

THE EASTERN CAPE BASIC SERVICES DELIVERY  
AND SOCIO ECONOMIC TRENDS SERIES



# Changing Migration Patterns and Basic Service Delivery in the Eastern Cape

# 3

Leslie Bank  
Ellen Kamman

# FHISER

Fort Hare Institute of  
Social and Economic Research



University of Fort Hare  
*Together in Excellence*

## **Acknowledgements**

This research project was initiated and managed through the Office of the Premier in the Eastern Cape, with the assistance of the Eastern Cape Socio-Economic Consultative Council and supported through IPSP, DFID funding. FHISER would like to acknowledge the role of Development Research Africa (DRA) Pty Ltd for administering the questionnaire on which the findings and analysis presented in the reports in this series are based. Specially mention her must be made of the role of Lizette Meyer, the project leader at DRA, and of Anne King and Nkosazana Ngcongolo at FHISER who worked on editing the original reports for this series. Leslie Bank at FHISER was the overall project leader.

FHISER would also like to thank the households, organizations, researchers and sector specialists who participated in the study. Special thanks are extended to the over 12200 households that gave of their time to respond to the detailed household questionnaire that lies at the core of this study. A large number of community organizations, NGOs, private concerns and government officials also participated willingly and assisted in the realization of the objectives of this study.

### **Copyright 2010**

Fort Hare Institute of Social and Economic Research (FHISER)  
University of Fort Hare  
East London Campus  
4 Hill Street  
East London  
5200

**ISBN No: 978-1-86810-709-4**

### **Disclaimer**

This report contains contributions by a number of authors and agencies. The findings of the report do not necessarily represent the views of all authors or the agencies with which they are associated. The findings and opinions expressed also do not represent the views of the Office of the Premier, ECSECC, IPSP or DFID.

## ***CONTENTS***

	<b><i>Page</i></b>
<b><i>SECTION ONE</i></b>	
<b>1.1 Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.2 Migration Trends in the Eastern Cape</b>	<b>6</b>
3.2.1 Migration as a Household ‘Struggle for the City’	5
3.2.2 Migration Trends in the Eastern Cape in the 1990s	7
3.2.3 Migration Streams and Trends in the 1990s	7
<b>1.3 New Migration Trends After 2000</b>	<b>11</b>
3.3.1 Reviewing the State of Circular Migration	11
3.3.2 The Growing Pull of the Metros	13
3.3.3 The Poor as Temporary Migrants	13
3.3.4 Judging ‘normal’ rural to urban flows	15
<b><i>SECTION TWO</i></b>	
<b>1.4 Results from the Rapid Assessment of Service Delivery and Socio-Economic Survey: Changing Migration Patterns</b>	<b>17</b>
1.4.1 A General Description of these migrating household members	23
<b>1.5 Executive Summary and Conclusion</b>	<b>55</b>
1.5.1 Demographics	55
1.5.2 Urban and Rural	55
1.5.3 Employment	55
1.5.4 Destinations	55
1.5.5 Living Arrangements	56
1.5.6 Remittances	56
1.5.7 Some Key Characteristics of migrants	56
<b><i>SECTION THREE</i></b>	
<b>1.6 Diagnostics: Changing Migration Patterns and Basic Service Delivery in the Eastern Cape</b>	<b>57</b>
1.6.1 Migration Rates Decline	57
1.6.2 Population Growth Slows, Household Proliferate	57
1.6.3 Where is the Urbanization and Settlement Strategy?	58
1.6.4 Developing an Urban Reception Strategy?	58
1.6.5 Looming Economic and Social Disconnection?	58
<b><i>References</i></b>	<b>59</b>

# ***CHANGING MIGRATION PATTERNS AND BASIC SERVICE DELIVERY IN THE EASTERN CAPE***

## ***SECTION ONE***

### **1.1 Introduction**

Migration patterns are changing very rapidly in South Africa and there is a new urgency within policy circles to understand current migration flows and emerging settlement patterns. The migration debate has recently been stimulated by the release of the 2001 census results, which have been compared with the results in the first full census in 1996, to generate a sense of the new directions and flows in the internal migration process. Like the intense debates around HIV and Aids and its projected short and long term impact on population growth, the discussions that surround changing migration dynamics are also crucial for rational development planning in South Africa. We now live in a society where we can choose our places of residence and are no longer locked in a racial spatial economy that controlled and restricted individual and group mobility. This means that the state - in planning service delivery and infrastructure - needs to develop models and systems that will help to predict where people are likely to move and what basic services they will need when they get there. Take the example of rural housing delivery. It had been discovered in some cases that up to a third of the original beneficiaries of state housing subsidies in rural areas had moved away from their villages before they received houses. In fact, some of these beneficiaries had settled in informal settlements in Cape Town and Johannesburg, where they had acquired employment and no longer wanted to return home. Such examples demonstrate why understanding migration is crucial for development planning.

Cost-effective infrastructure development requires that, firstly, services are not delivered in places where they are not needed; secondly, that they are not delivered in isolation of other services; and thirdly, that the state is able to accurately predict where citizens are likely to relocate in future so that government can plan and prepare for their arrival. The state certainly does not want to deliver running water and houses to rural villages that are likely to be deserted in five years time. It also does not want to deliver houses in urban communities which do not have schools, clinics and other basic services. Policy makers and planners need to understand migration trends in order to engage in effective integrated development planning and basic service delivery.

In the South African context, the motivations for migration are complex and do not necessarily revolve only around the quest for gainful employment. Indeed, it has been widely noted that households and individuals are now increasingly moving to take advantage of development and infrastructure delivery, rather than jobs per se. They are moving into areas and settlements where they hope to receive formal housing and other basic services, which are often not available in the areas from which they come. Recent research shows that there are increasing numbers of single person households in shack areas in the Western Cape. It is assumed that some of these individuals have been deliberately sent to try to qualify as beneficiaries of development projects in order to increase their household's asset base. This suggests that the delivery of

basic services should not be responsive to migration patterns, but should recognize how spatial and development planning itself is likely to impact on the decisions that households and individuals make in relation to mobility. Policy-makers need to address the scale of population movement, the direction of the current flows, the underlying causal factors and the probable outcomes in the medium and longer term.

This chapter explores migration trends in the Eastern Cape. It does so by reflecting on some of the observations noted by scholars working on the topic of migration in South Africa and the Eastern Cape in particular since the 1990s. In this brief literature review, we interrogate a number of key issues and topics in the migration debate, such as:

Is migration in the Eastern Cape largely circulatory or permanent?

- Are people moving around locally within the province or are there strong migration streams directed to areas outside of the Eastern Cape?
- Are poor households moving away from the Eastern Cape, or is it the richer households that tend to migrate permanently?
- Are urban areas in the Eastern Cape growing rapidly, or is most of the migration occurring between rural areas?
- Are women more likely to migrant than men, and which destinations do they choose and why?
- What are the implications of the current migration trends for infrastructure delivery?

In the discussion below, we will present the findings of our 2006 household survey, providing details of household migration strategies and trends in all district and local municipalities. The conclusion of the chapter considers what the trends mean for development planning and basic service delivery.

## 1.2 Migration Trends in the Eastern Cape

### 1.2.1 Migration as a Household ‘Struggle for the City’

In the 1980s, Alan Mabin (1989; 1990) set the agenda for the current migration debate in South Africa by arguing that one of the limitations of conventional migration studies was that they tended to focus on the *individual* as the key decision-making unit rather than the *household*. He suggested that it was appropriate to consider the *household*, conceived as a collectivity of individuals with shared interests, as the primary unit of analysis. This conceptual shift allowed Mabin (1989; 1990) to argue that black South African households, living on the margins of the South African political economy, had been involved in a ‘long and protected struggle for access to urban resources’. He suggested that rural households, acting as collective units, had been edging ever closer to the urban frontier by employing careful devised strategies to improve their access to urban jobs, services and resources. For Mabin, this process was never easy, especially in a context where poor households had to contend with a myriad of repressive laws and regulations that restricted mobility and controlled urbanization under apartheid. The outcome, Mabin concluded, was a ‘complex and diverse set of strategies’ that engaged rural households in a slow, incremental,

step-like migration process. The pressures under which households operated, he argued, often made it difficult for them to migrate as entire units:

The essential point is that entire households have frequently not migrated as whole units, and while a base has been maintained by some members in rural areas, other household members have moved to town or other rural areas, for longer or shorter periods (Mabin 1991: 40).

Mabin acknowledged that household segmentation was frequently a necessary, if undesirable, part of the 'struggle for the city'. This materialist model of the migration process as a household-based quest for the city won wide approval in South Africa in the 1990s and became the analytical cornerstone of a series of detailed studies of migration trends both in Gauteng and Kwa-Zulu Natal. Catherine Cross (1995), a leading figure in the analysis of migration in the 1990s, adopts this approach as a basic framework for the analysis of rural-urban migration for Kwa-Zulu Natal. She states that:

For the most part, rural to urban migrants find their way to destinations by a long interrupted route involving a number of stops. Less than a third of the rural individuals and families... move directly from a rural community to an urban or a peri-urban destination. For the majority, urbanization is a gradual process of moving on by capitalizing on opportunities.... Under contemporary conditions, migrating households move towards areas which are receiving infrastructural services (Cross 1995: 7).

### **1.2.2 Migration Trends in the Eastern Cape in the 1990s**

With the end of apartheid, many anticipated that rural households would flee the homelands and flood the larger urban areas in a tidal wave of uncontrolled rural to urban migration. From Mabin's perspective, liberation would surely drive forward the 'urban transition' in South Africa, but perhaps not as quickly as many imagined. Indeed, as Graaff (1986) had pointed out earlier, an urban transition of a kind was already occurring through a process of disguised urbanization, manifested in the densification of rural (peri-urban) settlements around commuter zones on the fringes of rural industrial towns and in homeland areas close to the larger cities.

So what happened to the migration pattern in the Eastern Cape in the 1990s? Did people stay where they were and let older patterns of circular migration continue? Or did the end of apartheid signal a sudden demographic shift of the rural poor into informal settlements? The answer lay somewhere in-between and involved a process of 'rural densification' in the Eastern Cape similar to that seen in other provinces in the 1980s. Probably the most visible demographic shift inside the Eastern Cape in the 1990s was the establishment of literally hundreds of new informal settlements in small towns across the province. In the 1980s, the apartheid government employed an 'orderly urbanisation' policy inside South Africa, which accepted expanded urbanization as long as new urban residents were 'properly housed' in the urban areas. The fact that the state provided very little housing served to effectively

block urban growth. The 'orderly urbanization' policy did not support squatting, although such settlements were increasingly tolerated in parts of the Eastern Cape by the late 1980s.

In the former Ciskei, the Oupa Gqozo regime had remained vehemently opposed to squatting and adopted strong-arm tactics to prevent the growth of informal settlements, well into the 1990s. As late as 1992, Gqozo was still issuing ultimatums to Ciskei 'squatters' threatening them with arrest if they did not demolish all illegal structures, especially on the fringes of small towns. In the Transkei, by contrast, the Holomisa regime was less concerned with enforcing the prevailing orderly urbanization policies and allowed informal settlements to grow around some of the homeland towns. Thus, from 1987 informal settlements began to expand rapidly, especially around Butterworth and Umtata. In the parts of the province under the jurisdiction of the former Cape Provincial Administration (CPA), local authorities continued to enforce the 'orderly urbanization' measures of the mid-1980s and tried where possible to use the Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act of 1986 to control squatting. Official action met with varying degrees of success (cf. Bank 1995).

The decisive moment for the expansion of informal settlements in the Eastern Cape as a whole, however, came after 1990 when the newly unbanned ANC declared its support for *land seizures* by dispossessed urban communities. The political endorsement of land seizures led to widespread defiance of the state and catalyzed rapid informal settlement formation throughout the province. During the early 1990s, Butterworth was the fastest growing Transkeian town with an average annual growth rate of over 10% per annum. According to local officials, there were only 700 shacks in the town in 1989, but by 1992 this figure had increased to 3500 and by 1995 there were over 5000. In other Transkeian towns, the annual population growth fluctuated between 7% and 9% between 1990 and 1995 (PPT Report 1997). In the Ciskei, new informal settlements grew on the outskirts of Dimbaza, Peddie, and Mdantsane after 1990. In former white towns, such as Burgersdorp, Bedford, Bathurst, Kei Road, Komga and others in the Eastern Cape district, informal settlements grew on the back of farm evictions. The crippling drought, which gripped the province between 1986 and 1992, led to an estimated 80 000 farm workers losing their jobs in the Eastern Cape alone. Moreover, new labour laws, farm violence and stock theft have had a negative effect on the commercial farming sector in the Eastern Cape, which continued to hemorrhage labour at an alarming rate. The vast majority of farm workers seem to have moved to the closest town, where they have taken up residence with or near relatives (cf. Bank 1997).

### **1.2.3 Migration Streams and Trends in the 1990s**

In 1999, Cross and Bekker released a major report on migration along the Eastern Seaboard of South Africa. They argued that their survey results revealed that poor, disadvantaged households in both Kwazulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape were perpetually on the move. In fact, they argued that about 3 million of the 5.7 million residents in the Eastern

Cape had moved at least once during their life-time. They suggested that traditional, agrarian livelihoods were collapsing and men and women from remote rural areas were increasingly being forced to move away from these remote areas in search of new opportunities. They suggested that there were two different migration streams in the Eastern Cape at this time – one involved individuals and households moving *between rural and urban* areas, and the other involved people moving *between rural areas*.

