FROM SEGREGATION TO INTRAURBAN RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY AMONG BLACK AFRICANS IN POST-*APARTHEID* CAPE TOWN

Sangeeta Parashar
University of Maryland, College Park

and

Robert E. Mazur
Iowa State University, Ames

Please direct correspondence to:

Sangeeta Parashar
Department of Sociology
University of Maryland, College Park
2112 Art-Sociology Building
College Park MD 20742
E-mail: sparashar@socy.umd.edu
Office: 301-405-6407
Department Fax: 301-314-6892

From Segregation to Intraurban Residential Mobility: Black Africans in Post-*Apartheid* Cape Town

Abstract

Apartheid laws in South Africa have resulted in race, class, and gender based occupational and residential segregation, with migration and social networks emerging as necessary and self-perpetuating survival strategies for many poor households. Using a 1995 household survey of metropolitan Cape Town's Black population, this study examines how human and social capital shapes intraurban mobility in Cape Town. Results indicate that the presence of human capital and the absence of social capital are associated with intraurban mobility. Homeowners possessing physical capital (houses *and* finance for improving those houses), households with a high percent of employed adults, and household heads involved in semi-skilled or skilled labor plan to migrate. Households contemplating a move were not members of social organizations. A critical question that emerges is: what happens to households that want to improve their present conditions through mobility but do not possess the human or social capital to do so? Explanations are advanced, and implications and policy issues, particularly in relation to South Africa's housing policy and social stratification, are discussed.

[A PRELIMINARY DRAFT;

MUCH NEEDS TO BE REVISED AND RECONCEPTUALIZED]

Introduction

Real world 'difficult cases' play a significant role in challenging contemporary theories and concepts regarding the complex phenomenon of residential mobility. Cape Town's similarity to other cities in the developing world *and* its uniquely checkered history of coerced population movement and social control, occasioned by restrictive apartheid laws, makes it an exceptionally interesting case study for investigating household dynamics and mobility patterns. Forced removal of people has resulted in serious problems of race, class, and gender based occupational and residential segregation, with migration and social networks emerging as necessary and self-perpetuating survival strategies for many poor households (Mazur, 1998).

As South Africa struggles to overcome the pervasive legacy of apartheid, efforts in the public and private sectors are underway to address the grave problems and manifold needs of the disadvantaged African population in both urban and rural areas. Investigating the transition from residential segregation to residential mobility in South Africa as it was initiating its transition into the post-*apartheid* era enables us to address some key questions:

(1) How does residential mobility emerge among impoverished urban residents following the collapse of rigid, legally codified segregation?
(2) What forms of individual and household mobility are revealed?
(3) What are the individual and combined roles of class and gender in articulating aspirations for residential mobility, and in facilitating or inhibiting the realization of those aspirations?
(4) How does the absence or presence of human and social capital shape intraurban mobility?

Cape Town: An appropriate setting to demonstrate Apartheid's urban legacy

The fundamental aims of 'grand *apartheid*' were to marginalize the African population economically through discrimination, spatially through segregation, and politically through

dispossession, thereby creating a system of circulatory migration of docile cheap labor. Urbanization of the African population was both controlled and displaced through a series of coercive laws. The African population was relegated to just over ten percent of the land in scattered barren 'homelands' (bantustans), and was prohibited from purchasing or leasing land outside these scattered areas (Maylam, 1990). Rural dispossession, forced removals and resettlement of an estimated 3.5 million Africans from towns and white rural areas severely restricted access to employment markets (Crankshaw, 1997).

The legal pillars were the Population Registration Act (1950), which classified people into racial and ethnic type, and the Group Areas Act (1950), which segregated residential and business areas of urban areas according to racial category. When it granted nominal autonomy to the overpopulated and economically non-viable bantustans through the Bantu Authorities Act (1951), the government endeavored to disentangle itself from the responsibility of sustaining these poor economies (Tomlinson, 1988), as well as permanently politically disenfranchises the African population.[1]

The draconian social engineering of *apartheid* not only distorted South Africa's urban geography, but also disrupted kinship systems and extended family relationships that were essential 'safety nets' for poor people (Hugo, 1993). The system of short-term circulatory migration between homelands and the cities and mining enclaves, with men moving to capital-intensive centers and women, old men and children staying behind, ensured that migrants remained socially and economically tied to their villages (Tomlinson, 1988).[2] 'Influx controls'

[1] 'Bantustans' were disconnected fragments of land, mostly unsuitable for farming. The Bantu Authorities Act of 1951 set up a territorial authority to control each region. In 1959, ethnic groups were designated as national units, each with its own homeland. All Blacks were considered citizens of a bantustan, although they retained their South African citizenship. A 1971 act provided for self-government, but many opposed independent bantustans because, on gaining independence, residents would lose their South African citizenship (Tomlinson, 1988).

