MIGRATION PATTERNS OF PROPRIETORS IN SWAZILAND'S URBAN INFORMAL SECTOR

BY

M.S. MATSEBULA
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

PROJECT PAPER No. 9
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITY OF SWAZILAND
OCTOBER 1988

MIGRATION PATTERNS OF PROPRIETORS IN SWAZILAND'S URBAN INFORMAL SECTOR

BY

M.S. MATSEBULA
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

PROJECT PAPER No. 9
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITY OF SWAZILAND
OCTOBER 1988

I. INTRODUCTION

During the period June 1983-March 1984, a lot of data was collected under a survey conducted on Swaziland's urban informal sector (hereafter abbreviated to UIS). The UIS can be construed as that part of the urban economy comprising very small production units which are typically outside the purview of regular statistical coverage and income taxation.

These units are characterized mainly by self-employment (at times assisted by unpaid family labour or very few hired workers and apprentices); low division of labour; low capital intensity; non-strict but long hours of operation; under-employment; low incomes; and rudimentary book-keeping at best. The activities include retail trade (for example in fruits, vegetables and soft goods); household and personal services (for example, repair of utensils, watches and radios; haircuts); and manufacturing (for example, food preparation, sewing, welding and carpentry). The owner-operators are referred to as proprietors.

The procedures followed in collecting, editing and computerizing the data are described in Matsebula (1986a). The present paper is the fourth in a series designed to analyze this data.[1] What motivated it is the desire to investigate the migration patterns of the proprietors. This investigation will be conducted within a theoretical framework which incorporates expected incomes, migration costs and skills as major determinants of migration. Accordingly, the empirical analysis of this paper will be a test (albeit indirect because of data constraints) of the corresponding model.

The rest of this paper is divided into five sections. Section II outlines the theoretical framework or model within which the subsequent discussion will be conducted. Sections III - V analyze the migration patterns of the proprietors alternately focusing at three levels - namely, national, regional and activity. Section VI summarizes the major conclusions of the paper.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Most of the literature on migration in developing economies focuses on rural-urban migration. There is now a consensus on the determinants of such migration. Whilst some of these determinants could be psychological, cultural, social or political in nature, the predominant ones are economic in nature. As Todaro (1976, p. 193) puts it, "there now seems to be widespread agreement among economists and non-economists alike that rural-urban migration can be explained primarily by the influence of economic factors".

The influence of economic factors on migration has also been demonstrated in the case of Swaziland. For instance, Kuper (1947, p. 18) observes that "the causes of migration are many and of unequal force... (but) the economic drive is undoubtedly the most effective".[2] Rosen-Prinz and Prinz (1978) found that 84% of migrants leave for economic reasons.[3] Doran (1977) and de Vletter (1978) also found a significant influence of economic factors (mainly expected sectoral income differentials). Finally, the analysis in Matsebula (1981, pp. 76-87, 146-154) derives from the premise that economic factors are predominant.

The major determinants of migration which come out of the current literature are expected sectoral income differentials and migration costs.[4] These are the determinants we wish to interprete in the context of regional migration. Our interest in regional migration derives from the fact that the central piece of information collected from the 1983/84 survey was a response to the question "Where did the proprietor grow up?" This is the information which has been computerized; and this is the information on which will hinge all of the empirical analysis.

We can distinguish two types of regional migration that are pertinent to the subject matter of this paper. The first is migration from a rural area in one region to an urban area in another region. Whilst the converse is theoretically possible, it is

of no consequence in the context of the Swaziland economy. Accordingly, we shall focus on the former. Let us refer to it as vertical regional migration. It coincides with standard rural-urban migration. It is for this reason that its determinants are identical to those typically posited for rural-urban migration.

The second type is migration from one urban area in one region into another urban area in another region. Let us refer to this as horizontal regional migration. If the destination area is identical in all economic respects to the origin area, then non-economic factors would be primarily responsible for the migration. If the destination area is perceived to have, on a net basis, higher economic returns than the origin area, then economic factors would be primarily responsible for the migration. Thus, the model used to explain rural-urban migration is also fully applicable to this situation.

On the basis of the widely-held premise (supported amply in both the theoretical and empirical literature) that migration is primarily influenced by economic factors, we can posit that the model for explaining rural-urban migration also applies to both vertical and horizontal regional migration in the context of the Swaziland economy. Furthermore, the information collected from the 1983/84 survey relates largely to the time before the proprietor entered the UIS (i.e., when growing up). The majority of UIS proprietors grew up in the rural sector. They moved into the urban sector in the hope of improving their economic welfare. Thus, the rural-urban migration model applies fully to the regional migration that is of interest to this paper.