It was the latter which Cross and Bekker (1999) identified as the strongest and dominant trend in the Eastern Cape in the 1990s. They suggested that most of the movement in the province was towards *rural densification* (i.e. the movement of people from more remote to more strategically placed rural areas). They also saw the emergence of large informal settlements on the outskirts of small rural towns as part of this process, although they made it clear that rural densification mainly involved closer settlement on the outskirts of local administrative and employment nodes (Cross & Bekker 1999: 15). Some of the key observations of the Cross and Bekker (1999) argument can be summarized as follows:

- **High Mobility:** the study found that there were very high levels of mobility amongst the rural populations on the Eastern Seaboard. They suggested that the assumption that most or all poor rural households would migrate to the metropolitan areas, where the best economic opportunities existed, had been greatly exaggerated and that the strongest migration streams were localized within districts.
- **Rural to Rural Flows:** the dominant migration pattern was rural-to-rural and rural-to-small town migration rather than rural to large urban centre migration. It was reported that: ‘rural-to-urban flows are generally small compared to the much larger rural-to-rural flows [and] ...roughly three quarters of all recorded moves from one named place to another in KwaZulu-Natal were from a rural source area to a rural destination, and the same trend occurs in the Cape regional system’ (Cross 2001: 117).
- **Rural Densification:** The trend of rural to rural migration resulted in rural densification and encouraged what Cross called ‘rural peri-urbanisation’. It is reported that: ‘as the rural economy in the remoter areas falls apart and the rewards of urban migration also fall away, households are moving towards the smaller centres and secondary cities’ (Cross 2001: 118). In the Eastern Cape, she suggested that densification was taking place on a very large scale around small rural towns as well as the major coastal cities (Cross 2001: 118).
- **Circular Migration:** the evidence provided by Cross (2001) supported a step migration model where individuals and households slowly moved onwards up the settlement hierarchy, from rural to peri-urban and then to urban centres, starting with the localized ones and then moving further afield. She argued that:

For the most part, rural to urban migrants find their way to destinations by a long interrupted route involving a number of stops. Less than a third of the rural individuals and families... move directly from a rural community to an urban or a peri-urban destination. For the majority, urbanisation is a gradual process of moving on by capitalising on opportunities.... Under contemporary conditions, migrating households move towards areas which are receiving infrastructural services (Cross 1995: 7).

In terms of Eastern Cape/Western Cape flows, she argued that the stream had remained strong and noted that:

though black migration in the Western Cape is comparatively recent and has been thought mainly circular, little return migration was found and it seems that a fully urban population has become established more rapidly than in KwaZulu-Natal (Ibid).

She concluded that if this trend stabilised at the urban end, it would create two regional populations, one relatively advantaged and the other marginal. The implication is that the rural poor would become increasingly disconnected from the cities and the modern urban economy.

- ***Chasing development and infrastructure***: it was argued that, given the scarcity of employment opportunities, many households were inclined to move if they felt they had a chance of gaining access to development resources and infrastructure. In Cross' view, it had increasingly become a struggle not only for jobs *per se*, but for access to services and development infrastructure. She also acknowledges that, given the difficulties of access to these resources, it is not always possible for rural households to migrate as entire units. In many cases, the younger generation members move off first to establish a base closer to the city, only to be joined later by other household members.

In the 1990s, Bank (1996; 1997; 1998) was involved in a series of studies of informal settlements in the Eastern Cape. His research confirms some of the trends highlighted by the above. In particular, his work demonstrated a strong and sustained shift of population from rural areas into small towns across the province, as well as steady flows into regional urban centres, like East London. He developed the following arguments:

- ***Rural to Small Town Migration Streams*** – He argued that informal settlements formation in Eastern Cape occurred in a context of sustained *rural to urban migration* over the past decade. Socio-economic surveys showed that in the mid-1990s more than 40% of the inhabitants of informal settlements in the province had moved in directly from rural villages or white owned farms, while less than 60% moved in from overcrowded townships and locations. In former white small towns, the major source of rural influx was the farming sector. In small towns, like Bathurst, Kei Road, Bedford and Kenton-on-Sea, surveys show that between 50% and 80% of the inhabitants came directly from white farms in the 1990s. In homeland towns, like

Peddie, Cala and Butterworth, an equally sizeable portion of the informal settlement residents came to town from rural villages. These observations broadly support Cross's findings.

- ***Intra-district Migration***: anywhere between 70% and 95% of informal settlement residents in local towns claimed they had arrived in the area from somewhere in the same district (old definitions). Even in East London, it was discovered that some 87% of the population of informal settlements were from within the city or surrounding rural areas (53% were, in fact, born in the East London district). This pattern suggests that the process of step-wise *on-migration*, noted by Cross (2001), where migrants shift up the urban hierarchy by moving from one centre to another, was less developed in the Eastern Cape than in KwaZulu Natal. The two main tendencies are described below:
  - ***Localised Poverty Traps***: in the small towns, especially those in the former homelands that have a very weak economic base, the combination of short-range, localised migration and the reluctance or inability of individuals to embark on a step migration or engage in long-haul migration created poverty traps on the outskirts of small towns. The rural poor set themselves up in new informal settlements, but were unable to find regular employment in their new places of residence and thus continued to *rely on their local social networks (both in and outside town) for survival*. This pattern encouraged circulation between town and village sites, especially in the former homelands.
  - ***Long-Distance Migration***: the massive influx of former Transkeians and Ciskeians into informal settlements in the Cape Town area and on the Witwatersrand throughout the 1990s is indicative of the fact that in the Eastern Cape there were two clear rural to urban migration streams. One of which was directed towards the major metropolitan centres, the other towards local urban centres. The absence of any significant inter-urban migration between local centres in the province is interesting, and appeared as a distinct feature of the Eastern Cape migration pattern (cf. Bank 1997). The general tendency in the 1990s was that men generally followed the well-trodden long-haul migration routes, while women generally seemed to stay closer to home, preferring to migrate locally.
  - ***Circulation and Double-rootedness***: the propensity of people to move between urban and rural bases and to access resources at both ends of the urban divide was demonstrated in the informal settlement research of the 1990s. In the Transkeian towns of Cala and Butterworth, between 30% and 40% of household heads in informal

settlements claimed to have a second house in the countryside, while between 50% and 80% of these populations admitted to being actively engaged in the transfer of 'goods and cash' between town and country. In Duncan Village in the city of East London, where the majority of informal settlement residents came from rural villages, a third of the household's heads claimed that they owned homesteads in their home villages and many send home goods and cash weekly or monthly to support relatives there. The research indicated that the tendency towards double-rootedness was stronger in the former Transkei than in the former Ciskei. In the absence of significant local economic opportunities in small towns, people seemed to rely heavily on their district-level social networks for survival and circulated between town and country in operationizing their multi-site livelihoods.

- Evidence from the metropolitan areas, especially Cape Town, suggests that the *frequency of home visits and remittance sending* decreased steadily through the 1990s. Seekings et al. (1990) found that about 70% of households sent home remittances from Khayelitsha in the late 1980, while Bekker (2003) discovered that only 30% of the population in the same area were sending money home in the late 1990s.
- ***Retrenchments and Rural Return:*** In 1996, 16 of the 56 districts, where mining earnings comprised more than 20% of total earnings, were located on the Eastern Cape Wild Coast. Retrenchments on the mines and elsewhere have thus created some return migration back into rural areas, like those of Mbashe and Great Kei (cf. Bank and Minkley 2005).

The picture that emerges is that there is considerable convergence between the overall migration patterns identified by Cross and Bekker (1999) and Cross (2001) through their quantitative and qualitative research along the Eastern Seaboard and the trends highlighted in Bank's work in informal settlements in the 1990s.

## 1.3 New Migration Trends After 2000

### 1.3.1 Reviewing the State of Circular Migration

If the work of Cross and Mabin dominated the migration debate in the 1980s and 1990s, new voices emerged after 2000. One issue that has received particular attention has been the *role of women in the migration*. In the past, women were seen to largely stay at 'home' in the rural areas, while their sons and husbands did most of the migrating to the cities. Since the 1990s, it has been suggested that the most striking change in migration patterns has been the great tendency of women to migrate, either by following male household members to the cities or by moving independently. Dorrit Posel (2001: 2002) has argued that data

from the October Household Survey for the 1990s clearly reveals that *circular migration* has not ceased since the transition to democracy, but increased and that *women have replaced men as the major agents of such migration*. She suggests that this is related to the growing number of women participating in the formal job market and by the strong attachment and commitment of many migrating women to their rural homes and kin. She goes on to suggest that this commitment is reflected in the continued practice of remitting cash and goods to the rural areas from the cities.

Posel argues that the October Household Survey data shows that 24% of black households still have active migrants that circulate between town and country and that frequent returnees tend to send about R200 a month while less frequently returnees send less (2002:13). In order to develop our understanding of circular and other migration trends, Posel has argued that we need to develop a much deeper understanding of current social dynamics within urban and especially rural households (2002: 15).

Kok and Collison have also recently noted that, while the urban transition is progressing steadily in South Africa, the rate of circular migration remains high in the country. Kok and Collison elaborate as follows:

The South African data shows that much urban to rural migration is temporary, in other words migrants stay in touch with their rural households and usually remit money or consumables back to the rural household and are likely to return and live there on retirement or retrenchment...These levels remain intractably high. An important contributory factor may be the relatively low levels of income per capita at a national level, compared with the economies that underpinned the urban transition in more developed countries in the previous century. Socio-cultural links with rural areas might also be an important part of the explanation... (Kok and Collison 2006:26)

Strikingly the data collected for this study, as will be seen below, shows lower rates of circular migration from the Eastern Cape than we expected. Only 15% of the households interviewed had an active migrant compared to the 24% quote by Posel from the October Household survey. One theory to consider here is that the circular migration tendency is most intense where home areas are quite close to the metros and less intense in areas that are located further away. The greater distance of the Eastern Cape from South Africa's major metropolitan areas could thus be a factor in explaining the low figure. Yet, more than this, the lower level does have implications for rural poverty, especially when combined with a low level of commitment or ability amongst migrants to remit cash or goods home.

### 1.3.2 The Growing Pull of the Metros

By contrast to those that stress the continued importance of circular migration, other scholars like Crankshaw (1999) have argued that from the perspective of larger townships such as Soweto in Johannesburg, there is also clear evidence of increasing one-way migration flows into the cities, indicating that the *urban transition* is gaining momentum and that patterns of migration into South African cities are increasingly reflecting trends in Latin America, where circular migration is less pronounced and permanent urbanization is the dominant trend. This argument is supported by recent studies reflecting on the Gauteng provincial housing survey, which indicate that cities in Gauteng are growing very rapidly with a sustained influx of new immigrants (4.8% per annum). The situation in Cape Town has now reached crisis proportions with 18 000 new households settling in the city every year. In 2001, there were 37 000 people living in shacks on the narrow strip of land on either side of the N2 alone. These communities are said to be growing at an average of around 3% per annum and are receiving 90% of their influx from the Eastern Cape. It was also found that 97% of Eastern Cape migrants living in Cape Town are settled in shack houses (Napier 2005). Currently, Cape Town is only able to deliver 8 000 low cost housing units per annum, whereas other cities such as Durban and Gauteng are delivering almost twice as many. The overall picture to emerge from the literature is that metropolitan centres are growing very rapidly, much more rapidly than others, and that the main streams of migration into these areas are from rural areas in the former homelands. Foreign immigrants only account for about 7% of the total influx (SAMP 2005). The implications of the most recent evidence is that the trend towards rural urbanization in the Eastern Cape might have slowed down and considerable larger numbers of people are now shooting straight for the big cities.

### 1.3.3 The Poor as Temporary Migrants

Another important development in the stimulation of debate about migration trends has been the publication of the 2001 census results, which can now be compared with the 1996 census to determined short term demographic trends.

**Table 1.3.1: Provisional Population and Income Shares: 1996-2001**

Province	1996 population share	1996 income share	2001 population share	2001 income share
Western Cape	10%	17%	10%	16%
Eastern Cape	16%	9%	14%	8%
Northern Cape	2%	2%	2%	2%
Free State	6%	5%	6%	4%
Kwa-Zulu-Natal	21%	17%	21%	16%
North West	8%	6%	8%	6%
Gauteng	18%	35%	20%	39%
Mpumalanga	7%	5%	7%	5%
Limpopo	12%	5%	12%	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Leibrandt, Naidoo, Poswell, Welsch and Woolard 2004: 111, also in Gelderblom 2005:3)

The Table 3.3.1 shows that, relatively speaking, the Eastern Cape became poorer by 1% between 1996 and 2001, while losing 2% percent of its population over that period. This suggests that households are leaving the province permanently and relocating elsewhere. We know from media reports that large numbers of Eastern Cape work seekers and workers have moved into Cape Town, many permanently. We also know from the above table that Gauteng has experienced the most rapid economic growth over this period and remains a target for economic migrants from poorer provinces. Leibbrandt et al. (2004: 86) interpret the figures to mean that: “poverty has increased in all provinces, but it increased faster in the best-off provinces, reflecting a migration of the poor from the worst-off to the best off provinces”. Gelderblom confirms that 206 000 people left the Eastern Cape between 1992 and 1996 (2005: 6). Over the same period, Gauteng received 262 000 people (475 000 arrived and 213 000 left the province), while the Western Cape received 143 000 (187 000 arrive and 44 000 left).

