

School Of Development Studies
University Of Kwa-Zulu Natal
Howard College Campus
Durban 4041

CASS 8/85

CASS copy

FUTURE DWELLING PREFERENCES OF
HOSTEL-DWELLING MIGRANTS

A STUDY OF THE HOUSING NEEDS OF STEVEDORES
IN THE DURBAN METROPOLITAN AREA

V. Møller, L. Schlemmer
T.G. Coughlin, and M.F. Dlamini

March 1985

Centre for Applied Social Sciences
University of Natal
Durban

(ii)

	<u>PAGE</u>
4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	67
4.1 Housing needs	67
4.2 Housing packages	67
4.3 The need for residential security in the housing package	70
4.4 The need for convenience in the housing package	71
4.5 Housing aspirations and expectations	71
4.6 Consultation and participation in housing	74
REFERENCES	75
APPENDICES	77
I COMPARISON OF POPULATION AND SAMPLE STATISTICS	78
II SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS	80

(iii)

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>LIST OF TABLES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	Satisfaction with aspects of life and life in general	8
2	Residence in town	10
3	Residential experience	10
4	Reasons for moving from alternative places of residence in town	11
5	Frequency of wives' visits to town	13
6	Annual period wife spends in town visiting	13
7	Accommodation for visiting wives	14
8	Incidence of rentals paid for visiting wives' accommodation	14
9	Major attractions of present accommodation	17
10	Major disadvantages of present accommodation	18
11	Evaluation of present accommodation	23
12	Preference for alternative residence	28
12.1	Reasons for choice of alternative housing	28
13	Preferred company housing arrangement	30
13.1	Major reasons for preference of different company housing arrangements	31
14	A trade-off exercise in housing involving the factors of housing costs, proximity to workplace, and family accommodation	37
14.1	Reasons for endorsing options in the trade-off exercise	39
15	Preferred size of shared rooms in hostels or flats	44
16	Survey categories in which above-average proportions recommend larger shared rooms	45
17	Preferences regarding location	47
18	Survey categories stating above-average preference for residing in Umlazi	47
19	Indicators of a rural orientation	49
20	Experience of family lifestyle in town	51
21	Desire to bring family to live in urban areas on a more permanent basis	52
21.1	Reasons for wishing/not wishing to bring family to live in urban areas on a more permanent basis	52

(iv)

<u>TABLE</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
22	Perceptions of migrant values and image factors	54
23	Indicators of urban rights	57
24	Survey categories in which above-average proportions would opt for hostel accommodation	59
25	Survey categories in which above-average proportions would opt for flatted accommodation	60
26	Survey categories in which above-average proportions would opt for township housing (inclusive making own housing arrangements)	61
27	Perceptions of corporate image	65

1. INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Over the past years the Centre for Applied Social Sciences has endeavoured to document the changing residential patterns of the black population residing in the Greater Durban Metropolitan Area. To date, the Centre has conducted research among specific categories of blacks: for example, among township residents (Moller and Schlemmer, 1980) and peri-urban shack dwellers (Moller, 1978; Moller and Stopforth, 1980; Schlemmer et al., 1980; Schlemmer and Moller, 1982; and Schlemmer, 1984) to establish housing needs and lifestyle preferences. Research into the housing aspirations of hostel-dwellers has still to be undertaken to complete the picture. Some incidental information pertaining to the housing satisfactions of hostel dwellers has been collected in the course of inquiring into the social circumstances of migrant workers living in Durban (Moller and Schlemmer 1977; 1979; and 1981). However, a more systematic investigation into the housing preferences of migrants is required.

To this end the Centre has commenced a programme of research into the dwelling preferences of men living in the major hostel complexes which provide accommodation for male contract workers employed in the Durban area. The present study conducted among a group of stevedores living in company housing represents the first in a series of inquiries to be conducted in a range of hostel situations in the metropolitan area.

The question of housing for contract workers appears to be particularly topical at the present moment when the government is in the process of reviewing its policy on influx control. It is envisaged that a relaxation of some aspects of the legislation regulating population movements may have a significant impact on the housing choices available to different categories of urban workers. In particular, the right to live in town on a more permanent basis as a family unit may be made more freely available to migrant contract workers who, in theory, have not been able to qualify for urban rights in terms of Section 10 since 1968. Therefore, it will be important to assess migrant workers' housing preferences in the light of the changing constraints on their choice of lifestyle in town.

We are commencing this research programme into the housing preferences of hostel dwellers with a study of 330 workers employed by one of the large stevedoring companies operating in the Durban harbour. This group of workers is of particular interest for the project because its present housing situation is relatively unique by most standards. The stevedores in the study reported on here live close to their place of work. This advantage is currently enjoyed by only a small proportion of the world's workers. The rapid growth of the urban areas has modified land use patterns adjacent to industrial areas and displaced working class residential areas to the periphery of the world's cities. In South Africa, apartheid policy has by and large forced most workers to commute long distances to their

workplaces every day. This study, then, seeks a subjective appraisal of the advantage of living close to one's place of work as part of an overall assessment of company hostels as a housing option for migrant workers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements go to South African Stevedores Limited for their willing cooperation in this project. When approached by the Centre, the Company expressed considerable interest in the Centre's proposed housing research programme and also volunteered to sponsor this initial stage of the research. A special vote of thanks goes to Mr L Owen, Captain D Dudley, and Mr S C Makanya of South African Stevedores for advice and assistance with technical matters related to sampling and the carrying out of the fieldwork.

The authors wish to thank the members of the Centre's fieldteam: Mrs B L Mthembu, Mr E M Mwandla, Mr T M Mzimela, and Mrs C Ngcobo, for their assistance in collecting the survey data.

The authors also give thanks to their colleagues at the Centre: Ethne de Groot assisted with the data-processing, and Nicolette Wells and Glynis Malcolm-Smith with the production of the report. Lastly, we are indebted to all those stevedores who willingly gave of their time to participate in the research programme.

V. Moller Senior Research Fellow
L. Schlemmer Director

22 March 1984.

2. METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

2.1 SAMPLING METHOD

A quota-sampling method was employed which stratified the employees of the S A Stevedore Company in terms of residence in town, place of origin, and age. A total sample of 330 men was drawn from the Stevedore population. The sample consists of two sub-groups or strata: the men living in the Point hostels, and the men who report for work at Maydon Wharf. The latter group is a minority in the stevedore population. In order to secure a sufficiently large number of men in the Maydon Wharf subcategory, this group was over-represented in the sample by some 4 percent. The sample as a whole is therefore not representative of the total stevedoring population. However, the two subsamples are representative of the corresponding population groups at the time of the fieldwork (November 1984) in terms of the sampling criteria (see Appendix I).

Survey results will be reported for the two subsample categories. For ease of reference, the two subsamples will simply be referred to as the "Point" and the "Maydon Wharf" stevedores, respectively. In some cases a further distinction will be made between the A and the B hostel complexes on the Point, and between the Maydon Wharf people residing in hostels, on the one hand, and in township or in shack areas, on the other hand.

2.2 THE FIELDWORK

The fieldwork was carried out by members of the Centre's team of fieldworkers who are experienced interviewers and had been specially trained for the task at hand. The field team worked under the direction of the team leader and reported regularly to the field supervisor, both of whom are also co-authors of this report.

A questionnaire schedule was administered by the fieldworkers to all the men included in the sample. The interviews were conducted with the men before or after work during weekdays on the Point hostel premises and in a minority of cases at Maydon Wharf.

Once the purpose of the study had been explained to the men they cooperated willingly. On average the interviews lasted approximately one to one-and-a-half hours. The fieldwork was conducted in November and December 1984. At this time only a small proportion of the stevedore population appeared to have been affected by staff reductions and forced leave. Only some 5 percent of the total sample reported they had returned from unpaid leave during the year preceding the interview.

2.3 THE SAMPLE

A brief characterisation of the stevedores obtained from the survey is as follows: The majority of the men are stevedores, who have worked for S A Stevedores over 14 years. Approximately half the men are over forty years old and have received no education. The overwhelming majority is married with 1 or more wives and supports a median of 3 adults and 6 children. The majority of the men are Zulu speakers and originate from KwaZulu. There is also a substantial Transkeian minority whose home language is Xhosa. The vast majority has access to land in its respective home area in the country. The majority remits one-third or more of its income. Over 95 percent of the stevedores are unionised, but only one-fifth are members of a pension scheme at work. The Maydon Wharf stevedores differ from the Point stevedores in that they tend to be younger, better educated, and to occupy the higher occupational ranks. The proportion of Transkeians and landless people is also slightly more pronounced in the Maydon Wharf category. Details of sample distributions on selected background variables are given in Appendix II.

3. THE SURVEY FINDINGS

3.1 INDICATORS OF WELL-BEING

With one notable exception the stevedores as a group expressed relatively high levels of satisfaction with various aspects of their lives and life in general as is evident in the survey results shown in Table 1 below.

<u>TABLE 1:</u>		
<u>Satisfaction with aspects of life and life in general</u>		
Percentage satisfied with:	<u>Point</u>	<u>Maydon Wharf</u>
Job	68%	71%
Health	72%	72%
Accommodation in town	45%	36%
Life in general	63%	61%
	N=220	N=110

Majorities of the stevedores reported they were satisfied with their health, their job, and life in general. By comparison only minorities in the Point and Maydon Wharf groups (45%/36%) were satisfied with their accommodation in town.

These results suggest that the accommodation needs of the stevedores require attention. In the next sections we shall explore the urban residential situation of the stevedores and the specific satisfactions and grievances which arise from their housing circumstances.

3.2 CURRENT RESIDENTIAL SITUATION

The majority of the stevedores live in single men's hostels, either at the Point or in Umlazi or KwaMashu (Table 2). However, one-quarter of the Point stevedores and one-fifth of the Maydon Wharf men who reside in a hostel also indicated an alternative address in a township or shack area.