The general hypothesis can then be couched in terms of the determinants arising out of the rural-urban migration model, with suitable extensions. Accordingly, it is hypothesized that a region which is perceived to have relatively high economic opportunities will receive a relatively high proportion of migrants, other things being equal. It is out of these migrants

that UIS proprietors emanate. Put differently, migrants will move out of regions whose expected net returns are low into those regions whose expected net returns are high; after taking into account migration costs and skills already possessed. The returns are net in the sense of having adjusted for cost of living differentials and taxation.

Migration costs on the other hand include not only out-of-pocket expenses (for travel, food, accommodation and the like), but also psychic expenses (in the form of leaving friends, relatives and a familiar environment). It may be noted in this connection that de Vletter (1978, p. 20) found that the majority of migrants orginated from areas near their places of employment (in the case of those formal sector employees whose households were permanently in the rural sector). Rosen-Prinz and Prinz (1978) found that urban dwellers make frequent visits to their rural kinfolk. This would certainly be possible if transportation costs are not prohibitive. The latter is possible if distances involved are short. Both of these findings suggest that migration costs are an important determinant of migration. They tend to discourage migration.

Entrance into the UIS can be construed as comprising three steps. The first step is in the form of the movement from the rural into the urban area (or from the area of low expected net returns into the area of high expected net returns, typically, an urban area). The immigrant then becomes part of the urban labour force. He will most probably be unemployed initially because it takes time to search for and obtain a job in the formal sector or to set oneself up in an UIS business operation.

The second step is in the form of movement from the urban pool of unemployment into a particular activity within the UIS. The activity first entered will depend largely on the skills already possessed by the immigrant and the associated capital

requirements. If the capital requirements are low, then he will go into that activity where he can use his skills profitably. Let us refer to this as the desired or permanent activity. In this case the capital can come from the immigrant's savings or informal credit sources. If, on the other hand, the capital requirements associated with his desired activity are high, then he will initially enter an activity whose capital and skill requirements are low. His intention will be to accumulate enough capital with which to eventually move into his desired activity. Let us refer to this as the transitory activity.

The third step is in the form of movement from the transitory into the desired or permanent activity within the UIS. This step applies not only to those who were forced into transitory activities because of inadequate capital, but also those who initially had no specialized skills and little capital. The latter would be free to move into other activities later after having accumulated some capital, skills and knowledge within the UIS. If they so move, then the previous activity was transitory. Hence the three-step process of movement into the UIS is quite general in coverage.

In summary then, we can distinguish three major determinants of regional migration. The first is expected net returns in the region of immigration relative to expected net returns in the region of emigration. The second is the cost of migration (encompassing both out-of-pocket and psychic expenses). The third is the nature of skills possessed by the migrant. The whole movement into the UIS can be broken down into three steps - namely, from rural into urban area; from urban area unemployment into a transitory activity; and then from a transitory into a desired or permanent activity.

III. NATIONAL MIGRATION PATTERNS

In this section we analyze the migration patterns from a national perspective. This will yield a bird's eyeview or composite picture of migration for proprietors in Swaziland's UIS. Wherever appropriate, we shall indicate whether or not the emerging picture is consistent with the theoretical framework outlined in the last section.

The starting point is the number of proprietors in each region and activity as contained in the sample on which the 1983/84 survey was based. This information is presented in Table III.1.
The activity codes are defined as follows:

1 = Sewing, Knitting and Tailoring
2 = Handicrafts and Traditional Attire
3 = Fruits and Vegetable Retail
4 = All Other Food
5 = Shoes and Leather Items
6 = Metal Work
7 = Wood Work
8 = Other
ALL = All Activities Pooled Together

The next question is what number of these proprietors grew up elsewhere and then moved into the present region where they were found during the survey. The answer is presented in Table III.2. These are the numbers which form the centre of interest in this paper. They will be transformed and analyzed from different perspectives.

Using Tables III.1 and III.2, we can then compute the proportions shown in Table III.3. There are four observations we can make from this Table. First, 48% of the proprietors grew up elsewhere and then migrated into their present region. This is a high proportion; indicating a considerable degree of movement into the UIS. This encompasses both the vertical and horizontal types of migration defined in the last section.