But are the Eastern Cape poor moving permanently out of the province? How many of them are leaving permanently? Where are they leaving from and where are they going? At first sight, the above figures seem to suggest a transfer of poor people from poor provinces, like the Eastern Cape, to vibrant centres of employment.

Using the 1996 Census data, Kok (2003) has argued that the census shows that migrants, defined as people who move permanently from one place to another, are likely to earn more than R3000 a month, while temporary or circular migrants (or migrant labourers) almost always earn less. Permanent migrants, he argues, are also generally much better educated than temporary ones. A study undertaken by Van Der Berg (2004) has confirmed this finding that male migration from the Eastern Cape to metropolitan centres outside the province increased with education and that female out-migration to such areas was most common when women had secondary education. Women with primary schooling tended to stay in the province. Kok concludes that the evidence does not seem to support the view that migrants from the Eastern Cape are extracted from the poorest sections of the population. In fact, it appears that *circular migration* is most common amongst the poor.

This conclusion is also supported by the observation that the demand for unskilled workers has slumped in the South African economy, suggesting that the capacity to migrate is dependent on education. As Van Der Berg concludes: [in the Eastern Cape] “aside from small pockets, there seems to be little scope for improving the dire predicament of the rural unemployed by moving to an urban area” (2004: 25). Jobs for the poor are too insecure and too poorly paid, it is argued, to provide a stable basis for moving permanently to the city and that it is better for them to stay in the rural areas, where consumption costs are lower and to pursue a multiple livelihood strategy, which combines urban wages with rural income and welfare assistance.

#### 1.3.4 Judging 'normal' rural to urban flows

Implicit in the arguments for the 1990s is a recognition that there was less '*normalisation*', that is, rural to urban migration, than had perhaps been initially anticipated by scholars like Simikins in the 1980s. Todes (2000) suggested that the cost of migration and the lack of social networks at the receiving end often acted as constraints, preventing people who would 'normally' migrate from actually doing so. Migration patterns, she argues, seem to have been more complex than a simple urban to rural transfer. She goes on to suggest that:

Declining levels of employment, crime and violence are some of the factors limiting the extent to which '*normalisation*' is occurring. In this context the securities, assets and social networks that people have build up in places are not easily abandoned (Todes 2000:xx)

Todes' (2000) argument is similar to that of Gelderblom (2005), Kok (2004) and Van der Berg (2004) in that she maintains that there is a lot more potential for more rapid urban out-migration from the Eastern Cape than is currently occurring. It appears that the strength of localized social networks, welfare payments and the poverty of households are preventing this process from speeding up. The underpinning observation seems to be that rural to urban migration could still increase considerably in the Eastern Cape and further population could be lost by 2010 and beyond. This would obviously mean that the service delivery demand would decrease in rural areas.

On the other hand, scholars like Parnell (2006, personal communication) suggest that we might be reaching the end of the urban transition and will see a growing stabilization of population in both urban and rural areas. She indicates that a lot of the new households found in the Western Cape are one person households, which makes it necessary for us to distinguish between population movement and growth in particular areas and the proliferation of households, which is obviously partially driven by the expectation of rapid housing delivery in metropolitan areas and the desire to get on the new housing list. Parnell also draws attention to the decreasing level of fertility in both urban and rural populations and the implications this has for the capacity of settlement growth in the future. The questions Parnell raises are fascinating: has migration peaked? Will there now be stabilization, which opens doors for more effective long-term planning and provision, especially along integrated development planning lines?

With the publication of the 2001 census, the second since democracy in 1994, there has been renewed interest in attempting to determine what the dominant demographic and migration trends in the country are? There is, for example, recognition and acknowledgment that provinces like the Eastern Cape have actually lost population over this period, while Gauteng has gained a significant number of people, many from the poorer provinces. Scholars are currently interested in deepening their understanding of these complex dynamics. The research undertaken in 12 300 household in the province earlier this year has sought to add to our understanding of change in this area. Our 2006 study suggests that the migration trends of the 1990s might well have changed.

It would appear that the population of the Eastern Cape is more stable today than it was 10 years ago. Our results do not give the impression of a population in *perpetual motion* as suggested by Cross and Bekker (1999). In fact, only 5.6% of all household members were on the move as migrants at the time we interviewed their families, that is, only one in 20 was away. We also found that about 85% of the households in the province had no migrants in them. The evidence seemed to suggest greater residential stability than had been witnessed in the 1990s. There was still evidence of rural densification, but this process had slowed down considerably. This seems to be related to the fact that social grants and many other basic services are now more widely available in rural areas and are not necessarily confined to densely settled areas. Where movement had occurred in the 1990s, it seems to have stabilized, but densification in the rural areas does not seem to have significantly intensified over the past decade. If anything, it has slowed down in favour of much more rapid rural to urban migration since the late 1990s. The bulk of this movement appears to have been aimed at the bigger metropolitan areas, especially Cape Town and Johannesburg, rather than local and regional urban centres.

Our findings therefore concur with the idea that there are still two main streams: a rural to rural and a rural to urban stream. But, we would argue on the basis of the evidence collected here, that rural to urban and urban to urban migration streams are now dominant in the Eastern Cape and that the main flows seem to be beyond the province and into the main metropolitan areas.

# **CHANGING MIGRATION PATTERNS**

## **SECTION TWO**

### **1.4 Results from the Rapid Assessment of Service Delivery and Socio-Economic Survey: Changing Migration Patterns**

When asked whether a household member often goes away to work or is now away to work more than 6 months per year, 5.6% of all household members (including all members age groups demographics and economic status) in the Eastern Cape are often or now away from home to work or find work in another area or are absent for some other reason. In terms of population group, 6.1% of Black household members are elsewhere to work or find work compared to 2.1% White household members and 1.3% Coloured household members. No such members were recorded for Indian households (Table 3.4.1).

**Table 1.4.1: Household member often/now away (more than 6 months per year) to work by population group (Q1.11 by 17.2) provincial level weights**

	<b>Black</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Colored</b>	<b>Indian</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Yes</b>	6.1	2.1	1.3		5.6
<b>No</b>	93.9	97.9	98.7	100.0	94.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The gender of the migrating household members is predominantly male (7.1%). Female household members accounted for 4.4% of the absent members (Table 3.4.2).

**Table 1.4.2: Household member often/now away (more than 6 month per year) to work by gender group (Q1.11 by 17.3) provincial level weights**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Yes</b>	7.1	4.4	5.6
<b>No</b>	92.9	95.6	94.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

When comparing gender and age of household head by absent members, no significant difference was found. Basically all household heads had similar percentages (Table 3.4.3).

**Table 1.4.3: Person away from home to work or to find work in another area, by category of household head.**

	Adult male under 60	Adult male over 60	Adult female under 60	Adult female over 60	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	5.7	5.9	5.3	5.7	5.6
No	94.3	94.1	94.7	94.3	94.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

When comparing District Councils, more household members are absent in the predominantly rural districts of Ukhahlamba (7%), O.R. Tambo (6.7%) and Alfred Nzo (6.6%) than in the other districts (Table 3.4.4). The lowest percentage of absent members were in Cacadu (1.7%), ECDMA10 (2.1%) and Nelson Mandela Municipality (3%).

**Table 1.4.4: Person away from home to work or to find work in another area, by district level weights.**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R. Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Yes</b>	3.0	1.7	6.2	4.8	7.0	6.7	6.6	2.1	5.6
<b>No</b>	97.0	98.3	93.8	95.2	93.0	93.3	93.4	97.9	94.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

In terms of a rural and urban perspective, most household members who migrate are from tribal settlements (7.4%) followed by household members from farming areas (Table 3.4.5 below). Therefore migrant workers have predominantly rural origins. Understandably, the lowest percentage of absent members is found where households reside in informal areas whether urban informal areas (2.2%) or peri urban areas (1.7%), possibly because so many shack dwellers are migrant workers from other areas.

**Table 1.4.5: Person away from home to work or to find work in another area, by locality (A3) weights.**

	Urban formal - built up town or city area	Urban informal	Peri urban - mostly informal/smallholding	Tribal settlement	Farming	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Yes</b>	3.0	2.2	1.7	7.4	5.8	5.6
<b>No</b>	97.0	97.8	98.3	92.6	94.2	94.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Interestingly though, these 5.6% absent members of all household members come from 15.2% of households in the Eastern Cape. The largest percentage of households with migrating members are Black households (17.2%) compared to 3.5% of Coloured households and only 2.9% of White households. Therefore, while only 5.6% of all household members migrate (juveniles included) only 15.2% of households (17.2% of Black households) have absent members (Table 3.4.6).

**Table 1.4.6: Percentage of Households with ONE OR MORE Household member often/now away (more than 6 months per year) to work by population group (Q1.11 by 17.2) district level weights**

	Black	White	Colored	Indian	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Yes</b>	17.2	2.9	3.5	.0	15.2
<b>No</b>	82.8	97.1	96.5	100.0	84.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Based on households, in homes where the respondent was female, 17% had absent members. In homes where the respondent was male, 11.9% of households had absent members (Table 3.4.7).

**Table 1.4.7: Percentage of Households with ONE OR MORE Household member often/now away (more than 6 months per year) to work by gender of household head or respondent (Q1.11 by 17.3) district level weights**

	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
<b>Yes</b>	11.9	17.0	15.4
<b>No</b>	88.1	83.0	84.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

When comparing District Councils to determine where most of these households reside that contain one or more household member, again more households have absent members in the predominantly rural districts of Ukhahlamba (18.0%), O.R. Tambo (22.3%) and Alfred Nzo (20.3%) than in the other districts. The lowest percentage of households with absent members were in Cacadu (4.2%), ECDMA10 (7.8%) and Nelson Mandela Municipality (also 7.8% (Table 3.4.8). Notably more households in O.R Tambo have migrating members, but they have less migrating members per household than Ukhahlamba (see table 4) where 7% of all household members migrate as opposed to 6.7% in O.R Tambo. However, according to the table, O.R. Tambo have more households with migrating members (22.3%) than Ukhahlamba (18.0%).

**Table 1.4.8: Percentage of households with a person away from home to work or to find work in another area, by district (district level weights)**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Yes</b>	7.8	4.2	15.9	12.6	18.0	22.3	20.3	7.8	15.2
<b>No</b>	92.2	95.8	84.1	87.4	82.0	77.7	79.7	92.2	84.8
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Looking purely at whether the households are based in an urban or rural area an interesting picture emerges (Table 3.4.9). Where less than one in ten households (7.6%) in urban areas have one or more absent member(s), almost three times more rural households (21.7%) have one or more absent member(s).

**Table 1.4.9: Percentage of households with a person away from home to work or to find work in another area, by Urban and Rural Base (district level weights)**

Q1.11 Person often away from home	Urban	Rural	Total
	%	%	%
<b>Yes</b>	7.6	21.7	15.2
<b>No</b>	92.4	78.3	84.8
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0

The households that have one or more person(s) absent most of the year, have a slightly higher mean income (R1,884.28 per month) than those without absent members (R1,732.95) (Table 3.4.10). The average monthly income for all households in the province is R1,756.45.

**Table 1.4.10: Mean amount of money brought into the household per month after deductions such as tax, medical aid and pension contributions by person away from home most of the time (District level weights)**

Q1.11 Person often away from home	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
<b>Yes</b>	1884.2763	230528	2417.50022
<b>No</b>	1732.9501	1253780	2630.49033
<b>Total</b>	1756.4526	1484308	2599.13343

In terms of household size, households with absent members have slightly larger household sizes on average (5.17 members) who live there most of the time than those without absent members (4.46 members on average) (Table 3.4.11). The average household size overall for all households in the province is 4.57 members (living there most of the time). Therefore, although households with absent members have a higher mean net income, they also support more ‘full-time’ household members.

**Table 1.4.11: Q2.5 Mean number of people living in this household most of the time by person away from home most of the time (District level weights)**

Q1.11 Person often away from home	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
<b>Yes</b>	5.17	233688	2.883
<b>No</b>	4.46	1302049	2.600
<b>Total</b>	4.57	1535737	2.657

Households with absent members have on average more rooms in the household (4.46) than households without absent members. The overall mean average for all households is 4.09 rooms (Table 3.4.12).

**Table 1.4.12: Q2.7 Total number of rooms used by household incl kitchen, living room, bedrooms etc by person away from home most of the time (District level weights)**

Q1.11 Person often away from home	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Yes	4.46	231352	3.185
No	4.02	1287244	2.401
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.09</b>	<b>1518596</b>	<b>2.541</b>

The number of years a household has lived in the area seems indicative of the move towards urban migration from rural areas (Table 3.4.13). Households with one or more absent member(s) have lived longer on average in the area (26.33) than other households (21.73). The provincial average is 22.43 years).

**Table 1.4.13: Q2.2 Years this household lived in this area by person away from home most of the time (District level weights)**

Q1.11 Person often away from home	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Yes	26.33	227142	19.221
No	21.73	1262716	18.472
<b>Total</b>	<b>22.43</b>	<b>1489858</b>	<b>18.661</b>

Interestingly however, is that despite higher average net income, households with absent members have on average access to fewer services (9.3) than other households (11) (Table 3.4.14). The provincial average is 10.75. The reason could rest in the rural nature of these households based on the notion that urban households have more access to services than rural households.