3.3 RESIDENTIAL EXPERIENCE

Over the years the stevedores have lived in a number of different residential circumstances in town as shown in Table 3. It is noteworthy that over one-quarter of the Point stevedores have had experience of living in a hostel other than the one in which they are currently living. Some 30 percent of the Point and 48 percent of the Maydon Wharf men have had experience of township living. Experience of living in white suburbs and shack areas is less commonplace.

The men who claimed to have had alternative residential experience were asked to state the reasons why they were no longer occupying these alternative places of residence. The results are shown in Table 4. Shifting in and out of hostel accommodation appears to be related mainly to job factors. A substantial minority of the men stated they had left hostel accommodation in order to live with their families in a township or shack area.

TABLE 2:

<u>Residence in town</u>	<u>Point %</u>	<u>Maydon Wharf %</u>
Hostel only	75	50
Hostel and other address:	25	15
Hostel and township (renter/owner)	3	-
Hostel and township (lodger)	11	8
Hostel and shack area (owner)	4	2
Hostel and shack area (lodger)	6	5
Hostel and other	1	-
Township house (owner/renter)		5
Township house (lodger)		18
Shack owner		9
Shack lodger		3
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
	N=220	N=110

TABLE 3:

Residential experience

"The men we are interviewing have stayed in many different places in town. Which of the following places have you tried as your place for staying in town?"

	<u>Point %</u>	<u>Maydon Wharf %</u>
White suburb	6	10
Another hostel	28	27
Township residence	31	48
Shack residence	15	20
	N=220	N=110

TABLE 4:

Reasons for moving from alternative places of residence in town

Reasons for moving from: %*

White suburb: (N=22)

Changed or lost job	51
Eviction	14
Poor relationship with occupant	14
Cost factors	9
Found hostel accommodation	5
Influx control regulations	5

Hostel: (N=91)

Changed job	19
Lost job	14
Lost bed due to long absence	11
Distance from work	10
Transfer to other accommodation	10
Preference for family accommodation	10
Alternative company accommodation	9
Poor living conditions	7
Influx control regulations	4
Cost factors	3
Hostel closed	2
Crowding	2

Township residence: (N=123)

Still in township residence	33
Uses township residence when family is in town	26
Crowding	10
Unpleasant relationship with landlord	9
Landlord evicted, died, moved	7
Cost factor	6
Distance to work	5
Found (company) hostel accommodation	6

Shack residence: (N=58)

Still in shack residence	52
Uses shack residence when family is in town	19
Distance from work	9
Shack demolished	5
Poor living conditions	5
Unpleasant relationship with landlord	3

* Multiple responses

Similarly, white suburb accommodation is job-tied. It is mainly domestic workers who are provided with live-in accommodation in white residential areas. The majority of the stevedores who had lived in white suburbs reported that they had shifted when they themselves or the domestic workers with whom they were sharing the premises had left the job which went with the accommodation. In a smaller number of cases the stevedores had shifted out of a white suburb when they had parted company with their girlfriends in domestic service.

Shifts from township and shack residential areas are predominantly related to the domicile of the stevedores' families. It would appear that stevedores shift out of township and shack accommodation at times when accommodation for the family is no longer required. Further reasons cited were crowding, unpleasant relationships with the landlord, and convenience and cost factors.

3.4 FAMILY VISITING PATTERNS

The findings reviewed so far suggest that although the majority of the stevedores are housed in single sex hostels in town, they also make extensive use of family accommodation during the time their families visit them in town.

Thirty-one percent of the Point and 37 percent of the Maydon Wharf men replied in the affirmative in response to the question: "has your family ever lived with you here in town?"

TABLE 5:

Frequency of wives' visits to town

"Does your wife (and children) visit you here in town?
If yes, how often?"

Wife:	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
Stays in town	2	10
Visits once a month	9	9
Visits once every 2 months	8	9
Visits 3-4 times a year	18	25
Visits 1-2 times a year	40	25
Wife does not visit	20	15
Not applicable (no wife)	3	7
	100	100
	N=220	N=110

TABLE 6:

Annual period wife spends in town visiting*

	Point %	Adjusted %	Maydon Wharf %	Adjusted %
Less than 1 fortnight	6	7	4	5
1 fortnight but less than 1 month	10	12	9	12
1 month but less than 2 months	22	30	23	30
2 months but less than 6 months	29	37	32	42
6 months but less than 8 months	10	13	4	5
8 months or more	1	1	4	6
Not applicable, wife does not visit	22	-	24	-
	100	100	100	100
	N= 220	172	110	83

*In the case of more than one wife visiting at different times,
visiting periods were totalled.

TABLE 7:

Accommodation for visiting wives

"Where does your wife stay when she is in town?"

	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
Township	78	68
Shack	22	24
Visitor's section in hostel	0	7
White suburb	0	1
	100	100
	N=171	N= 87

TABLE 8:

Incidence of rentals paid for visiting wives' accommodation

	%	%
Pay rent for visitors' accommodation	86	71
	N=173	N=86

Four out of every 5 stevedores stated they received visits from their family while they were working in town. In the majority of cases the stevedores received 1 to 4 visits per annum (Table 5). Wives spent anywhere from less than a fortnight to over 8 months in town. The median period was some 2 months in the case of both the Point and the Maydon Wharf stevedores (Table 6). The majority of the visiting wives were accommodated in township lodgings. Small percentages of visiting wives stayed in shack areas. Only very few Maydon Wharf stevedores made use of the visitors' accommodation provided for the wives of the men living in hostels (Table 7). In the majority of cases rent was paid for visiting wives' accommodation (Table 8).

Although numbers are small a tendency is detected for visitors accommodated in shack areas to stay for longer periods in town. This may be explained by the fact that only 64 percent of the wives staying in shacks but 87 percent of those accommodated in township lodgings paid rent for visitors' accommodation.

3.5 RESIDENTIAL SATISFACTION

We have seen that the stevedores appear to be generally less satisfied with their accommodation situation in town than with other aspects of their lives. In this section we shall explore some of the reasons why this is the case. We have learned that the stevedores have gained some measure of residential experience, mainly in connection with visits from their wives and families. Therefore, one might expect that the stevedores'

evaluation of their present residential circumstances may be coloured to a certain degree by their experience of different types of urban lifestyle.

Two probes were employed to look into satisfactions and grievances with present dwelling circumstances in town. In a first instance the respondents were asked to spontaneously name facets of their accommodation which were to their liking or disliking. In a second instance the respondents were asked to evaluate a number of aspects of their housing situation in terms of a four-point satisfaction scale ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied.

The results of these two probes are shown in Tables 9, 10 and 11.

3.5.1 Spontaneous mention of housing advantages (Table 9)

Spontaneous mention of attractive features of one's present accommodation included convenience and cost factors, amenities such as water and electricity, physical safety, and companionship. Emphasis on the advantages of convenience and cost factors were most pronounced among the Point stevedores. The Maydon Wharf hostel dwellers also emphasised peaceful living. It is noteworthy that a sizeable proportion of the Maydon Wharf hostel dwellers expressed minimal satisfaction with their accommodation; they were glad to have a roof over their heads. By contrast to the hostel dwellers in the sample the township

TABLE 9:

Major attractions of present accommodation (spontaneous mention)

"What do you like very much, what is the best thing about where you are staying here in town (your accommodation) at present?"

	Point	Maydon Wharf Hostels	Townships/ Shacks
	%*	%*	%*
Convenience factors	41	27	23
Cost factors	37	16	8
Amenities	15	13	15
Safety factors	9	6	10
Companionship	5	6	5
Not too many rules and regulations	5	0	13
Peaceful	4	7	10
No women allowed	3	1	0
Roof over one's head	3	11	3
General satisfaction	3	1	0
Not too crowded	1	4	5
Nothing	17	24	23
	N=220	N=70	N=40

*Multiple responses

TABLE 10:

Major disadvantages of present accommodation (spontaneous mention)

"What do you dislike most, what is a very bad thing about where you are staying here in town (your accommodation) at present?"

	Point	Maydon Wharf Hostels	Township/ Shacks
	%*	%*	%*
Cannot accommodate family	45	26	10
Job and residential security	29	3	8
Noise factors	8	19	13
Food and cooking issues	6	6	-
Cannot accommodate friends	5	1	3
No urban rights for children	5	-	-
Crowding	5	10	15
Rules and regulations	3	3	3
No place of one's own	3	3	8
Amenities	3	10	18
Cost	0	9	13
Cleanliness	2	13	-
Females allowed into hostels	-	11	-
Safety factors	-	1	13
Nothing	15	13	13
	N=220	N=70	N=40

*Multiple responses

residents in the sample stressed the advantages of leading a peaceful and an unrestricted life.

3.5.2 Spontaneous mention of housing disadvantages (Table 10)

Disadvantages tended to be specific to the subgroups in the samples. We shall therefore discuss the grievances of each of these groups in turn.

The major disadvantage of the Point hostels in the view of the residents is that they cannot accommodate members of their family and friends. Furthermore, no provision is made for residential and job security for residents or their families in the longer term. These concerns appear to be unique to the Point stevedores, although a substantial proportion (26%) of the other hostel dwellers also cite lack of family accommodation as one of the major disadvantages of their housing circumstances.

Some excerpts from the interviews with the Point men illustrate these problems:

- "There are no houses for wives. That's why my wife doesn't pay me a visit".
- "When I'm visited by my children, - say, they come in the night, then I'm forced to move around looking for an accommodation for them and by then I'm exposed to danger in the streets".
- "The bad thing about staying here is that you are as good as a prisoner because even if your brother is in desperate need of accommodation, I cannot help him."
- "Once I leave this job I won't have work again here in town because I am not registered in the township or in other hostels".

