Improving the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa: Existing data-sets

2

MiWORC Report
July 2013

Deborah Budlender

Suggested citation: Budlender, Deborah (2013) *MiWORC Report N°2. Improving the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa: Existing data-sets*. Johannesburg: African Centre for Migration & Society, University of the Witwatersrand.

ISBN 978-0-9922133-1-2

Improving the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa: Existing data-sets

July 2013

Prepared by:

Deborah Budlender
for the African Centre for Migration & Society, University of the Witwatersrand

Copy-editor:
Becca Hartman-Pickerill

Coordination of editing:
Zaheera Jinnah & Aurelia Segatti

Printing & dissemination:
Sharon Mina Olago

The Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC)

Building on over a decade of research experience in migration studies, the African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) at Wits University has embarked on a partnership with a range of academic (GovINN, UP; UNU-CRIS; UNESCO Chair on Free Movement), government (Department of Labour; South African Local Government Association; Statistics South Africa), and international (ILO; IOM) partners. This partnership is expressed through the Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC).

MiWORC is based on a matching fund principle. The European Union, in the framework of the EU-South Africa Dialogue Facility (EuropeAid/132200/L/ACT/ZA), funds 50 per cent of the consortium. Beyond an ambitious scholarly agenda, one of MiWORC's objectives is to avail empirically based evidence to the EU- SA Dialogue facility, a bilateral on-going strategic partnership between the European Union and South Africa, as well as to a range of key stakeholders in government, organised labour, business, and the NGO sector.

Work Package 2: The improvement of existing labour market survey instruments to better reflect migrant workers' position

Existing national statistical instruments omit any description and account of foreigners' participation within the South African economy. By and large, data are inadequate and limited. This work package aims to improve the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa, and to allow comparison to domestic labour participation at a national and local level. The WP begins with a critical review of the scope and relevance of existing statistical data sets in South Africa and provides recommendations on the technical and institutional aspects of a longer-term improvement strategy, with options that can be implemented, such as a pilot survey. WP2 is guided by an advisory committee comprised of the DoL, Stats SA, SALGA, ILO, IOM, and ACMS.

Table of contents

Table of tables

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACMS	African Centre for Migration & Society
Benbo	Bureau for Economic Research re Bantu Development
DHA	Department of Home Affairs
DoL	Department of Labour
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
FMSP	Forced Migration Studies Programme
GCRO	Gauteng City-Region Observatory
GMOD	Global Migrant Origin Database
HSRC	Human Sciences Research Council
ILO	International Labour Organisation
MCS	Movement Control System
NIDS	National Income Dynamics Study
QLFS	Quarterly Labour Force Survey
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SALDRU	Southern African Development and Research Unit
SAMP	Southern African Migration Project
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
Stats SA	Statistics South Africa
SWOP	Society, Development and Work Institute
TEBA	The Employment Bureau of Africa
UIF	Unemployment Insurance Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
ZDP	Zimbabwean Documentation Project

Executive summary

This report was commissioned by the African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) on behalf of the Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC). It aims to assist with improving the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa. Such improvement is intended, in turn, to advance understanding of the role played by foreign workers in the South African labour market.

The core of this report is an assessment of the scope and relevance of existing statistical data sets in South Africa. The term "foreign labour" is understood as referring to foreign nationals who are either involved in economic activity or seeking to be involved in such activity. In terms of time period, the focus is on the period 1980 to date. However, more emphasis is placed on current data sources given that the ultimate aim is to contribute to improving available data for future use. Geographically, special attention is given to statistics on foreign labour originating within the Southern African region.

The first section of the report, *Statistical options and data collection methodologies*, summarises relevant aspects of key international guides on the collection of statistics on foreign or migrant labour. The second section, *Historical statistics for South Africa*, focuses primarily on available sources for the period 1980 to 1994. The third section, *Current government statistics*, describes and discusses data produced and/or published by key government or government-related agencies. This is the core section of the report as ultimately government-produced statistical sources present the greatest opportunities for large-scale, sustainable and publicly available data. The fourth section, *Recent non-government sources*, describes sources and data coming from outside of the government. Finally, the fifth section – *Synthesis and appraisal* – summarises what the various sources described previously can tell us about foreign labour in South Africa.

Ultimately, the fifth section concludes that South Africa does not currently have adequate data for reliable estimates of the stocks and flows of foreign labour in South Africa. Nevertheless, the report reveals that the country has a wide range of different sources of data that, if improved, present the potential for more reliable estimates of all the various stocks and flows. The available data sets allow identification of crude trends which are confirmed by several sources, although there are wide areas of uncertainty about the size of many of the trends. The stylised **facts** that are supported across several sources include the following:

- Most sources that reflect stock suggest that **foreigners (regardless of work status) account for less than 10 per cent of the population**, whatever definition is used, and also for less than 10 per cent of employed people. However, in particular sectors, such as agriculture, mining and hospitality, foreign workers might account for a higher percentage.

- There are also **wide variations spatially**. All sources confirm Gauteng as having a much higher rate of foreigners in its population than any of the other provinces.

- Several sources confirm that fo**reigners are concentrated in the working age group – 15-64 years** – and especially in the younger age ranges within this broad group.

- **Most sources – whether stock or flow – are biased towards recording formal employment rather than informal employment**. This results in undercounts as foreigners almost certainly constitute a

greater share of informal than formal employment. Similarly, most sources focus on employees rather than the self-employed. This again is likely to result in an undercount of foreigners.

- Several of the flow sources confirm a **noticeable increase over the years in migrants from the region coming to South Africa for work purposes** as well as a marked increase in entries from elsewhere in Africa.
- Several of the flow as well as stock sources confirm that **Southern African Development Community (SADC) citizens are numerically very dominant** among African migrants. Zimbabwe has also become increasingly dominant over the last decade, with Mozambique having high numbers over a longer period.
- Several stock sources confirm that **unemployment rates tend to be lower for migrants than for local people**. This is a finding that is relatively unusual internationally.
- Several stock (and some flow) sources confirm that the **male: female ratio is higher among foreigners** – especially among employed foreigners – than among South Africans.
- **Reliable, comprehensive statistics on skills levels and the skills profile of foreigners are scarce.** The Employment Equity data suggest that, at least in formal sector establishments, foreign workers are more concentrated at the unskilled and semi-skilled levels than are South African workers.
- In terms of industry, the NIDS data **suggest similar distributions for foreign and South African workers at broad industry level**, except for community, social and personal services (more common for South Africans) and mining (more common for foreign workers).
- **Reliable statistics on foreign labour at local level are extremely scarce** and, where they exist, likely to be subject to wide error margins.

Recommendations for improving future statistics on foreign labour in South Africa

Five main recommendations arise from this report. Further discussion and motivations for each of the recommendations can be found in two technical reports developed as supplements to this main report (Budlender 2013 a and b). The five recommendations are as follows:

1. In respect of stock measures, Stats SA should build on its experience of piloting a migration module in the third quarter 2012 QLFS. Stats SA should consider including in the current module a small number of additional questions to be drawn from the model questionnaires found in Bilsborrow et al (1997). Regular inclusion of the module in the QLFS will allow for description of the labour market characteristics of foreigners as well as comparison of the situation and characteristics of foreigners with South Africans in respect of the labour market.

2. In respect of flow measures, the relevant government agencies – more specifically the Department of Home Affairs, Department of Labour, and Statistics South Africa – should continue to improve the reliability and up-to-dateness of administrative information systems. The relevant agencies, with the Department of Home Affairs in the lead, should also create or improve mechanisms to make these data publicly available.

3. The QLFS will not be able to provide reliable local-level statistics. Instead, individual municipalities should commission studies on key topics of interest. The methodology and instruments for these studies would need to be developed in line with the purpose, scope and available resources and should, wherever possible, use the same concepts and definitions as used by Stats SA.

4. For measures in respect of skills, the Department of Labour should set up systems to collate and combine data from the general skills-based work and residence permit systems falling under the Department of Home Affairs and the sector-specific skills accreditation, registration and approval programmes in respect of health and education.

5. The Department of Labour should establish a permanent forum for relevant actors to meet, share and discuss achievements and challenges in respect of improving statistics on foreign labour. This forum would also provide the opportunity to explore ways to collaborate and harmonise approaches.

Introduction

This report was commissioned by the African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) on behalf of the Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC). The report aims to assist with improving the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa. Such improvement is intended, in turn, to advance understanding of the role played by foreign workers in the South African labour market.

