



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

**Effect of rural inequality on migration among the farming
households of Limpopo Province, South Africa**

By

JULIANA KENTE RWELAMIRA

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirement for the degree of

PhD

in the
Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension
and Rural Development
Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
University of Pretoria
Pretoria

July 2008



DEDICATION

To

Adela, Adelina and Anita,

My wonderful and caring daughters, whose support, encouragement and love were my greatest source of inspiration;

My beloved late husband, Professor Medard Rwelamira, whose academic excellence and astuteness kept me on my toes, rest in peace my love.

and

I salute the migrant workers of South Africa, who provide the backbone of livelihood to many rural households that would not survive otherwise.



DECLARATION TO BE SIGNED BY THE STUDENT

I declare that the thesis that I hereby submit, for the degree PhD at the University of Pretoria has not previously been submitted by me for degree purposes at any other University.

I take note that, if the thesis is approved, I have to submit final copies as stipulated by the relevant regulations by 15 July (for the Spring graduation ceremony and 15 February (for the Autumn graduation ceremony), and that if I do not comply with the stipulations, the degree will not be conferred upon me

SIGNATURE.....DATE 22.July, 2008

The author and promoters give permission to use this dissertation only for consultation and to copy parts of it for personal, academic and non-commercial use. Any other use is subject to copy right laws; when using results from this work the source should be exclusively specified. Permission to reproduce any material contained in this work should be obtained from the author.

The author

.....

Juliana K. Rwelamira

BSc Agric. (Hons):–Univ. DSM-Tanzania, MAMRD: Univ. Florida-USA

The Promoters

Prof. JF KIRSTEN

Prof.Luc D’HAESE



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been inspired by the effort of many professionals, who continue to gather and analyse views, experiences and aspirations of many migrants from the rural areas in pursuit of their dreams.

I am greatly indebted to my promoters, Professor Johann Kirsten and Professor Luc D'Haese, for their motivation, support and guidance. Professor Kirsten, my principal promoter, assisted me from the initial stage of selecting a topic for this thesis, through research design, data collection up to the necessary steps of thesis submission. I wish to express my appreciation to him not only for giving my work direction, providing excellent academic guidance but also for keeping me focused on the main objectives of the research. His keen interest in my work went beyond call of duty and helped me to think more scientifically and conceptually. His door was always open for consultation and he never turned me away much as he has heavy demands on his time. My special and sincere gratitude goes to Prof. Kirsten for patiently believing in my ability to carry out research of this magnitude, especially during those moments when I had little faith in myself as the terrain became rough.

My second promoter; Professor D'Haese added invaluable to this work, his rigorous standards and wide experience led me to understand the different aspects of the research, which I had not thought about before. His insightful comments on the chapters, which he patiently read through several times, greatly improved this work. During a six months' visit to the University of Ghent, Department of Agricultural Economics, Professor D'Haese ensured things went smoothly for me at the University as well as caring for my wellbeing in a foreign land. He did not only share his useful and relevant documents and sometimes his office with me, but made sure I had unlimited access to the Agricultural Library and the necessary scope to work. He and his wife Mrs Tienieke D'Haese kept the door of their home wide open for me; it became my home in Gent and a place of rest after a hard week's work. Not to forget Dr. Marijke D'Haese and Ms Clare D'Haese both of whom went out of their way to assure a comfortable stay in Gent. Marijke also spent valuable time with me and gave me useful hints on the quantitative analysis techniques.