- "I am not sure how long we are going to stay here since the Durban Corporation is removing old buildings. I like to stay with other men because I do not like to stay with women in a workplace".

In comparison to the problems of residential insecurity and finding accommodation for visiting family all other grievances of the Point stevedores appear to be relatively superficial. Noise factors, food issues (e.g., the number of meals provided daily and the variety of the food served), and crowding in rooms were mentioned as specific disadvantages by some 5-8 percent of the Point hostel dwellers.

- "We are crowded in a room. We are 10 in one room. If one has got flu or cold we all catch it".
- "The very bad thing is that we only get one meal a day and it's not enough".

The other hostel dwellers share the Point stevedores' concern about not being able to accommodate their families. Otherwise the Maydon Wharf hostel dwellers have a greater number of grievances concerning the physical and comfort features of their living environment: noise, untidy and dirty living areas, insufficient amenities, and crowding are common complaints. A sizeable proportion of this group feels that the presence of women in the men's hostels is undesirable.

- KwaMashu hostel dweller: "What I dislike most is that they made our premises a place like a garage where they repair their cars".
- Glebeland hostel dweller: "What I dislike is that my family get arrested when they are with me at the hostel".

- Glebeland hostel dweller: "The bad thing is that there are no separate rooms for those who are married. We just sleep together".
- Glebeland hostel dweller: "What I dislike is that the police are worrying us every night checking if there are no girls sleeping without permission".

The township and shack residents in the sample have a range of complaints including: lack of amenities (mainly in shack areas), crowded and noisy living quarters in lodgings, and high rent and transport costs. It is worth noting that a small proportion of the township and shack stevedores have not been able to solve the problem of providing accommodation for their visiting families.

- Umlazi lodger: "The very bad thing is that every month I have to pay R20 for only one room".
- Umlazi lodger: "The very bad thing is that the room is too small to accommodate my whole family if they are in town".

A last point deserves mention. Substantial proportions in all the subgroups were at a loss when required to itemise the best and worst aspects of their accommodation circumstances. This may simply be a reflection of a feeling that there is really nothing very remarkable about one's accommodation. One gains the impression that some of the Point people who have been living in the hostels at the Point for the entire period of their service with the company feel at home there and take their housing situation for granted. On the other hand a number of the Maydon Wharf hostel dwellers indicated they were simply glad to have a roof over their heads. One might also mention that the Point groups as a whole appeared to have somewhat fewer problems than the other respondent groups in identifying at

least one very positive feature of their housing circumstances. However, this difference is not statistically significant.

3.5.3 An evaluation of present accommodation circumstances

The satisfaction ratings of specific aspects of the stevedores' accommodation are shown in Table 11. The figures in Table 11 reveal that the Point hostels provide accommodation which is generally satisfying. In several instances this accommodation affords advantages not extended to men living in other housing situations. A comparison of the housing profiles shows that the majority of the Point stevedores are satisfied on 14 of 17 counts, while the Maydon Wharf hostel dwellers and township/shack people are only satisfied on 10 and 12 of 17 counts, respectively.

The satisfaction derived from specific aspects of housing also differ significantly for the subgroups as indicated by the starred items in Table 11. The Point stevedores are more privileged than their Maydon Wharf counterparts regarding the following factors:

- They are accommodated close to their place of work.
- They pay no rent 1).
- They are served meals.

1) Some Point stevedores doubted whether they lived rent-free. This group thought that a small rent might be deducted from their pay packet.

TABLE 11:

Evaluation of present accommodation

"Here are some things that men have told us are important about their accommodation in town. Could you tell us how satisfied you are with these things where you are staying in town now?"

Percentage satisfied that present accommodation has the following advantages:

	Point	Hostels	Maydon Wharf Township/ Shacks
	%	%	%
Close to workplace	98*	31	43
Transport nearby	98*	93	83
Plenty of companionship	97*	90	93
Shops and entertainment nearby	97*	81	73
Enough electricity	96*	93	23
Enough hot/cold water	96*	81	73
Can come and go as please	95*	84	73
Do not pay too much	85*	26	33
Things kept clean and tidy	81 ^a *)	59	83
Canteen which serves food	80*	44	32
Quiet to sleep at night	69*	36	73
Rooms not crowded	63	61	60
Friends can visit	57*	81	80
Not too many rules and regulations	55	56	75
Proud to live here	43	39	50
Enough privacy in rooms	39	31	72
Wife/girlfriend can visit me when in town	1*	7	83
	N=220	N=70	N=40

a) Point A hostel: 77%, Point B hostel 90%

* Point and Maydon Wharf percentages significantly different at the 0,05 level

The Point stevedores also felt slightly better off than the Maydon Wharf stevedores as regards the items:

- Shops and entertainment nearby.
- Enough hot/cold water.
- Can come and go as please.

Generally speaking the profiles suggest that the level of services and conveniences may be somewhat higher in hostels than in shack or even in formal township areas.

The satisfaction ratings for the shack areas in particular are lower regarding electricity and water supplies. It also appears that standards of cleanliness and quiet 1) are more satisfactory in the Point than in other hostels and compare favourably to that found in private housing.

1. A significantly higher proportion of the Point stevedores occupying the B (90%) than the A (77%) hostel were satisfied that their living area was "clean and tidy".

To sum up, the profile of the Point accommodation is by and large positive. Nevertheless, the Point stevedores expressed dissatisfaction in several areas as shown in the overview below.

Disadvantages peculiar to the Point stevedores:

- Friends cannot visit

Disadvantages common to Point and other hostel dwellers:

- Wife/girlfriend cannot visit
- Not enough privacy in rooms
- Too many rules and regulations

Disadvantages common to all stevedores:

- No pride in place of residence.
-

The most serious of all the dissatisfactions listed above is the lack of accommodation for visiting wives. Ninety-nine percent of the Point stevedores and 93 percent of the Maydon Wharf hostel dwellers were dissatisfied in this respect. Most of the stevedores living in the township and the shack areas seemed to have solved this problem; less than one-fifth expressed dissatisfaction that they could not receive visits from their wives where they were staying. We shall return to the question of family accommodation in a later section of this report.

3.6 HOUSING PREFERENCES

Having explored the satisfactions and grievances related to the current housing circumstances of the stevedores we now turn to their dwelling preferences.

3.6.1 Preference for type of accommodation

Two questions regarding housing preferences were posed.

The first item explored the alternative preferences of the stevedores in case they could not secure a living space in the type of accommodation they were currently occupying. A range of alternative housing options were cited and the respondents were asked to chose one.

The second item presented a scenario to the respondents which described the following situation: A company had not been successful in securing land to build a hostel in the city centre and but nevertheless sought to make proper living arrangements for its workers. Six alternative housing arrangements were presented to the respondents, who were allowed to select one option from the list.

The results of these two probes are shown in Tables 12 and 13.

3.6.1.1 Preferred housing alternative (Tables 12 and 12.1)

In response to the first probe almost three-quarters of the Point

stevedores (74%) elected to live in a township house as owners or renters. Only a few in this group (2% of Point stevedores) wished to reside as lodgers in a township. Approximately one-fifth of the Point stevedores (22%) would prefer to live in another hostel if they could not stay where they were at present (cf Table 12).

The response pattern was similar among the Maydon Wharf stevedores. The majority of these men (64%) stated they would prefer to rent or own a township house, a minority (16%) to move to another hostel. However, a sizeable proportion living in township houses or the shack areas said they would not consider moving.

The reasons for selecting a specific housing alternative are shown in Table 12.1. The township choice is related mainly to the desire to secure urban rights for one's children and to provide suitable accommodation for members of the family while they are in town for reasons of visiting, attending school, receiving medical treatment, and seeking work or working in a job. A smaller but substantial proportion in this response group (13%) would wish to move to a township house primarily in order to stay with family.

Some excerpts from the interviews illustrate these points.

- "I will be glad to have a house in a township for my wife and children so that it can be easy for them to have town permits and a place to sleep when paying me a visit or collecting money".

TABLE 12:

Preference for alternative residence

"If you could not get space in a place like the one you are staying in now, where would you like to live (whether it is possible or not)?"

Options:	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
Another hostel	22	16
Township house as owner/renter	74 ²	65 ²
Township house as lodger	72	63
Shack as owner/renter	3	2
Shack as lodger	-	-
Other	-	2
Would not think of moving	1	15
	100	100
	N=220	N=110

TABLE 12.1

Reasons for choice of alternative housingAnother hostel choice: (N=64)

(Point 22%, Maydon Wharf 16%)

- 56% Convenience factors
- 28% Relatives living there
- 13% Cost factors
- 8% Familiarity of hostel life

Township house choice: (N=235)

(Point 74%, Maydon Wharf 65%)

- 33% Secure urban rights for family
- 21% Accommodate visiting family
- 13% Live with family
- 11% Place of one's own
- 9% Convenience factors
- 6% Place for family to stay while receiving medical treatment
- 6% Place for family to stay while attending school or working

- "So that if my children arrive unexpectedly, I shall not walk around looking for accommodation".
- "If I lose my job here, it means that I do not have accommodation. Therefore my home will act as my shelter".
- "If you own a house in a township you are entitled to get a workseeker's permit in case you lose your present job".
- "I want to have my own house so as to be registered in that house with my family".

3.6.1.2 Preferred company housing arrangement (Tables 13 and 13.1)

If a company were to assist workers with accommodation, the Point and the Maydon Wharf stevedores were generally agreed as to which provisions they would recommend the company to make.

Just under half would recommend the provision of township or similar housing. Preferably the company should negotiate with the relevant township authorities to ensure that housing was secured within a short space of time.

Just over one-quarter would recommend flatted accommodation, preferably flats which could also accommodate the families of workers.

