYACHEE, V. (Eds.) (2002) (D)urban vortex. South African city in transition, Pietermaritzburg, University of Natal Press.
- HOSEGOOD, V. & TIMAEUS, I. (2001) Household composition and dynamics in KwaZulu Natal, South Africa: Mirroring social reality in longitudinal data collection. KwaZulu Natal.
- HUNTER, M. (2010) Love in the time of AIDS. Inequality, gender and rights in South Africa, Durban, University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- INGENE, C. A. (2001) The state of the art in modelling migration in LDCs: A comment. *Journal of regional science*, 41, 529-543.
- ISANDLA INSTITUTE & SBC (2007) Do urban land markets work for poor people? An assessment of three metropolitan cities in South Africa. Pretoria, Urban LandMark.
- JAMES, D. (2001) Land for the landless: conflicting images of rural and urban in South Africa's land reform programme. *Journal of contemporary African studies*, 19, 93-109.
- KIRONDE, J. M. L. (2000) Understanding land markets in African urban areas: the case of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Habitat international*, 24, 151-165.

- KUPER, L., WATTS, H. & DAVIES, R. (1958) *Durban. A study in racial ecology,* London, Jonathan Cape.
- MAKHATHINI, M., PATHER, C. & SEEDAT, F. (2002) The eThekwini Municipality's informal settlement programme. An informal settlement free Durban in 15 years - Dream or reality? *Western Cape Provincial Housing Conference*, Breakwater Lodge, Cape Town, 24-27 March.
- MILLS, S. O. M.-F. (2004) Housing the household: Gender and empowerment in South Africa. *Department of geography and environment*. London, London School of Economics.
- NAKAGOME, M. (1989) Urban unemployment and the spatial structure of labor markets: An examination of the Todaro paradox in a spatial context. *Journal of regional science*, 29, 161-170.
- PERLMAN, J. E. (1976) *The myth of marginality*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- POSEL, D. & CASALE, D. (2003) What has been happening to internal labour migration in South Africa, 1993-1999. *The South African journal of economics*, 71, 455-479.
- POSEL, D. & CASALE, D. (2006) Internal migration and household poverty in post-Apartheid South Africa. IN KANBUR, R. & BHORAT, H. (Eds.) *Poverty and policy in post-Apartheid South Africa*. Pretoria, Human Sciences Research Council Press.
- POTTS, D. (1995) Shall we go home? Increasing urban poverty in African cities and migration process. *Geographical journal*, 161, 245-264.
- POTTS, D. & MUTAMBIRWA, C. (1990) Rural-urban linkages in contemporary Harare: Why migrants need their land. *Journal of Southern African studies*, 16, 677-698.
- RAKODI, C. (2006) State-society relations in land delivery processes in five African cities. An editorial introduction. *International development planning review*, 28, 127-136.
- RAZZAZ, O. M. (1993) Examining property rights and investment in informal settlements the case of Jordan. *Land economics*, 69, 341-355.
- RIGG, J. (2006) Evolving rural-urban relations and livelihoods in Southeast Asia. IN TACOLI, C. (Ed.) *The Earthscan reader in rural-urban linkages*. London, Earthscan.
- SACN (2006) State of the cities report. Johannesburg, South African Cities Network.
- SHARP, J. & SPIEGEL, A. (1990) Women and wages: gender and the control of income in farm and Bantustan households. *Journal of Southern African studies*, 16, 527-549.
- SMIT, W. (1998) The rural linkages of urban households in Durban, South Africa. *Environment and Urbanisation*, 10, 77-87.
- TODES, A., KOK, P., WENTZEL, M., VAN ZYL, J. & CROSS, C. (2010) Contemporary South African urbanisation dynamics. *Urban forum*, 21, 331-348.
- WHEELOCK, J. & OUGHTON, E. (1996) The household as a focus for research. *Journal of economic issues*, XXX, 143-159.
- WRATTEN, E. (1995) Conceptualizing urban poverty. *Environment and Urbanization*, 7, 11-38.