[2] These mechanisms of manipulated displacement and migrant labor systems were subversively linked to a policy of economic decentralization, whereby industrial centers were set up on the borders of homelands, so that Black and White employees could travel from opposite sides without infringing group area limitations (Mabin, 1992).

and 'pass laws' severely restricted Africans' access to cities (Tomlinson, 1988), with women particularly cited for pass offenses to forestall the permanent residence of African families in urban areas (Skeldon, 1990). Deliberate neglect of African townships discouraged family settlements; workers were housed in large squalid single-sex, dormitory-like hostels (Mabin, 1992). In Cape Town, the Coloured Labour Preference Policy sought to make the surrounding Western Cape region the preserve of white and 'Coloured' (mixed race) people,[3] further constraining job prospects of the African population (Dubow, 1989).[4]

When *apartheid*'s stringent influx controls became untenable and were repealed in the mid-1980s, individuals and households migrated among urban, peri-urban and rural bases in pursuit of employment, education, healthcare, and better living conditions (Adepoju, 1995). Yet discrimination and segregation persist in the post-*apartheid* era, restricting access to resources and opportunities, and maintaining a pervasive sense of exclusion among Africans. South Africa is one of the most unequal societies in the world (Gini coefficient of income per adult equivalent = 0.65), and approximately half of South Africa's population lives in poverty (RSA, 1998a).[5] The richest 10% of households account for 51% of annual income, while the poorest 40% account for less than 4% (World Bank, 1995). Unemployment was 57% in 1995, and 30% of the labor force was engaged in informal economic activities where women outnumbered men 2-to-1 (Rogerson, 1995). Household structures among Blacks in Cape Town have become increasingly female headed with increased duration of urban residence; the poverty rate among these households is 60%, or twice that for male-headed households (Pick and Obermeyer, 1996).

[3] Cape Town was created by the Group Areas Act, but before 1948 it was one of the least segregated cities in sub-Saharan Africa. However, it was remade in the image of racial regimentation in the forty years during which apartheid was the governing policy of South Africa. The 1981 deportation of Blacks from Cape Town to the East Transkei under alien immigrant laws bears testimony to the marginalization of Black urbanization (Mabin, 1992).

[4] Shortages of White labor in the 1960s forced the government to relax stringent race-based labor laws and promote Black advancement in semi-skilled/skilled occupations, as well as entry within restricted urban areas. This led to further social and occupational differentiation and inequality within the Black population (Tomlinson, 1988).

[5] The higher the Gini coefficient, the greater the inequality ($0.0 \leq \text{Gini} \leq 1.0$).

The impoverished material conditions of Blacks,[6] insufficient low-cost housing, high rents, and lack of basic amenities, infrastructure and services further reveal the nature of residential segregation (Mabin, 1992). Major inequalities and deprivation characterize the housing sector. In 1995, the housing backlog (approximately three million units) was reflected in the burgeoning rental sector and overcrowding of hostels and township houses, proliferation of backyard shacks, and the development of squatter settlements in and around formal townships (Crankshaw and Parnell, 1996). Approaches include providing dwellings for the rural poor, upgrading hostels in urban areas for labor migrants, and initiating self-help housing schemes on the peripheries of urban cores (Crankshaw and Parnell, 1996).[7] Policies discouraging redlining, making housing finance available to poor people on a non-discriminatory basis, providing subsidies focusing on individual and collective ownership and social housing, and accommodating a wide range of tenure and delivery options, are also included within the housing framework (RDP, 1994).