The core of this report is an assessment of the scope and relevance of existing statistical data sets in South Africa, with the term "foreign labour" understood as referring to foreign nationals who are either involved in economic activity or seeking to be involved in such activity. There are two additional ACMS commissioned reports related to this one, available upon request. One report provides recommendations in respect of the technical and institutional aspects of a longer-term improvement strategy, while the other presents implementable options, including a pilot, for taking the longer-term strategy forward. The content of these reports is summarised in the executive summary and presented synthetically at the end of this report.

In terms of time period, the focus of this report is on the period 1980 to date. However, it places more emphasis on current data sources given that the ultimate aim is to contribute to improving available data produced in the future. Geographically, special attention is given to statistics on foreign labour originating within the Southern African region and the role played by these Southern African workers in the South African labour market.

The report is divided into five sections, as follows:

- The first section, *Statistical options and data collection methodologies*, summarises relevant aspects of key international guides for the collection of statistics on foreign or migrant labour.
- The second section, *Historical statistics for South Africa*, focuses primarily on available sources for the period 1980 to 1994. In some cases, for example when describing trend statistics, the discussion extends into the more recent period.
- The third section, *Current government statistics*, describes and discusses data produced and/or published by key government or government-related agencies.
- The fourth section, *Recent non-government sources*, describes sources and data coming from outside of the government.
- Finally, the fifth section – *Synthesis and appraisal* – summarises what the various sources described previously can tell us about foreign labour in South Africa.

Within each section, the discussion is organised primarily by different sources. In practice, however, neither the division into sections nor the division into sources is always very neat. One reason for this, among many, is that sources quote and cross-reference each other. Further, while the government is a key source of estimates, it sometimes does not publish them. When the government publishes estimates, it usually does so only on an annual basis. It is thus other agencies and individuals that are the predominant source of tabulations and analysis over time. Nevertheless, the report's attempted division into sections and sources

was chosen because it matches the overall aim of the project – to improve the quality of statistics on foreign labour – for which recommendations must consider which actors and agencies will be responsible for improvements.

Throughout the report the emphasis is on sources that provide broad coverage, ideally of the entire country, rather than small-scale investigations. Further, the main interest is in ongoing sources of statistics rather than in one-off investigations. Partly as a result, the report focuses on statistics produced by the government, while also discussing smaller-scale and one-off non-governmental investigations, where they highlight important issues.

Statistical options and data collection methodologies

A comprehensive paper (Hoffmann and Lawrence, 1995) and bulky manual (Bilsborrow et al, 1997) emanating from a mid-1990s International Labour Organisation (ILO) project together constitute an excellent basis for discussion of data sources on foreign labour and labour migration. In particular, they clearly distinguish the different types of measures of "stock" and "flow" (see below) of migrant labour that can be produced, as well as the different types of administrative, survey and census data sources that might be available. Both documents are based on in-depth knowledge and experience of statistics production across a very wide range of developed and developing countries. Both documents are also particularly useful because of their explicit focus on migration for work purposes, rather than migration in general.

The discussion of the documents below includes some italicised text that highlights particular points of relevance for South Africa. The italicised text does not explore issues in depth but is instead intended as an implicit link of the discussion in this section with the discussion in later sections.

Hoffmann and Lawrence

Hoffmann and Lawrence (1995) provide a comprehensive review of the various sources of statistics on international migration and the related methodological issues. Their report was prepared within the ILO's Interdepartmental Project on Migrant Workers. One of the main aims of the project was to improve countries' ability to develop policy in respect of regulation of migrant flows and protection of the rights of migrant workers through provision of improved statistics.

The authors discuss the characteristics of different sources of statistics on migrant labour, highlighting strengths and weaknesses of each one as well as possibilities for addressing weaknesses. The discussion focuses on sources related to the number of migrant workers, their demographic and socio-economic (including labour-related) characteristics, and changes in numbers over time.

The publication includes an appendix detailing key sources of data on migrant labour in the countries covered by the project. South Africa is named as one of the 22 countries, but does not have a page in the appendix. A fact-finding mission to South Africa was planned in the 1993-1994 period, during which time assistance would be provided in completing the questionnaire. The mission did not, however, materialise (Sophia Lawrence, personal communication, 6 December 2012). This is not too disappointing as a questionnaire completed at that time would have reflected the apartheid-era system rather than the current one.

The discussion in Hoffmann and Lawrence is organised in terms of five key groups, namely:

(a) *Persons arriving in a country to work there, i.e. the **inflow** of* foreign workers over a specified time period

(b) Persons leaving their country to find work abroad, i.e. the **outflow** of migrant workers

(c) Persons returning after having worked abroad, i.e the **return flow** of migrant workers

(d) *The stock (number at a specified time) of **foreign workers** in the country*

(e) Persons working abroad, i.e. the stock of **migrant workers abroad**.

The groups (a) and (d) are italicised as they are the ones of key interest for our purposes. The first records the number of foreign workers entering the country in a given period, and the second records the number in the country at any given time.

Each of these groups is defined on the basis of citizenship. For example, (a) is defined in terms of the number of non-citizens of the country arriving in that country to work there. The authors note that for some purposes another characteristic, such as country of birth or ethnic origin, may be seen as more relevant. *The definition used by Hoffmann and Lawrence matches the preferred definition reflected in the terms of reference for this research. However, in South Africa the fact that permanent residents are generally treated in the same way as citizens may create challenges in distinguishing them as foreigners in some data sources.*

The definitions of the five key groups above do not refer to a minimum period of (intended) stay or change in place of residence as adding this to the definition could exclude some groups, such as seasonal foreign migrant workers. The disadvantage of not specifying these aspects is that the definitions do not include foreigners who enter the country, perhaps for another purpose, and only subsequently decide to seek work and become employed. *As discussed below, this is a concern for South Africa.*

The authors note further that in counting arrivals (or departures), it will often not be possible to avoid double-counting where a particular individual enters (or departs) from the country more than once in the specified period. *Again, this is a particular concern for South Africa where, for example, individuals from groups such as cross-border traders and deportees are likely to cross borders very regularly – the former generally doing so in a way that will be "counted" by official statistics, while the latter will often not be officially counted when entering the country.*

Inflows of foreign workers

Administrative sources

Most countries have some statistics on the in-flow of foreign workers as most countries place some forms of restrictions on work by foreigners and are prepared to incur some administrative costs in implementing and enforcing these. Many countries issue **visas**, with visas often specifying the purpose of the visit as well as duration. Where this is the case, the associated systems can generally produce statistics on the number of work visas approved. The system might also be able to produce statistics on the number of applications, and the number of work visas actually "used" by the person entering the country and starting work. Counts based on visas and similar documents exclude people who enter the country to work without legal permission, as well as those who for various reasons do not require visas. South Africa, does not require visas from citizens of a large number of countries if the intended duration of stay is less than 90 or 30 days, depending on the country concerned (see **http://www.home-affairs.gov.za/index.php/immigration-services/exempt-countries**) and if the purpose of the visit is not work. If the person intends to work, they are legally required to obtain a temporary work permit. Segatti (2011) notes that the Immigration Amendment Act of 2011 replaced the term "permit" with "visa" in respect of all temporary permits.

Hoffmann and Lawrence note a "Catch 22" situation in respect of data accuracy of this source. On the one hand, where obtaining a work visa is difficult or expensive, foreigners who want to work will be more likely to avoid the system or state that the purpose of the visit is something other than work. On the other hand, if the purpose of entry is not regarded as an important issue, government authorities will do little to ensure that the information is accurate. The ability of the visa statistics to produce accurate statistics is also influenced by the ease with which foreigners can enter the country and work without having the relevant visa. This would be determined by, among other factors, the effectiveness of border control and policing of employment. Similarly, for those granted visas, the extent to which the information on the application about the type of work to be done matches the work done in practice depends on the seriousness with which the system is implemented, policed and enforced. This includes, among other factors, potential penalties incurred by the worker and/or the employer for violations.