**Table 1.4.14: Mean number of services that household has access to by person away from home most of the time (District level weights)**

Q1.11 Person often away from home	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Yes	9.3028	233688	5.36635
No	11.0144	1302049	6.57593
<b>Total</b>	<b>10.7540</b>	<b>1535737</b>	<b>6.43605</b>

#### 1.4.1 A General Description of these migrating household members

Overall in the Eastern Cape, almost half of the household members away for more than six months out of the year was as a result of employment (47.9%), while more than a quarter (26.1%) were looking for work (Table 3.4.15). One tenth (11.1%) were attending primary or secondary schools away from home and 6.7% were attending tertiary institutions. While 47.9% of Black household members were working elsewhere, 68.5% absence in Coloured households could be attributed to working elsewhere compared to 31.3% of whites. More than a quarter of the absent household members in Black households were seeking employment elsewhere (26.6%) compared to 12.5% of Whites and 5.6% of Coloured household members.

Almost one in five absent household members in White (18.7%) and Coloured (18.6%) households were attending primary or secondary schools elsewhere, but only 10.9% of Black household members did. While the percentage of absent persons attending tertiary education facilities elsewhere was nil (for Coloured households) and 6.3% (for Black households), this reason accounted for 37.5% of the absent members of White households.

**Table 1.4.15: Reason for household member's absence by population group (Q1.12 by 17.2) provincial level weights**

	<b>Black</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Colored</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Other</b>	.1			.1
<b>Employment</b>	47.9	31.3	68.5	47.9
<b>Looking for work</b>	26.6	12.5	5.6	26.1
<b>Primary/secondary schooling</b>	10.9	18.7	18.5	11.1
<b>Personal reasons</b>	1.1			1.1
<b>Visiting spouse/family</b>	2.9		1.9	2.9
<b>Visiting friends</b>	.2		1.9	.3
<b>Visiting other home</b>	2.3		1.9	2.2
<b>Living with other partner</b>	.7		1.9	.7
<b>Prison</b>	.4			.4
<b>Hospital</b>	.5			.4
<b>Tertiary education</b>	6.3	37.5		6.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

More than half of the household absent members working elsewhere are male (55.1%) compared to 38.5% of females, yet interestingly more females (29.2%) are looking for work elsewhere than males (23.7%) (Table 3.4.16). Also, slightly more females (8.6%) than males (5.3%) are away at tertiary education facilities.

**Table 1.4.16: Reason for household member's absence by gender group (Q1.12 by 17.3) provincial level weights**

	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
Other		.2	.1
Employment	55.1	38.5	47.9
Looking for work	23.7	29.2	26.1
Primary/secondary schooling	10.1	12.6	11.2
Personal reasons	.8	1.5	1.1
Visiting spouse/family	1.7	4.4	2.9
Visiting friends	.2	.4	.3
Visiting other home	2.1	2.4	2.2
Living with other partner	.3	1.3	.7
Prison	.6	.1	.4
Hospital	.3	.7	.4
Tertiary education	5.3	8.6	6.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The main reason for the absence of members across all districts was to work somewhere else. These persons found employment elsewhere, especially household members from Ukhahlamba (65%) and Alfred Nzo (55.2%) (Table 3.4.17 below). However, it is plausible here that many of these members have left to search for employment, but that they could still be looking for work.

**Table 1.4.17: Reason for members absents, by district level weights, by district level weights.**

	<b>NEISON Mandela Municipality</b>	<b>Cacadu DC</b>	<b>Amathole DC</b>	<b>Chris Hani</b>	<b>Ukhahlamb a</b>	<b>O.R Tambo</b>	<b>Alfred Nzo</b>	<b>ECDMA10</b>	<b>Total</b>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Other</b>						0.3			0.1
<b>Employment</b>	35.7	47.3	44.9	43.0	65.4	48.2	55.2	17.8	47.6
<b>Looking for work</b>	14.2	10.0	31.0	29.9	17.5	27.1	19.7	82.2	25.9
<b>Primary/secondary schooling</b>	19.5	10.0	8.0	11.5	8.2	12.6	13.1		11.4
<b>Personal reasons</b>	4.8		1.0	0.9	1.1	0.8	1.5		1.3
<b>Visiting spouse/family</b>	6.1	5.0	2.6	1.2	0.7	4.0	2.1		3.1
<b>Visiting friends</b>	0.7		0.6	0.2		0.1			0.3
<b>Visiting other home</b>	8.2	10.3	3.3	0.9	0.4	0.8	3.0		2.5
<b>Living with other partner</b>	6.8	1.0	0.5		0.4	0.7			1.0
<b>Prison</b>	1.4		0.5	0.2	0.4	0.3			0.4
<b>Hospital</b>		1.3	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.6		0.4
<b>Tertiary education</b>	2.7	14.9	6.9	11.7	5.7	5.1	4.8		6.3
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Households were asked to indicate for how long these members had been away from the household in the past 12 months. More than one quarter in the province indicated that they had been away for less than one month. This is very telling as the short duration of the absence could account for why these members are still regarded as household members. The survey was conducted in the beginning of 2006 and it is assumed that many persons move away from home at the start of a new year for school, work and tertiary studies. However, it should be noted that this survey was conducted roughly a month after the December festive season known for migrant workers returning to their mainly rural homes. The two districts where the highest percentage of members absent for less than a month was Alfred Nzo (82.2%) and Cacadu (54.2%) (Table 3.4.18 below).

Some members have been away for as long as 12 months in the past year, but are still regarded as part of the household especially in Ukhahlamba where 22.1% indicated a length of absence of a member for 12 months. A

further 22.7% in Alfred Nzo recorded absence of members of 11 months in the past 12 months.

**Table 1.4.18: Duration of absents in months over the past 12 months which member has been absent, by district level weights.**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA 10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Not absent in the past 12 months</b>	13.7		0.2	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.5		1.6
<b>Less than one month</b>	25.6	54.2	17.5	10.7	26.9	28.8	28.7	82.2	23.6
<b>1</b>	6.5	10.4	10.2	8.6	6.6	15.7	6.6		11.0
<b>2</b>	8.6	9.1	8.6	11.2	7.4	10.2	5.1		9.0
<b>3</b>	2.8	1.0	5.0	9.3	4.8	7.4	2.1		5.7
<b>4</b>	2.8		4.9	2.0	3.3	2.4	0.9		3.0
<b>5</b>	4.0	1.3	3.7	1.2	0.7	0.8	0.9		2.0
<b>6</b>	13.2	8.7	12.7	9.1	11.1	5.2	3.6		8.7
<b>7</b>	0.7	1.3	4.0	2.2	1.8	1.7	2.1		2.4
<b>8</b>	5.0	3.1	9.0	3.4	0.7	4.7	4.5		5.6
<b>9</b>	2.2	1.0	4.8	5.4	2.6	2.2	3.6		3.4
<b>10</b>	8.5	5.0	5.1	7.2	5.2	8.3	17.9		8.0
<b>11</b>	3.6	2.7	5.8	21.8	5.9	10.7	22.7	17.8	10.6
<b>12</b>	2.9	2.1	8.4	7.4	22.1	1.1			5.4
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Households were asked to indicate where the absent household member resides. Overall almost one third (29.3%) live in Johannesburg and a quarter (25.6%) reside in Cape Town while less than one fifth (16.4%) live in other Eastern Cape towns. The migration patterns differ significantly by population group. While about a third of Black household members (30.2%) moved to Johannesburg and a quarter (25.4%) to Cape Town, more than a third of White Household members (37.5%) went to Cape Town and just under a third (31.3%) to another province. The patterns for Coloured household members differ even more significantly with migration patterns within the province rather than to outside the province. Here 40.7% noted moves to other Eastern Cape towns while more than a quarter (27.8%) reside in Port Elizabeth (Table 3.4.19 below).

**Table 1.4.19: Absent household member's place residence by population group (Q1.14 by 17.2) provincial level weights**

	<b>Black</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Colour ed</b>	<b>Total</b>
	%	%	%	%
<b>Cape Town</b>	25.4	37.5	20.4	25.6
<b>Johannesburg</b>	30.2		5.6	29.3
<b>Durban</b>	8.6		1.9	8.4
<b>East London</b>	4.8	6.2	1.9	4.8
<b>Port Elizabeth</b>	5.6	18.8	27.8	6.1
<b>Other Eastern Cape town</b>	16.3		40.7	16.4
<b>Rural village or farm in the Eastern Cape</b>	5.7			5.6
<b>Another province</b>	3.0	31.3		3.4
<b>Another country</b>	.3	6.2	1.9	.4
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

While the percentage of male and females who migrated to Cape Town was equal (25.6%), significantly more males (34.3%) migrated to Johannesburg than did females (22.8%) (Table 3.4.20). Slightly more females than males migrated to other areas inside the province such as other towns (18.3%) compared to males (14.9%). The same held for migration within rural areas of Eastern Cape cities.

**Table 1.4.20: Absent household member's place residence by gender group (Q1.14 by 17.3) provincial level weights**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
	%	%	%
<b>Cape Town</b>	25.6	25.6	25.6
<b>Johannesburg</b>	34.3	22.8	29.4
<b>Durban</b>	8.0	9.0	8.4
<b>East London</b>	3.8	6.1	4.8
<b>Port Elizabeth</b>	5.5	6.8	6.1
<b>Other Eastern Cape town</b>	14.9	18.3	16.4
<b>Rural village or farm in the Eastern Cape</b>	4.3	7.3	5.6
<b>Another province</b>	3.3	3.5	3.4
<b>Another country</b>	.2	.7	.4
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0

It is interesting to note that half of the absent household members in Nelson Mandela Municipality (50.5%) actually still reside within the boundaries of the municipality, only in a different household. The main reasons would include moving into residences of secondary and tertiary facilities, marriage or moving out of parental homes.

More than half of the absent household members in Cacadu moved to other Eastern Cape towns (35%) and a further 31.4% to Port Elizabeth. In ECDMA10, actually a part of Cacadu where 55 randomly selected farming worker or owner families were interviewed, 82.2% of absent members went overseas (Table 3.4.21).

The most popular destination for household members in Amathole (36.7%) and Chris Hani (46.7%) is Cape Town and for members in Ukhahlamba (48.4%), O.R. Tambo (34.5%) and Alfred Nzo (43.3%) it is Johannesburg. Johannesburg has been a traditional destination for Eastern Cape male migrant workers for decades due to the mining industry.

**Table 1.4.21: Person currently is living, by district level weights**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R. Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Cape Town</b>	13.5	20.3	36.7	46.7	30.0	14.7	4.5	17.8	24.5
<b>Johannesburg</b>	5.0		22.3	23.5	48.4	34.5	43.3		28.9
<b>Durban</b>	0.7	1.0	1.1	0.7	3.2	17.1	20.0		8.5
<b>East London</b>	2.2	2.7	10.4	7.1	0.7	1.8	0.9		4.8
<b>Port Elizabeth</b>	50.5	31.4	7.0	3.6	0.7	1.3	2.4		7.4
<b>Other Eastern Cape town</b>	15.1	35.0	13.9	12.5	6.9	21.6	15.8		16.5
<b>Rural village or farm in the Eastern Cape</b>	5.8	4.0	5.7	2.6	3.6	7.3	5.4		5.7
<b>Another province</b>	2.9	5.7	2.7	3.2	6.5	1.7	7.2		3.2
<b>Another country</b>	4.3		0.2	0.2			0.6	82.2	0.5
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Household members were asked to indicate with whom the absent members reside when away from the household. Overall, about two in five live (42.7%) alone and slightly less than a further two in five (38.8%) live with other relatives (other than partners or spouses). Residing with other relatives possibly explains district trends as people will migrate mainly to places they know people in or know that they will find work in, perhaps through the contacts they have. The result is that people from the same place often migrate to the same area. The highest percentage of absent household members originating from all districts reside alone when absent (or perceived by family members to live

alone) except for the largest portion of household members in Nelson Mandela Municipality (36.2%) and Cacadu (49.2%) who reside with relatives (Table 3.4.22).

**Table 1.4.22: During absents person lives with, by district level weights.**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Other</b>	1.9	1.0	0.2		0.4	0.1			0.3
<b>Do not know</b>			0.2	0.2	0.7	0.1			0.2
<b>Living alone</b>	27.8	26.9	41.3	45.4	43.7	45.5	47.6	100.0	42.7
<b>With relatives</b>	36.2	49.2	38.8	37.6	41.9	39.4	36.9		38.8
<b>Near relatives</b>	5.8	1.0	4.3	3.1	0.7	1.5	3.0		2.9
<b>With friends</b>	5.8	10.2	8.4	6.2	4.3	7.2	3.4		6.8
<b>With partner/spouse</b>	20.3	4.0	5.9	4.5	7.2	5.4	7.0		6.8
<b>Hospital</b>			0.3	0.5		0.1	0.6		0.2
<b>Boarding school</b>		3.4	0.1	0.3		0.3	1.2		0.3
<b>Prison</b>	1.5		0.5	0.2	0.4	0.2			0.4
<b>With employer</b>	0.7	4.2	0.1	0.5		0.2	0.3		0.3
<b>With co-workers / colleagues</b>				1.4	0.7	0.2			0.3
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

When asked in which type of dwelling structure the absent members reside, more than one third (37%) indicated informal dwellings or shacks. This correlates with the general perception that informal settlement dwellers are mainly from rural areas and highly mobile. More than two out of five of the absent members from O.R. Tambo (43.5%) and Amathole (40.4%) reside in informal dwellings (Table 3.4.23). More than half of those who migrated from Nelson Mandela Municipality (57.9%) and Cacadu (52.8%) reside in formal (non RDP) dwellings when away. It seems most of the absent members in ECDMA10 reside in hostels elsewhere and according to the previous table, hostels overseas.