TABLE III.1

NUMBER OF PROPRIETORS IN SAMPLE BY ACTIVITY AND REGION

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
1	16	166	24	5	211
2	14	51	8	3	76
3	28	97	16	7	148
4	10	65	10	7	92
5	6	21	3	0	30
6	3	20	3	2	28
7	5	18	1	2	26
8	3	20	2	0	25
ALL	85	458	67	26	636

TABLE III.2

NUMBER OF PROPRIETORS WHO IMMIGRATED INTO PRESENT REGION

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
1	8	83	15	0	106
2	6	24	2	0	32
3	12	42	10	2	66
4	4	35	4	1	44
5	1	15	3	0	19
6	3	9	3	0	15
7	1	10	0	1	12
8	1	9	1	0	11
ALL	36	227	38	4	305

IMMIGRANTS AS A PROPORTION OF TOTAL PROPRIETORS

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
1	50,0	50,0	62,5	0,0	50,2
2	42,9	47,1	25,0	0,0	42,1
3	42,9	43,3	62,5	28,6	44,6
4	40,0	53,8	40,0	14,3	47,8
5	16,7	71,4	100,0	0,0	63,3
6	100,0	45,0	100,0	0,0	53,6
7	20,0	55,6	0,0	50,0	46,2
8	33,3	45,0	50,0	0,0	44,0
ALL	42,4	49,6	56,7	15,4	48,0

SOURCES: Computed from Tables III.1 and III.2

The second observation is that the region which received the highest proportion of immigrants is Lubombo; followed by Manzini; then Hhohho; and finally Shiselweni. The Lubombo situation could be reflective not only of the fact that there is a high degree of economic activity and concentration of localized markets for UIS products (as represented by the formal business enterprises and employees in Tshaneni, Mhlume, Simunye, Siteki and Big Bend), but also of the relatively recent start-up of those activities (as compared to Hhohho and Manzini). The high proprotions in Manzini and Hhohho are reflective of the high expected net returns associated with the high concentration of economic activities and localized markets for UIS products. The smallest proportion in the case of Shiselweni is reflective of the low expected net returns there; associated with the fact that it is the least industrialized of the four regions.

The third observation from Table III.3 is that, from an aggregative viewpoint, the activities which received above-average proportions of immigrants are Activities 1,5 and 6. All three activities require specialized skills. From the available information, it is not possible to tell whether these proprietors moved directly into these activities on their arrival in the region in question or only moved into them after a while (i.e., after having entered transitory activities). We shall return to this point later.

The fourth observation is that from regional viewpoints, the activities which received the highest proportions of migrants are Activities 1,2,3 and 6 in the case of Hhohho; Activities 1,4,5 and 7 in the case of Manzini; Activities 1,3,5 and 6 in the case of Lubombo; and Activities 3 and 7 in the case of Shiselweni. Those activities which have above-average proportions in at least two regions are Activities 1,3,5,6 and 7. All of these activities (with the exception of Activity 3) require specialized skills. Because of data constraints, it is not possible to tell whether these activities were entered into directly on arrival or after

The second observation is that the region which received the highest proportion of immigrants is Lubombo; followed by Manzini; then Hhohho; and finally Shiselweni. The Lubombo situation could be reflective not only of the fact that there is a high degree of economic activity and concentration of localized markets for UIS products (as represented by the formal business enterprises and employees in Tshaneni, Mhlume, Simunye, Siteki and Big Bend), but also of the relatively recent start-up of those activities (as compared to Hhohho and Manzini). The high proprotions in Manzini and Hhohho are reflective of the high expected net returns associated with the high concentration of economic activities and localized markets for UIS products. The smallest proportion in the case of Shiselweni is reflective of the low expected net returns there; associated with the fact that it is the least industrialized of the four regions.

The third observation from Table III.3 is that, from an aggregative viewpoint, the activities which received above-average proportions of immigrants are Activities 1,5 and 6. All three activities require specialized skills. From the available information, it is not possible to tell whether these proprietors moved directly into these activities on their arrival in the region in question or only moved into them after a while (i.e., after having entered transitory activities). We shall return to this point later.

The fourth observation is that from regional viewpoints, the activities which received the highest proportions of migrants are Activities 1,2,3 and 6 in the case of Hhohho; Activities 1,4,5 and 7 in the case of Manzini; Activities 1,3,5 and 6 in the case of Lubombo; and Activities 3 and 7 in the case of Shiselweni. Those activities which have above-average proportions in at least two regions are Activities 1,3,5,6 and 7. All of these activities (with the exception of Activity 3) require specialized skills. Because of data constraints, it is not possible to tell whether these activities were entered into directly on arrival or after

having gone through transitory activities. However, to the extent that the majority of these activities (namely, Activities 3,6 and 7) have above-average capital requirements,[5] it can be conjectured that these activities were entered after the transitory steps.

Let us now turn to those who grew up in a given region and then moved out into a different region. This is essentially the flip side of the picture analyzed above. The relevant numbers are presented in Table III.4. When converted into proportions of proprietors in the sample they appear as shown in Table III.5. The pattern revealed by these numbers is consistent with the four observations outlined above.

Let us now present the migration levels in an origin-destination format. This is done in Table III.6. Next, we convert these levels into proportions using alternately the column and row totals as divisors. The results from the former operation are presented in Table III.7; whilst those from the latter operation are presented in Table III.8.