Just under one-quarter would elect a hostel solution. The majority of the Point stevedores would prefer hostels to be for the exclusive use of company workers. The Maydon Wharf stevedores who voted for the hostel option were divided as to whether only company workers should occupy the hostel or whether it should be open to all workers.

Reading across housing alternatives the preference pattern outlined above also contains a strong general recommendation for family accommodation. An estimated 65-70 percent of the total

TABLE 13:

Preferred company housing arrangement

"If a company were to be established near here and they could not find a place to build a hostel here, what arrangements should it make for where its workers stay?"

The company would compensate workers to cover extra housing costs so all possibilities would cost the same".

- (1) A hostel in Umlazi or KwaMashu where workers from many different companies stay.
- (2) A hostel in Umlazi or KwaMashu where only workers from this company stay.
- (3) Flats in Umlazi or KwaMashu where some workers could have families with them and others could stay alone or share rooms with other men.
- (4) Flats in Umlazi or KwaMashu but in which all workers could have families with them.
- (5) Arranging with the township authorities to find a township house for each worker.
- (6) Just letting the workers find their own accommodation

	<u>Point</u>		<u>Maydon Wharf</u>	
	%	%	%	%
<u>Hostel</u>	25		23	
General hostel		5		10
Company hostel		20		13
<u>Township flats</u>	27		26	
Mixture single men and family flats		6		5
All family flats		21		21
<u>Township houses</u>				
Company to negotiate with township authorities	48	44	51	44
Workers to find own accommodation*		4		7
	100	100	100	100
	N=220		N=110	

*Judging from the respondents' comments this option referred almost exclusively to detached housing usually in a township setting.

TABLE 13.1

Major reasons for preference of different company housing arrangementsHostels: (N=81)

- 69% Companionship, live with friends
- 9% Convenience factors
- 4% Secure urban rights for self

Flats: (N=88)

- 18% Live with family
- 18% Accommodation for visiting family
- 17% Convenience factors
- 16% Secure urban rights for children
- 10% Can live with friends
- 6% Access to transport to rural home
- 5% Cost factors

Township house: (N=144)

- 33% Live with family
- 22% Secure urban rights for children
- 17% Accommodation for visiting family
- 10% Place of own
- 10% Secure urban rights for self

Find own accommodation: (N=17)

- 24% Self-builder aspirations
- 18% Live with family
- 18% Choice of housing
- 12% Place of own
- 12% Cost factors

All arrangements: (N=330)

- 20% Live with family
- 16% Companionship
- 14% Secure urban rights for children
- 12% Accommodation for visiting family
- 7% Convenience factors
- 6% Place of own

sample would urge the company to assist with the provision of family dwelling units in houses or flats.

Respondents were asked to qualify their recommendations. The major reasons for selecting the 3 main options: hostel, flatted, or township accommodation are shown in Table 13.1.

The hostel arrangement was selected mainly for reasons of companionship and convenience and to secure a firmer foothold for oneself in town.

All the other arrangements were selected mainly in order to be able to live with one's family periodically or permanently and to secure urban rights for members of one's family. There was a tendency for the group supporting the flat recommendation to consider convenience and cost factors to a greater extent than others. The small group of stevedores who wished to make their own housing arrangements included persons who aspired to build or had built their own homes. Others in this response group emphasised choice in housing and the need for a sufficiently large house which could accommodate the entire family.

An impression of some of these motivating factors is rendered in these excerpts from the interviews:

The company hostel:

- "I would like this plan because it will enable me to get a workseeker's permit if I'm dismissed from work because I will be staying in a hostel and not in a compound.
- "It's better because we know each other. As we are working together we won't quarrel.

- "Our hostel is clean and everything is done in order and so it will be wise to be together".
- "Even if one of our workmates is not well or not fit to go to work they can report him at work".
- "We want to protect each other against robbers and this will be possible if we are going as a group".
- "It's easier if we are using company transport. It can take us all in one time".
- "I want to stay where only workers of this company stay so I can send messages home when I am not well enough to go

of single men's and family units:

"I do not like to stay with women, and some of us stay with our wives".

"If I wanted to stay with my family, then I choose

"I will accommodate my family as well as my faction fights".

"I will be with my family to avoid sending money

"The rent is very high at Umlazi T-Section".

"I would stay with my family, and my children. Otherwise they will grow up taking me

"This will enable my wife to be accommodated and she can visit me anytime she feels

"I stay here because I have 2 wives. One must stay for 2 months, and the next month the

"I want each wife must have her own house".

"If I do not stay here, it will be a good thing to have permits to work in town".

- "I like this plan because the house will belong to me even if I get dismissed from work".
- "Nobody will worry me at my own place".
- "I want a house for my future".
- "I think it is better to get an accommodation in a township so that my children can occupy that house when I'm retired and have gone back to my home".

3.7 A TRADE-OFF EXERCISE IN HOUSING CHOICE

The inquiry conducted so far referred by and large to housing preferences regardless of the costs to the consumer. When reviewing the company housing solutions the respondents were asked to make their recommendations based on the assumption that the costs of each solution would be equal for them. When responding to the question concerning alternative housing options earlier on in the interview the stevedores may have borne cost-constraints in mind. For example, nine of the 64 stevedores (14%) opting for alternative hostel housing if they could not remain in their present accommodation recommended flatted or township housing as the ideal company housing arrangement in the exercise which stipulated equal costs for all housing arrangements. Therefore, one might imagine that the pattern of housing preferences might shift if price tags and other constraints were attached to the various housing options explored.

In order to test this possibility another exercise was conducted with the survey respondents.

The stevedores were invited to trade off 3 housing advantages/constraints against each other:

- a) Cost factors
- b) Proximity to workplace
- c) Family accommodation

It can be assumed that all these factors are particularly salient to the Point stevedores in their consideration of alternative accommodation.

- a) At present the Point stevedores pay no rental and also reap many hidden benefits as part of their housing package. This effectively reduces their cost of living in town and enables them to save for their families at home in the country. These housing advantages were reflected in the satisfaction rating the Point stevedores gave to their present accommodation.
- b) As mentioned at the outset of this report the Point stevedores enjoy a housing advantage which is considered ideal for the rank-and-file industrial worker. They live close to their place of work and have no transport costs.
- c) By definition, single men's hostels, such as the Point ones, do not provide for family living. According to the survey results this is the main disadvantage of hostel living. Ninety-nine percent of the Point stevedores are dissatisfied that they cannot accommodate their visiting wives and family. We have already mentioned that family housing, in particular of the township house variety, and to a lesser extent of the family flat variety, is a strong draw-card for a number of reasons. It remains to be seen if the preference for family accommodation outweighs the need to live close to work and to save on housing, transport and related costs.

In the trade-off exercise the respondents were invited to weigh 3 housing advantages and constraints in the following combinations:

- 1) Housing cost versus proximity to workplace
- 2) Housing cost versus family accommodation
- 3) Proximity to workplace versus family accommodation

The results of the exercise are shown in Table 14. Judging from the figures in table there is a considerable difference of opinion among the stevedores regarding the price which one is prepared to pay for housing advantages. For example, only about 4 in 10 stevedores would wish to increase their housing costs in order to stay close to their place of work, and only about 5 out of 10 would be prepared to make a greater outlay for housing or to live farther from their workplace if they could live with their family. It will be remembered that all costs being equal some 7-8 of 10 men wished to live in family accommodation of some type.

A slightly more extreme percentage split of 40-60 obtains for the first trade-off between housing cost and proximity to workplace. This is partially explained by the fact that some respondents saw an extra hidden advantage in living far from their place of work. In their view not only would they pay less for housing as was explicitly stated in the question. They also

TABLE 14:

A trade-off exercise in housing involving the factors of housing costs, proximity to workplace, and family accommodation

If the workers of this company we have been talking about were offered different choices of accommodation, how should they decide in the following situations:

- A. (1) They should pay more for accommodation if necessary in order to be closer to their workplace.
 (2) They should pay less for accommodation even if this means staying farther away from their workplace.
- B. (1) They should pay more for accommodation if necessary in order to have their families stay with them.
 (2) They should stay without their families in order to pay less for accommodation.
- C. (1) They should stay much closer to their workplace and live without their families.
 (2) They should have their families with them even if this means staying farther away from their workplace.

	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
A <u>Housing cost versus proximity to workplace:</u>		
1) Pay more but stay close to workplace	40	38
2) Pay less but stay far from workplace	60	62
	100	100
B <u>Housing cost versus family accommodation:</u>		
1) Pay more but stay with family	53	50
2) Pay less but live in single accommodation	47	50
	100	100
C <u>Proximity to work versus family accommodation:</u>		
1) Stay close to workplace without family	52	47
2) Stay far from workplace with family	48	53
	100	100
	N=220	N=110

assumed that living far from one's place of work would mean access to family housing.

To sum up there is no clear consensus among stevedores as a group regarding the opportunity costs one would carry in order to achieve salient housing values. The Point and Maydon Wharf groups were equally divided in their opinions. Nevertheless there is a greater willingness on the part of the Maydon Wharf people to live farther away from their place of work. This is perhaps understandable, because Maydon Wharf people are presently living farther away from their place of work than the Point stevedores and may already be used to travelling longer distances to work. According to figures in Table 11 reviewed earlier the Maydon Wharf people appear to have few transport problems.