**Table 1.4.23: During absents he/she lives in, by district level weights.**

	Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Other	1.9		0.1	1.7	2.5	1.0			0.8
Do not know	1.5		0.4	0.7	0.4	0.1			0.4
Informal dwelling/shack	18.0	12.3	40.4	37.0	19.9	43.5	34.6		37.0
Formal urban dwelling (non RDP)	57.9	52.8	32.7	36.9	44.0	30.5	41.2		36.2
RDP housing estate	12.3	21.4	7.1	6.9	14.1	3.1	3.3	17.8	6.4
Hostel	4.2	13.5	11.4	13.0	12.6	12.7	12.2	82.2	11.7
Rural dwelling	2.9		7.2	3.1	6.1	9.0	8.1		7.0
Prison	1.5		0.5	0.2	0.4	0.2			0.4
Hospital			0.3	0.5			0.6		0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

When households were asked whether these household members send any money or remittances back to the household, three out of five in the province (59.4%) indicated that they do not send money or remittances back (Table 3.4.24). This was especially the case with White households where only 12.5% send back monthly remittances while 59% of Black and 56.6% of Coloured households send money or remittances back. Almost a third of Coloured households (30.2%) and a quarter of Black households (26.7%) received monthly remittances.

**Table 1.4.24: Whether absent household member sends any money or remittances by population group (Q1.17 by 17.2) provincial level weights**

	Black	White	Coloured	Total
	%	%	%	%
No	59.0	87.5	56.6	59.4
Yes, weekly	4.3		9.4	4.3
Yes, monthly	26.7	12.5	30.2	26.5
Yes, about 4 times a year	4.5		3.8	4.4
Yes, 3 times a year or less	5.5			5.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Male household members are more likely to send remittances home than female members, probably because (from an earlier Table 3.4.16) they were more successful in finding work (Table 3.4.25). Males send home monthly remittances in 31.5% of the cases while females send home monthly remittances in 20% of the cases. Overall, 45.9% of males and 33.6% of females send home remittances.

**Table 1.4.25: Whether absent household member sends any money or remittances by gender group (Q1.17 by 3 17.3) provincial level weights**

	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
<b>No</b>	54.1	66.4	59.4
<b>Yes, weekly</b>	3.9	4.8	4.3
<b>Yes, monthly</b>	31.5	20.0	26.6
<b>Yes, about 4 times a year</b>	4.2	4.7	4.4
<b>Yes, 3 times a year or less</b>	6.2	4.1	5.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

On a district level, less migrant members in Alfred Nzo (47.8%) and Ukhahlamba (53.4%) sent money home than in other districts (Table 3.4.26). Most absent members in all districts send money home monthly. This may indicate a greater likelihood to fall into a poverty trap in the current area of residence, such as Johannesburg.

**Table 1.4.26: Person sends you money or remittances, by district level weights**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>No, nothing</b>	64.6	65.1	66.1	60.0	53.4	56.8	47.8	82.2	59.5
<b>Yes, weekly</b>	4.3	6.8	4.6	6.8	3.6	3.2	4.2		4.2
<b>Yes, monthly</b>	26.1	24.2	23.8	28.0	22.0	28.7	30.7	17.8	26.6
<b>Yes, about four times a year</b>	3.5	1.3	2.7	3.3	9.0	5.0	6.9		4.4
<b>Yes, three times or less a year</b>	1.5	2.7	2.8	1.9	11.9	6.4	10.4		5.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

A strong correlation seems to exist between household income and the ability of the absent member to send money home. For households who earn around R2000 a month or less, the absent members seems more likely not to send remittances or money home whereas those households earning more (Table 3.4.27). It could also be that the reason for migration plays a role. Those households with absent students and scholars could afford to send them elsewhere however they are not likely to expect remittances to be sent back to the household. However, poorer households where an absent member found employment elsewhere will probably expect remittances.

**Table 1.4.27: Person sends you money or remittances, by household net income.**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
<b>No, nothing</b>	2002.5	243145.4	2925.1
<b>Yes, weekly</b>	2141.0	17657.8	2512.6
<b>Yes, monthly</b>	2120.9	106668.7	2349.3
<b>Yes, about four times a year</b>	2471.4	18312.5	2555.5
<b>Yes, three times or less a year</b>	2439.8	21726.4	3044.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2083.9</b>	<b>407510.8</b>	<b>2762.0</b>

The Table 3.4.28 below confirms that there seems to be a relationship between the reason for absence and household income. Those households with members absent for tertiary education are far better off than other households (R3,736.52 net income per month) while those looking for work seem to be from much poorer households (income of R1,245.94 net a month). The households with absent members, who seemed to have found employment (R2,322.86), also seem better off than the average Eastern Cape household (R2,045.57). Households seem quite poor on average where the absent person lives with another partner elsewhere or are in prison, hospital or visiting their other home or visiting friends.

**Table 1.4.28: Mean amount of money brought into the household per month after deductions such as tax, medical aid and pension contributions by reason for absence**

Q1.12 Reason household member absent	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Other	2286.6667	362	2225.52490
Employment	2322.8550	191950	2997.72126
Looking for work	1245.9405	106415	1280.20799
Primary/secondary schooling	2128.3960	46160	2827.99632
Personal reasons	2180.2329	5075	2838.72894
Visiting spouse/family	1544.2222	12622	1685.82426
Visiting friends	557.3417	1149	365.81530
Visiting other home	1836.1068	10192	2326.98090
Living with other partner	1155.0359	3937	710.71075
Prison	1062.1511	1516	388.11366
Hospital	1400.3781	1737	1343.99921
Tertiary education	3736.5196	25763	4407.59709
<b>Total</b>	<b>2045.5737</b>	<b>406877</b>	<b>2749.80673</b>

When asked whether the absent member sends money home, four in five households (80.6%) in the province said no (Table 3.4.29). The highest percentage of households who send money to the absent member reside in the relatively more well-off districts of Cacadu (30.2%) and Nelson Mandela Municipality (27%).

**Table 1.4.29: Household sends this person money or remittance, by district level weights.**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
Yes	27.0	30.2	21.7	21.7	11.5	17.8	15.0		19.4
No	73.0	69.8	78.3	78.3	88.5	82.2	85.0	100.0	80.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The absent person seems to send money home to households which earn slightly more rather than very little money. Of those who send money to the household, the average household income of the household is R2,649.60. The average disposable income of households, who do not receive money from absent members, is only about R1,958.10 (Table 3.4.30 below).

**Table 1.4.30: Household sends this person money or remittance, by household net income.**

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Yes	2649.6	77665.2	2984.2
No	1958.1	325258.9	2704.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2091.4</b>	<b>402924.1</b>	<b>2773.8</b>

Households were asked whether they expect the absent person to return to their household in the near future to live there permanently. For the province, the overwhelming majority (91.2%) indicated that they expected them to return (Table 3.4.31). The highest percentages of expected returns were recorded for ECDMA10 (100%), O.R. Tambo (94.6%), Amathole (94.5%) and Ukhahlamba (93.5%). The lowest percentages were recorded for Nelson Mandela Municipality (78.3%) and Alfred Nzo (81.1%).

**Table 1.4.31: Member is expected to return to this household permanently in the future, by district level weights.**

	Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	78.3	85.0	92.4	94.5	93.5	94.6	81.1	100.0	91.2
No	21.7	15.0	7.5	5.5	6.5	5.4	18.9		8.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

#### 1.4.2 Description of absent members, but only those who are employed or looking for work (only away household members (DC weights) select cases 1.11 = 1 & 1.12 <= 2)

The following section explores the realities of households with migrant workers (as opposed to those away for other reasons) and who these members are. Included in this analysis are all absent members who are seeking employment or who are employed.

More than three in five of these household members in the Eastern Cape are either from O.R. Tambo (34%) and Amathole (29.8%) (Table 3.4.32 below). The remainder is mostly from Chris Hani (12.3%) and from Alfred Nzo (9.9%). In terms of gender, there are no significant differences regarding districts of origin and gender of absent member, with the implication that area is a determining factor of migration irrespective of gender.

**Table 1.4.32: District level of absent members working or job seeking by gender (district weights)**

District Council	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
<b>Nelson Mandela Municipality</b>	2.1	4.1	2.9
<b>Cacadu DC</b>	1.9	1.6	1.8
<b>Amathole DC</b>	28.7	31.5	29.8
<b>Chris Hani</b>	11.9	12.9	12.3
<b>Ukhahlamba</b>	9.0	9.3	9.1
<b>O.R Tambo</b>	35.7	31.5	34.0
<b>Alfred Nzo</b>	10.4	9.0	9.9
<b>ECDMA10</b>	0.2	0.1	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

To confirm the district level data, it is clear from the table below that absent migrant labour come mainly from King Sabata Dalindyebo (in the O.R. Tambo District) and Mquma and Mbhashe Local Municipalities in Amathole, the two most likely originating Districts of Eastern Cape migrant labour. Other areas include Umzimvubu in Alfred Nzo and Senqu in Ukhahlamba (Table 3.4.33).

**Table 1.4.33: Municipal level of absent members working or job seeking by gender (district weights)**

		Male	Female	Total
<b>Cacadu DC</b>	<b>Camdeboo Local Municipality</b>	0.5	0.5	0.5
	<b>Blue Crane Route Local Municipality</b>	0.6	0.4	0.5
	<b>Ikwezi Local Municipality</b>		0.1	0.0
	<b>Makana Local Municipality</b>			0.0
	<b>Ndlambe Local Municipality</b>			0.0
	<b>Sunday's River Valley Local Municipality</b>	0.4	0.2	0.3
	<b>Baviaans Local Municipality</b>	0.1	0.2	0.1
	<b>Kouga Local Municipality</b>	0.2	0.2	0.2
	<b>Kou-Kamma Local Municipality</b>	0.2		0.1
<b>Amathole DC</b>	<b>Mbhashe Local Municipality</b>	10.9	10.9	10.9
	<b>Mquma Local Municipality</b>	11.6	10.2	11.1
	<b>Great Kei Local Municipality</b>	0.3	0.7	0.5
	<b>Amahlati Local Municipality</b>	1.2	2.0	1.5
	<b>Buffalo City Local Municipality</b>	2.2	4.9	3.2
	<b>Ngqushwa Local Municipality</b>	0.6	0.6	0.6
	<b>Nkonkobe Local Municipality</b>	1.5	1.8	1.6
	<b>Nxuba Yethemba Local Municipality</b>	0.4	0.5	0.4
<b>Chris Hani</b>	<b>Inxuba Yethemba Local Municipality</b>	0.9	0.6	0.8
	<b>Tsolwana Local Municipality</b>	0.7	0.9	0.7
	<b>Inkwanca Local Municipality</b>	0.1	0.3	0.2
	<b>Lukhanji Local Municipality</b>	1.0	1.4	1.1
	<b>Intsika Yethu Local Municipality</b>	4.0	4.7	4.3

	<b>Emalahleni (EC) Local Municipality</b>	1.2	1.3	1.2
	<b>Engcobo Local Municipality</b>	3.9	3.2	3.6
	<b>Sakhisizwe Local Municipality</b>	0.3	0.6	0.4
<b>Ukhahlamba</b>	<b>Elundini Local Municipality</b>	2.4	1.4	2.0
	<b>Senqu Local Municipality</b>	6.0	7.5	6.6
	<b>Maletswai Local Municipality</b>	0.3	0.2	0.2
	<b>Gariep Local Municipality</b>	0.4	0.2	0.3
<b>O.R Tambo</b>	<b>Mbizana Local Municipality</b>	3.4	3.0	3.2
	<b>Ntabankulu Local Municipality</b>	3.2	3.0	3.1
	<b>Qaukeni Local Municipality</b>	5.0	5.0	5.0
	<b>Port St Johns Local Municipality</b>	0.9	0.6	0.8
	<b>Nyandeni Local Municipality</b>	4.3	3.5	4.0
	<b>Mhlontlo Local Municipality</b>	4.3	3.7	4.1
	<b>King Sabata Dalindyebo</b>	14.6	12.9	13.9
<b>Alfred Nzo</b>	<b>Umzimkhulu Local Municipality</b>	3.5	2.2	3.0
	<b>Umzimvubu Local Municipality</b>	7.0	6.8	6.9
<b>ECDMA10</b>	<b>ECDMA10</b>	0.2	0.1	0.2
<b>Nelson Mandela</b>	<b>Nelson Mandela Municipality</b>	2.1	4.1	2.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Female migrants seem generally younger than male migrants with 44.8% of female migrants between the ages of 20 and 29 as opposed to only 34% of males (Table 3.4.34). However, migrating males, who are deemed part of the household, are generally older than females. While almost one third of migrant men (33.2%) are 40 or over, only about 21.6% of female migrants are 40 or older.

**Table 1.4.34: Age Profile of Migrants in categories by gender (district weights)**

District Council	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
<b>Aged 15 to 19</b>	2.7	3.2	2.9
<b>Aged 20 to 29</b>	34.0	44.8	38.3
<b>Aged 30 to 39</b>	30.1	30.3	30.2
<b>Aged 40 to 49</b>	19.8	13.9	17.5
<b>Aged 50 to 59</b>	10.5	6.2	8.8
<b>Aged 60 to 77</b>	2.9	1.5	2.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

More men migrate to Johannesburg, most likely for the mines while about one quarter of women go to Johannesburg. An equal percentage goes to Cape Town, but slightly more women than men go to Durban and other Eastern Cape Towns (Table 3.4.35).