There are two observations we wish to make from Table III.7. First, from an overall perspective, the highest proportion of the proprietors come from Shiselweni; followed by Hhohho; then Lubombo. Trailing the list are migrants from Manzini and the rest of the world. The lead position by Shiselweni is not surprising in view of the fact that it has the lowest degree of economic concentration among the four regions.

The second observation is that from a regional perspective, the leading sources of proprietors are Manzini (in the case of Hhohho and Lubombo), Shiselweni (in the case of Manzini), and Hhohho (in the case of Shiselweni). This picture is not inconsistent with the hypothesis that high expected net returns induce migration.

It can be noted from Table III.8 that from both the overall and regional perspectives, Manzini is the leading destination of migrants. Given the high concentration of

NUMBER OF PROPRIETORS WHO EMIGRATED FROM PRESENT REGION

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
1	22	10	18	46	96
2	6	2	6	15	29
3	20	10	11	22	63
4	16	5	4	16	41
5	4	1	1	9	15
6	2	2	1	7	12
7	5	0	1	3	9
8	2	2	2	3	9
ALL	77	32	44	121	274

TABLE III.5

EMIGRANTS AS A PROPORTION OF TOTAL PROPRIETORS

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
1	137,5	6,0	75,0	920,0	45,5
2	42,9	3,9	75,0	500,0	38,2
3	71,4	10,3	68,8	314,3	42,6
4	160,0	7,7	40,0	228,6	44,6
5	66,7	4,8	33,3	...	50,0
6	133,3	10,0	33,3	350,0	42,9
7	40,0	0,0	100,0	150,0	34,6
8	166,7	10,0	100,0	...	36,0
ALL	90,6	7,0	65,7	465,4	43,1

SOURCES: Computed from Tables III.1 and III. 4.

NOTE: "..." denotes infinity.

TABLE III.6

OVERALL MIGRATION BY ORIGIN AND DESTINATION
(NUMBER OF PROPRIETORS)

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
HHOHHO	0	63	12	2	77
MANZINI	18	0	13	1	32
LUBOMBO	3	40	0	1	44
SHISELWENI	11	98	12	0	121
REST OF WORLD	4	26	1	0	31
TOTAL	36	227	38	4	305

TABLE III.7

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY REGION OF ORIGIN

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	27,8	31,6	50,0	25,2
MANZINI	50,0	0,0	34,2	25,0	10,5
LUBOMBO	8,3	17,6	0,0	25,0	14,4
SHISELWENI	30,6	43,2	31,6	0,0	39,7
REST OF WORLD	11,1	11,4	2,6	0,0	10,2
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table III.6.

TABLE III.8

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY REGION OF DESTINATION

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	81,8	15,6	2,6	100,0
MANZINI	56,3	0,0	40,6	3,1	100,0
LUBOMBO	6,8	90,9	0,0	2,3	100,0
SHISELWENI	9,1	81,0	9,9	0,0	100,0
REST OF WORLD	12,9	83,9	3,2	0,0	100,0
TOTAL	11,8	74,4	12,5	1,3	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table III.6.

economic activity in Manzini (the capital town of Manzini is known as the "business hub of Swaziland"), this picture is to be expected. It is consistent with the hypothesis that high expected net returns induce migration.

We can summarize the analysis in this section in terms of three statements. First, there is a high degree of regional mobility into the UIS. This reflects the structural changes that the Swaziland economy is experiencing. As a result, the UIS is being used as an important source of income by a high proportion of migrants. Second, the observed pattern of migration is consistent with the hypothesis that migrants are influenced by differentials in expected net returns (as proxied by degrees of regional industrialization). Third, it can be surmized on the basis of skill and capital requirements of the activities containing above-average proportions of migrants that the three-step migration process is largely followed.

IV. MIGRATION PATTERNS FROM REGIONAL VIEWPOINTS

In this section we focus on migration from a regional perspective. In other words, we analyze the migration of proprietors from the standpoint of one region at a time. This becomes the second level of analysis in the three-tier framework mentioned at the beginning of the paper.

The starting point is the number of proprietors who immigrated into each of the four regions. This immigration is categorized by source (i.e., region of origin) and destination activity (i.e., activity in which involved at the time of enumeration). The corresponding numbers are presented in Tables IV.1-IV.4; representing immigration into Hhohho, Manzini, Lubombo and Shiselweni, respectively. These Tables are a detailed breakdown of Table III.6 presented in the last section.

The next step is the conversion of these numbers into percentages to bring out more clearly the patterns of migration.