A number of professionals contributed to this work indirectly by virtual of their involvement with an international research project belonging to the 4th European Union Research Programme, which was undertaken in South-Africa, Botswana and India. I would like to acknowledge and thank the European Union – United Kingdom (EU-UK), for the initial funding of the study, which enabled the study to start. Through this research I had an opportunity to exchange views on migration issues with distinguished researchers and scholars including Professor Johann Kirsten, and Dr. Moraka Makhura, of University of Pretoria; Professor Michael Lipton, of University of Sussex (UK); Professor Vidya Sagar and Professor Rathore, of The Institute of Research and Development Studies, in Jaipur, India; Dr. Arjan De Haan; Prof. Rolang Majelantle and Dr. Ken Bainame, of University of Botswana; Professor G. De Santis, University of Messina, (Italy) Professor Silvana Salvini, Dr. Simona Drovandi and Dr. Letizia Mencarini of Department of Statistics, University of Florence, Italy, some students, who assisted me during the early stages of the study as research assistants. I have to make special mention of Frances Fraiser, and Margaret Phosa, who at different stages helped with data entry and or data cleaning.

During my working years at University of Pretoria, Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, and Rural Development and at the Post Graduate School of Agriculture and Rural Development, I worked with special people who encouraged and assisted me in different ways, they include: Professor Frans Swanepoel, Professor Gideon Steyn, Professor Charles Machete, Professor Sylvain Perret, Dr. Sabina Silaula, Dr. Simpiwe Ngqangweni and Dr. Micah Masuku. No process can flow smoothly without administrative support; Mrs Zuna Botha and Ms Charlotte Kock became my best friends and always encouraged me to persevere, while Mrs Jo Coertse was always ready to lend me a helping hand.

My former employers, University of Pretoria and ECIAfrica afforded me time to work on this study and still work full time. My sincere thanks to Professor Gerhard Coetzee, who after taking me out of an academic environment continued to encourage me to stay academically active. Even though I did not manage to keep his pace I thank him for keeping me on my toes, by regularly enquiring about the progress on this work.



Data collection in the field was a great challenge, but the task was made easier by the receptiveness of the 573 household heads and their families, who endured the long interviews and provided invaluable information. I have to make a special mention of the non-resident members of the households, who agreed to be interviewed on weekends and during public holidays when they were home for holidays. Equally important were the enumerators who went around the villages to collect the information and persevered until the job was well done. I salute all of you and say thank you so much for your hard work.

A number of people helped me with editing, formatting and the final production of bound copies of the thesis; they include: Ms. Judi Burger for professional editing, Mrs Jo Coertse for final formatting, Ms Beth Wamuu, Ms Nerashnee Harichand, Ms Winnie Musani and Ms Gloria Williams for lending a hand for formatting, producing (printing, collating and binding) of various drafts of the Thesis at different stages; thank you ladies for a job well done, I do not know what I would have done without you.

Many members of my family contributed enormously, directly or indirectly, towards making this study possible. My loving mother, Ma Justine Ninsiima Kente and my late father Ta Eustace Rugemalira Kente, who had much faith and hope in me as their first born child; I had to work hard to meet their expectations. They never tired of encouraging me and gave me a solid foundation in education during my formative stage, as they nurtured me through adolescence and youth; they sacrificed enormously to put me through school. My daughters: Adela, Adelina and Anita and my nephew Edson, were there for me through thick and thin, encouraging me not to give up and rubbing my neck, shoulders and back whenever I could not bear the stiffness of sitting for long periods of time. My uncles, Mr. Emmanuel Lulinga and Mr. Joash Lulinga, who partly brought me up and taught me at primary school level and moulded me towards an ambitious academic path, I can never repay you enough. My close relatives and friends, who were always at hand to give a word of encouragement: Ma Elitha Lulinga, Shangazi Ma Yulitha, my siblings: Agnes, Jackson, Newstar, Happiness, Georgefrey, Yudesi, Jonesia, Anna, Danford, Loveness, Siima and Kahwa, this is to inspire you and our children.



I thank God for great friends, who kept asking about the progress of this work, thus providing the necessary pressure and encouragement to keep me going: Ms Sarah Kabaija (your prayers saw me through this), Ms Stella Mugisha, Dr. Hulda Swai, Dr. Mariam Said, Professor Lawrence and Mrs Bertha Buberwa, Mr. Phakiso & Mrs Mary Mochochoko, Dr Raphael and Mrs Nora Kasonga, Mr. George and Mrs Christine Rutwama, Professor Theo & Mrs Sandra Kleynhans, Professor Bart Rwezahura, Mrs Juliet Kairuki and many others; I thank you all for your support and encouragement.