The housing policy has yet to manifest discernible changes, but it has already been criticized from several fronts (Bond and Tait, 1997). To undo the broad apartheid geography of urban centers and to accommodate the disadvantaged populations streaming in from rural areas, the new government aimed to construct 350,000 houses annually for ten years (RSA, 1997). By 1999, housing delivery had slacked to about 170,000 units per annum (*RDP Development Monitor*, April 1999). Privatization of housing finance and delivery is emphasized, and joint ventures between the South African government and banks have been established to encourage bank lending to the lower end of the housing market (RSA, 1997). Despite the low

[6] For whites, the average floor area per person is about 33 square meters, whereas for Africans it is 9 square meters in formal housing and a meager 4-5 square meters in informal housing (RSA, 1998a).

[7] Hostel residents can chose either to upgrade to family accommodation in which case they receive a grant of R15,000, or continue living in single quarters in which case they receive a subsidy of R3,750. A migrant who chooses to receive a subsidy to live in single quarters is also eligible for a full state subsidy on his/her permanent home whether it is in a rural or urban area (Crankshaw and Parnell, 1996).

socioeconomic status of the majority population, financial institutions are evicting and repossessing houses of bond defaulters in townships (*RDP Development Monitor*, April 1999). Dissatisfaction with housing, infrastructure, and community are widespread (Nathan, 1995), combined with marked disparities in education, employment, services, and resources (Klasen, 1997) and rising poverty rates, all contribute to an overall poor quality of life among Blacks.

Relevance of the study

We hope to provide a modest but important contribution to the lively debates on appropriate approaches to housing and employment policies in contemporary South Africa. Examination of household dynamics and intraurban mobility in Cape Town may provide insights for the development of realistic strategies for alleviating inequities and injustices.

Seeking answers to these questions in the South African context can inform theories of mobility in several important ways. First, we identify factors that facilitate or constrain mobility during a process of political, social, and economic transition. Second, we analyze mobility at the individual, household, and structural levels. Finally, we explicitly articulate the roles of class and gender in these processes. In this way, our research can provide insights that are relevant for researchers engaged in comparative studies of urban desegregation and mobility patterns. Our analysis is most directly comparable to that of other countries undergoing transformation from centrally planning regimes, whether industrialized (e.g., some republics of the former Soviet Union and Eastern European states) or industrializing (e.g., China).

Conceptual Framework

The task of generating a useful theory of mobility challenges researchers to integrate social structure with individual agency. This can be approached through a synthesis of political

economy and structuration theory. A political economy perspective focuses on the historical and political contexts that explain linkages among disparities in access to resources, patterns of development, and mobility. Social structures influence, mediate, or constrain one's position, behavior, and choice processes (Lee, 1996). The 'agency' embodied in mobility strategies of individuals and households should be examined for its interactive relation to structural opportunities and constraints (Shrestha, 1996), particularly in terms of class, race and gender relations (Goss and Lindquist, 1995). Livelihood strategies, representing the interplay of structure and agency, reflect households' knowledge and ability to produce, sustain, negotiate, and transform their relations with institutions across space and time, in order to increase their access to resources. It is within livelihood strategies that mobility derives meaning.

At the micro level, analyses that take into account household-level strategies and individuals' positions and roles within the household provide a more complete understanding of migration (Norris, 1988). This contrasts with earlier behavioral models based on rational choice and individual decision-making (Speare, 1974) and neo-classical, male focused studies of households (Becker, 1981). Households, being neither homogenous nor demographically fixed, are most appropriately viewed as arenas of cooperation and conflict where affective relations, power, a division of labor, and resource diversification and allocation are played out to try to achieve mutual survival (Sen, 1981). Household structures and socioeconomic characteristics shape livelihood strategies and migration plans, reflecting not only individual volition but also household efforts to minimize risk and maximize welfare (Catalla, 1996; Davidson, 1991; Mazur, 1991).[8]

[8] Even though it is the household's welfare that is being maximized, power structures and internal stratification based on kinship ties, gender roles, and age allow individuals to take decisions regarding sustenance activities and mobility for the complex family unit (Davidson, 1991, p. 26).

Social class is inextricably linked to mobility because class differences in access to education, occupational status, and income, structure the opportunities and the constraints in relation to which migration decisions are made. Migration has been observed more commonly in both the poorest and richest households, with 'push' and 'pull' factors being suggested for these classes respectively (Mazur, 1991). There may be fundamental differences in the mobility expectations and experiences of dominant class households for whom mobility decisions reflect an array of strategic choices, compared to mobility representing a means for survival among subordinate class households (Shrestha, 1996). Class may also influence the 'quality' of social integration, support and assistance. Finally, social class shapes employment, occupational status, level and stability of income – all of which are positively associated with the social integration, satisfaction with housing and community, and future mobility plans (Van Lindert, 1991).