TABLE IV.1

IMMIGRATION INTO HHOHHO BY ORIGIN AND ACTIVITY

(NUMBER OF PROPRIETORS)

ACTIVITY CODE	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	REST OF WORLD	TOTAL
1	5	0	3	0	8
2	0	2	3	1	6
3	7	0	4	1	12
4	3	0	1	0	4
5	1	0	0	0	1
6	1	1	0	1	3
7	0	0	0	1	1
8	1	0	0	0	1
ALL	18	3	11	4	36

TABLE IV.2

IMMIGRATION INTO MANZINI BY ORIGIN AND ACTIVITY

(NUMBER OF PROPRIETORS)

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	REST OF WORLD	TOTAL
1	17	18	38	10	83
2	6	4	12	2	24
3	14	10	17	1	42
4	15	4	13	3	35
5	3	1	7	4	15
6	2	0	5	2	9
7	4	1	3	2	10
8	2	2	3	2	9
ALL	63	40	98	26	227

TABLE IV.3

IMMIGRATION INTO LUBOMBO BY ORIGIN AND ACTIVITY
(NUMBER OF PROPRIETORS)

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO	MANZINI	SHISELWENI	REST OF WORLD	TOTAL
1	5	5	5	0	15
2	0	2	0	0	2
3	5	3	1	1	10
4	1	1	2	0	4
5	1	0	2	0	3
6	0	1	2	0	3
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	1	0	0	1
ALL	12	13	12	1	38

TABLE IV.4

IMMIGRATION INTO SHISELWENI BY ORIGIN AND ACTIVITY

(NUMBER OF PROPRIETORS)

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	REST OF WORLD	TOTAL
1	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	0	1	0	2
4	0	1	0	0	1
5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	1	0	0	0	1
8	0	0	0	0	0
ALL	2	1	1	0	4

This is done in Tables IV.5-IV.8 where the percentages are calculated column-wise; and Tables IV.9-IV.12 where the percentages are calculated row-wise. With so many Tables, it would be tedious to attempt a summary of observations for each of them. Instead, we shall merely highlight those results that have a bearing on the predictions of the theoretical framework outlined in Section II.

It can be observed from Tables IV.5-IV.8 that the two activities with the highest proportions of immigrants are mostly Activities 1 and 3. This is the case in three of the four regions. To the extent that the basic skills requisite for Activity 1 are typically acquired as part of household chores when growing and Activity 3 does not require any specialized skills, this result would be consistent with the second step in the three-step migration process (i.e., from urban unemployment into transitory activities).

From Tables IV.9-IV.11 it can be observed that the migrants in most of the activities come predominantly from Manzini and Shiselweni in the case of Hhohho; Shiselweni and Hhohho in the case of Manzini; Manzini and Shiselweni in the case of Lubombo. This pattern is consistent with the hypothesis that people move in response to expected net returns. In this case the movement may be from a rural area in one region into an urban area in another region (i.e., vertical regional migration);or from an urban area in a region with low expected net returns into another urban area in another region with high expected net returns (i.e., horizontal regional migration). Furthermore, this pattern is consistent with the first step in the three-step migration process outlined in Section II.

It can also be observed from Tables IV.9-IV.11 that the activities which generally receive above-average proportions of immigrants are Activities 1 and 3. In the case of Activity 1, it is certainly the case in all three Tables. In the case of

TABLE IV.5

DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS INTO HHOHHO BY ACTIVITY PER ORIGIN

ACTIVITY CODE	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	REST OF WORLD %	TOTAL %
1	27,8	0,0	27,3	0,0	22,2
2	0,0	66,7	27,3	25,0	16,7
3	38,9	0,0	36,4	25,0	33,3
4	16,7	0,0	9,0	0,0	11,1
5	5,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,8
6	5,6	33,3	0,0	25,0	8,3
7	0,0	0,0	0,0	25,0	2,8
8	5,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,8
ALL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table IV.1.

TABLE IV.6

DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS INTO MANZINI BY ACTIVITY PER ORIGIN

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	REST OF WORLD %	TOTAL %
1	27,0	45,0	38,8	38,5	36,6
2	9,5	10,0	12,2	7,7	10,6
3	22,2	25,0	17,3	3,8	18,5
4	23,8	10,0	13,3	11,5	15,4
5	4,8	2,5	7,1	15,4	6,6
6	3,2	0,0	5,1	7,7	4,0
7	6,3	2,5	3,1	7,7	4,4
8	3,2	5,0	3,1	7,7	3,9
ALL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table IV.2.

TABLE IV.7

DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS INTO LUBOMBO BY ACTIVITY PER ORIGIN

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	SHISELWENI %	REST OF WORLD %	TOTAL %
1	41,7	38,5	41,7	0,0	39,5
2	0,0	15,4	0,0	0,0	5,3
3	41,7	23,1	8,3	100,0	26,3
4	8,3	7,7	16,7	0,0	10,5
5	8,3	0,0	16,7	0,0	7,9
6	0,0	7,7	16,6	0,0	7,9
7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
8	0,0	7,6	0,0	0,0	2,6
ALL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table IV.3.