**Table 1.4.35: Age Profile of Migrants in categories by gender (district weights)**

District Council	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
Cape Town	28.4	28.5	28.4
Johannesburg	39.6	26.1	34.3
Durban	7.9	11.0	9.1
East London	2.9	6.2	4.2
Port Elizabeth	4.2	5.1	4.5
Other Eastern Cape town	11.5	15.7	13.2
Rural village or farm in the Eastern Cape	2.3	3.8	2.9
Another province	3.0	2.6	2.8
Another country	0.3	1.0	0.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Women come home slightly more frequently than men in one year (Table 3.4.36). Women visit the household about 5.27 on average per year and men 5 times.

**Table 1.4.36: Mean Number of months been absent in the past 12 months by gender (district weights)**

Q1.3 Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Male	5.27	179959	4.112
Female	5.00	118153	4.074
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.16</b>	<b>298112</b>	<b>4.099</b>

More than half of the migrant workers (61.5%) were the son or daughter of the household head (Table 3.4.37 below). Actually, females (68.1%) are more likely to be the child of a household head than males (57.1%). However, more than a quarter of males (28.8%) were viewed as household heads as opposed to 10% of females.

**Table 1.4.37: Relationship to Household Head by gender group (district level weights)**

	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
Head of household	28.8	10.1	21.3
Husband/wife/partner of HHH	3.7	5.4	4.4
Son/daughter/step-/adopted child	57.1	68.1	61.5
Brother/sister	3.5	6.6	4.7
Father/mother	.3	.6	.4
Grandchild	4.3	4.7	4.5
Other relative	2.3	4.3	3.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

More than one third of the migrant workers (34.7%) have a grade 12 qualification (Table 3.4.38). Interestingly, the female migrant workers seemed to be slightly more educated than male migrant workers where almost seven in ten have at least a grade 10 and 44.5% have a grade 12 qualification. Of the males, less than half (44.5%) have at least a grade 10 qualification and only 28.1% have a grade 12 qualification. One of the reasons for an increase in female migration may rest with their relatively high level of education.

**Table 1.4.38: Highest level of school education by gender group (district level weights)**

	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
Do not know	0.2	0.3	0.2
None	4.8	2.3	3.8
Grade 1/Sub A	0.6	0.4	0.5
Grade 2/Sub B	1.2	0.9	1.1
Grade 3/Std 1/L 1	2.8	0.6	1.9
Grade 4/Std 2/L 2	5.8	2.3	4.4
Grade 5/Std 3/L 3	5.7	2.2	4.3
Grade 6/Std 4/L 4	8.2	2.9	6.1
Grade 7/Std 5/L 5	7.6	4.2	6.2
Grade 8/Std 6/L 6/Form I	8.8	7.3	8.2
Grade 9/Std 7/L 7/Form II	9.8	7.8	9.0
Grade 10/Std 8/L 8/Form III/NTC/RCE Higher	9.1	11.8	10.2
Grade 11/Std 9/Form IV	7.3	12.5	9.3
Grade 12/Std 10/Matric	28.1	44.5	34.7

<b>Grade R/pre-school at public primary school</b>	0.1		
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Slightly more than one in ten migrant workers (12.7%) has some form of tertiary education. In line with secondary school education, females show slightly more education than males. Almost twice as many females (8.4%) have a College, technikon or university certificate than males (4.6%) and females (6.1%) are 2.4 times more likely to have a College, technikon or university diploma than men (2.5%) (Table 3.4.39)

**Table 1.4.39: Post school qualifications by gender group (district level weights)**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
	%	%	%
<b>Do not know</b>		0.1	
<b>None</b>	90.6	82.2	87.3
<b>College/technikon/university certificate</b>	4.6	8.4	6.1
<b>College/technikon/university diploma</b>	2.5	6.1	3.9
<b>Technikon/university degree</b>	1.3	2.4	1.7
<b>Post-graduate qualification</b>	0.9	0.8	0.9
<b>Unspecified</b>	0.1	0.1	0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Despite the higher levels of education of female migrant workers, more men (65.6%) are employed per capita than females (50.4%) (Table 3.4.40). Overall, 59.5% of migrant workers are employed.

**Table 1.4.40: Person currently working by gender (district level weights)**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
	%	%	%
<b>Yes</b>	65.6	50.4	59.5
<b>No</b>	34.4	49.6	40.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Out of interest, all the people, who indicated that the migrant person is looking for work, are unemployed whilst only 8%, who indicated that the reason the absent person left was employment, may actually still be looking for work or has subsequently become unemployed (Table 3.4.41).

**Table 1.4.41: Person currently working by Reason household member absent (district level weights)**

	Employment	Looking for work	Total
	%	%	%
<b>Yes</b>	92.0		59.6
<b>No</b>	8.0	100.0	40.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Overall, more than one third (35.2%) of the absent members who are employed or looking for work, are actually looking for work (Table 3.4.42). It therefore follows that more females are looking for work (43.1%) than males (30.1%).

**Table 1.4.42: Reason household member absent by gender (district level weights)**

	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
<b>Employment</b>	69.9	56.9	64.8
<b>Looking for work</b>	30.1	43.1	35.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

For migrant workers who are employed or looking for work, 5.4% receives grants or other sources of income. Significantly, more women receive other income or grants (11.1%) than men do (1.6%). Grants or other income includes pensions, disability grants and child care grants (Table 3.4.43).

**Table 1.4.43: Household member receives grants or any other source of income by gender (district level weights)**

	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
<b>Yes</b>	1.6	11.1	5.4
<b>No</b>	98.4	88.9	94.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Of these migrant workers, men bring more money into the household (R669.80) than the female migrant workers (R454.52), most likely because many females

are still unemployed or employed in lower paying jobs than men despite their average higher education (Table 3.4.44). The mean amount brought into the household by those migrant workers looking for work or employed is R584.91 which explains why these households are generally better off than households without migrant workers.

**Table 1.4.44: Total amount of money brought in by household members by gender (district level weights)**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
<b>Male</b>	669.8071	168796	1455.19692
<b>Female</b>	454.5226	109898	923.87466
<b>Overall</b>	<b>584.9134</b>	<b>278695</b>	<b>1276.79470</b>

Males are slightly more likely to be absent from the household for longer periods of time than females (Table 3.4.45). Females spend an average of about 5 months absent from the household, while males spend about 5.3 months on average away from the household.

**Table 1.4.45: Number of months been absent in the past 12 months (district level weights)**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
<b>Male</b>	5.3	175728.1	4.1
<b>Female</b>	5.0	116725.7	4.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>292453.8</b>	<b>4.1</b>

When looking at the periods sent away from the households, more than one fifth of men and women were absent for less than one month in the past 12 months. About one in ten men and women were absent for 11 months in the past 12 months and 5.6 overall for 12 months in the past 12 months (Table 3.4.46).

**Table 1.4.46: Duration of absents in months over the past 12 months by gender (district level weights)**

	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
<b>Not absent in the past 12 months</b>	1.5	2.0	1.7
<b>Less than one month</b>	21.8	22.6	22.1
<b>1</b>	10.9	13.1	11.8
<b>2</b>	7.3	9.3	8.1
<b>3</b>	6.3	6.1	6.2
<b>4</b>	4.5	1.4	3.3
<b>5</b>	2.2	2.0	2.1
<b>6</b>	8.8	9.1	8.9
<b>7</b>	2.1	2.5	2.3
<b>8</b>	4.9	5.4	5.1
<b>9</b>	3.8	3.4	3.6
<b>10</b>	7.9	7.9	7.9
<b>11</b>	11.9	10.2	11.2
<b>12</b>	6.1	5.0	5.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Households were asked to indicate where the absent migrant workers (remember only those employed or looking for work) reside (Table 3.4.47). Overall one third (33.9%) lives in Johannesburg and more than a quarter (27.7%) reside in Cape Town while just more than one in ten (13.2%) live in other Eastern Cape towns. The migration patterns differ significantly by population group. While more than one third of Black household members (34.5%) moved to Johannesburg and more than a quarter (27.8%) to Cape Town, more than a quarter of White Household members (26.7%) went to Cape Town and almost half went to Port Elizabeth to find employment or to work. This differs significantly when comparing these migrant workers to the patterns for all absent members where almost one third went to Cape Town and just under a third (31.3%) to another province, most likely to study. Here, nobody went to another province, besides the metros mentioned, to work.

The patterns for Coloured household members differ significantly from Black Households, but are quite in keeping with White households where the migration patterns seem to be within the province rather than outside the

province (Table 3.4.47). Here 40.7% noted moves to other Eastern Cape towns while more than a quarter (27.8%) resides in Port Elizabeth. It should be noted that migration in the context of the survey may even include moving within the same town or city and living alone rather than with the parent household. In this case, parents may still regard these children as household members although they are now semi-autonomous separate households. This could also explain why certain households regarded absent members as ‘not absent in the past 12 months’ as indicated in the previous Table.

**Table 1.4.47: Absent household member’s place residence by population group (district level weights)**

	<b>Black</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Coloured</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Cape Town</b>	27.8	26.7	17.7	27.7
<b>Johannesburg</b>	34.5		8.9	33.9
<b>Durban</b>	9.5		2.0	9.3
<b>East London</b>	4.2	19.9	2.1	4.3
<b>Port Elizabeth</b>	4.5	48.4	24.7	5.1
<b>Other Eastern Cape town</b>	13.0		38.8	13.2
<b>Rural village or farm in the Eastern Cape</b>	3.1			3.0
<b>Another province</b>	2.8			2.8
<b>Another country</b>	0.6	5.0	5.8	0.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

While the percentage of male and females who migrated to Cape Town was roughly equal (27.8%), significantly more males (39.6%) migrated to Johannesburg than females (25.3%) (Table 3.4.48). It can be said that for the overwhelming majority, these distant metropolitan areas are seen mainly as employment destinations rather than for study, leisure or other reasons for relocation. Slightly more females than males migrated to other areas inside the province such as other towns (18.3%) compared to males (14.9%). The same held for migration within rural areas of Eastern Cape cities. The main reason could be that females often have closer bonds to the household than males: many of these females are the parents of children that remain in the rural household and are looked after by the grandparents. This would also explain lower average salaries for females compared to males because salaries are generally higher in Cape Town or Johannesburg than in any place in the Eastern Cape, even the Province’s cities.

**Table 1.4.48: Absent household member's place residence by gender group (district level weights)**

	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
<b>Cape Town</b>	27.7	27.8	27.7
<b>Johannesburg</b>	39.6	25.3	33.9
<b>Durban</b>	8.2	11.0	9.3
<b>East London</b>	2.9	6.5	4.3
<b>Port Elizabeth</b>	4.7	5.7	5.1
<b>Other Eastern Cape town</b>	11.3	15.9	13.2
<b>Rural village or farm in the Eastern Cape</b>	2.5	3.8	3.0
<b>Another province</b>	2.9	2.6	2.8
<b>Another country</b>	0.2	1.4	0.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

It is interesting to note that one third of the absent household members in Nelson Mandela Municipality (30.1%) actually still reside within the boundaries of the municipality, only in a different household. This is much lower than the 50% figure obtained for all absent members and therefore confirms the hypothesis that many absent members moved into residences of secondary and tertiary facilities. However, the majority are probably employed and moved out of parental homes into their own homes.

Almost half of the absent household members in Cacadu moved to other Eastern Cape towns (43.5%) and a further quarter to Port Elizabeth. In ECDMA10 (a part of Cacadu with N = 55), 82.2% of absent members went overseas to find employment or have found employment (Table 3.4.49).

The most popular destination for migrant workers from Amathole (41%) and Chris Hani (51.2%) to find employment is Cape Town and for members in Ukhahlamba (50.9%), O.R. Tambo (39.6%) and Alfred Nzo (48.8%) Johannesburg. Johannesburg has been a traditional destination for Eastern Cape male migrant workers for decades due to the mining industry. The high percentage of migrancy to these cities indicates the likelihood of social networks existing in these cities where people from particularly the Eastern Cape areas have information and are able to tap into.

**Table 1.4.49: Person currently is living by district level weights**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Cape Town</b>	23.9	17.4	41.0	51.2	28.7	16.8	4.8	17.8	27.7
<b>Johannesburg</b>	8.5		25.8	27.9	50.9	39.6	48.6		33.9
<b>Durban</b>		1.8	1.2	0.7	3.5	19.2	18.3		9.3
<b>East London</b>	4.3	4.6	9.1	5.5	0.4	1.5	1.2		4.3
<b>Port Elizabeth</b>	33.1	25.8	6.7	1.3	0.9	1.4	3.2		5.1
<b>Other Eastern Cape town</b>	13.0	43.5	11.2	9.8	6.1	16.4	13.9		13.2
<b>Rural village or farm in the Eastern Cape</b>	7.2	6.9	2.0	1.3	3.5	3.5	3.2		3.0
<b>Another province</b>	1.4		2.8	2.0	6.1	1.6	6.0		2.8
<b>Another country</b>	8.5		0.3	0.3			0.8	82.2	0.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Household members were asked to indicate with whom the absent members reside when away from the household (Table 3.4.50 below). Overall, more than half (51.1%) live alone and slightly less than one third (32.4%) live with other relatives (other than partners or spouses). Again, residing with other relatives possibly explains district trends as people will migrate mainly to places where they know people or know that they will find work, perhaps through the contacts they have. The result is that people from the same place often migrate to the same area. The greatest percentage of household members originating from all districts that are absent, reside alone when absent (or perceived by family members to live alone).