I reserved the best to the end, my sincere and heartfelt special gratitude to my late husband Professor Medard Rwelamira. Initially, I misunderstood his persistent enquiries about this work as harassment, as I sometimes felt despair over lack of significant progress. He literally became my home supervisor and applied his long term experience of supervising Ph.D students to help me and keep me focused. He insisted on reading through some of the chapters and sometimes gave harsh comments that sent me back to the library to look for more information. All the while he expressed confidence in me. *Your contribution to this study was invaluable, it is a pity you can not be here with me to share the fruit of this hard work. May the Lord continue to rest your soul in eternal peace!*



Effect of rural inequality on migration among the farming households of Limpopo Province, South Africa

BY

JULIANA KENTE RWELAMIRA

Degree: PhD

Department: Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development

Promoter: Professor Johann Kirsten

Co-promoter: Professor Luc D'Haese

ABSTRACT

This thesis describes a study undertaken in the semi arid areas of Limpopo among rural households with or without migrant workers in their households. The study aimed at analyzing and establishing the association between unequal distribution of land and other productive assets and rural household migration decisions; and to ascertain the relationship between migration remittances received by migration sending households and rural inequality in the migration sending economies. In essence, two important phenomena of inequality and migration are addressed simultaneously from two related angles: the effect of rural inequality on migration behaviour and the effect of migration (through cash and in-kind remittances) on rural inequality.

A combination of explorative and confirmative economic analytical tools was used for empirical data analysis. Explorative analysis was meant to present distribution characteristics of the data including frequency analysis, descriptive statistics and cross tabulation; correlation and non-parametric analysis. In the confirmative analysis model specific deterministic relationships among variables or response models were used to confirm the existence of relationships. First, the Gini coefficient technique and Lorenz curves were used to measure inter household income and asset inequality.



Factor Analysis (FA) was used to combine variables and create new but fewer factors; and logistic regression analysis (LRA) was used to determine variables that positively or negatively affect migration.

A survey was conducted among 573 rural households selected from 24 villages of Limpopo in the Central, Southern and Western Regions. Two types of research instruments were used. The first was a semi-structured village questionnaire to gather qualitative information about the villages by interviewing key informants. The second instrument was a structured household questionnaire, which provided information on household composition and characteristics, household income and other assets, environmental issues, migration and remittances. The household head or his/her deputy responded to a major part of the questionnaire but the migrants responded to some of the migration and remittance related questions.

Findings from the Gini coefficient measure and Lorenz curves indicated uneven asset distribution and that landlessness is common in Lebowa. However, comparatively, land and income are more evenly distributed than the other assets. The results of the correlation matrix indicate that there is a negative correlation between the presence of migrants and per-capita household assets and per-capita land ownership (-0.043 and -0.126 respectively). A one-tailed t test indicated that per-capita land is significantly related to the presence of migrants within households ($p < 0.05$). The presence of migration in a household was also negatively correlated with adult equivalent landholding. Households with migrants tended to have smaller landholdings and the relationship between migration and other asset categories was negative, implying an inverse relationship between them and the propensity to migrate. Variables influencing migration were aggregated using Factor analysis and on the basis of the factor loadings four factors (components) with the largest loadings were identified as: household land and income factor, livestock factor, asset (farm and non farm) factor and lastly pension and household composition factor.