3.7.1 Housing values

A clearer pattern of housing values emerges if one looks at the motivations underlying the choices in the trade-off exercise. Reasons for making specific choices are shown in Table 14.1. If these results are read in conjunction with those emerging from the exercises in housing preferences reviewed earlier a number of conclusions can be drawn:

Proximity to workplace is a housing value which is particularly salient to the respondents who opted for hostel housing in the other exercises. The motivations for wishing to live close to one's workplace are similar to those put forward in connection

TABLE 14.1:

Reasons for endorsing options in the trade-off exerciseA Housing cost versus proximity to workplace:1) Pay more but stay close to workplace (N=108)

- 42% Won't be late for work
- 14% Self-evident (good to be close to work)
- 13% Works night shift (hence needs to be close to workplace)
- 13% To avoid high transport costs
- 6% Concern for physical safety

2) Pay less but stay far from work (N=142)

- 32% Opportunity to save
- 28% Can't afford high rent
- 8% Transport costs usually lower than housing costs
- 8% Far from work implies family housing, place of own, urban rights etc
- 7% Provided there is company transport
- 7% Transport is not a problem (especially in KwaMashu)

B Housing cost versus family accommodation:1) Pay more but stay with family (N=142)

- 54% Can live with family, self-evident
- 16% Can save by staying with family
- 11% Can secure urban rights for children
- 9% Accommodation for visiting family

2) Pay less but stay far from family (N=109)

- 43% Opportunity to save, remit more
- 40% According to tradition family should live in the rural areas and only visit in town
- 10% Cannot afford to stay with family in town

C Proximity to workplace versus family accommodation:1) Stay close to workplace without family (N=102)

- 29% To save on transport
- 18% Cannot afford to be late for work
- 16% Self-evident choice: does not wish family to stay in town
- 12% Need to be close to workplace
- 10% Concern for physical safety
- 7% To save on living expenses

2) Stay far from workplace with family (N=96)

- 65% Can live with family
- 8% Can secure urban rights for self and family
- 6% To save on living expenses
- 5% Accommodation for family when sick
- 5% Accommodation for visiting family

with a stated preference for a hostel lifestyle. Hostel living is inexpensive, which means one can save for the needs of one's family. It is ideal for people who work irregular hours and may therefore be exposed to dangers when travelling to and from work. The traditional migrant who believes in keeping his family at the rural home is best served by the housing package which includes single accommodation, proximity to the workplace, and low housing and transport costs. If the advantage of living close to one's workplace were to fall away, then suitable transport arrangements might compensate for this loss.

Housing costs: All stevedores were agreed that there is a need to save on housing and ancillary costs. However, there was a difference of opinion regarding the means of achieving this. For the traditional stevedore who is not interested in bringing his family to town, the recipe is relatively easy. Less conservative groups argue that there may be considerable savings in having a place at hand for visiting family. Transport costs tend to be regarded as minor in comparison to those of housing. It is argued that the stevedore living permanently with his family in town also avoids paying the transport costs for his family to visit him in town and only has the costs of running one household. It also appeared that respondents who were firmly convinced of the necessity to live farther from their workplace in order to stay with their families were less concerned with transport problems.

We shall see later that a large proportion of the persons favouring family rather than hostel housing are weekly paid

workers who presumably do not work shifts and irregular hours and are therefore not so dependent on company transport.

Family housing: is generally conceived as accommodation which is typically not as centrally located as hostel accommodation. The cost of family housing is known to be higher than that of single housing. Therefore, in terms of rent and transport costs family housing is an expensive housing option. Many stevedores, especially the rank-and-file stevedores, felt they could not afford the extra outlay, especially in the present economically uncertain times. Other stevedores felt the social benefits associated with township housing were worth the extra financial costs. Reference was also made to the hidden savings involved in securing a permanent family base in town as described above. The longer-term benefits of township housing in terms of residential and job security make this option attractive to all groups with the exception of the ultra-conservative one which is completely satisfied with the hostel lifestyle.

A selection of comments concerning the trade-off options gleaned from the interviews highlight some of the points made above.

Proximity to the workplace:

- "Because if you stay further away there is a possibility of losing the job because of what may happen on the way".
- "Work comes first, so it's better to be in time for work".
- "The money we save on transport; it's better to send it to the families at home".
- "There are no sites which can be used to establish my house near our workplace and I want to be sure that my family does have a house".

Housing costs:

- "I have no money to pay because I am not used to paying for accommodation".
- "Workers must pay less because wages are low".
- "It's better to pay less for accommodation and send money to my family at home".
- "My family is at home so there is no need for them to come here and to pay more. The money I am earning is for them".
- "It's better to pay less because sometimes we run short of work and if we pay more children will starve".

Savings in family accommodation:

- "To stay with my family will save on transport costs to and from home in my rural area".
- "It's better to stay with my family in order to eat one loaf of bread together".

Family accommodation:

Pro-arguments:

- "I'd like to live with my family and be free".
- "I must not be separated from my family and that is why I am dissatisfied with staying in a hostel".
- "It is important not to disturb family relationships. To stay alone means that your family will be destroyed".
- "This will mean you are better than a person who lives in a hostel".
- "My family will have a home to stay in and my children will get work permits".

Contra-arguments:

- "We want more money to send to our families and to build more houses for our families at home".

- "Our families are too wasteful; it is better to stay without them while on duty".
- "If I bring my family to town I won't have a home in the homeland".
- "Women are not allowed to stay with a man on duty. That's our traditional custom".
- "I will have no chance for my girlfriends if I live with my family". (This may be an isolated view.)

3.8 PREFERRED SIZE OF SHARED ROOMS IN HOSTELS AND FLATS

The respondents were asked to specify the ideal size of a room to be shared by several men. The majority of the stevedores felt that 2 or 4 men to a room was ideal (Table 15). A significantly higher proportion of the Point men elected for 4 (44%) rather than 2 (32%) men to share a room. Conversely, a significantly higher proportion of the Maydon Wharf men were of the opinion that 2 men (41%) to a room was preferable to 4 (32%) to a room.

Generally speaking, the Point group recommended a median of 4 men to share a room, while the Maydon Wharf group preferred a median of 2 men to a room.

A significantly higher proportion of the Point stevedores (55%) than those living in other hostels (41%) or in township houses or shacks (9%) would recommend the larger room size which accommodates 4 or more persons.

Survey categories which are most likely to give support to the 4-bed room are listed in Table 16. A number of the correlates are

TABLE 15:

Preferred size of shared rooms in hostels or flats

"If the company we have been talking about were to plan for men to share rooms in hostels or flats, how many men should share a room?"

	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
Men per room:		
1	3	12
2	<u>32</u>	<u>41</u>
3	10	8
4	<u>44</u>	<u>32</u>
5	4	3
6	4	2
7	1	0
8 or more	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
	100	100
Median number men per room*	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>

* Statistically significant at the 0,01 level

TABLE 16:

Survey categories in which above-average proportions recommend larger shared rooms

Percentage recommending 4 or more men per room

Sample average 49,5%

Stevehand	56
15 or more years service	57
Married with one wife	53
Visiting wife accommodated in township rather than shack area	55
Pays rent for visiting wife's accommodation	53
Transkeian	58
Visits home fortnightly or more often	59
Remits every fortnight or more often	55
Does not plan to retire on savings	54
Expects children to support him in old age	60
Generally satisfied with life	54
Satisfied with present accommodation	56
Proud to stay in present accommodation	55
Dissatisfied that wife cannot visit him in present accommodation	52
Satisfied that rooms are not too crowded in present accommodation	54
Satisfied that rooms are clean and tidy	53
Satisfied that it is quiet at night	53
Satisfied that there is enough electricity	53

incidental. The general picture which emerges is that the more senior rank-and-file stevedore is more likely to accept this housing standard. Transkeians and persons who are satisfied with their present housing circumstances in general and with the rate of occupation of rooms, in particular, are also more accepting of the 4-bed room.

3.9 PREFERRED LOCATION

The respondents were questioned regarding their preference for staying in KwaMashu or Umlazi. The majority of the stevedores expressed a marked preference for KwaMashu; the Point stevedores (88%) to a significantly greater extent than the Maydon Wharf stevedores (67%) (Table 17). Among the Point stevedores a significantly higher proportion of the B-block (95%) than the A-block (84%) residents favoured the KwaMashu location.

The men participating in the survey were not asked to qualify their location preferences but judging from comments collected in other sections of the interview the preference for KwaMashu may be related to transport considerations. The choice of location might also be linked to one's social ties in one or the other township.

Table 18 sets out the survey categories which would be better served by the Umlazi location. Here again, a number of the listed correlates are incidental. Many of the categories are

TABLE 17:

Preferences regarding location

"Generally, would it be better for this company to find a place in Umlazi or KwaMashu for its workers to stay?"

	Point*	Maydon Wharf*
	%	%
Umlazi	12	33
KwaMashu	88	67
	100	100
	N=219	N=109

*Distribution significantly differed at the 0,01 level

TABLE 18:

Survey categories stating above-average preference for residing in Umlazi

	Sample average 19%
Maydon Wharf stevedores	33%
Stevedores not working as stevehands	28%
Remits R106 or more per month	23%
Wife visits for two or more months per annum	24%
Supports fewer than 3 adults	22%
Originates from KwaZulu West or South Coast	33%
Satisfied with job	22%
Tendency to identify with urban area	31%
Dissatisfied with present accommodation regarding proximity to work	31%
Dissatisfied with cost of present accommodation	34%
Dissatisfied with companionship aspect of present accommodation	38%
Persons presently living in accommodation to the south of Durban	47%

descriptive of the Maydon Wharf group, in which an above-average percentage prefer the Umlazi location. It is important to note that the transport needs of the stevedores who report for work at Maydon Wharf can be met by the trains operating from Umlazi. However, Point workers are better served by the buses which operate from KwaMashu. The general conclusion is that the better qualified, more urban-oriented type of stevedore would be more willing to reside in Umlazi. Persons whose urban or rural address is to the south or west of Durban are also more positively disposed toward residing in Umlazi.

3.10 THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FAMILY RESIDENCE IN TOWN

The survey findings indicate that, finances permitting, some 3 out of 4 stevedores would wish to reside in family accommodation in town. However, this does not necessarily mean that the stevedores wish to bring their families to live permanently with them in town. The majority of the stevedores are rural-oriented and have strong socio-economic links with their rural homes as is evident from the indicators displayed in Table 19. The Point stevedores are also more likely to identify with the migrant category and its values than the Maydon Wharf people who express leanings toward an urban point of reference. There is a tendency for higher proportions of the Point than the Maydon Wharf stevedores to be rural-oriented. This difference in the orientation of the Point and the Maydon Wharf people is clearly reflected in the housing preferences of the two groups.