A sophisticated border control system would capture details of the entry visa and allow this to be linked to a database recording visas granted. However, this matching is not done in many countries. *No evidence was found that this type of matching is done in South Africa.*

Information and statistics on **asylum seekers** (those who have applied for refugee status but whose cases have not yet been adjudicated) could be relevant for inflows of migrant workers for at least two reasons. Firstly, some of those who register as asylum seekers may be seeking asylum more for economic than for other reasons. Secondly, some of those seeking asylum might seek and take up work while waiting for their applications to be processed. Bilsborrow et al (1997) observe that even if asylum seekers are not motivated primarily by economic considerations, the economic consequences of their migration is of interest to policy makers and others. *Legally, both asylum seekers and refugees are entitled to work in South Africa.*

Some countries have **population registration** systems administered at the local level. Where these exist, they may be a source of information on the inflow of migrant workers. However, the extent to which such registers are accurate and regularly updated varies greatly. *South Africa's population register includes only citizens and permanent residents. It is not updated regularly and does not record information on employment.*

In some cases, particular categories of workers are recruited from other countries by special processes and agencies, and/or subject to particular government regulations and controls. In these cases reports submitted by those responsible for implementing these processes can be a source on inflows of foreign migrants. *Recruitment by The Employment Bureau of Africa (TEBA) is relevant for South Africa in respect of mine workers.*

Household surveys

Hoffmann and Lawrence are not very optimistic about the possibilities of measuring inflows of foreign migrant workers through surveys. They note that if the sub-groups of interest are relatively small, a general survey would need either a very large sample survey or a specially designed sampling procedure that over-samples in areas where the sub-group of interest is likely to be found. However, such over-sampling can create serious challenges in terms of adjustment of weights to compensate for differing chances of selection.

Additional challenges in surveying foreign workers include language difficulties in obtaining information, and reluctance of workers to participate, especially if they fear that their actions or status are illegal. Adjustments to correct for the resulting non-response and bias are difficult as these groups are, by definition, likely to have different characteristics from other more easily-surveyed migrants.

Establishment surveys

Establishment surveys are surveys in which the questionnaire is completed or administered by establishments (businesses) rather than, for example, by households. Hoffmann and Lawrence (1995) suggest that surveys of establishments are generally not a good source of statistics on inflows of foreign workers as those completing the surveys may not have the necessary information about newly-arrived workers.

Stock of foreign workers

Administrative sources

Hoffmann and Lawrence suggest two approaches to estimating the "stock" of foreign workers at a particular point in time. The first is to adjust a previous stock measure by adding the inflow and subtracting the outflow over the intervening period. The second is to establish, for the specified point in time, what number and percentage of workers (employed people) satisfy the criteria for being considered a foreign worker. The first strategy is dependent on having good quality data for the previous stock measure as well as for the inflows and outflows of the intervening period. This method will not provide estimates disaggregated by sex or other variables unless the previous measures and the inflow and outflow statistics are disaggregated. The challenge with the second strategy is the large scope of the exercise.

The administrative records relating to work permits are a possible source of the stock if the records can be used to produce a count of permits that are still valid at a given point in time. This count assumes that all those who are working are doing so with valid work permits.

If foreign workers are sourced through **recruitment agencies** (or labour brokers), the records of these agencies could be a source of the stock of foreign workers at any point in time. For this to be a valid source, the agencies would need to know for how long each recruited worker was contracted to be employed. They would also need to keep accurate records. In the latter respect, Hoffmann (2010) observes the need for regular, unannounced inspections – with related sanctions where necessary – to identify inadequate or fraudulent record-keeping. He notes that the same inspections could be used to ensure adequate treatment of workers.

Survey sources

Hoffmann and Lawrence (1995) suggest that inclusion of a few basic questions in an existing general **labour force survey**, with additional questions in a special periodic module, is the most cost-effective way of estimating the stock of foreign workers through a survey. The effectiveness of this approach will depend on the relative prevalence of foreign workers and their dispersion around the country. They note that the design of the survey sampling procedure must ensure that "compounds" for foreign workers are included and responses received from these (and similar areas) appropriately weighted in proportion to their

prevalence in the total population. Similarly, Hoffmann (2010) notes the need to include collective living quarters such as hostels and hotels in the sampling frame as newly arrived workers and those with short-term work contracts are more likely to live in such quarters. *These issues are discussed below for South African surveys*.

Population censuses are a further potential source of statistics. Censuses should not, if implemented effectively, have sampling bias. Further, Hoffmann (2010) suggests that a major advantage of a census is that special efforts are usually made to capture small or marginal groups that are not considered important enough to get special attention in other types of surveys. However, there is always some degree of under-count in a census and that under-count may, in part, reflect people who do not want to be counted, perhaps because they are illegally staying or working in the country. Further, those responsible for a census may not see foreigners as a group meriting special attention.

One disadvantage of censuses is that they are done, at most, every five years, but generally less frequently. Further, the results are – according to Hoffmann and Lawrence – available "at best" 18 months after the fieldwork is completed. *South Africa currently conducts a census every ten years. The overall results for 2011 were announced about 12 months after the census, but did not include details on foreign workers.*

Establishment surveys are also a potential source of estimates of the stock of foreign workers. However, they tend to have narrower coverage than household surveys. For example, they generally exclude agriculture as well as informal sector businesses. Employers would also be unlikely to report illegal workers. Further, some employers will not record the citizenship of their employees.

Hoffmann and Lawrence include a list of the characteristics (variables) that they see as needing to be collected in respect of inflows and stocks and as relatively easy to obtain from routine data collection exercises. They also provide guidance on how to frame questions about the key characteristics of individuals, and the associated classification systems. For example, for education they recommend the use of the International Standard Classification of Education so as to be able to standardise information on individuals who obtained their education in countries with different educational systems. If the estimates from different sources are to be combined and compared, the classification system for occupation also needs careful consideration as, for example, a recruitment agency will use a different system from that used in a household survey. Further, recruitment agencies targeting different categories of worker or different industries are likely to have vastly different, and often incompatible, ways of recording occupation. Similar challenges may exist in respect of industry.

"Status in employment" – whether a person is an employee, self-employed, or in some other status – is an area of increasing concern as more and more workers find employment outside of a standard employer-employee relationship. Hoffmann and Lawrence (1995) refer to the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-93) but acknowledge that this classification needs further development. *In South Africa, there would be particular interest in capturing whether foreign workers are employed directly, or through labour brokers or some other form of intermediary.*

Hoffmann and Lawrence also discuss the possibilities and challenges of collecting information and deriving estimates on the number of foreigners who are unemployed. (Here, in strict terms, the focus should be those who are of working age and would like to work, but are not employed. However, it might also include those who are of working age and not working – i.e. both the "unemployed" and those "not economically

active".) They note that social security registers often exclude non-employed foreign citizens. Whether they are excluded or included depends on the legislation, regulations and practice in particular countries. *In South Africa, foreign workers who are not on contract are covered by the Unemployment Insurance Fund (UIF).*

An additional administrative source is registrations with employment services. Here, too, registrations might exclude foreigners, and/or might cover only particular categories of employers and employees in terms of level of job, education, and so on. Even if foreigners are recorded on these systems, their usefulness as a source of statistics on unemployed foreigners depends on whether there is an efficient system of removing people from the system when they find work. These are a potential source of statistics where employment (placement) services are provided by private agencies, as long as the agencies are required to submit periodic quantitative reports on their operations. *The Department of Labour's employment placement services do not cover foreigners other than permanent residents.*

Bilsborrow et al

Bilsborrow et al's (1997) manual is a product of the same ILO project that produced the Hoffmann and Lawrence (1995) publication. The title of the 1997 manual refers to "migration" in general rather than only labour migration. However, much of the discussion focuses on labour migration. The manual is approximately 450 pages in length, and contains a wealth of examples of experiences of both developed and developing countries. The publication also includes model questionnaires – one set for the country of destination and one set for the country of origin – for specialised surveys focusing on migration. It also provides recommendations for censuses and other instruments. *In this part of the report and elsewhere, our interest is in South Africa as a country of destination.*

The "immediate objectives" of the manual are explained as to provide a critical review of existing data sources on international migration, to discuss the related conceptual and analytical issues, and to suggest improved methods of collection of internationally comparable data through administrative records, population censuses, sample surveys, and the like.

Chapter 3 of the manual describes the various systems used to collect information about international migrants in general, rather than on migrant workers in particular. Chapter 4 describes data collection systems that focus on migrant workers, including work permit systems, employer reports on foreign workers, data on contract workers collected by countries of origin and statistics from regularisation drives. Chapter 5 discusses measurement of forced migration, such as that of refugees and asylum-seekers. Chapter 6 discusses the use of sample surveys to investigate the determinants and consequences of international migration.