The Logistic regression analysis (LRA) using a non-metric, dichotomous dependent 'dummy variable for presence of migrants in households showed that: the presence of migrant(s) is significantly influenced by per-capita land, per-capita income, per-capita all assets, and total assets ($p < 0.05$). The results show that a unit increase in value of per-



capita assets will result to 0.1 percent change in the odds ratio against migration; a unit increase in pension received by a member in a household will result in a 0.6 per cent change in odds ratio against migration; as pension money increases there would be less incentive for members of the household receiving it to migrate. However, a unit increase in per capita income will not result in any change in the odds ratio of migration. In the Central, Southern and Western regions of Limpopo households with smaller land holding per capita tended to have migrants, however, the pattern of migration from these areas does not support the hypothesis that higher inequality of land holding lead to higher out-migration. The Western Region, which has better land distribution than the other two regions, has a higher proportion of households with migrants than the other two regions. Thus, migration must be influenced by a complex association of variables other than just land. Livestock did not have significant influence on migration from the rural areas. This is not surprising for Limpopo, since the province is not well endowed with livestock as a form of asset. Nevertheless, households with migrants have higher total value of livestock than those without migrants.

The empirical findings have shown that remittances are an important source of livelihood and the relationship between migration and rural inequality depend critically on how remittances and the losses and gains of human resources through migration are distributed across households.

Different income sources add to income inequality but at different rates and extent. In the case of Limpopo, remittances account for a smaller percentage of total inequality (14.9%) than that of salaries and wages (72.3%); pensions contribute the least to the rural income inequality, contributing only 4.3%. This means that remittances are distributed more evenly than salaries and wages among the households that receive them. It means also that even some migration sending households at the lower end of the income spectrum in rural areas have access to some migrant remittances. Income inequality decreases considerably when migrant remittances are combined with income from other sources; in our case it drops by fifteen percentage points from 0.62 to 0.47. The influence of migration remittances upon income inequality will tends to become more favourable as migration opportunities spread throughout the villages.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	I
DECLARATION TO BE SIGNED BY THE STUDENT.....	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
ABSTRACT.....	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS	X
LIST OF TABLES	XVII
LIST OF FIGURES.....	XVIII
CHAPTER 1.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2 EVIDENCE OF RURAL INEQUALITY IN LIMPOPO.....	3
1.2.1 Basic social indicators	3
1.2.2 Demographic and economic indicators	5
1.2.2.1 <i>Unemployment</i>	5
1.2.2.2 <i>Equitable distribution of resources</i>	7
1.2.3 State of agriculture in Limpopo.....	8
1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND CONTEXT	12
1.3.1 Rural inequality and migration	12
1.3.2 Rural inequality and poverty	16
1.3.3 Reaction to inequality and poverty.....	21
1.3.4 The impact of migration and remittances on rural economies	21
1.4 THE THESIS AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.....	23
1.5 HYPOTHESES.....	25
1.6 DELIMITATION	27
1.7 ORGANISATION OF THE THESIS.....	27
CHAPTER 2.....	29
A REVIEW OF THE EFFECT OF RURAL INEQUALITY ON MIGRATION.....	29
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	29



2.2	INTERNATIONAL EVIDENCE OF MIGRATION AND RURAL INEQUALITY	30
2.2.1	Prevalence of rural inequality	30
2.2.2	Overview on migration internationally	32
2.2.2.1	<i>Characteristics of migrants</i>	<i>35</i>
2.2.2.2	<i>Effect of age and education of the migrant.....</i>	<i>37</i>
2.3	THE CAUSE AND EFFECT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INEQUALITY AND MIGRATION	38
2.3.1	Land distribution affects migration.....	38
2.3.2	Asset distribution (other than land) affects migration	42
2.3.2.1	<i>Human capital and rural inequality</i>	<i>43</i>
2.4	RURAL INEQUALITY AND MIGRATION IN SOUTH AFRICA: PAST AND PRESENT.....	44
2.4.1	Historical perspective of rural inequality and migration in South Africa	48
2.5	RURAL INEQUALITY AND MIGRATION IN THE LIMPOPO.....	51
2.5.1	Background and setting	51
2.5.2	Some important indicators	53
2.5.3	Equitable distribution of resources	53
2.6	SUMMARY.....	54
	CHAPTER 3.....	55
	THEORIES OF INEQUALITY AND MODELS OF MIGRATION BEHAVIOUR.....	55
3.1	INTRODUCTION	55
3.2	Patterns and theories of inequality	55
3.3	THE BASIS FOR A LINK BETWEEN ASSET INEQUALITY AND MIGRATION	59
3.4	REVIEW OF SELECTED MIGRATION THEORIES AND MODELS	63
3.4.1	Theories	64
3.4.1.1	<i>Ravenstein’s laws of migration</i>	<i>64</i>
3.4.1.2	<i>The “push-pull” model.....</i>	<i>65</i>
3.4.1.3	<i>Sjaastad’s human investment theory</i>	<i>66</i>