TABLE 19:

Indicators of a rural orientation

	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
Has access to arable land	97	86
Has feelings of security regarding this land	99	90
Has intentions of living on this land in retirement	97	88
Plans to retire to the rural area	93*	81
Plans to farm in retirement	64	50
Visits the rural home at least once a month	56	59
Remits regularly to the rural areas	100	99
Identifies as a rural migrant ¹⁾	88	81

* Percentage differences significantly different

1) Feels himself to be "a person whose real place is in the rural area but who has to work in the city" rather than "a person who is changing from a rural person to being a city person", or "a person who is fully of the city whose life and future is in the city".

The Point people are more appreciative of the advantages of a hostel lifestyle and tend to value family accommodation mainly as an instrument for securing a temporary base in town.

The Maydon Wharf stevedores on the other hand, are more likely to value family living as such. They tend to see a township house as the means of establishing a family home and gaining a permanent foothold in town.

In this connection it is important to note that the proportion of the stevedores, even among the more urban-oriented Maydon Wharf people, who have had experience of living with their family in town or who wish to bring their family to live in town permanently, is only between 30 and 40 percent (cf Tables 20, 21).

The main reason for not wishing to bring the family to town is related to the traditional norm.

- "It's better to stay without our families because our wives are not allowed to stay in town. Our traditional custom doesn't allow them to do so".

Other reasons refer to considerations of the welfare of the children, and financial and property constraints. The highest proportion of the stevedores who would wish to bring their families to town reason that their wives would be able to take better care of them. Smaller proportions feel they could save on household expenses, and their children would benefit.

TABLE 20:

Experience of family lifestyle in town"Has your family ever lived with you here in town?"

	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
Yes	30	37
No	70	63
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
	N=220	N=110

TABLE 20:

Experience of family lifestyle in town

"Has your family ever lived with you here in town?"

	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
Yes	30	37
No	70	63
	100	100
	N=220	N=110

TABLE 21:

Desire to bring family to live in urban areas on a more permanent basis

"If it were possible would you like to bring your wife and children to stay with you here in town?"

	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
Yes:	43	42
Wife already living in town	2	7
Yes, would like to bring wife to stay in town	41	35
No:	<u>57</u> <u>57</u>	<u>58</u> <u>58</u>
	100 100	100 100
	N=220	N=109

TABLE 21.1:

Reasons for wishing/not wishing to bring family to live in urban areas on a more permanent basis

"Which is the most important reason why you feel this way?"

- It is less expensive this way
- This is the way it should be/always has been
- A wife can look after a man's things better this way
- It is better for children's upbringing"

Wishes to bring family to town N=142

44% Wife can care for man's things
20% Less expensive
18% Better for children
16% Self-evident

Does not wish to bring family to town N=187

52% Self-evident, tradition
21% Better for children
14% Less expensive
11% Wife can care for rural property

The typical dilemma which oscillating migrants and their families face is expressed as follows by several respondents in the survey in connection with the trade-off exercise in housing values:

It is important to maintain a rural sheet-anchor:

- "It is good to be with the family but you must not lose the farm".
- "To stay with the family means losing my home in the rural area."

On the other hand, an urban foothold is required:

- "I need a house for my children to be registered in the township".

3.10.1 Migrant values and family housing

A number of the indicators shown in Table 22 suggest that the majority of the stevedores desire to retain their rural migrant identity and are cautious in their attempts to increase their life chances in town. For example, the stevedores as a group appear to be far more conservative than a similar group of hostel dwellers interviewed on the Witwatersrand in 1982 (cf last column included for purposes of comparison in Table 22). For all their aspirations of securing a firmer base in town the stevedores would not wish to become urban people. For example, 88 percent of the Point and 83 percent of the Maydon Wharf stevedores are critical of blacks living in the city who "throw away the good, traditional African customs". Similarly 46 and 40 percent disagree with the statement that "migrant workers must try to learn more modern ways and become more like city people". There are further indications that majorities of the stevedores resent

TABLE 22:

Perceptions of migrant values and image factors

"Here are a number of things we have heard people say. Tell me whether migrant workers like you agree with what is said or not".

	Point %	Maydon Wharf Hostels %	Townships/ Shacks %	Reef hostel migrants, 1982 ^{b)} %
Migrant workers are becoming more and more angry with African people in the city - agree	41*	29*	50*	26
Many whites are strict but honest and fair - we would not be happier under our own people - agree	60	54	47	38
It is best for black people to be careful in politics, not risk getting into trouble and losing what they have - agree	79*	70	75	44
The best place for a permanent home is close to a big city where many opportunities exist - disagree	55	44	68	30
Migrant workers are too poorly educated and backward to earn respect from whites - agree	77	81	65	31
African people who live permanently in the cities are too quick to throw away the good, traditional African customs - agree	88*	83	83	50
Migrant workers would be wise not to wish their wives to join them to live in the city - agree	73	69	65	46
Migrant workers must try to learn more modern ways and become more like city people - disagree	46	44	33	30
For migrant workers, staying in a hostel is the best way of living while in the city - agree	60	59	45	43
City people are foolish in rejecting the leaders which migrant workers from the rural areas admire - agree	86	93	90	41
City Africans are far too willing to accept the way whites want them to behave - agree	83	90*	75* ^{a)}	41
Migrant workers are more fortunate than township blacks because they can get away from the white man's world if they wish - agree	93	86	93	58
Township blacks take all the best jobs in town and migrant workers don't get enough chances - agree	84	87	88	82
*5-15% undecided	N=220	N=110		N=100

a) Significant difference between stevedore categories at the 0,05 level

b) This data was collected in a study exploring changing migrant values (Schlemmer and Møller, 1985)

the privileges and the headstart which urban Africans have over them. At the same time the majority (60%/53%) of the stevedores agree at least in principle that "staying in a hostel is the best way of living while in the city" and that "migrant workers are more fortunate than township blacks because they can get away from the white man's world if they wish" (93%/88%).

The implications of these findings are very clear. If the migrant workers involved in the study were to occupy family housing units they would continue to lead a migrant lifestyle. The workers and their families would most probably still circulate between town and country in order to spread the risks of survival evenly in both contexts. However, the urban base would be somewhat more secure and living conditions more satisfying if the stevedores were given access to family housing.

It must also be borne in mind that under current conditions the financial constraints of family housing are likely to be extremely high for the rank-and-file stevehand. Therefore compromise solutions involving the least expensive of the family housing options, such as family flats, or even a hostel with a well-regulated and easily accessible family section might serve the same end. However, it is all-important that these compromise solutions can be used as a passport to secure urban rights to the same extent as the regular solutions.

3.10.2 Urban rights and family housing

Evidence reviewed earlier suggests that the stevedores are extremely concerned about securing and maintaining their urban working rights in order to provide for their future and that of their children. Some 39 percent of the Point and 51 percent of the Maydon Wharf stevedores claim to have Section 10 rights endorsed in their reference books. Some 90 percent of all the stevedores interviewed were of the opinion that they would qualify for Section 10 rights (cf Table 23). It is perhaps symptomatic of the fundamentally confusing situation of the migrant worker in town that such a large proportion of the stevedores have not tried to formally apply for an endorsement of their urban rights in their reference books. Currently some 71 percent of the Point and 77 percent of the Maydon Wharf people thought they would qualify for township housing. Therefore, it would appear that the stevedores' aspirations for township housing are legitimate on the grounds of the legal preconditions existing at present. One might, therefore, draw the conclusion that factors such as the scarcity of suitable housing and the high cost of housing most likely represent the major constraints preventing the realisation of these aspirations.

TABLE 23:

Indicators of urban rightsSection 10 rights

"Do you have Section 10a, 10b, or 10c stamped into your reference book?"

	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
Section 10a	7	1
Section 10b	25	44
Section 10c	7	6
Is applying for Section 10 stamp	8	4
No Section 10 stamp but qualifies	45	36
Contract worker	8	9
	100	100

"Will the registration you have now allow you to get a house in a township?"

	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
Yes	71	77
No, don't know	29	23
	100	100
	N=220	N=110

3.11 PROFILES OF HOUSING PREFERENCES

The survey has identified three major groupings within the ranks of the stevedores in terms of housing preferences. In this section we shall attempt to identify the type of worker who would correspond to a particular type of lifestyle in town. The characteristics of the people who were particularly predisposed to the three major housing alternatives distinguished in the study: single hostel, flatted family, and township family accommodation, are listed in full detail in Tables 24, 25, and 26. A brief characterisation of each of these three groups is as follows:

3.11.1 Preference for single hostel accommodation

This group consists of migrants whose urban residential experience is limited to hostel-living. The men in this group are predominately rural-oriented either by choice or by the force of circumstances. They do not qualify for urban rights, nor do they wish to bring their families to town. At present their families visit them in town only for relatively brief periods. They are generally satisfied with their hostel accommodation and would not wish to change their present lifestyle in town. Housing preferences are clear-cut and consistent: this group wishes to be conveniently located close to the workplace, to economise on housing, and to live in single men's quarters.