Human and social capital shape the ability to utilize mobility to improve social and economic conditions by reducing the uncertainties and expenses of transition from one spatial location to another and by increasing the expected rewards of migration (Findley, 1987). Human capital, which varies by age, gender, race and class, is important in shaping labor force participation (Davidson, 1991; Mazur, 1998). Social capital, embodied in networks of relatives, friends, and other relationships based on mutual trust and reciprocity, defines the resources, capacity for action, and valuable information that can be productively used to facilitate the achievement of certain ends.[9] At its most basic level, this involves the survival of households and their members under conditions of material deprivation (Portes, 1998; Goss and Lindquist,

[9] Dimensions of social capital affecting migration include the number, quality, and strength of relationships, membership within organizations, and the nature and amount of resources available from these associations. However, few researchers have focused on processes of creating and acquiring social capital; instead, most research is focused on the consequences of possessing or not possessing adequate amounts of social capital (Massey and Espinosa, 1997; Portes and Zhou, 1996).

1995).[10] Social capital may be as important as human capital for the successful adaptation of new migrants, particularly in terms of success in income earning activities (Astone et al., 1999).

Households possessing insufficient human capital (low educational attainment and occupational skills) may rely heavily on social networks for survival and maintenance which aid in access to productive assets, diversification of income sources, and increased income levels (Chant, 1997).[11] However, in the face of persistent poverty and unemployment, tensions within and between these domestic groups increase and social capital may decline because they do not possess adequate resources required to maintain reciprocity. Extreme isolation, little trust, household fission, rapid residential and population turnover, and high levels of conflict characterize such communities (Massey, 1996; Koen, 1998). In South Africa, poor families may be unable to access outside resources because of their perceived lack of reciprocity (Lloyd, 1995).

The complex relationship between social capital and mobility represents provides a further challenge for researchers. Frequent residential mobility is both an indicator and a source of weak social integration and support networks because mobility compounds the problems of investment in local friendships, organizations, and the community (Deane, 1990; RSA 1998a). Households with longer duration of current residence and who extensively use community support groups are less likely to relocate (Harbison, 1981). Though studies indicate that local social ties do not inhibit mobility overall, low income households are less likely to plan a move when they have friends and relatives living nearby (Deane, 1990). Social capital is significantly

[10] When social institutions systematically restrict the resources of particular individuals, they also restrict the social capital that derives from these individuals. To the extent that people are dependent on social capital for resources, this structural inequality will affect the formation, quality, and dissolution of relationships with people whose resources are structurally limited (Astone, et al. 1999).

[11] Studies revealed that squatters in Ankara, Turkey, manifest mutual help, sharing, cohesive social relations, preservation of village life values, traditional gender roles, and substantial community control over individual lives. In contrast, those living in apartments (signifying upward social mobility) have higher residential density and heterogeneity, more formal and distant social relations, and greater independence.

gendered due to the different socially ascribed roles that women and men play in the private and public spheres. Women mobilize resources and use networks more extensively and effectively to procure accommodation, employment, etc. (Shields et. al. 1996). Women's higher levels of participation in neighborhood organizations increase their social integration and place satisfaction.

Housing and demographic characteristics are also significant predictors of intraurban mobility and integration within the community. Yet even 'obvious' factors do not have unambiguous relationships with mobility. High crowding, strongly associated with poverty, aggravates residential dissatisfaction and hastens mobility since these households may not possess the means to increase dwelling space or improve dwelling quality (Klasen, 1997). In contrast, those with a low dependency burden may migrate to even better conditions (Brockerhoff and Eu, 1993; Davidson, 1991; Lucas, 1997).

Housing tenure may constitute an enduring aspect of class inequality in terms of the social reproduction of stratification. Homeownership may constrain mobility directly as well as indirectly through its association with augment social integration and residential and community satisfaction (Boaden and Taylor, 1992). Tenant households prefer not to invest money, time, and effort in improving their rental dwelling because of the absence of security of tenure, as found in KwaZulu in eastern South Africa (Boaden and Taylor, 1992); their relatively shorter duration of stay may affect their social integration. Yet tenure clearly doesn't address all needs. Despite having the ability to acquire their own self-help home outside city limits either as squatters or in site-and-service projects, tenant households in Cape Town and Johannesburg often prefer to stay in their poor quality rental housing within the city limits to avoid time consuming and expensive commuting to their work places and poor amenities and infrastructure in self-help service schemes (Gilbert et al., 1997).