3.4.1.4	<i>Lee’s “pluses and minuses” theory</i>	67
3.4.1.4	<i>Relative Deprivation</i>	67
3.4.2	Economic models of migration	68
3.4.2.1	<i>The Lewis model or Lewis-Fei-Ranis (L-F-R) model of development</i>	68
3.4.2.2	<i>The Harris-Todaro model</i>	70
3.4.2.3	<i>The Harris-Todaro model and the informal sector</i>	75
3.4.2.4	<i>New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) Model: A household perspective</i>	76
3.5	CAN MIGRATION PROVIDE A WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY?	79
3.6	SUMMARY	82
	CHAPTER 4	83
	CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	83
4.1	INTRODUCTION	83
4.2	KEY DEFINITIONS	84
4.2.1	Inequality	84
4.2.2	Household assets and income	86
4.2.2.1	<i>Household land ownership</i>	86
4.2.3	Migration	86
4.2.3.1	<i>Rural out-migration</i>	88
4.3	FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSING THE MIGRATION DECISION AND ITS IMPACT	88
4.4	FACTORS OR DETERMINANTS OF MIGRATION	90
4.4.1	Part II: The cost of migration	92
4.4.1.1	<i>Opportunity cost</i>	94
4.4.2	Returns to migration	94
4.4.3	Measuring and decomposing inequality	97
4.4.3.1	<i>The axioms</i>	97
4.4.3.2	<i>Some negative characteristics of the the Gini coefficient</i>	99
4.5	SUMMARY	99
	CHAPTER 5	100
	RESEACH DESIGN	100
5.1	INTRODUCTION	100
5.2	THE STUDY AREA AND SAMPLE DESIGN	100



5.2.1	Selection of the Study Area	100
5.2.2	Location and size of Limpopo	101
5.3	SAMPLING FRAME AND SURVEY DESIGN	102
5.3.1	Sampling of villages.....	103
5.3.2	Households Sampling strategy and size	104
5.3.1	Representativeness	105
5.4	QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND DATA COLECTION	106
5.4.1	Questionnaire Design	106
5.4.2	Questionnaire pre-testing	106
5.4.3	The Survey	107
5.5	CATEGORIES OF THE MAIN VARIABLES.....	108
5.6	FRAMEWORK FOR DATA PREPARATION AND ANALYSIS ...	109
5.6.1	Data reception, editing and organisation	109
5.6.2	Data capturing (punching) and cleaning.....	109
5.6.3	Validity and reliability of data	110
5.7	DATA ANALYSIS METHODS	111
5.7.1	Exploratory analysis	111
5.7.2	Confirmative analysis	112
5.7.2.1	<i>Inequality measure using the Gini coefficient</i>	<i>112</i>
5.7.2.2	<i>Factor analysis</i>	<i>113</i>
5.7.2.3	<i>Logistic regression model.....</i>	<i>115</i>
5.8	SUMMARY.....	118
	CHAPTER 6.....	119
	CHARACTERISTICS AND IMPACT OF RURAL MIGRATION	
	UNDER DIFFERENT ASSET DISTRIBUTION - A CASE STUDY	
	OF LIMPOPO.....	119
6.1	INTRODUCTION	119
6.2	SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SURVEY AREA	
	120
6.3	INFRASTRUCTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE BASE	121
6.4	HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS	121
6.4.1	Demographic characteristics.....	122
6.4.1.1	<i>Age composition</i>	<i>122</i>