The authors argue that the richness of existing data in various systems is rarely fully utilised. In particular, much of the existing administrative data are not used to produce tabulations and/or published and disseminated in any way. In many cases, only the overall count is reported. *This comment is relevant for several of the sources in South Africa.*

The manual does not discuss government-run social security and health insurance systems which cover foreigners who are economically active. These are excluded on the basis that they are a potential source only in a few developed countries. *As noted above, the UIF could be relevant for South Africa.*

The manual begins by tracing the international agreements, starting in 1932, on the need to improve migration statistics. This history explains the increasing sophistication in distinguishing different aspects of the phenomenon and the development of associated definitions. However, Bilsborrow et al acknowledge that a single universal definition of international migrant is unlikely to be found given that what constitutes a migrant is determined by the laws and regulations of a particular country. They argue further that it is therefore "expedient" to take explicit account of government views and practices in designing a data collection and categorisation system. They also note that different users will be interested in different types of migrants, and thus different definitions. Nevertheless, they argue that from a policy perspective, citizenship is a key factor as it determines the right of a person to enter, live in and work in a country. *This approach again matches the terms of reference for this research. However, citizenship will not be the most appropriate definitions for all purposes, including all government-related purposes.*

The manual refers to a range of conventions relating to international migration, namely the Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 97), and the Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (No. 143); the Convention on the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, 1990 (which the United Nations has opened for signature and ratification); and the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol. South Africa has not signed the first three of the conventions but acceded to the last-named in 1996.

Bilsborrow et al (1997) identify five basic concepts (or "building blocks") that are regularly used to describe international migrants, as follows:

- **Citizenship**: based on concrete evidence, especially for administrative records, so generally more reliable than some other characteristics;
- **Residence**: probably the most widely used characteristic, but the least well defined. The legal definition differs from country to country, while the *de facto* definition differs according to duration of stay and whether the period/s of stay must be continuous;
- **Time**: reflecting the legal time granted and/or actual stay;
- **Purpose of stay**: reflecting either the intentions of a migrant or the reason for admission approved by the receiving government. The latter is more easily validated than the former.

In addition, **place of birth** is often used in censuses and surveys. One advantage of this characteristic is that it does not change over the lifetime of a person. However, country of birth can differ from country of citizenship in a range of different circumstances. For example, according to the 1990 French census, there were 3.6 million foreigners and 5.9 million foreign-born persons in metropolitan France (excluding French overseas territories) (Bilsborrow et al, 1997: 28).

Bilsborrow et al argue that there are two approaches to identifying who is an international migrant. The first, the "outsider's approach", proceeds from basic principles to identify the criteria that define an international migrant. The second, the "insider's approach", tries to organise existing identification

procedures in the country into workable concepts and definitions. The manual attempts to combine these two approaches but, where clashes occur, favours the outsider's approach.

The table below outlines the framework within which Bilsborrow et al (1995: 33-4) conceive international migration. They comment that the framework includes some categories that are not generally considered to be international migrants but are included so as to have a comprehensive view. They give the example of tourists who may become (irregular) migrants if they stay beyond the approved time or engage in economic activity not allowed by their entry as a tourist. *Other literature suggests that this could be an issue in South Africa.*

Bilsborrow et al's framework is intended for use in measurements of both flows and stocks of migrants. However, it is intended to count individuals rather than moves, therefore if it were used for the purpose set forth by this report, there would need to be an adjustment of sources, such as border crossings, that could count an individual more than once. The framework envisages an individual belonging to only one category for any count, although they may subsequently move to another category. The framework thus avoids double-counting. Where there might be different views of a particular movement or individual, it prioritises the viewpoint of the receiving government.

The framework is not restricted to those who work and in this sense goes beyond the scope of this report. The framework is nevertheless helpful in identifying which categories are of interest. The italicised categories indicate – tentatively – those that are likely to be most relevant for our purposes. The categorisation emphasises the legal aspects of classifying people. This is useful for our purposes to the extent that sources of statistics, and their accuracy, often depend on the particular legal categories into which migrants fall.

Table 1. Bilsborrow et al framework for the characterisation of different categories of international migration

Citizenship	Legal basis for admission	Category	Sub-category	Admission of family membes	Period of stay
Citizens	Not relevant for our purposes				
Foreigners	Right to Citizenship	Returning ethnics		Allowed	Unrestricted
	Right to free movement	Free-movement migrants		Allowed	Unrestricted
	Provisions for short-term admission of foreigners	Non-migrant categories	Consular personnel	Allowed	Open-ended
			Military personnel	Allowed	Open-ended
			Tourists	Not applicable	Restricted
		Possible migrant categories	*Students*	Sometimes allowed	Restricted
			Trainees	Sometimes allowed	Restricted
			Retirees	Allowed conditionally	Open-ended
	Immigration laws	*Immigrants*	Settlers	Allowed	Unrestricted
	Labour migration laws	*Migrant workers*	*Frontier workers*	Not allowed	Restricted
			Seasonal migrant workers	Not allowed	Restricted
			Project-tied migrant workers	Not allowed	Restricted
			Contract migrant workers	Rarely allowed	Restricted
			Temporay migrant workers	Sometimes allowed	Restricted
			Established migrant workers	Allowed conditionally	Open-ended
			Highly skilled migrant workers	Allowed	Restricted
	Economic migration laws	Business travellers		Not applicable	Restricted
		Immigrating investors		Allowed	Unrestricted
	Laws of asylum	*Asylum migration*	*Convention refugees*	Soeemtimes allowed	Open-ended
			Humanitarian admissions	Sometimes allowed	Open-ended
			Asylum seekers	Not allowed	Uncertain
			Temporary protection status	Not allowed	Uncertain
			Stay of deportation	Not allowed	Open-ended
	Unauthorised	*Irregular migration*	*Unauthorised entry*	Not applicable	Not applicable

Source: Bilsborrow et al, 1997: 33ff

Migrants for family reunification are not specified as a separate category in the framework because they can be linked to other categories of international migrants. Elsewhere, Bilsborrow et al note that women are more likely than men to be admitted as dependants without the right to work and thus become more likely to engage in "irregular" work activity.

Bilsborrow et al note that frontier workers (people who regularly work in a country that is not their own but who live in a neighbouring country to which they return every day or at least once a week) and seasonal workers are often excluded from statistics on labour migration. Frontier workers are explicitly excluded from the ILO Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 97), and the ILO Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (No. 143), but are covered by the 1990 Convention on the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. *Frontier work may be relevant for South Africa in, for example, the case of citizens of neighbouring countries who do daily or weekly work on farms across the border.*

In Chapter 3 of the manual, which discusses statistics on international migrants as a whole rather than only labour migrants, Bilsborrow et al distinguish between registers of foreigners (a specialised type of population register) and registers created through administrative procedures associated with obtaining permission to live (and work) in a country. They argue that the former measures people while the latter measures documents. The latter could, as a result, conceivably result in double-counting where a person changes status in a given period. *In South Africa, permanent residents are included on the population register. However, as noted above, this is not regularly updated and does not include information on employment*.

Because of the differences between countries' permit systems, Bilsborrow et al argue that it is "essential" that agencies that produce and publish statistics based on residence permits explain the procedures and definitions used. They note that because the agencies that issue residence permits are generally not required to follow up with recipients of the permits, the number of valid permits can exceed – sometimes by a wide margin – the number of foreigners actually resident or working in the country.

In Chapter 4, on data collection systems in respect of labour migration, the authors note that agencies responsible for work permits often do not distinguish, when presenting statistics, between new permits and renewals. However, where work permits are issued in respect of a specified job, in contrast to being obtained through self-reporting tools, for example in a survey, information on the nature of the job – such as the industry, occupation, and salary – is likely to be more accurate than when obtained through self-reporting, for example in a survey.

A count of foreign workers based on work permits will not include foreigners admitted as "settlers" who subsequently take up employment; refugees who are employed; and foreigners admitted as tourists, students or family members who do work either legally or illegally.

Historical statistics for South Africa

This section of the report is organised primarily according to the sources of earlier sources of statistics and discussion on sources and trends. The organisation is, however, not neatly organised into entirely distinct categories as different sources often quote each other and/or rely themselves on the same sources, especially when presenting synthetic or narrative analysis. In particular, much of the later writing refers to, and often builds on, primary and secondary research done by the Southern African Migration Project (SAMP). The SAMP research, in turn, draws from both its own primary research and primary data produced by government and other actors. It is important to keep this overlapping of sources in mind as some oft-repeated "known facts" may, ultimately, come from a source that is not always as reliable as the frequent repetitions imply.