**Table 1.4.50: During absents person lives with by district level weights**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Other</b>	1.3	1.8							0.1
<b>Do not know</b>			0.3	0.3	0.9	0.1			0.2
<b>Living alone</b>	43.8	35.4	48.3	54.6	48.5	53.4	56.0	100.0	51.1
<b>With relatives</b>	24.5	30.8	34.8	31.4	36.7	32.1	28.6		32.4
<b>Near relatives</b>	2.9	1.8	3.2	2.9	0.9	0.8	3.2		2.1
<b>With friends</b>	8.7	16.0	7.1	2.3	4.8	7.3	4.0		6.4
<b>With partner/spouse</b>	17.4	6.9	6.3	5.9	7.4	5.8	7.7		6.9
<b>With employer</b>	1.4	7.3	0.1	0.7		0.2	0.4		0.4
<b>With co-workers / colleagues</b>				2.0	0.9	0.2			0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

When asked in which type of dwelling structure the absent members reside, more than one third (37%) of **all** the absent persons (as discussed in the previous section) indicated they reside in informal dwellings or shacks. However, when looking at only those who are employed or seeking employment, 44.1% reside in informal dwellings and one third (33.7%) in formal non RDP urban houses. Therefore, migrant workers seem a bit worse off than absent household members in general (Table 3.4.51 below).

This correlates with the general perception that informal settlement dwellers are mainly from rural areas and highly mobile. More than two out of five of the absent members from O.R. Tambo (43.5%) and Amathole (40.4%) reside in informal dwellings. In keeping with the previous findings, more than half of those who migrated from Nelson Mandela Municipality (53.3%) and Cacadu (56%) reside in formal (non RDP) dwellings when away. However, the more rural migrants seem worse off. Here about half of all migrant labourers from Amathole, Chris Hani, and O.R Tambo live in informal areas in the place of employ. It seems most of the absent members in ECDMA10 reside in hostels elsewhere and according to the previous table, hostels overseas.

**Table 1.4.51: During absents he/she lives in by district level weights**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Other</b>	3.7		0.1	2.0	2.6	0.2			0.7
<b>Do not know</b>	2.9		0.4	1.0	0.4	0.1			0.4
<b>Informal dwelling/shack</b>	27.1	19.2	46.0	48.8	22.3	50.6	40.2		44.1
<b>Formal urban dwelling (non RDP)</b>	53.3	56.0	35.1	30.4	42.4	26.6	38.2		33.7
<b>RDP housing estate</b>	13.0	16.5	7.4	7.2	14.0	3.5	2.4	17.8	6.4
<b>Hostel</b>		8.3	7.3	8.8	13.1	14.1	12.8	82.2	10.5
<b>Rural dwelling</b>			3.7	2.0	5.2	4.9	6.4		4.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

When households were asked whether these household members send any money or remittances back to the household, almost half in the province (48%) indicated that they do not send money or remittances back. This was especially the case with White households where only 43.5% send back monthly remittances, while 52.1% of Black and 53% of Coloured households send money or remittances back (Table 3.4.35). Almost a third of Coloured households (32.3%) and Black households (33.6%) received monthly remittances.

**Table 1.4.52: Whether absent household member sends any money or remittances by population group (district level weights)**

	Black	White	Colour ed	Total
	%	%	%	%
<b>No</b>	47.9	56.5	47.0	48.0
<b>Yes, weekly</b>	5.3		11.7	5.3
<b>Yes, monthly</b>	33.6	43.5	32.3	33.7
<b>Yes, about 4 times a year</b>	6.0		8.9	6.0
<b>Yes, 3 times a year or less</b>	7.1			7.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Male household members are more likely to send remittances home than female members, probably because (from an earlier Table 3.4.16) they were more successful in finding work. Males send home monthly remittances in 38.7% of

the cases while females send home monthly remittances in 26.3% of the cases. Overall, 43.6% of males and 54.5% of females do NOT send home remittances. It should be noted that over 80% of the migrant labourers who do not send money home are from Tribal areas (Table 3.4.53).

**Table 1.4.53: Whether absent household member sends any money or remittances by gender group (district level weights)**

	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
<b>No</b>	43.6	54.5	48.0
<b>Yes, weekly</b>	4.7	6.3	5.3
<b>Yes, monthly</b>	38.7	26.3	33.7
<b>Yes, about 4 times a year</b>	5.3	7.0	6.0
<b>Yes, 3 times a year or less</b>	7.7	5.9	7.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

On a district level, more labour migrants in Alfred Nzo (67.3%) and Ukhahlamba (53.4%) sent money home than in other districts. Most absent members in all districts send money home monthly, most notably Cacadu and Alfred Nzo (Table 3.4.54).

**Table 1.4.54: Person sends you money or remittances by district level weights**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>No, nothing</b>	49.0	42.6	57.6	49.1	46.7	44.1	32.7	82.2	48.0
<b>Yes, weekly</b>	5.5	10.1	5.3	9.4	4.4	4.2	5.2		5.3
<b>Yes, monthly</b>	37.1	40.3	30.1	34.3	23.6	36.6	39.0	17.8	33.7
<b>Yes, about four times a year</b>	7.0	2.3	3.5	4.5	10.9	6.6	9.2		6.0
<b>Yes, three times or less a year</b>	1.4	4.6	3.6	2.6	14.4	8.5	13.9		7.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

A strong correlation seems to exist between household income and the ability of the absent member to send money home. The Table 3.4.55 contains the mean income of all households who do have a labour migrant (as opposed to households without absent members or members absent for other reasons).

Households who receive remittances are better off than homes where these labour migrants do not send back remittances. For households who earn around R2000 a month or less, the absent members seems more likely not to send remittances or money home whereas those households earning more.

**Table 1.4.55: Person sends you money or remittances, by household net income (district level weights)**

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
No, nothing	1634.9	143321.8	2596.6
Yes, weekly	2239.4	15955.4	2618.0
Yes, monthly	2132.4	98679.8	2379.6
Yes, about four times a year	2436.7	18136.3	2560.4
Yes, three times or less a year	2434.0	20949.1	3066.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1937.9</b>	<b>297042.4</b>	<b>2580.7</b>

When asked whether the household sends the absent member money or remittances, only about one in ten households (12.5%) in the province said yes. The highest percentage of households who send money to the absent member reside in the relatively more well-off districts of Cacadu (25.3%) and Nelson Mandela Municipality (29.5%) (Table 3.4.56).

**Table 1.4.56: Household sends this person money or remittance by district level weights**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
Yes	29.5	25.3	13.9	12.4	8.7	9.0	13.1		12.5
No	70.5	74.7	86.1	87.6	91.3	91.0	86.9	100.0	87.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The absent person seems to send money home to households who earn slightly more money than the poorest of poor households. Of those who send money to the household, the average household income is R2,030.80. The average disposable income of households who do not receive money from absent members is only about R1,933.10 (Table 3.4.57 below).

**Table 1.4.57: Household sends this person money or remittance by household net income (district level weights)**

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
<b>Yes</b>	2030.8	35954.1	2201.2
<b>No</b>	1933.1	257982.4	2639.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1945.1</b>	<b>293936.5</b>	<b>2590.3</b>

Households were asked whether they expect the absent person to return to this household in the near future to live there permanently. For the province, the overwhelming majority (91.8%) indicated that they expected them to return. The highest percentages of expected returns were recorded for ECDMA10 (100%), Chris Hani (95.5%), O.R. Tambo (95.3%), Ukhahlamba (93.9%) and Amathole (93.3%),. The lowest percentages were recorded for Nelson Mandela Municipality (73.5%) and Alfred Nzo (79.7%) (Table 3.4.58 below).

**Table 1.4.58: Member is expected to return to this household permanently in the future, by district level weights**

	Nelson Mandela Municipality	Cacadu DC	Amathole DC	Chris Hani	Ukhahlamba	O.R Tambo	Alfred Nzo	ECDMA10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Do not know</b>			0.1						0.0
<b>Yes</b>	73.5	88.6	93.3	95.5	93.9	95.3	79.7	100.0	91.8
<b>No</b>	26.5	11.4	6.6	4.5	6.1	4.7	20.3		8.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 1.4.59: Person currently working by Reason household member absent (district level weights)**

	Employment	Looking for work	Total
	%	%	%
<b>Urban formal - built up town or city area</b>	13.8	9.3	12.2
<b>Urban informal</b>	2.9	1.9	2.6
<b>Peri urban - mostly informal/smallholding</b>	0.2	0.1	0.2
<b>Tribal settlement</b>	82.7	87.9	84.5
<b>Farming</b>	0.4	0.8	0.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 1.4.60: Absent household member sends household money by locale or settlement type (district level weights)**

		Urban formal - built up town or city area	Urban informal	Peri urban - mostly informal / smallholding	Tribal settlement	Farming	Total
No, nothing	Count	19091.0	2601.0	123.0	121988.0	817.0	144620.0
	% Absent member sends hh money	13.2	1.8	0.1	84.4	0.6	100.0
	% within Locale or settlement type	52.7	33.2	25.9	47.8	52.6	48.0
Yes, weekly	Count	2715.0	856.0	0.0	12384.0	0.0	15955.0
	% Absent member sends hh money	17.0	5.4	0.0	77.6	0.0	100.0
	% within Locale or settlement type	7.5	10.9	0.0	4.9	0.0	5.3
Yes, monthly	Count	11857.0	2870.0	0.0	86110.0	614.0	101451.0
	% Absent member sends hh money	11.7	2.8	0.0	84.9	0.6	100.0
	% within Locale or settlement type	32.7	36.7	0.0	33.7	39.5	33.7
Yes, about four times a year	Count	1105.0	1023.0	97.0	15789.0	123.0	18137.0
	% Absent member sends hh money	6.1	5.6	0.5	87.1	0.7	100.0
	% within Locale or settlement type	3.1	13.1	20.5	6.2	7.9	6.0
Yes, three times or less a year	Count	1455.0	474.0	254.0	18889.0	0.0	21072.0
	% Absent member sends hh money	6.9	2.2	1.2	89.6	0.0	100.0
	% within Locale or settlement type	4.0	6.1	53.6	7.4	0.0	7.0
Total	Count	36223.0	7824.0	474.0	255160.0	1554.0	301235.0
	% Absent member sends hh money	12.0	2.6	0.2	84.7	0.5	100.0
	% within Locale or settlement type	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 1.4.61: Absent household member sends household money by Dominant housing type in ward (district level weights)**

		Formal housing	Mostly formal housing	Mostly informal housing	Squatter housing / impoverished area	Traditional housing	Hostel(s)	Total
No, nothing	Count	17031.0	5390.0	1433.0	864.0	119902.0	0.0	144620.0
	% within Absent member sends hh money	11.8	3.7	1.0	0.6	82.9	0.0	100.0
	% within Dominant housing in ward	52.6	49.7	32.2	77.3	47.5	0.0	48.0
Yes, weekly	Count	2714.0	853.0	100.0	0.0	12288.0	0.0	15955.0
	% within Absent member sends hh money	17.0	5.3	0.6	0.0	77.0	0.0	100.0
	% within Dominant housing in ward	8.4	7.9	2.3	0.0	4.9	0.0	5.3
Yes, monthly	Count	10707.0	2651.0	2081.0	127.0	85885.0	0.0	101451.0
	% within Absent member sends hh money	10.6	2.6	2.1	0.1	84.7	0.0	100.0
	% within Dominant housing in ward	33.1	24.5	46.8	11.4	34.1	0.0	33.7
Yes, about four times a year	Count	886.0	1097.0	358.0	127.0	15668.0	0.0	18136.0
	% within Absent member sends hh money	4.9	6.0	2.0	0.7	86.4	0.0	100.0
	% within Dominant housing in ward	2.7	10.1	8.1	11.4	6.2	0.0	6.0
Yes, three times or less a year	Count	1045.0	847.0	472.0	0.0	18454.0	254.0	21072.0
	% within Absent member sends hh money	5.0	4.0	2.2	0.0	87.6	1.2	100.0
	% within Dominant housing in ward	3.2	7.8	10.6	0.0	7.3	100.0	7.0
Total	Count	32383.0	10838.0	4444.0	1118.0	252197.0	254.0	301234.0
	% within Absent member sends hh money	10.8	3.6	1.5	0.4	83.7	0.1	100.0
	% within Dominant housing in ward	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 1.4.62: Household sends absent member money by Dominant housing type in ward (district level weights)**

		Formal housing	Mostly formal housing	Mostly informal housing	Squatter housing / impoverished area	Traditional housing	Hostel(s)	Total
<b>Yes</b>	Count	8256.0	1832.0	860.0	123.0	26135.0	0.0	37206.0
	% within Q1.18 Household sends absent member money	22.2	4.9	2.3	0.3	70.2	0.0	100.0
	% within A5 Dominant housing type in ward	25.9	16.9	19.4	11.0	10.5	0.0	12.5
<b>No</b>	Count	23572.0	9006.0	3584.0	995.0	223513.0	254.0	260924.0
	% within Q1.18 Household sends absent member money	9.0	3.5	1.4	0.4	85.7	0.1	100.0
	% within A5 Dominant housing type in ward	74.1	83.1	80.6	89.0	89.5	100.0	87.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>31828.0</b>	<b>10838.0</b>	<b>4444.0</b>	<b>1118.0</b>	<b>249648.0</b>	<b>254.0</b>	<b>298130.0</b>
	<b>% within Q1.18 Household sends absent member money</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>83.7</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>100.0</b>
	<b>% within A5 Dominant housing type in ward</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 1.4.63: Total amount of money brought into the household per month after deductions such as tax, medical aid and pension contributions**

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
<b>Urban formal - built up town or city area</b>	2492.2376	35146	3388.64452
<b>Urban informal</b>	2207.2630	7605	3003.39022
<b>Peri urban - mostly informal/smallholding</b>	1112.9135	474	432.65879
<b>Tribal settlement</b>	1850.3305	253947	2405.53236
<b>Farming</b>	2891.1909	1554	3913.37252
<b>Total</b>	<b>1939.1848</b>	<b>298727</b>	<b>2574.87842</b>

**Table 1.4.64: Age of household head of labour migrant household by gender (district level weights)**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
<b>Male</b>	46.25	52079	9.716
<b>Female</b>	46.92	11908	8.980
<b>Total</b>	<b>46.38</b>	<b>63987</b>	<b>9.587</b>

## **1.5 Executive Summary and Conclusion**

### **1.5.1 Demographics**

- 5.6% of individuals in the province are away from their households as migrants - 6.1% of Africans, 2.1% of Whites and 1.3% of Coloureds.
- 17.2% of black households have members that are now/often away from home for 6 months or more. The ratio of female to male headed households is 3 to 2. It is also revealing that households with migrants are larger (over 5 members on average) than those without (under 4.5).
- The households involved in migration also own residential areas in the same area. Households with migrants have, on average, R150 a month more to spend than those that do not.