TABLE IV.8

DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS INTO SHISELWENI BY ACTIVITY PER ORIGIN

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	REST OF WORLD %	TOTAL %
1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
3	50,0	0,0	100,0	0,0	50,0
4	0,0	100,0	0,0	0,0	25,0
5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
7	50,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	25,0
8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
ALL	100,0	100,0	100,0	0,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table IV. 4

TABLE IV.9

DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS INTO HHOHHO BY REGION PER ACTIVITY

ACTIVITY CODE	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	REST OF WORLD %	TOTAL %
1	62,5	0,0	37,5	0,0	100,0
2	0,0	33,3	50,0	16,7	100,0
3	58,3	0,0	33,3	8,4	100,0
4	75,0	0,0	25,0	0,0	100,0
5	100,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
6	33,3	33,3	0,0	33,4	100,0
7	0,0	0,0	0,0	100,0	100,0
8	100,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
ALL	50,0	8,3	30,6	11,1	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table IV.1.

TABLE IV.10

DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS INTO MANZINI BY REGION PER ACTIVITY

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	REST OF WORLD %	TOTAL %
1	20,5	21,7	45,8	12,0	100,0
2	25,0	16,7	50,0	8,3	100,0
3	33,3	23,8	40,5	2,4	100,0
4	42,9	11,4	37,1	8,6	100,0
5	20,0	6,7	46,7	26,6	100,0
6	22,2	0,0	55,6	22,2	100,0
7	40,0	10,0	30,0	20,0	100,0
8	22,2	22,2	33,3	22,3	100,0
ALL	27,8	17,6	43,2	11,4	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table IV.2.

TABLE IV.11

DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS INTO LUBOMBO BY REGION PER ACTIVITY

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	SHISELWENI %	REST OF WORLD %	TOTAL %
1	33,3	33,3	33,4	0,0	100,0
2	0,0	100,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
3	50,0	30,0	10,0	10,0	100,0
4	25,0	25,0	50,0	0,0	100,0
5	33,3	0,0	66,7	0,0	100,0
6	0,0	33,3	66,7	0,0	100,0
7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
8	0,0	100,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
ALL	31,6	34,2	31,6	2,6	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table IV.3.

TABLE IV.12

DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS INTO SHISELWENI BY REGION PER ACTIVITY

ACTIVITY CODE	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	REST OF WORLD %	TOTAL %
1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
3	50,0	0,0	50,0	0,0	100,0
4	0,0	100,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
7	100,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
ALL	50,0	25,0	25,0	0,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table IV.4.

Activity 3, it is the case in two of the three Tables (which is still a majority). This pattern tends to confirm the earlier inference drawn from Tables IV.5-IV.8.

Table IV.12 has too few non-zero proportions to enable reasonable inferences about the sources of the immigrants and the popular destination activities. All that can be said in this connection is that Activity 3 has tended to receive an above-average proportion of immigrants. As such, the earlier inference regarding this activity is further confirmed. The numerous zeros in this Table are indicative of the fact that the Shiselweni region has mostly been experiencing emigration rather than immigration. It is the least industrialized of the four regions and has the lowest concentration of localized markets for UIS products. As such, this Table is consistent with the hypothesis that people move in response to differentials in expected net returns.

There are two general conclusions emanating from the above analysis. First, there has been both vertical and horizontal regional migration in response to differentials in expected net returns. This coincides with the first step in the three-step migration process posited in Section II. Second, Activities 1 and 3 have received above-average proportions of migrants. To the extent that they generally do not require specialized skills to enter them initially, they could be considered as transitory activities (i.e., activities for accumulating enough capital to move into more permanent activities). If the immigrants find such transitory activities highly profitable, they may turn them into permanent accupations. The movement into transitory activities comprises the second step in the three-step migration process; whereas the movement into permanent activities comprises the final step.

V. MIGRATION PATTERNS FROM ACTIVITY VIEWPOINTS

In this section we focus on migration patterns from an activity perspective. In other words, we analyze the migration patterns from the standpoint of one activity at a time. This becomes the third level of analysis in the three-tier framework mentioned at the beginning of the paper.

The starting point is the number of proprietors who moved from one region into another in the case of each of the eight activities. These numbers are a further breakdown and arrangement of the numbers presented in the last two sections. The corresponding numbers are presented in Tables V.1-V.8.

The next step is to convert these figures into proportions so as to bring out more clearly the patterns of migration. This is done in Tables V.9-V.16 where the proportions are computed column-wise; and in Tables V.17-V.24 where the proportions are computed row-wise. Rather than attempt to list observations in terms of each of these Tables (which would clearly be tedious), we propose to merely highlight general observations emanating from these Tables taken jointly.