The section includes discussion of internal migration in what currently constitutes the Republic of South Africa. This point needs to be noted because from 1976 onwards the apartheid government started splitting off some of the "homeland" areas as so-called "independent states". By 1981 four homelands – Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei – had been "granted independence". As this process progressed, the official statistics produced by the Central Statistical Service (the forerunner of Statistics South Africa) stopped including people in these areas in their statistics on the South African population.

The section also includes some discussion of the patterns in respect of internal migration related to migrant labour for the mines and agriculture. These patterns are important as formal and informal policy decisions by government and the mining and agriculture industries affected the flows of labour from neighbouring countries. Further, as for the flows from neighbouring countries, apartheid policy endeavoured to ensure that the flows from both "independent" and non-independent homelands were temporary (circular or oscillating), with workers required to return at least once a year to their "permanent homes" in the homelands, and to return to their homes at the end of the contract.

While this section is entitled "historical", it includes more recent estimates where these are presented as part of a series or trend that begins in an earlier period.

Bureau for Economic Research re Bantu Development (Benbo)

Benbo was a government-funded agency that specialised in research into what it described as the "ten different Black peoples" (Benbo, 1976, IX) of South Africa. The institution specialised, in particular, in providing information in respect of the "own historic territory or homeland" of each of the ten "peoples". The 1976 publication is especially important as it was produced in the same year that the first homeland, Transkei, was made "independent". It is thus one of the last official sources that include the full African ("Black") population when reporting on South African statistics. Many of the statistics in the publication are based on estimates from the 1970 census, with further estimates from 1973.

The 1976 publication notes that although "a large number" of African people are in the "White areas" of South Africa, the focus of the publication is on the ten homelands. However, the publication does include useful information on African people in the "white areas".

Overall, the publication puts the African proportion of the population of South Africa at 70 per cent in 1970, with Africans accounting for a similar 69 per cent of employment. Close to half – 48 per cent – of African

people were reportedly living in the homelands. This was a substantial increase from the 38 per cent living in homelands ten years earlier. The increase was attributable to both apartheid policies and some border changes. Commuting, where workers were required to live in homeland areas and commute each day to work in neighbouring "white" areas, also contributed to the increase in numbers recorded as "living" in non-homeland areas. However, such an arrangement was not possible for homelands that were situated very far from work opportunities.

In the early 1970s over half (52 per cent) of (South African) Africans living in white areas were in Transvaal, with approximately half living in the PWV (Pretoria-Witwatersrand-Vaal) area where both mines and industry were concentrated.

The publication explains the complication of distinguishing between where someone is living and where they are working as follows (Benbo, 1976: 31):

For a homeland to function as a national unit, most of its citizens should live there. However, a substantial proportion of the Black population lives either temporarily or permanently elsewhere. The temporary absentees are mainly men in their most productive years who go to a White area to supplement their family income. They may work under contract in the White areas and return to their families after their contract has expired. Strong cultural and other bonds with the homeland inhabitants also exert a powerful influence upon their return.

The system that forced as many African people as possible to live in homelands and controlled their work in "white" areas was effected through regulations enforced by the labour bureaux. These bureaux controlled movement both between homelands and "white" South Africa and within each of the many "jurisdictions". The fact that employers were required to pay the "tribal labour bureaux" one rand for every African whose employment contract was registered with the bureau served as a strong incentive for homeland authorities to cooperate with the system.

In addition to discussing the various categories of South African "Blacks", the publication also discusses "foreign Blacks". In 1970, the census recorded 490 000 people in this category, of whom 434 020 (89 per cent) were economically active (and also, it seems, employed). Of the economically active, 352 480 (81 per cent) were employed in mining, 39 580 (9 per cent) in agriculture, and 18 000 (4 per cent) in manufacturing and construction, with 5 per cent in an unspecified sector. The number of foreign Africans had decreased from 606 000 in 1951, in part due to "stricter measures". Nevertheless, in 1970 foreign workers from neighbouring countries still accounted for more than two-thirds of workers on South African mines. The publication notes that an ongoing decrease in workers from Malawi – with a decrease of close on 30 per cent in the twelve months up to October 1975 – arising from the prohibition of recruitment – was likely to increase the competition between the mining and agricultural sectors for "local Black labour" (Benbo, 1976: 39-41).

Migration estimates by Charles Simkins

A series of essays from the early 1980s by economist-demographer Charles Simkins on migration between areas of South Africa provides a further early source of migration statistics of both African (in the apartheid sense) South Africans within the country and foreign Africans into the country. These statistics include all

areas of South Africa, including the then "independent" homelands as the statistics are based on modelled estimates from the censuses of earlier years.

Simkins provides an implicit link to the Benbo population statistics in noting that during the decade 1970-80 net emigration of (local) Africans from metropolitan areas to other areas was minimal, while net emigration from rural areas outside the homelands to the homeland areas was just over half a million. Meanwhile net migration from towns increased as the government closed small town "locations" and relocated inhabitants to homeland areas, from where they were required to commute.

For 1980, Simkins puts the total African population of the country at 20,97 million – 10,45 million male and 10,51 million female. Of the total, 48,3 per cent of the males and 57,2 per cent of the females were estimated to be living in homeland areas. The overall totals were estimated to include 5,63 million men aged 15-64 years and 5,50 million women aged 15-59 years; at that time, sex-differentiated age groups were considered an appropriate measure of the economically active population.

In some of the estimates of Africans living in "white" areas, Simkins distinguishes between those living in households and those living on their own, whether in hostels, compounds or as domestic workers. This distinction is useful for our purposes as both South African and foreign migrants are more likely than others to live alone rather than with families. Further, workers who live alone are often missed by surveys which sample "dwellings" and "households". Simkins assumes that all foreign Africans live on their own. He assumes further that all those who live on their own are aged between 15 and 69 years.

Table 2 (compiled from Simkins, 1983: 71-74) shows Simkins' estimates of the number of local and foreign Africans living in metropolitan and other "white" urban areas in 1980. Overall, foreign Africans account for 2,5 per cent of the total. However, the percentage is much higher for men than women – at 4,1 versus 0,4 per cent. The percentage of foreign Africans is highest for men in towns. This probably reflects a concentration of mines in towns rather than in areas classified as metropolitan.

Table 2. Africans in urban areas by nationality, sex, area type and living arrangements, 1980

Area type	Sex	Household	Single SA	Single foreign	Total	% foreign
Metro	Male	1 294 400	903 100	81 800	2 279 300	3,6
	Female	1 351 400	366 700	7 000	1 725 100	0,4
	Total	2 645 800	1 269 800	88 800	4 004 400	2,2
Town	Male	807 300	177 000	54 200	1 038 500	5,2
	Female	693 800	13 000	1 700	708 500	0,2
	Total	1 501 100	190 000	55 900	1 747 000	3,2
Total urban	Male	2 101 700	1 080 100	136 000	3 317 800	4,1
	Female	2 045 200	379 700	8 700	2 433 600	0,4
	Total	4 146 900	1 459 800	144 700	5 751 400	2,5

Source: Compiled from Simkins, 1983: 71-74

Simkins also provides estimates for total foreign Africans (i.e. not only those living in urban areas) over the decades 1960 to 1980. For males, the highest figure is recorded for 1960, at 484 300, and the highest figure for females is in 1950, at 120 700. By 1980 the total for males is 177 900 and the total for females 23 700, indicating extremely sharp decreases in foreign Africans living in South Africa over a period when the total

African population of the country grew from 8,7 million to 21,0 million. In the period 1970 to 1980, net emigration of foreign Africans from South Africa amounted to 46 800. Of this, the largest decrease was in the under-20 age group, which accounted for 18 200 of the 46 800 decrease (Simkins, 1983: 83). Simkins does not offer possible reasons for these trends.

Southern African Migration Project (SAMP)

SAMP is an international network of organisations established in 1996 to promote awareness of migration-development linkages in the Southern African Development Community (SADC). Research constitutes one of its core functions and, over the years, it has produced a wide range of high-quality research on migration in the region. The wide range of research produced, and the fact that the SAMP's work is used and expanded on by many others, makes it difficult to discuss it as a separate source. Instead, much of the SAMP work is discussed below under other organisations that have used its data and findings.