The remarkable status consistency reflected in this group's

TABLE 24:

Survey categories in which above-average proportions would opt for hostel accommodation

In response to item referring 1) to alternative housing in general, see Table 12
2) to company housing arrangements, see Table 13

	1) 19%	2) 25%
Sample average=		
Hostel address only	24%	31%
Presently residing in hostel to the north of Durban	n.s.	40%
Transkeian origin	29%	35%
Stevehand	26%	29%
No education	25%	29%
Earns R90 or less weekly	25%	29%
Remits monthly or less often	28%	30%
Remits R105 or less per month	29%	30%
Married with one wife	n.s.	29%
Supports fewer than 3 adults	25%	30%
Not member of a pension scheme	25%	27%
Identifies with rural area	24%	28%
Plans to retire to rural area	23%	27%
Plans to farm in retirement	24%	n.s.
No experience of lodging in township	n.s.	29%
No experience of living in a shack area	n.s.	27%
Has never lived with family in town	n.s.	29%
Does not wish family to live in town	31%	36%
Wife stays less than 2 months in town p.a.	25%	32%
Registration in reference book does not allow access to township housing	28%	34%
Generally satisfied with present accommodation	34%	38%
Satisfied with specific aspects of present accommodation:		
- Proud to live there	31%	38%
- Not too many rules and regulations	25%	32%
- Sufficient hot/cold water	22%	26%
- Rooms not too crowded	26%	30%
- Enough privacy in rooms	29%	28%
- Plenty of companionship	n.s.	26%
- Free to come and go	22%	26%
- Enough electricity	n.s.	27%

n.s. Not significantly above-average

TABLE 25:

Survey categories in which above-average proportions would
opt for flattened accommodation

In response to item referring to company housing arrangements,
see Table 13

	Sample average =	27%
Less than 14 years service		31%
Less than 3 acres arable land		32%
Visits home bimonthly or less often		31%
Was on leave 1-2 months prior to the survey		37%
Remits fortnightly or more often		33%
Remits R106 or more per month		32%
Dissatisfied with life in general		44%
Dissatisfied with job		34%
Not member of a pension scheme		29%
Identifies with rural area		29%
Plans to retire to rural area		29%
Expected sources of income in retirement:		
Farming - yes		39%
Savings - no		31%
Pension from work - no		38%
Small business enterprise - no		30%
Support from children - no		32%
Wife's earnings - no		29%
Government pension expected to be main source of retirement income		31%
Wishes family to live in town		39%
Registration in reference book allows access to township housing		31%
Generally dissatisfied with present accommodation		36%
Dissatisfied with specific aspects of present accommodation:		
- Rooms too crowded		35%
- Rooms lack privacy		34%
- Rooms not clean and tidy		36%
- Not free to come and go		63%
- Wife cannot stay with me		28%
- Too many rules and regulations		35%

TABLE 26:

Survey categories in which above-average proportions would opt for township housing (inclusive making own housing arrangements)

In response to item referring to company housing arrangements, see Table 13

	<u>Sample average =</u>	<u>49%</u>
Township address		65%
Two addresses, one in hostel, another in a township		65%
Resident in B section of Point hostel		56%
Resident in area to the south of Durban		56%
Polygamous, (widowed, or single)		57%
Supports 4 or more adults		57%
KwaZulu origin		57%
Self-sufficient in maize		62%
Was not on leave 1-2 months prior to the survey		51%
Weekly income of R90 or more		56%
Remits 32% or less of wages		50%
Member of a pension scheme		67%
Satisfied with life		58%
Satisfied with job		53%
Identifies with urban area*		83%
Has experience of living in township		57%
Wife stays in town for 2 months or more per annum		56%
Has Section 10 rights		55%
Plans to retire in the urban or peri-urban area*		86%
Expected sources of income in retirement:		
Savings - yes		56%
Pension from work - yes		65%
Farming - no		69%
Small business enterprise - yes		58%
Support from children - yes		57%
Does not expect government pension to be most important source of retirement income		59%
Satisfied with specific aspects of present accommodation:		
- Close to work		52%
- Free to come and go		51%
- Wife can stay with me*		66%
- Enough privacy		54%
Dissatisfied with specific aspects of present accommodation:		
- Lack of company*		75%
- Friends cannot visit		56%
- Not proud to live there		57%
- Not enough hot/cold water		68%

* Small number of cases in category

profile is reminiscent of the type of person who has adapted optimally to a classical migrant lifestyle (cf Moller, 1985). Transkeians and rank-and-file workers are dominant in this group.

3.11.2 Preference for township family accommodation

This group comprises a large proportion of the entire stevedore workforce. It is therefore not surprising that housing preferences are not as precisely defined as in the other groups. Persons who have a firmer foothold in the urban area in terms of their residential and work status designations are characteristic of this preference group. A small minority would even see their longer-term opportunities in the urban areas. The members of this group have experimented widely with a range housing possibilities but have not achieved full satisfaction. A township house would solve their housing problems.

The more senior, higher ranking employee of KwaZulu origin is a typical prototype of this group.

The motivational pattern of this group is strikingly similar to Turner's (1968) prototype of the migrant worker seeking to consolidate his position in town.

3.11.3 Preference for flatted family accommodation

This group consists of persons who have not as yet explored their possibilities in town to the same extent as the previous group.

Members of this group tend to be less senior persons at work. They are also quite rural-oriented. Nevertheless, they only visit the rural home infrequently and wish to bring their families to stay with them in town. The men in this group are consistently dissatisfied with their present housing circumstances.

Housing preferences form a clear-cut pattern: a strong preference for family housing coupled with a willingness to live farther away from the workplace and pay for the advantage of living in family accommodation.

The profile suggests that this group wishes to maintain one foot in town and one in the country. A housing solution which lies somewhere between the hostel and township one may be more appropriate for this group, especially in view of its less senior status.

In contrast to the rural person aspiring to township housing the person wishing to stay with his family in flatted accommodation might be compared with the bridgeheader (Turner, 1968) who seeks a modest toehold rather than a foothold in town commensurate with his limited means.

TABLE 27:

Perceptions of corporate image

"Here are a number of things which black people have been heard to say about companies where people like you work"

	Point % N=220	Maydon Wharf % N=110
Owners of companies:		
They allow their supervisors to treat blacks badly - disagree	61	58
They often try to help blacks by appealing to government - agree	47**	49*
They get as much work from blacks for as little pay as possible - disagree	5	5
They help blacks by providing work - agree	97	98
They do not allow blacks to make progress or show ability in work - disagree	33	25
They pay as much to blacks as they can without losing profits - agree	66*a)	52*
They favour Indians or Coloureds over black people - disagree	11 b)	8
They only dismiss blacks for serious faults after fair investigation - agree	68	73
They work with and support the government - disagree	15**a)	4**
They try to help blacks with housing, education and loans - agree	16 a)	25
They try to appoint helpful and sympathetic supervisors over blacks - agree	63	56
They dismiss black workers without giving them a chance to state their case - disagree	64	58
They train blacks in companies for better jobs and promotion - agree	67	72
They never consult with black workers before changing things - disagree	48	39
They listen to the grievances of black workers - agree	67	66

b) Many respondents felt this item was not applicable in their work situation

a) Significant difference between Point and Maydon Wharf groups at 0,01 level

* Proportions between 10%-20% don't know

** Proportions over 20% don't know

Wharf stevedores, felt companies did not provide sufficient benefits. Eighty-two and 75 percent of the Point and Maydon Wharf respondents, respectively, disagreed with the statement: "owners of companies try to help blacks with housing, education, and loans". Of course, it is not known which aspect of the benefit package is the focal issue. Nevertheless, it is indeed problematic that the Point stevedores, who live virtually rent free, should take such a poor view of the financial assistance workers receive from companies. In other sections of the survey the impression was gained that many of the rank-and-file workers were fully aware that unless they received a housing subsidy or higher wages they would not be in a position to pay for their housing preferences. In terms of the profile discussed in the last section, the "bridge-headers" who aspire to live in more modest flatted accommodation would typically fit this description.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 HOUSING NEEDS

A brief resume of the major findings emerging from the study is as follows. The survey among the stevedores employed at SA Stevedores has shown that housing preferences fall into two main categories:

- single hostel accommodation, and
- family accommodation.

Family accommodation is the housing preference of approximately three-quarters of the stevedores.

Preferences within the family type of accommodation are two-fold:

- Flatted accommodation in which employees can live with their families for all or part of the year.
- Detached family dwellings in a township setting which can be rented or owned by the employees.

Approximately one-fourth of the stevedores would prefer to live in family flats, one half in township houses.

4.2 HOUSING PACKAGES

Judging from the survey findings at least three housing packages will be required to meet the needs of the stevedores.

- a) Hostel accommodation is essential for a hard core of the Point stevedores who are well-adjusted to the hostel lifestyle and are extremely satisfied with their present

company-accommodation. Members of this group would prefer to remain where they are. Failing this, these men would wish to stay in hostel accommodation which is exclusive to company workers. The main requirement of this group is that its home is close to the workplace, inexpensive, and well run. Convenient, safe, and comfortable transport is of paramount importance because the majority in this group of stevedores work shifts. In many respects the Point hostels may serve as a model for this type of accommodation. The positive profile shown in Table 11 indicates its suitability in most respects. A revision of occupancy rates and visiting policy is, however, essential. Ideally, the number of men per room should not exceed four. In view of the fact that all hostel dwellers in the survey are dissatisfied with the hospitality they can afford to visiting wives, a suitable arrangement should be made to accommodate the families of hostel dwellers on a temporary basis.

- b) Family flats may represent an ideal solution for accommodating the stevedores who do not wish to commit themselves to an urban lifestyle, yet need to have instant accommodation for their families when they visit town for shorter or longer periods during the year. However, the flat concept needs further clarification.

Some stevedores may have a housing situation in mind which is similar to the cottage system. In this system a small number of men share a dwelling unit. Each man has a room

of his own which can be converted into a family dwelling unit for a short period of time.

Others may conceive of the flat option as a variation of the hostel system. Some hostels in the Durban area make provision for family units which are occupied by the hostel dwellers and their families on a demand basis.

Convenience aspects of housing are relatively important to the persons stating a preference for flatted accommodation. Therefore arrangements might be made to transport the workers living in the same flat complex.