Data and Methods

The data source is the 1995 survey commissioned by the Western Cape Community-based Housing Trust (WCCHT) that sought to encourage reform of housing policy based on research which increases understanding of local population dynamics and socioeconomic realities. The WCCHT study involved two interrelated research objectives: to provide crucial information about the sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics and dynamics of the African population in metropolitan Cape Town, and to provide housing policy makers, community organizations, and other parties with data to formulate and/or revise their housing and urban development strategies. A major part of this multidimensional study was devoted to the migration experiences and patterns of the households' members. A public seminar was held to disseminate the findings of the research *Household Dynamics and Mobility of Africans Amongst Africans in Cape Town: Appropriate Housing Responses* (Mazur and Qangule, 1995), and to discuss implications for housing policy.

The WCCHT survey used a cluster sample design covering Metropolitan Cape Town to include African households residing in formal, informal, and site-and-service settlements. The sample consisted of 807 households with a total of 3,223 individuals (including 14 visitors). Weighted, it represented 209,158 households and 892,945 (Mazur and Qangule, 1995, p. 10). Though the primary unit of analysis was the household, information on individual members also was collected. At the household level, detailed information on income and expenditures (including remittances), housing conditions, food security, community integration, as well as individual-level data on migration and residential mobility (especially of household heads), educational and occupational status (including casual work and seasonal employment) was also gathered. These data permit analysis of a wide array of sociodemographic and socioeconomic factors that shape migration.

Following an often used definition in social survey research, the household was defined as a demographically fluid structure composed of people who lived in the same dwelling for at least 15 days in the past 12 months, who shared food from a common source (cooked and ate together), and who contributed to or benefited from a common resource pool (Mazur, 1998). Thus, individuals temporarily away because of work, study, or other reasons (e.g. visits) were also included, as were persons who had been usual household members within the 12 months preceding the survey but who were no longer living in the household. Although no definition of the concept, 'household,' can be applied with equal validity to the diverse range of households that exist in the developing world, let alone reflect their complex processes of formation and dissolution over time, this operationalization appears appropriate in the context of a metropolitan wide survey (Mazur, 1998).

Multivariate logistic regression analyses are used to examine the relationships between dependent and independent variables while simultaneously controlling for the influence of other variables. The exp (β) (odds ratio) value represents the probability of a specified outcome for households in a given category in relation to those in the respective reference category, controlling for the influences of all other variables in the model. The statistical analysis software used was STATA for Windows version 9.0.

Household Sociodemographic and Socioeconomic Profile

Evaluation of the data pertaining to household dynamics and migration experiences reveals important features of the study population. One third of sampled household heads have resided in their current residence for more than 10 years, i.e. before 1985 and the repeal of influx control, reflecting an older, more settled population; however, one-fourth have stayed in their dwelling only for three years or less. Many households (42%) have either stayed in the same

dwelling ever since they moved to Cape Town or have moved only once within the metro area; at the other extreme, one-third of the population has exhibited great intraurban mobility by moving three or more times. One-third of households experienced upward mobility in housing that revealed an improvement in their ~~socioeconomic status and~~ residential type.[12] Some (15%) reported downward mobility; half did not undergo any change in housing type since their last move.

Demographic characteristics of the population are also quite noteworthy. Female headed households form 39% of the population as opposed to 12% being male headed households; jointly headed households form half of the sample. One-third of households had a majority of their members 18 years or under; at the other extreme, one-third had no dependents; these may have either very young or senior household heads. The modal age group among household heads is 30-39 years, followed by 40-49 years, reflecting a relatively middle-aged working population.

Housing conditions exhibit varying patterns: about 50% of the households reside in formal houses, of which only half own their dwellings. Many (43%) live in shacks (either freestanding or backyard) - mostly owner occupied, and the remaining 7% stay in rented hostel accommodation. Despite the high frequency of ownership (whether of houses or shacks), only 42% have made any improvements to their dwelling in the past two years or planned to do so in the near future. More than half of households had more than one person per room.