Crush (2001) provides a comprehensive discussion of available statistics on illegal immigration. Unfortunately, the paper was produced more than ten years ago and is thus not up-to-date. A more recent policy brief (Crush and Williams, 2010) provides a useful update, and is referred to elsewhere in this report.

The earlier paper by Crush (2001) is helpful in capturing the use of foreign contract labour on the mines and in agriculture. Agriculture, in particular, is an area that is poorly covered by others. Even Crush does not have solid statistics to offer. However, he identifies areas where it is (or was) more common. These include parts of Mpumalanga and Limpopo (then Northern Province) bordering Mozambique and Zimbabwe respectively, with smaller numbers in the sugar fields of Kwazulu-Natal, and increasing use of foreign labour in Western Cape and Free State. Crush notes that estimates of the number of Mozambicans working on Mpumalanga farms range widely, from 10 000 to 80 000. He suggests that seasonality may account for some of this variance. The number of Zimbabweans working seasonally on Northern Province farms is estimated to be 7-8 000 (Crush, 2001).

Crush refers to a "special zone" lawful entry system established to assist white farmers in border areas. This system had allowed 3-4 000 Zimbabweans to be legally employed on farms in the Northern Province. Since mid-1996, two "informal" crossing points had been established on the border between Zimbabwe and Limpopo. Persons living within 50 km of the border could obtain 21-day passes at the border. For a small fee, and on production of an identity card and letter from a South African farmer, workers could enter South Africa to work for periods of three to six months. Another system operated through the Labour Department in Lesotho, which provided for legal recruitment of temporary (mainly female) workers for work in Free State. The numbers from Lesotho were estimated to be as high as 20 000. Farmers employing undocumented migrants could also register them with a local DHA office and receive a "Section 41" permit. At the time Crush did his research, 11 000 workers had been recruited in this way since 1994, mainly by farmers in Mpumalanga and Limpopo. An earlier report, from 1998, recorded that 2 146 such permits were issued in 1994, 1 825 in 1995 and 6 466 in 1996. The report suggested that the numbers were likely to increase if the government followed through on its threat to impose sanctions on employers (International Labour Office, 1998: 13).

Also very useful for our purposes are two papers by Waller (2006a; 2006b). As secretary of the Immigration Board, she was in an especially good position to understand the migrant flows.

The first of the papers (Waller, 2006a) is one of very few available sources on deportations. Table 3 is calculated from this source, which – in turn – used the Department of Home Affairs' annual reports for numbers from the earlier years and relied on numbers obtained directly from the Department for the latter years.

The table shows the annual number of deportations as being more than 150 000 for most years in the period 1995 to 2004. As Waller and others note, some individuals are deported more than once in a single year. The numbers nevertheless are very high when compared with the number of people provided with temporary and permanent residence permits each year (see below). The table also reveals that Mozambique accounted for over half of all deportees in all years except 2004, although Mozambique's share tended to fall over the period, while that of Zimbabwe increased.

Table 3. Deportations by country, 1994-2004

Year	Percentage distribution					Number
	Mozambique	Zimbabwe	Lesotho	Other	Total	
1994	79	14	4	3	100	90 692
1995	84	11	3	2	100	157 084
1996	87	8	2	3	100	180 713
1997	83	12	2	2	100	176 351
1998	78	16	3	3	100	181 286
1999	67	23	3	6	100	183 861
2000	58	32	4	6	100	145 575
2001	60	31	4	5	100	156 123
2002	62	28	4	6	100	135 870
2003	53	36	5	6	100	154 808
2004	49	43	4	4	100	167 137

Source: Compiled from Waller, 2006a

Waller notes that between 1990 and 1997 SADC citizens accounted for 99,7 per cent of all deportations. However, in the first years of the twenty-first century there were substantial numbers of deportations to Pakistan, India, China, United Kingdom, Bangladesh, Turkey and Thailand.

In terms of the total absolute numbers shown in Table 3, Waller explains the sharp increase in the number of deportations between 1994 and 1995-6 by the 1995 amendments to the Aliens Control Act of 1991 combined with increased "irregular" migration in the hope of employment after the end of apartheid.

Crush (2011) reports that between 1994 and 2005 there were 150 000 asylum applications, but only 26 900 people were granted refugee status.

Compilations by Sally Peberdy

In 2012 Peberdy (previously employed by SAMP) produced a useful compilation of available statistics on migrants for the International Social Law Project. The compilation – which drew extensively on SAMP research – was intended to inform an assessment of the impact of immigration and migration on potential

claims for social grants, but it is useful beyond this purpose. The paper (Peberdy, 2012a) includes tabulations and discussion of approved permanent and temporary residence applications, emigration, amnesty initiatives, and contract workers at the gold mines.

Permanent residence and emigration

Table 4 provides the official numbers of people leaving and entering South Africa on a permanent basis for the period 1980 to 2011 based on permanent residence permits issued (for immigrants) and the number of people declaring themselves as emigrants. For the years up until 2004, the table also shows the net gain or loss through immigration and recorded emigration. The main source used for the table was the annual reports of the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) and Statistics South Africa's (or Central Statistical Service's) standard P0351 reports and releases (see below for further discussion).

The number of emigrants is available only until February 2004, the last year for which emigration was recorded by DHA. DHA stopped collecting these data when the Immigration Act of 2002 came into effect as the new Act no longer required that citizens leaving the country complete a form declaring their reason for travel. The statistics on emigration were, even when collected, an under-count of the true picture because many emigrants did not declare that they were emigrating. In some cases the person may have initially seen the move as a temporary one, but subsequently decided to remain outside the country. In other cases people would not want to declare that they were emigrating for a range of other reasons. This gap is not of major concern for our purposes as our focus is on foreigners working in South Africa rather than on South Africans living and working elsewhere.

In Peberdy's original tabulation, the totals for both immigrants and emigrants are disaggregated by sex until 1994, the last year for which this disaggregation was published. For the period 1980 to 1994, women account for between 47 and 50 per cent of all immigrants, and between 49 and 52 per cent of all emigrants.

Despite the fact that the emigration figures are an under-estimate, the table shows a net loss from 1994 onwards in every year for which emigration numbers are available. This suggests that more people emigrated than immigrated in the period 1993 to 2003. In terms of immigrants, the table shows much higher numbers in 2003 to 2005 – and especially in 2005 – than for 1995-2002, 2006 and 2008-2011. Crush (2011), writing on the basis of numbers available only up to 2004, suggests that the new immigration policy of the early 2000s resulted in an increased number of approved applications for permanent residence. Crush notes further that close to 50 per cent of the approved applications for 2004 were from Africa. However, the table below shows a sharp decline in the number of approved resident permits after 2005. It is possible that some of the fluctuations in the most recent years are the result of better or worse performance in catching up with backlogs.

Table 4. Permanent residence permits issued and emigrants, 1980-2011

Year	Immigrants	Emigrants	Net gain/loss
1980	29 365	11 363	+18 002
1981	41 542	8 791	+32 751
1982	45 784	6 832	+38 952
1983	30 483	8 247	+22 236
1984	28 793	8 550	+20 243
1985	17 284	11 401	+5 883
1986	6 994	13 711	-6 717
1987	7 953	11 174	-3 221
1988	10 400	7 767	+2 633
1989	11 240	4 911	+6 359
1990	14 499	4 722	+9 777
1991	12 379	4 256	+8 123
1992	8 686	4 289	+4 397
1993	9 824	8 078	+1 746
1994	6 398	10 235	-3 837
1995	5 064	8 725	-3661
1996	5 407	9 078	-3671
1997	4 103	8 946	-4 843
1998	4 371	8 276	-3 905
1999	3 669	8 487	-4 818
2000	3 053	10 262	-7 209
2001	4 832	12 260	-7 428
2002	6 545	10 890	-4 345
2003	10 578	16 165	-5 587
2004	10 714	n/a	n/a
2005	17 771	n/a	n/a
2006	2 136	9235n/a	n/a
2007	9 235	3817n/a	n/a
2008	3 817	2393n/a	n/a
2009	n/a	4083n/a	n/a
2010	4 083	n/a	n/a
2011	5 476	n/a	n/a

Source: Peberdy, 2012a: Table 1

Segatti and Landau (2011: 156) show some differences in the numbers for 2005 through 2009. For example, they have no number for 2005, but then have 9 235 recorded for 2007, which in the table above is recorded for 2006. A similar shift occurs for the next few years. For 2008 (equivalent to the missing 2009 above), they have a figure of 2 393.