It can be observed from the last column of Tables V.9-V.16 that the highest proportion of the migrants come from Shiselweni.[6] Since the Shiselweni region has the lowest concentration of economic activities (and, therefore, lowest market-size for UIS output) the migrants were induced away by higher expected net returns. Hence a major component of the migration model has been validated.

Turning to Columns 2-5 of Tables V.9-V.16, we can make four general observations. First, Hhohho gets its immigrants mostly from Manzini. This is the case in six out of the eight activities (namely, Activities 1,3,4,5,6 and 8) where the highest proportion is sourced from Manzini. Second, Manzini gets its immigrants mostly from Shiselweni. This is the case in six of out the eight activities (namely, Activities 1,2,3,5, 6 and 8) where the highest proportion is sourced from Shiselweni.

TABLE V.1

MIGRATION LEVELS FOR ACTIVITY 1 (SEWING, KNITTING & TAILORING)

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
HHOHHO	0	17	5	0	22
MANZINI	5	0	5	0	10
LUBOMBO	0	18	0	0	18
SHISELWENI	3	38	5	0	46
REST OF WORLD	0	10	0	0	10
TOTAL	8	83	15	0	106

SOURCES: Tables IV.1 - IV.4.

TABLE V.2

MIGRATION LEVELS FOR ACTIVITY 2 (HANDICRAFTS & TRADITIONAL ATTIRE)

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
HHOHHO	0	6	0	0	6
MANZINI	0	0	2	0	2
LUBOMBO	2	4	0	0	6
SHISELWENI	3	12	0	0	15
REST OF WORLD	1	2	0	0	3
TOTAL	6	24	2	0	32

SOURCES: Tables IV.1 - IV.4.

TABLE V.3

MIGRATION LEVELS FOR ACTIVITY 3 (FRUITS & VEGETABLE RETAIL)

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
HHOHHO	0	14	5	1	20
MANZINI	7	0	3	0	10
LUBOMBO	0	10	0	1	11
SHISELWENI	4	17	1	0	22
REST OF WORLD	1	1	1	0	3
TOTAL	12	42	10	2	66

SOURCES: Tables IV.1 - IV.4

TABLE V.4

MIGRATION LEVELS FOR ACTIVITY 4 (ALL OTHER FOOD)

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
HHOHHO	0	15	1	0	16
MANZINI	3	0	1	1	5
LUBOMBO	0	4	0	0	4
SHISELWENI	1	13	2	0	16
REST OF WORLD	0	3	0	0	3
TOTAL	4	35	4	1	44

SOURCES: Tables IV.1 - IV.4.

TABLE V.5

MIGRATION LEVELS FOR ACTIVITY 5 (SHOES & LEATHER ITEMS)

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
HHOHHO	0	3	1	0	4
MANZINI	1	0	0	0	1
LUBOMBO	0	1	0	0	1
SHISELWENI	0	7	2	0	9
REST OF WORLD	0	4	0	0	4
TOTAL	1	15	3	0	19

SOURCES: Tables IV.1 - IV.4.

TABLE V.6

MIGRATION LEVELS FOR ACTIVITY 6 (METAL WORK)

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
HHOHHO	0	2	0	0	2
MANZINI	1	0	1	0	2
LUBOMBO	1	0	0	0	1
SHISELWENI	0	5	2	0	7
REST OF WORLD	1	2	0	0	3
TOTAL	3	9	3	0	15

SOURCES: Tables IV.1 - IV.4.

TABLE V.7

MIGRATION LEVELS FOR ACTIVITY 7 (WOOD WORK)

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
HHOHHO	0	4	0	1	5
MANZINI	0	0	0	0	0
LUBOMBO	0	1	0	0	1
SHISELWENI	0	3	0	0	3
REST OF WORLD	1	2	0	0	3
TOTAL	1	10	0	1	12

SOURCES: Tables IV.1 - IV.4.

TABLE V.8

MIGRATION LEVELS FOR ACTIVITY 8 (OTHER)

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO	MANZINI	LUBOMBO	SHISELWENI	TOTAL
HHOHHO	0	2	0	0	2
MANZINI	1	0	1	0	2
LUBOMBO	0	2	0	0	2
SHISELWENI	0	3	0	0	3
REST OF WORLD	0	2	0	0	2
TOTAL	1	9	1	0	11

SOURCES: Tables IV.1 - IV.4.

TABLE V.9

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY ORIGIN FOR ACTIVITY 1

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	20,5	33,3	0,0	20,8
MANZINI	62,5	0,0	33,3	0,0	9,4
LUBOMBO	0,0	21,7	0,0	0,0	17,0
SHISELWENI	37,5	45,8	33,4	0,0	43,4
REST OF WORLD	0,0	12,0	0,0	0,0	9,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	0,0	100,0

SOURCES: Computed from Table V.1.