- c) Township houses for family living: This option is consonant with a more permanent commitment to an urban lifestyle. The members of this option group have typically assumed far greater responsibility for housing themselves than those in the other two categories. For example, a substantial proportion of the Maydon Wharf stevedores have gained experience of lodging in township houses. In most cases this experience has proved unsatisfactory. For this reason company assistance in negotiating improved housing opportunities would be welcome. The Maydon Wharf stevedores presently living at a township address would most certainly wish to avail themselves of this housing option if it were forthcoming. Others might follow suit if there were not too many costs involved. It is important to note that the stevedores seem to be attracted to the "instant" type of housing.

Little interest is expressed in the self-build option. However, this issue was not fully explored in the study.

4.3 THE NEED FOR RESIDENTIAL SECURITY IN THE HOUSING PACKAGE

It is imperative that the family flat and the township house options contain a similar measure of security for the stevedores and their families. The majority of the stevedores in the survey were concerned that they should reap the full benefits of urban housing for themselves and their children. The workers of this persuasion will only be satisfied with a housing option which guarantees working rights and reasonable residential security for themselves and their families. It is also clear that some stevedores viewed housing as the ideal vehicle for achieving social mobility for their children. The township house, for instance, was sometimes described as the perfect base for those children who are being educated in town in order that they may later gain access to the jobs reserved for the blacks "inside" the urban system.

The survey findings suggest that people only take pride in housing which is consistent with their status aspirations. Under present circumstances the only stevedores who were able to express pride of residence were the confirmed hostel dwellers. According to the survey findings the hostel option seemed to be tailor-made for the needs of this conservative group of migrants. However, this is a minority group. Therefore, increasing the housing opportunities for the remainder of the stevedore

population might go a long way toward restoring the self-esteem of the entire workforce.

4.4 THE NEED FOR CONVENIENCE IN THE HOUSING PACKAGE

At the time of writing the majority of the stevedores in the survey are fortunate in that they live close to their place of work. It is foreseeable that any reduction in factors of convenience will create hardship for the stevedores who work shifts. If forced to choose between two residential locations the majority of the respondents expressed a preference for staying in KwaMashu rather than Umlazi for convenience reasons. Exceptions were the Maydon Wharf stevedores who appeared to be well served by the rail link between Umlazi and Maydon Wharf. These findings suggest that stevedores might be willing to alter their residential preferences as far as location is concerned if transport facilities were improved.

4.5 HOUSING ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

Housing aspirations are typically shaped by a variety of factors. Experience of living in a variety of accommodation types is one such factor. Contact with people living in different dwelling circumstances is another. In and around Durban there is a rich variety of housing options: some are more attractive than others, not all are accessible to certain categories of black workers. This study has demonstrated that the majority of migrant workers who live in town without their families have a fair knowledge of

the range of housing options on the market.

In the course of a working lifetime hostel dwellers are likely to experiment with other forms of housing and they hear about different residential situations from their friends and relatives living outside of the hostels. The stevedores participating in this study are no exception. Moreover, this study will no doubt have contributed to making these men more conscious of housing issues and perhaps raising their expectations as well.

Based on the survey findings the conclusion is drawn that the stevedores who had gained a greater experience of urban lifestyles tended also to have markedly higher housing aspirations. Higher aspirations, in the sense that they were dissatisfied with their present living conditions to a lesser or greater degree and would also have preferred to change their lifestyle. The only people in the study who appeared to have achieved some measure of congruence between expectations and aspirations were the Point hostel dwellers who identified themselves unambiguously as hostel dwellers and migrant workers. Another similarly contented group was the self-builder category. However, it is a numerically insignificant category in the stevedore workforce. All the remaining stevedores who aspired to family accommodation of various kinds appeared to be faced with the typical dilemma of the migrant condition. On the one hand each migrant must ask himself if there is any wisdom in committing himself and his family to an urban lifestyle given the uncertain conditions dictated by influx control regulations. On

the other hand, an investment in housing might provide that measure of security which would make the commitment worthwhile. Obviously, black housing in the South African urban context cannot simply be viewed like any other consumer commodity. Housing connotes a whole range of interrelated constraints and opportunities. This is likely to remain the case until influx control regulations are completely revised. Perhaps the trade-off exercise in housing conducted as part of this study best demonstrates the complex considerations involved in the housing choices of migrant workers.

Any company seeking to formulate a sound housing policy will have to be aware of the many delicate considerations which are all part and parcel of the housing package it offers to its workers. In the case of the stevedoring company under study at least three such packages are required: one for confirmed hostel dwellers, another for men who have some aspirations of family housing, and a third which has appeal for the men who have a firmer commitment to a house of their own. Each housing package will have to provide a reasonable mix of security, convenience, comfort, and other attractive features which are conducive to pride of place.

4.6 CONSULTATION AND PARTICIPATION IN HOUSING

Lastly, it should be mentioned that the majority of the stevedores in the study have not been required to assume responsibility for their housing in the urban areas in the past and would not wish to have to do so in future. This is not to say that the stevedores do not wish to be consulted in housing matters and participate actively in the shaping of a housing policy in their company. 1) The cooperation of the stevedores in this inquiry is a reflection of this type of responsible attitude.

The stevedores were very concerned about their future housing situation. The impression was gained that the stevedores regarded their future housing circumstances with a certain amount of positive anticipation mixed with some apprehension. Nevertheless, it is hoped that the stevedores' misgivings will be unfounded and that they will arrive at a satisfactory solution to their housing needs.

1. Note that majorities of the Point and Maydon Wharf stevedores agreed with the statement: "They (owners of companies) never consult with black workers before changing things". (cf Table 27).

REFERENCES

MOLLER, V., (1978):

Mobility on the Urban Fringe: Some Observations Based on Seventy-two African Households in the Inanda Peri-urban Area. Durban: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Natal.

MOLLER, V., (1985):

"Change in the South African Labour Migration System: A Phase Model" in H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer (eds.), Up Against the Fences: Poverty, Passes and Privilege in South Africa. Cape Town: David Philip.

MOLLER, V., and L. SCHLEMMER, (1977):

The Situation of African Migrant Workers in Durban: Brief Report on a Preliminary Survey Analysis. Durban: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Natal.

MOLLER, V., and L. SCHLEMMER, (1979):

Migrant Workers and the Fundamental Dilemma: Urban Commitment or Rural Return? Durban: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Natal.

MOLLER, V., and L. SCHLEMMER, (1981):

Contract Workers and Job Satisfaction: A Study of Job Aspirations, Motivations and Preferences among Migrants in Durban. Durban: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Natal.

SCHLEMMER, L., (1985):

"Squatter Communities: Safety Valves in the Rural-Urban Nexus" in H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer, (eds.), Up Against the Fences: Poverty, Passes and Privilege in South Africa. Cape Town: David Philip.

SCHLEMMER, L., V. MOLLER and P. STOPFORTH, (1980):

Black Urban Communities, Socio-Political Reform and the Future. Durban: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Natal.

SCHLEMMER, L., and V. MOLLER, (1982):

Informal Peri-urban Communities and Planning Needs. Durban: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Natal.

SCHLEMMER, L., and V. MOLLER (1985):

"Constraint, Stress and Reaction: The Response of Migrant Contract Workers to their Situation" in H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer (eds.), Up Against the Fences: Poverty, Passes and Privilege in South Africa. Cape Town: David Philip.

TURNER, J.F.C., (1968):

"Housing Priorities, Settlement Patterns, and Urban Development in Modernising Counties", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol 34: 354-363.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX II

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

	N=220 Point %	N=110 Maydon Wharf %
<u>Occupation:</u>		
Stevehand*	80	64
Gangwayman	3	4
Winchman	1	-
Induna	6	6
Lasher	-	2
Hatchman	1	3
Weekly paid workers	9	21
	100	100
<u>Length of service*:</u>		
-10 years	15	35
11-14 years	34	35
15 or more years	51	30
	100	100
<u>Age:</u>		
-39 years	42	47
40-49 years	36	36
50 or more years	22	14
	100	100
<u>Educational standard:</u>		
None	49	40
Substandards	7	6
Standards 1-2	15	15
Standards 3-5	23	24
Standards 6-7	5	6
Standards 8+	1	9
	100	100
<u>Marital status:</u>		
Married - 1 wife	72	74
Married - 2 wives	21	13
Married - 3 or more wives	4	5
Widowed	1	1
Single	2	7
	100	100

	Point %	Maydon Wharf %
<u>Adult dependents:</u>		
-2	34	42
3-4	41	36
5 or more	24	22
	100	100
median	3	3
<u>Child dependents:</u>		
-3	15	25
4-5	28	26
6-8	36	36
9 or more	21	13
	100	100
median	6	5
<u>District of origin*:</u>		
KwaZulu	77	65
Transkei	23	34
Other	-	1
	100	100
<u>Home language*:</u>		
Zulu	77	65
Xhosa	22	32
Sotho	1	2
Other	-	1
	100	100
<u>Arable land in the rural areas:</u>		
None	1	7
Garden only	2	6
Land	97	87
	100	100
<u>Monthly remittance:</u>		
-R90	27	33
R91-R181	49	33
R181 or more	24	34
	100	100
median monthly remittance	R120	R120
	N=219	N=109

<u>Percentage of wages remitted:</u>	<u>Point %</u>	<u>Maydon Wharf %</u>
Less than 22%	24	33
22-32%	27	18
33-46%	26	20
47% or more	23	29
	100	100
median percentage of wages remitted	32%	32%
<u>Trade union membership:</u>		
Yes	96	96
No	2	3
Past membership	2	1
	100	100
<u>Pension scheme membership:</u>		
Yes	20	21
No	26	31
Past membership	48	47
Don't know	6	1
	100	100

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 Licence.

To view a copy of the licence please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>