6.4.1.2	<i>Gender</i>	123
6.4.1.3	<i>Marital status</i>	125
6.4.1.4	<i>Vocational status</i>	126
6.4.1.5	<i>Household size</i>	127
6.5	ASSET DISTRIBUTION	129
6.5.1	Land-holdings	129
6.5.1.1	<i>Regional and sub-regional land distribution</i>	132
6.5.1.2	<i>Land-holding and migration</i>	134
6.5.2	Livestock ownership	136
6.5.3	Farm assets other than land and livestock	138
6.5.4	Non-farm assets	139
6.5.5	Household income	140
6.5.5.1	<i>Salaries and Wages</i>	141
6.5.5.2	<i>Pensions</i>	141
6.5.5.3	<i>Farm income (agricultural produce sales and other farm sources)</i>	142
6.5.5.4	<i>Remittances from migrant members</i>	143
6.5.5.5	<i>Total household income</i>	147
6.6	EXTENT OF MIGRATION IN LIMPOPO	149
6.6.1	Extent of migration by sub-regions and regions	150
6.6.2	Characteristics of migrants	151
6.6.3	Migration decisions	151
6.6.3.1	<i>Period of absence</i>	152
6.6.3.2	<i>Affinity of migrant to households left behind</i>	153
6.6.4	Migrants' economic activities	154
6.6.5	Effect of migration on family labour	156
6.6.6	Effect of migration on household income	157
6.7	DISTINCTION BETWEEN HOUSEHOLDS WITH AND WITHOUT MIGRANTS	157
6.7.1	Are households with and without migrants significantly different?	157
6.7.2	Remittances and their uses	159
6.8	SUMMARY	161
	CHAPTER 7	163
	RURAL ASSET INEQUALITY AND MIGRATION	163



7.1	INTRODUCTION	163
7.2	ESTIMATION STRATEGY AND EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLD ASSETS	165
7.2.1	Measuring inequality using the Gini coefficients and Lorenz curves	166
7.2.1.1	<i>Inequality in landholdings</i>	168
7.2.1.2	<i>Inequality in livestock ownership</i>	171
7.2.1.3	<i>Farm assets</i>	172
7.2.1.4	<i>Non-farm assets</i>	173
7.2.1.5	<i>Household income</i>	174
7.2.1.6	<i>Remittances</i>	175
7.3	DOES ASSET INEQUALITY CAUSE MIGRATION?.....	175
7.3.1	Dependent and independent variables used in the model	175
7.3.2	Relationship between assets, some household characteristics and migration	177
7.3.2.1	<i>Correlation analysis using un-standardised data</i>	177
7.3.2.2	<i>Correlation using standardised data</i>	178
7.3.3	Aggregating variables influencing migration using Factor Analysis	181
7.3.3.2	<i>Communality and Variance Explained</i>	182
7.3.3.3	<i>Factors retained</i>	184
7.3.3.4	<i>Interpretation of Results</i>	186
7.3.4	Relationship between migration, assets and selected household characteristics using Logistic Regression Analysis	190
7.3.4.1	<i>Land-holding and migration</i>	191
7.3.3.2	<i>Other assets and migration</i>	191
7.4	SUMMARY	195
	CHAPTER 8.....	196
	REMITTANCES AND RURAL INEQUALITY.....	196
8.1	INTRODUCTION	196
8.2	THE IMPORTANCE AND SHARE OF REMITTANCES IN HOUSEHOLD INCOME	197
8.3	ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK	199
8.4	EMPIRICAL DERIVATION OF DECOMPOSED GINI INDICES	201
8.4.1	Overall inequality from different income sources.....	203