### **1.5.2 Urban and Rural**

- There are 4 households with migrants in rural areas to 1 in urban areas, suggesting that rural households remain suppliers of the migrants.
- For every three males that leave the household there are now two females, which presents a fundamentally different situation to the apartheid migration system of male migration - areas with above average migration rates include Ukahlamba (7%), OR Tambo, Alfred Nzo and Amathole (6.2%), which reinforces the Eastern half of the province as the main sending areas.
- It is interesting that a greater proportion of those who are away from deep rural areas like Ukahlamba and Alfred Nzo were employed while away than in sat Nelson Mandela, which would involve urban people being away (probably suggests that more of these are away for schooling or visiting).

### **1.5.3 Employment**

- Almost half of all migrants are employed, a quarter looking for work and a sixth are at school, and the remainder are just visiting friends and relatives (many of these probably indirectly looking for work, which could push the work seekers to about a third of the total).
- A lot of households indicated that the members had been away for less than a month, but this is probably explained by the fact that many had just returned after Christmas.

### **1.5.4 Destinations**

- 25% of those who are absent are in Cape Town, 30% in Johannesburg and 10% in EL or PE and 16% in other Eastern Cape towns. I think that this supports the idea that there is local circulations between rural areas and small towns as well as to local centres like PE and EL (I would like to know how many of those in local towns and centres are currently employed compared to those in external towns and centres).
- Only 6% moving between rural areas, compared to the much higher rate of the 1990s (cf. Cross 2000).
- 3 men go to Johannesburg for every 2 women, while the gender ratios of migration to Cape Town are more even.
- 2 women are migrating to East London for every man, the ratio is more equal for the Nelson Mandela Metropole, although women are in the majority; and for other towns in the EC, it is three women for every two

men. Overall, there are three women migrating within the province for every two men.

- In the Port Elizabeth area, there is a lot of migration from the immediate hinterland into the city (over 50% in PE metro); Chris Hani and Amathole are the main senders to Cape Town; and Ukuhlamba, OR Tambo and Alfred Nzo are the main senders to Johannesburg.

#### **1.5.5 Living Arrangements**

- 42% of those who are migrants live alone, while 38% live with relatives.
- Those from NMM and Cacadu were less inclined to stay alone – this is because they traveled locally. *It might be useful to see who those who go to Cape Town and JHB stay with, by comparison with those who stay in the Eastern Cape.*
- 37% of those away live in informal settlements, 36% live in formal settlements (probably mainly with relatives and maybe in the backyard).

#### **1.5.6 Remittances**

- About a quarter of migrants in all areas send home income monthly and 4% weekly, which means that 30% send money home regularly, while a further 10% send it home less often.

#### **1.5.7 Some Key Characteristics of Migrants**

- Mainly from rural areas – over 80%.
- Male and female – more and more female members now migrate.
- Female migrants are usually younger than males.
- Female migrants are usually better educated than the male migrant workers, although education levels are low throughout.
- Females earn less than males.
- Females send less money back than males.
- Most migrants now travel mainly to Johannesburg or Cape Town in search of employment rather than Eastern Cape towns and cities as they apparently did in the 1990s.
- Migrant households are poor, but not the poorest of the poor
- More than half of the migrants live alone in informal settlements, suggesting that they are aiming to become targets of development and are hedging their bets, perhaps seeking access to housing subsidies.

# ***CHANGING MIGRATION PATTERNS***

## ***SECTION THREE***

### **1.6 Diagnostics: Changing Migration Patterns and Basic Service Delivery in the Eastern Cape**

#### **1.6.1 Migration Rates Decline**

One of the most striking conclusions of this study, when compared to those of the 1990s, is that the almost endemic mobility of household residents, especially in the rural areas, seems to have declined across the region. The restless, mobile household of the 1990s seem to have settled down somewhat in the 2000s. The idea that has come through from previous statistics in the province, especially those of Cross and Bekker (2001), is that people were frantically moving around in the post-apartheid period in an effort to reposition themselves in relation to available resources. Our evidence shows that only 5% of household members, located in 15% of households, are active migrants. What does this mean? It seems to imply that out-migration from rural areas is slowing down and that most of those who intended or are able to leave have already left. Perhaps it is not a lack of desire, just that the cost of migration has increased and the opportunities to go have decreased since the 1990s making it more difficult to move. Another point we make is that there seems to be more migration to the metros from rural areas in the Eastern Cape now than was the case in the 1990s, when many rural households moved onto the fringes or into small towns and local urban centres. This also has implications for local development strategies.

#### **1.6.2 Population Growth Slows, Household Proliferate**

The problem, however, for service deliver is that, while the number of people moving might be decreasing, the demand for services in receiving localities is not necessarily following this trend. This is because households are proliferating, while population is declining. In the Western Cape, it has been discovered that in some informal settlements over one third of the shacks are inhabited by *one member households*. In one recent case study, it was found that 43% of households only had one member (Pietrese & Parnell 2006). This trend has also been observed in Duncan Village and other informal settlements in the Eastern Cape, and there are certainly a large number of single migrants living in backyard shacks in the townships of Port Elizabeth and East London. The challenge for the state, in terms of basis service delivery, is that it is simply impossible to roll-out a package of basic services to each individual (one person households). The aim of the state is to *provide basic services to households not individuals*.

In the context of the above, it is necessary to reflect on what the term household might mean in South Africa today. It is also clear that development infrastructure and the anticipated access to it has become a major driven of migration – people are actively seeking out ‘sites of development’ rather than jobs per se.

### **1.6.3 Where is the Urbanization and Settlement Strategy?**

There appears to be a very fragmented response to migration and settlement within the province. The capacity of municipalities to source funds for housing is driven development investment, rather than any clear understanding of where migrants might best be accommodated and secure sustainable livelihoods. One problem is that the provincial government has been ‘dumping funds’ on municipalities in a desperate attempt to avert criticism for under-spending. The problem that arises is that funds are not necessarily spent where they should, but rather where they can be. The absence of a coherent urbanization and settlement strategy for the province makes it very difficult to appreciate where state investment in housing and service delivery would be most effective. Since 1998, provincial policy has focused on increasing investment in rural development needs and countering a perceived urban bias in the province. The policy is based on the idea that more poverty is located in the rural therefore more funds should be sent there.

### **1.6.4 Developing an Urban Reception Strategy?**

One of the points that might be made in relation to migration is that more should be done for those arriving in towns and cities. The observation made above is that new migrants struggle to establish a foothold in the urban areas and are forced into a ‘circular migration’ because they find it difficult to make the rural to urban transition. Targeting opportunities for new arrivals would make the transition easier. If it is the desire of the state to increase and stabilize urbanization, then measures should be put in place to assist this process.

One debate that have been raging in policy circles over the past year has been whether it would be *desirable* for the government to eradicate all informal settlements in the metropolitan areas by 2014, even if it was possible to achieve this. Critics of the Minister’s stance on informal settlements have suggested that the formalization of all residential areas would increase the cost of urban migration to such an extent that it would be impossible for the poor to move away from the poverty traps into which apartheid policies created for them in the reserves or homelands. It is suggested that informal settlements are crucial staging posts in the struggle for the city, and that they serve a critical function in the overall process of urbanization in the society. Some level of tolerance for these settlements is therefore seen to be desirable.

### **1.6.5 Looming Economic and Social Disconnection?**

One conclusion that needs to be investigated is whether reduced mobility and the decline in economic opportunities is creating more distance between rural and urban areas? Some scholars highlight post-apartheid connections between town and country. This is certainly the case, and it remains the desire of many families to have access to bases, resources and networks in both urban and rural areas. But the reality is that fewer people are able to constantly move between the urban and the rural, and many are finding themselves trapped within the countryside. We therefore need to be careful not to over-emphasise the capacity of the urban and rural poor to remain mobile in the current context of mass retrenchments and de-industrialization. We also need to note that spaces for manoeuvrability having been closed down may have implications for the future of some rural areas and service delivery in general.

## References

- Aliber, M. 2001. *An overview study of the incidence and nature of chronic poverty in South Africa*. PLAAS, University of the Western Cape in conjunction with the Institute for Development Policy & Management University of Manchester.
- Bank, L. 1997. "Town and country: Urbanisation and migration". *South African Labour Bulletin*, 12(4).
- Bekker, S. 2003. *Migration Study in the Western Cape 2001*. Cape Town: Provincial Government of the Western Cape.
- Bekker, S. 2004. 'The social role of agriculture in South Africa'. *Socio-economic analyses and policy implications of the roles of agriculture in developing countries*. Agricultural and Development Economics Division. Rome: FAO
- Cross, C. 2006. *Migrant motivations and capacities in relation to key migration streams*. In Kok, P., Gelderblom, D., Ouchou J.O, and Van Zyl, J.(eds). *Migration in South Africa*. HSRC Press.
- Cross, C., Bekker, S., Mlambo, N., Kleinbooi, K., Saayman, L., Pretorius, H., Mngadi, T. and Mbela, T. 1999. *An unstable balance: Migration, small farming, infrastructure and livelihoods on the Eastern Seaboard: Part two – Eastern and Western Cape*. Final Report to Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), Halfway House: DBSA.
- Cross, C., Mngadi, T. Mlambo, N., Pretorius, H., Mbhele, T. and Bekker, S. 1997. *Locating productive small farmers: Population shifts & land reform on the Eastern Seaboard*. Summary interim report to the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), Halfway House: DBSA
- De Wet, C. & Whisson, M. (eds). 1997. *From reserve to region: Apartheid and social change in the Keiskammahoek district of (former) Ciskei 1950 – 1990*. Grahamstown: ISER Rhodes University.
- De Wet, C. & Holbrook, G. 1997. "Regionalisation of the household: A temporary phase, or a longer-term trend?" In: De Wet, C. & Whisson, M. op.cit
- Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA). 1996. *Eastern Cape: A human development profile* Halfway House: DBSA.
- Dewar, D., Rosmarin, T. and Watson, V. 1991. "Movement patterns of the African population in Cape Town: Some policy implications." UPRU working paper 44. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- Gelderblom, D. and Adams, W. 2006. *The limits and possibilities of migrant networks*. In Kok, P., Gelderblom, D., Ouchou J.O, and Van Zyl, J.(eds). *Migration in South Africa*. HSRC Press.
- Kok, P., Gelderblom, D. and Van Zyl, J. 2006. *Introduction*. (eds). *Migration in South Africa*. HSRC Press.
- Mabin, A. 1990. "Limits of urban transition models in understanding South African urbanization" *Development SA*, 7(3).
- May, J. 1998. "Poverty and inequality in South Africa". *Indicator SA*, 15(2).
- Seekings, J., Graff, J. and Joubert, P. 1990. *Survey of residential and migration histories of residents of the shack areas of Khayelitsha*. Occasional Paper No.15

Stellenbosch: Research Unit for Sociology of Development, University of Stellenbosch.

Stats SA (Statistics South Africa). 2000. *Living in South Africa – Population Census, 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Stats SA (Statistics South Africa). 2000. *Stats in brief 2000*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Stats SA (Statistics South Africa). 2003. *Census 2001: Investigation into appropriate definitions of urban and rural areas for South Africa: Discussion document*. Report No. 03-02-20.

Todes, A. 1999. Urbanisation theme paper: *An overview of urbanization issues in the 1990's*. Unpublished paper for the project on spatial guidelines for infrastructure investment and development.

Wentzel, M., Tlabela, K. 2006. *Historical background to South African migration*. In Kok, P., Gelderblom, D., Ouchou J.O, and Van Zyl, J .(eds). *Migration in South Africa*. HSRC Press.

Wilson, F. 1972. *Migrant labour in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Sprocas.