Large sections of the African population in Cape Town have low socioeconomic statuses and live in impoverished conditions. Two-thirds of the household heads are either unemployed (25%) or involved in unskilled labor activity (42%); only 31% have a skilled or semi-skilled occupation. Consequently, adults other than the household head often have to engage in the labor force to provide household income; 44% of the households have at least two-thirds of the

[12] Housing type mobility is defined as a change in housing types according to quality, structure, and ownership.

adults (ages 20-59) employed in the work force; one-fourth have fewer than half of their adult members employed. However, despite high adult employment rates, household incomes are relatively low, with approximately 40% of the population living in households where the household income is less than 80% of the poverty line for low-middle income households. At the other extreme, 22% of households have incomes at least twice the poverty level.[13]

Taken together, these data portray a poor urban African population in Cape Town that has a high proportion of households headed by females and by persons in the prime working ages who are either unemployed or have a low skilled occupation, and that have a relatively high age-dependency burden. Despite having a relatively high percent of adults employed, most households have low to modest incomes, reside in poor quality shacks or rental housing, are relatively crowded, and have not recently experienced upward mobility in housing type. These factors are expected to impede the sustenance of social networks, create stress with housing and community, and exacerbate future mobility plans.

Multivariate Analysis

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

---

[13] Household income was calculated as a percent of the "Primary Household Subsistence Level" (PHSL) that is updated twice a year for all major urban areas and published by J. F. Potgieter at the University of Port Elizabeth (Potgeiter, 1995). The PHSL is based on the cost of food, clothing, and other basic household expenditures (fuel, lighting, washing, and cleansing), for each individual, as well as fixed amounts for rent and transport. The value for individuals vary according to age, and to a lesser extent, gender. Thus, this method is preferred to a *per capita* measure because it takes into account expenditures for which there is little or no marginal cost in their use by additional household members (i.e. rent or bond payment) and weighs other variable costs according to age and gender rather than treating each person as identical in consumption needs. The data were calculated using the low-middle income PHSL standards. An important aspect of the PHSL is that it reflects *subsistence* expenditures and does not reflect the purchases of *consumer durable* items, housing renovations, etc. (i.e. major discretionary consumption), and does not allow for illness, emergencies, and other unexpected events that affect household economics.

Discussion and Conclusion

The struggle to end apartheid was long and arduous, but despite its transition to democracy, South Africa is still a deeply divided society, with high levels of migrant labor and a long history of impeded and displaced urbanization. Class polarization associated with globalization has replaced the racial discrimination of apartheid, and the socioeconomic changes and development promised during the 1994 election campaign are ideals that seem difficult—if not impossible—to achieve.

Today, the urban Black population of Cape Town and other South African urban centers is increasingly female headed (through the feminization of old age, migration, and the labor force), significantly impoverished, lives in social and spatial isolation, lacks adequate livelihood and housing opportunities, has experienced downward residential mobility, and faces limited life choices. Assistance provided by kin and neighbors through reciprocity networks has emerged as an important survival and livelihood strategy of the South African political economy. Poor human and social capital has widened differences in social class *between* and *within* races, fractured communities through competition for scarce urban resources, and affected the capacity of households to mitigate poverty through mobility and self-reliance. Thus, as is evident from the results, while socioeconomically comfortable households can improve their conditions through intraurban mobility, those with low socioeconomic status are forced into residential immobility with limited hopes of advancement.

References

ADEPOJU, A. (1995) Migration in Africa: an overview, in J. Baker and T. Akin Aina (Eds.) *The Migration Experience in Africa*, pp. 87-108. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.

BOND, P. and TAIT, A. (1997) The Failure of Housing Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Urban Forum,* 8 (1), pp. 19-41.

CHAMBERS, R. (1995) Poverty and Livelihoods: Whose Reality Counts? *Environment and Urbanization,* 7(1), pp. 173-204.

CITY OF CAPE TOWN. (1999) Solving the Housing Crisis. July. http://www.ctcc.gov.za/Commit/Newcom/page2.htm

CRANKSHAW, O. (1997) *Race, Class, and the Changing Division of Labour Under Apartheid*. New York: Routledge.

CRANKSHAW O. and PARNELL. (1996) Housing Provision and the Need for an Urbanization Policy in the New South Africa, *Urban Forum,* 7 (2), pp. 232-237.

DAVIDSON, A.P. (1991) Rethinking Household Livelihood Strategies, *Research in Rural Sociology and Development,* 5, pp. 11-28.