The table above gives the total for permanent residence permits, without disaggregating by purpose. The table therefore does not show the trend in work permits, which might give an indication of the number of new immigrants who are likely to be “foreign labour”.

Permanent residence through amnesty initiatives

Table 4 above does not include the numbers of granted residence permits obtained through three post-1994 amnesties, namely the 1995 amnesty for mineworkers; the 1996 amnesty for SADC nationals; and the 1999-2000 amnesty for Mozambicans. Peberdy reports these amnesties as granting permanent residence to a total of 258 266 people – 51 504 in the mineworker amnesty, 124 073 in the SADC national amnesty, and 82 689 in the Mozambican national amnesty.

The first two amnesties were introduced in recognition of the fact that apartheid immigration policies did not allow for black migrants and immigrants other than contract workers for the mines and commercial agricultural sector. The first amnesty targeted people 28 years or older in 1996 who were employed on the mines and had worked on the mines for the previous ten years. These workers were already legally resident in the country as contract workers and the provision was thus not an amnesty in the usual meaning of the word. Of an estimated 130 000 eligible miners, less than half applied for permanent residence (Crush and Williams, 1999, quoted in Peberdy, 2012). Oucho (2006) writes that of all mineworkers in South Africa in 1995, 40 per cent of Batswana, 55 per cent of Basotho, 39 per cent of Mozambicans, and 44 per cent of Swazis applied for amnesty.

The second amnesty was granted to undocumented citizens of SADC member states living in South Africa who had been "continuously resident" in South Africa for a period of five years or longer before 1 July 1996; did not have a criminal record; would be a "desirable inhabitant of the Republic"; "engaged in productive economic activity" in either the formal or informal sector; and/or were "in a relationship" with a South African; and/or had dependent children born in or legally resident in South Africa (regulations quoted in Peberdy, 2012). By the end of the extended amnesty period 201 602 applications had been received and 124 073 individuals were granted amnesty.

The third amnesty was introduced in recognition of the absence of a refugee policy in the apartheid years and that many eligible Mozambicans had not been able to take advantage of the second amnesty for SADC nationals because of the civil war in their country. The amnesty was provided for in a tripartite agreement between Mozambique, South Africa and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR). This agreement provided for a form of refugee status for Mozambicans who had arrived between January 1985 and December 1992 and lived in the Northern Province (Limpopo), North West, Mpumalanga and KwaZulu-Natal. More than 130 000 applications were submitted of which 82 969 had been approved by mid-2001 (Johnston, quoted in Peberdy, 2012).

All three amnesties granted permanent residence to eligible applicants. All three amnesties primarily involved adults of working age. Once they had permanent residence status, the individuals would have been able to apply for family members to get similar status. However, Peberdy notes that the statistics do not show any evidence of such applicants happening in any numbers as there was no spike in applications from the countries concerned.

Temporary residence

As implied by the Bilsborrow et al's (1997) distinction between documents and people, the number of temporary residence permits issued does not give a good sense of the number of temporary residents in the country at any one time because the permit numbers do not show the duration of the permit.

Temporary work permits are issued for different time periods, often related to the duration of a contract. Usually the permits are issued in respect of relatively skilled workers.

Table 5, based on DHA annual reports, shows the number of new temporary residence permits for work purposes issued over the period 1990 to 2011 as well as – for the period up to 2000 when it was still reported – the number of renewals. (The "n/a" indicates that no information is available in respect of a particular data item for that year.) One interesting aspect is that this table often shows higher numbers where the previous table, on permanent permits, shows lower numbers, and vice versa.

Peberdy (2012a) suggests that the increase in numbers for 2006-2008 could relate either to a change in policy and/or to preparations for the 2010 World Cup. The large number of temporary residence permits issued in 2011 is explained by the programme described below that aimed to move Zimbabweans out of the asylum system and issue them with temporary permits, whether for work, business or study.

The lack of information on renewals renders analysis difficult because, as seen in the table, the number of renewals is often larger than the number of new permits. Crush and Williams (2010) suggest that the government began to reduce renewals in the 1990s out of concern with the country's serious unemployment problem, and suggest that the subsequent increase in numbers of new permits – and perhaps also renewals – in the mid-2000s could reflect a change in the country's immigration policy.

Table 5. Work permits issued, 1990-2011

Year	New permits	Renewals	Total
1990	7 657	30 915	38 572
1991	4 117	32 763	36 880
1992	5 581	33 318	38 899
1993	5 741	30 810	36 551
1994	8 714	29 352	38 066
1995	11 053	32 838	43 891
1996	19 498	33 206	52 704
1997	11 361	17 129	28 490
1998	10 828	11 207	22 035
1999	13 163	10 136	23 299
2000	6 643	9 191	15 834
2004	4 185	n/a	n/a
2006	17 205	n/a	n/a
2007	19 601	n/a	n/a
2008	32 344	n/a	n/a
2009	n/a	n/a	n/a
2010	5 926	n/a	n/a
2011	132 577	n/a	n/a

Source: Peberdy, 2012a: Table 5

Crush (2011) notes that in the mid-1990s policy still strongly favoured skilled migrants from Europe and North America. In 1995, 65 per cent of work permits went to Europeans, 12 per cent to North Americans and only 8 per cent to citizens of 12 SADC countries, with the remaining percentage accounted for by all other regions combined.

Contract workers

For many decades large numbers of contract workers have entered South Africa under bilateral agreements with neighbouring states and through agreements framed around the Immigration Act of 2002 (as amended) rather than through temporary work permits. The Immigration Act of 2002 introduced the possibility of using "corporate permits" for specified numbers of foreign workers. The agreements allow only the worker (not their family) to enter South Africa to work for a specified period of time for a specified employer or mine. When the contract ends, the worker must return to their home country (Crush et al, 1999). The Department of Labour (DoL) suggests that doing away with these agreements completely could potentially reduce the protections provided to the workers concerned (Department of Labour, 2007: 28). However, the same report suggests that the agreements need revision, in line with ILO recommendations, if they are to be retained. According to Crush (2011), such agreements, dating back to the 1960s and early 1970s, exist with Mozambique, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. An earlier agreement with Malawi is now defunct (Department of Labour, 2007: 27). The DoL report also notes the temporary importation of Cuban doctors in terms of a bilateral agreement between South Africa and Cuba (Department of Labour, 2007: 29).

Table 6 (sourced from TEBA, but cited in Crush and Williams, 2010) gives the nationality of workers on South African gold mines over the period 1990 to 2006. As can be seen, the numbers are substantial, in the hundreds of thousands. The table shows a substantial decrease in employment of contract workers from 1990 onwards. In particular, employment of foreign workers fell from 55 per cent of gold mine workers in 1994 to 38 per cent in 2006. The decrease was concentrated among workers from Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland.

Table 6. Mineworkers on gold mines, 1990-2006

Year	Local	Botswana	Lesotho	Mozambique	Swaziland	Total	% foreign
1990	199 810	14 609	99 707	44 590	17 757	376 473	47
1991	182 226	14 028	93 897	47 105	17 393	354 649	49
1992	166 261	12 781	93 519	50 651	16 273	339 485	51
1993	149 148	11 904	89 940	50 311	16 153	317 456	53
1994	142 839	11 099	89 237	56 197	15 892	315 264	55
1995	122 562	10 961	87 935	55 140	15 304	291 902	58
1996	122 104	10 477	81 357	55 741	14 371	284 050	58
1997	108 163	9 385	76 361	55 879	12 960	262 748	59
1998	97 620	7 752	60 450	51 913	10 336	228 071	57
1999	99 387	6 413	52 188	46 537	9 307	213 832	54
2000	99 575	6 494	58 224	57 034	9 360	230 687	57
2001	99 560	4 763	49 483	45 900	7 841	207 547	52
2002	116 554	4 227	54 157	51 355	8 698	234 991	50
2003	113 545	4 204	54 479	53 829	7 970	234 027	51
2004	121 369	3 924	48 962	48 918	7 598	230 771	47
2005	133 178	3 264	46 049	46 975	6 993	236 459	43
2006	164 989	2 992	46 082	46 707	7 124	267 894	38

Source: Crush and Williams, 2010: 11

A table in Crush et al (1999) showing the number of Basotho workers engaged by TEBA and the average number employed on the mines for a given year reveals that the two numbers do not match exactly for the period 1985 to 1994, and that the pattern as to which is larger than the other is not consistent. The numbers are, however, probably close enough to produce reliable trends.