8.4.1.1	<i>Key conclusions</i>	203
8.4.2	Share of income sources in the Gini coefficients of sub-regional total incomes	204
8.5	SUMMARY.....	209
CHAPTER 9.....		210
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS....		210
9.1	INTRODUCTION	210
9.2	RESULTING CONCLUSIONS	211
9.3	RECOMMENDATIONS	217
9.5	CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY	220
9.6	POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH IN RURAL MIGRATION	220
REFERENCES		222
APPENDICES		242



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1:	A comparison of social indicators for South Africa and Limpopo	4
Table 1.2:	Important demographic and selected economic characteristics in Limpopo	7
Table 1.3:	Characteristics of farming households in the former homelands of Limpopo	11
Table 1.4:	Gini Coefficients indicating income inequality in South Africa.....	20
Table 1.5:	Comparison of Gini coefficients of countries at similar level of Development in 2001.....	20
Table 2.1	Economic indicators differentiating landowners and other households in Rabura, Eastern Cape.....	46
Table 4. 1:	Types of migration	87
Table 6.1:	Distribution of household members by age and sub-regions.....	123
Table 6.2:	Marital status of household members	125
Table 6.3:	Main vocational Status of household members (mainly residents)	126
Table 6.4	Average household size by income group	128
Table 6.5:	Average household size by subregions	128
Table 6.6:	Land categories 1 to 8 for all households (N=573).....	131
Table 6.7:	Characteristics of households with and without access to land.	132
Table 6.8:	Land categories (ha) for households by Regions.....	133
Table 6.9:	Land categories by six sub-regions (count and percent)	134
Table 6.10:	Households with migrants by land category and by surveyed regions	136
Table 6.11:	Livestock ownership	138
Table 6.12:	Ownership and value of farm assets other than land and livestock.....	138
Table 6.13:	Farm-based sources of household income	142
Table 6. 14	Migrants' contributions to household income (N=573).....	144



Table 6.15:	Distribution of land ownership and share of remittance in household income (N 320 = landed households).....	145
Table 6. 16:	Annual household income in surveyed sub-regions.....	148
Table 6. 17:	Households reporting income from source by sub-regions.....	149
Table 6.18:	Households with migrant by sub-regions and regions	150
Table 6. 19:	Reasons for migration.....	152
Table 6.20:	Migrant current economic activity.....	155
Table 6.21:	Activity of migrants per region in the Limpopo Province- South Africa.....	155
Table 6.22:	Effect of migration on family responsibilities	156
Table 6.23:	Use of cash remittances	160
Table 7.1:	Total, per capita and adult equivalent Gini coefficients for different categories assets.....	167
Table 7. 2:	AE value of HH assets in sub regions.....	173
Table 7.3:	1AE income Gini by sub-region & regions.....	174
Table 7. 4:	Dependent and independent variables used in the model	176
Table 7.5:	Correlation Matrices – migration and assets	179
Table 7. 6:	Communalities of principal component.....	183
Table 7.7:	Initial and rotated principal components and total their variance.....	184
Table 7. 8:	Unrotated Component Matrix*	187
Table 7.9:	Rotated Component Matrix.....	188
Table 7.10:	Factors influencing migration.....	191
Table 8.1:	Composition of 1999 / 2000 income inequality in Limpopo	202
Table 8. 2:	Composition of 1999 / 2000 income inequality in six sub-regions	205

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: A General framework of the household-migration decision-making process	36
Figure 3.1 Kuznets Inverted Curve	56



Figure 4. 1:	Framework Analysing Migration Decision, Impact and Consequences.....	89
Figure 5. 1:	The districts and sites in the study area.....	102
Figure 6.1:	Age composition of sample members	122
Figure 6.2:	Gender of household head.....	124
Figure 6.3:	Sectors of economic activities for sample population	127
Figure 6.4:	Share of remittances in household income and land per household	146
Figure 6. 5:	Contribution of different sources of income to total Household income	147
Figure 7.1:	Total land owned (land-owners only, N=320)	169
Figure 7. 2:	Lorenz curve for Adult Equivalent value of livestock.....	171
Figure 7.3:	Scree test of eigenvalues for component analysis.....	186