DAILY NEWS BULLETIN. (1999) 25 February. http://southafrica.net/news/(1999)/febuary/febuary25.hmt.

DEANE, G.D. (1990) Mobility and Adjustments: Paths to the Resolution of Residential Status, *Demography,* 27(1), pp. 65-79.

DUBOW, S. (1989) *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa 1919-1936*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd.

GILBERT, A. and GUGLER, J. (1992) *Cities, Poverty, and Development: Urbanization in the Third World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GILBERT A., MABIN, A., MCCARTHY, M. and WATSON, V. (1997) Low-income Rental Housing: Are South African Cities Different?, *Environment and Urbanization,* 9 (1), pp. 133-147.

GOLDSCHEIDER, C. (1987) Migration and social structure: analytic issues and comparative perspectives in developing nations. in R. Cohen (Ed.) *Sociology of Migration*, pp. 273-95. Brookfield, MA: Edward Elgar.

GUGLER, F. and LUDWAR-ENE, G. (1995) Gender and migration in Africa south of the Sahara. in J. Baker and T. Akin Aina (Eds.) *The Migration Experience in Africa*, pp. 257-68. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.

JAFFEE, D. (1998) *Levels of Socio-economic Development Theory*. New York: Praeger.

HUGO, G.J. (1993) Migration as a survival strategy: the family dimension of migration, in *Population Distribution and Migration*, pp. 139-149 New York: United Nations.

KANE-BERMAN, J. (1981) Population Removal, Displacement, and Disvestment in South Africa, *Social Dynamics,* 7 (2), pp. 28-46.

KLASEN, S. (1997) Poverty, Inequality and Deprivation in South Africa: An Analysis of (1993) Saldru Survey, *Social Indicators Research,* 41, pp. 51-94.

KOEN, C. (1998) The Structure of Urban Black Households: New survey evidence from a Coloured and an African Community on the Cape Flats in the Western Cape of South Africa: A comment on Amoateng's Methods and Findings, *African Sociological Review*, 2(1), pp. 165-173.

MABIN, A. (1992) Dispossession, exploitation, and struggle: an historical overview of South African urbanization, in D. Smith (Ed.) *The Apartheid City and Beyond: Urbanization and Social Change in South Africa*, pp. 13-24. London: Routledge

MAYLAM, P. (1990) The Rise and Decline of Urban Apartheid in South Africa, *African Affairs,* 89, pp. 57-84.

MAZUR, R.E. (1992) Challenges confronting South Africa's separate development: the legacy of segregation and displaced urbanization, in C. Goldscheider (Ed.) *Migration, Population Structure, and Redistribution Policies*, pp. 181-205. Boulder, CO: Westview.

MAZUR, R.E. (1998) Migration Dynamics and Development in Rural South Africa: Demographic and Socioeconomic Perspectives, *Research in Rural Sociology and Development,* 7, pp. 195-225.

MAZUR, R.E. and QANGULE, V.N. (1995) *Household Dynamics and Mobility Amongst Africans in Cape Town: Appropriate Housing Response*. Cape Town: Western Cape Community-based Housing Trust.

NATHAN, V. (1995) Resident's Satisfaction with the Site and Service Approach in Affordable Housing, *Housing and Society,* 22 (3), pp. 53-78.

O' LAUGHLIN, B. (1998) Missing Men? The Debate Over Rural Poverty and Women-headed Households in Southern Africa, *The Journal of Peasant Studies,* 25(2), pp. 1-48.

POTTS, D. (1994) Urban environmental controls and low-income housing in Southern Africa, in H. Main and S. Williams (Eds.) *Environment and Housing in Third World Cities*, pp. 207-23. New York: Wiley.

RDP DEVELOPMENT MONITOR. (1999) New Finance Options for Housing: Rabbits Out of the Hat. April. http://www.development-sa.co.za/

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA (RSA). (1996) Growth, Employment, and Redistribution [GEAR]: A Macroeconomic Strategy. Pretoria, South Africa. http://www.polity.org.za/govdocs/policy/growth/html

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA (RSA). (1997) Housing the Nation: Doing Justice to Delivery. Report prepared by the Ministry of Housing. (January (1997). Pretoria. http://www.polity.org.za/govdocs/reports/nation.html

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA (RSA). (1998a) Poverty and Inequality in South Africa. Report Prepared for the Office of the Executive Deputy President and the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Poverty and Inequality. (13 May). Pretoria. http://www.policy.org.za/govdocs/reports/poverty.html.