TABLE V.10

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY ORIGIN FOR ACTIVITY 2

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	25,0	0,0	0,0	18,8
MANZINI	0,0	0,0	100,0	0,0	6,3
LUBOMBO	33,3	16,7	0,0	0,0	18,8
SHISELWENI	50,0	50,0	0,0	0,0	46,9
REST OF WORLD	16,7	8,3	0,0	0,0	9,2
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	0,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.2.

TABLE V.11

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY ORIGIN FOR ACTIVITY 3

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	33,3	50,0	50,0	30,3
MANZINI	58,3	0,0	30,0	0,0	15,2
LUBOMBO	0,0	23,8	0,0	50,0	16,7
SHISELWENI	33,3	40,5	10,0	0,0	33,3
REST OF WORLD	8,4	2,4	10,0	0,0	4,5
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.3.

TABLE V.12

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY ORIGIN FOR ACTIVITY 4

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	42,9	25,0	0,0	36,4
MANZINI	75,0	0,0	25,0	100,0	11,4
LUBOMBO	0,0	11,4	0,0	0,0	9,1
SHISELWENI	25,0	37,1	50,0	0,0	36,4
REST OF WORLD	0,0	8,6	0,0	0,0	6,7
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.4.

TABLE V.13

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY ORIGIN FOR ACTIVITY 5

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	20,0	33,3	0,0	21,1
MANZINI	100,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,3
LUBOMBO	0,0	6,7	0,0	0,0	5,3
SHISELWENI	0,0	46,7	66,7	0,0	47,4
REST OF WORLD	0,0	26,6	0,0	0,0	20,9
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	0,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.5.

TABLE V.14

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	22,2	0,0	0,0	13,3
MANZINI	33,3	0,0	33,3	0,0	13,3
LUBOMBO	33,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,7
SHISELWENI	0,0	55,6	66,7	0,0	46,7
REST OF WORLD	33,4	22,2	0,0	0,0	20,0
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	0,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.6.

TABLE V.15

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY ORIGIN FOR ACTIVITY 7

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	40,0	0,0	100,0	41,7
MANZINI	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
LUBOMBO	0,0	10,0	0,0	0,0	8,3
SHISELWENI	0,0	30,0	0,0	0,0	25,0
REST OF WORLD	100,0	20,0	0,0	0,0	25,0
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	0,0	100,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.7.

TABLE V.16

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY ORIGIN FOR ACTIVITY 8

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	22,2	0,0	0,0	18,2
MANZINI	100,0	0,0	100,0	0,0	18,2
LUBOMBO	0,0	22,2	0,0	0,0	18,2
SHISELWENI	0,0	33,3	0,0	0,0	27,3
REST OF WORLD	0,0	22,3	0,0	0,0	18,1
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	0,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.8.

TABLE V.17

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY DESTINATION FOR ACTIVITY 1

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	77,3	22,7	0,0	100,0
MANZINI	50,0	0,0	50,0	0,0	100,0
LUBOMBO	0,0	100,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
SHISELWENI	6,5	82,6	10,9	0,0	100,0
REST OF WORLD	0,0	100,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
TOTAL	7,5	78,3	14,2	0,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.1.

TABLE V.18

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY DESTINATION FOR ACTIVITY 2

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	100,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
MANZINI	0,0	0,0	100,0	0,0	100,0
LUBOMBO	33,3	66,7	0,0	0,0	100,0
SHISELWENI	20,0	80,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
REST OF WORLD	33,3	66,7	0,0	0,0	100,0
TOTAL	18,8	75,0	6,2	0,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.2.

TABLE V.19

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY DESTINATION FOR ACTIVITY 3

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	70,0	25,0	5,0	100,0
MANZINI	70,0	0,0	30,0	0,0	100,0
LUBOMBO	0,0	90,9	0,0	9,1	100,0
SHISELWENI	18,2	77,3	4,5	0,0	100,0
REST OF WORLD	33,3	33,3	33,4	0,0	100,0
TOTAL	18,2	63,6	15,2	3,0	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.3.

TABLE V.20

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY DESTINATION FOR ACTIVITY 4

ORIGIN	DESTINATION				
	HHOHHO %	MANZINI %	LUBOMBO %	SHISELWENI %	TOTAL %
HHOHHO	0,0	93,8	6,2	0,0	100,0
MANZINI	60,0	0,0	20,0	20,0	100,0
LUBOMBO	0,0	100,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
SHISELWENI	6,3	81,3	12,4	0,0	100,0
REST OF WORLD	0,0	100,0	0,0	0,0	100,0
TOTAL	9,1	79,5	9,1	2,3	100,0

SOURCE: Computed from Table V.4.