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA (RSA). (1998b) Government's Report to the Nation. http://www.gov.za.reports/(1998)/gov-rep.htm

RUSSELL, M. (1998) Black Urban Households in South Africa, *African Sociological Review*, 2(1), pp. 174-180.

SAGNER, A. (1997) Urbanization, Aging and Migration: Some Evidence from African Settlements in Cape Town, *Southern African Journal of Gerontology,* 6(2), pp. 13-19.

SHRESTHA, N. (1996) A Structural Perspective on Labour Migration in Underdeveloped Countries, in V. Robinson (Ed.) *Geography and Migration*, pp. 463-91. Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar.

SKELDON, R. (1990) *Population Mobility in Developing Countries*. New York: Belhaven.

SPEARE. A. (1974) Residential Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in Residential Mobility, *Demography,* 7, pp. 449-458.

SPIEGEL, A., WATSON, V. and WILKINSON, P. (1996) Devaluing Diversity? National Housing Policy and African Household Dynamics in Cape Town, *Urban Forum,* 7(1), pp. 1-30.

TODES, A. and WALKER, N. (1992) Women and Housing Policy in South Africa: A Discussion of Durban Case Studies, *Urban Forum,* 3.2, pp. 115-138.

TOMLINSON, R. (1988) South Africa's Urban Policy: A New Form of Influx Control, *Urban Affairs Quarterly,* 23, pp. 487-510.

VAN LINDERT, P. (1991) Moving Up or Staying Down? Migrant-Native Differential Mobility in La Paz, *Urban Studies,* 28(3), pp. 433-63.

WORLD BANK. (1995) *World Development Report (1995)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the World Bank.

Table 1. Multivariate Logistic Regression of Residential Mobility

Sociodemographic Factors	Likely to Move Exp (β)	S.E.
Intra-Urban Mobility	***	
0-1 times	1.00	
2 times	1.75***	0.15
3+ times	1.77***	0.15
Duration of Residence		
1 –3 years	1.00	
4 - 9 years	0.88	0.15
10 + years	0.85	0.19
Housing Type Mobility	***	
Downward Mobility	1.00	
No Change in Status	0.41***	0.17
Upward Mobility	0.38***	0.22
Household Headship		
Female head	1.00	
Male head	0.85	0.22
Male and Female	0.77	0.14
Age of Head	*	
15 – 29	1.00	
30 – 39	0.96	0.19
40 – 49	0.58**	0.21
50 – 59	0.81	0.23
60 +	0.66	0.29
Pct. of Members 18 and under		
0%	1.00	
1-49%	0.89	0.18
50% and above	0.93	0.19
Type of Dwelling	**	
Shack	1.00	
Hostel Resident	1.42	0.26
House Renter	1.00	0.22
House Owner	1.51*	0.19
Crowding	***	
More than 2 persons/room	1.00	
Up to 2 persons/room	1.20	0.16
1 person/room or less	0.67*	0.20

Table 3. (continued)

Socioeconomic Factors	Likely to Move Exp. (β)	S. E.
Residential Improvements	*	
No Past/Future improvements	1.00	
Past/Future improvements	1.35*	0.12
Occupational Type of Head		
Unemployed	1.00	
Unskilled Services	1.24	0.21
Semi-skilled/Skilled Services	1.58*	0.23
Employed Adults	**	
0-49%	1.00	
50-65%	1.21	0.19
66-100%	1.75**	0.20
Household Income		
Up to 80%	1.00	
80.1-200.0%	0.88	0.14
201.1+%	0.85	0.21
Social Integration		
Assistance in Feeling Settled		
Self reliant	1.00	
Assistance from others	0.80	0.15
Assistance in Solving Problems		
Self reliant	1.00	
Assistance from others	1.09	0.16
Membership in Organizations	***	
No	1.00	
Yes	0.63***	0.13
Place Satisfaction		
Housing Satisfaction	***	
Dissatisfied	1.00	
Satisfied	0.20***	0.17
Community Satisfaction	***	
Dissatisfied	1.00	
Satisfied	0.57***	0.12
Percent Reduction in –2LL	15.73%	

* for $p < 0.05$, ** for $p < 0.01$, and *** for $p < 0.001$