Besides mines, commercial agriculture is the other major employer of workers from neighbouring countries. This employment is organised based on both bilateral agreements with the countries (and related corporate permits) and various informal and semi-formal practices.

Undocumented migrants

In terms of undocumented migrants, Peberdy again quotes Crush and Williams' 2010 work, which refers to estimates ranging between 1 and 3 million. She suggests that the true number is likely to be between 1,5 and 2,5 million. Segatti and Landau (2011: 146-8) include a detailed discussion on how sources arrived at various estimates of undocumented migrants. They conclude, on the basis of work done by SAMP and ACMS, that the total number of both documented and undocumented foreigners in South Africa at the time was around 3 million, but acknowledge that the crisis in respect of Zimbabwean migrants might result in the total being somewhat higher than this.

African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS)

Like SAMP, information from the ACMS and its predecessor, the Forced Migration Studies Programme, is frequently quoted by others. This section discusses the analysis produced through the Centre on the Zimbabwe Documentation Project (ZDP) (the special dispensation for Zimbabweans) and on deportations.

Zimbabwe

A presentation by Polzer (2012), formerly a staff member of the ACMS, divides the response to Zimbabwe in-migration into three periods. In the first period, between 2000 and 2008, there was no special response, resulting in as many as 170 000 deportations of Zimbabweans in 2008 alone. Between 2009 and 2010 the South African government acknowledged the crisis situation through a programme of "constructive regularisation". As a result, a new refugee reception office was opened in Musina, a moratorium on deportations was announced, Zimbabweans became entitled to a free visa and a special dispensation was introduced in respect of work, study and business permits. In 2011, there was a move back to "business as usual". The moratorium on deportations ended as did the special permits issued under the ZDP, asylum seekers were denied entry at the border, and the process of rejecting asylum applications was fast-tracked.

Amit (unpublished) provides a detailed documentation of the ZDP, drawing on both official (sometimes conflicting) statistics and information from surveys conducted at Home Affairs offices.

The ZDP process was in place between 20 September and 31 December 2010 after Cabinet announced that it was ending the previous special dispensation for Zimbabweans that had been in place since April 2009 and had included a moratorium on deportations. The ZDP was intended as a mechanism through which Zimbabweans could regularise their status before deportations began again. It did so by providing relaxed permitting requirements for Zimbabweans who had been in South Africa prior to 31 May 2010.

Amit documents the many challenges encountered by both Zimbabweans and DHA in the implementation of the process. In total, 275 762 Zimbabweans applied for permits, of whom 6 243 applied for amnesty for having fraudulent documents. When the process proved much slower than anticipated, the Department extended the deadline for processing applications to March and eventually to July 2011. It also extended the moratorium on deportations. However, deportations then resumed in October, with more than 45,000 Zimbabweans deported between October 2011 and November 2012.

There are conflicting estimates of the number of applications approved under the ZDP. In January 2012, the Director General of Home Affairs reported that 255 282 permits had been granted while a further 20 480 applications had yet to be finalised. The Department's annual report for 2011/12 (Department of Home Affairs, 2012a: 61) states that 203 364 cases had been resolved by the end of March 2012 but does not say how many of the applications were successful. Some offices required that those who had applied for asylum status retract this application when applying under the ZDP before knowing whether the latter application would be successful.

Deportations

Table 3 in an earlier section gives the number of deportations by country up until 2004. Segatti and Landau (2011: 158) have a table which provides total deportations for the years 2005 to 2008. The numbers are 209 988, 266 067, 312 733 and 280 839 respectively – far higher than in any previous year.

Vigneswaran (2011: 111) observes that a rate of 150 000 or more per year, which was evident from 2001 onwards, makes South Africa "one of the world's most prolific deporters of foreign nationals" in absolute terms.

For 2009 and 2010, the DHA's annual reports reflect a sudden decline to 1 060 and 55 825 respectively. These lower numbers almost certainly reflect the impact of the special measures in this period in respect of Zimbabweans.

Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC)

In one chapter of the HSRC's volume on migration Wentzel et al (2006b) provide a useful historical summary of both internal and cross-border migration (in the narrow sense of the term, from neighbouring countries) since the nineteenth century. The summary gives a sense of the variations in patterns and stances of both the South African and other governments across time and countries. The focus is on the mines, although the discussion is not restricted to the mines. The mining focus is expected given that the major flows and systems related to mine workers. The researchers note that throughout the twentieth century at least 40 per cent of mine workers came from outside South Africa. The percentage peaked in the early 1970s, at around 80 per cent, but had fallen to 40 per cent by the late 1990s. Anderson (2006) reports that in 1990 a total of 396 968 contract workers from other countries were working on South African mines, while by 1994 – only four years later – the number had fallen to 302 998.

Mozambique was the main source of workers for many decades, reaching its peak in terms of numbers around 127 000 in about 1975, around the time of national independence. This date coincided with a growing preference within the South African government for use of local labour as levels of unemployment

rose. By 1977, the number had fallen sharply to 35 000. Subsequently, however, the numbers increased again, reaching 83 000 in 1997, but then falling again to 60 000 by 2003.

Workers from Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland could obtain passports to work on the mines only after 1963. From 1977 onwards, with the fall-off in workers from Mozambique, Lesotho became the main supplier of mine workers. Crush et al (1999) note that in the 1980s, approximately 60 per cent of Lesotho's male workforce consisted of migrant workers. The numbers reached 108 000 in 1990, but then fell to 100 000 in 1995. By 2003, there were 60 000 Lesotho workers on South African mines. In 1995, the number of Botswanan workers stood at 12 700, while there were 16 700 from Swaziland.

Zimbabwe outlawed active recruitment of Zimbabweans for any work, not only mine work, after independence in 1980. However, the Zimbabwean government did not restrict citizens from coming to South Africa for work purposes.

The number of mineworkers from Malawi peaked at 140 000 in 1973, and further recruitment was prohibited after an aeroplane carrying workers for the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association, a recruiting agency, crashed. The prohibition was lifted between 1977 and 1988 but re-instated in the latter year as a result of a dispute over HIV testing.

Relatively few workers from Zambia, Tanzania and Angola have been employed on South African mines. Zambia and Tanzania prohibited recruitment after they attained independence. Angolan recruitment stopped in the mid-1970s.

Wentzel et al (2006) note that employment of undocumented workers has been a common practice within agriculture for many years. In the mid-1990s the DHA introduced special provisions for regularisation of undocumented workers, in particular those employed in Mpumalanga and Limpopo. However, relatively few farmers took advantage of these provisions as the high labour turnover and limited chance of prosecution meant employers were unlikely to suffer negative consequences from inaction.

In another part of the HSRC volume on migration, Kok et al (2006a) note that the nature of international migration to South Africa has changed since the end of apartheid. They observe that during the apartheid years African migration largely took the form of migrant labour employed on farms and mines, short-term visitors and professionals who settled in homeland areas. Waller (2006b) records that after 1986, countries that were sources of skilled migration to the "independent" homelands included Congo, Mali, Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Zaire, Kenya and Uganda. The apartheid government encouraged this migration in its efforts to "prop up" the homelands' education and health systems. She observes that in the 1980s there was also some migration to South Africa of highly skilled professionals and people working in trades from Zimbabwe, Zambia, Ghana and Uganda. These migrants came in search of the higher wages on offer in the country.

In the post-apartheid years, African in-migration was comprised of professionals, asylum seekers, illegal immigrants and criminal syndicates, as well as shorter-term visitors for trade purposes. In the same HSRC volume Oucho (1996: 50) presents the categorisation of current migration within the Southern African region. Noteworthy is that South Africa features as a destination country for all the listed categories. The countries provided as examples for various categories such as refugees and asylum seekers might have changed since the table, which is reproduced below, was compiled.

Oucho also cites Dodson's work in characterising gender aspects of migration from Lesotho, Zimbabwe and Mozambique in mid-1997:

- Immigration is dominated by males;
- Males migrate primarily in search of employment; females migrate for a wide range of social and reproductive factors as well as economic factors;
- Males migrate to areas with employment opportunities (mainly mines); females migrate to towns and cities where informal sector trade is common and where they are better able to get goods and services;
- Men are more likely than women to be illegal migrants;
- Men are more likely to work in formal and women in informal sectors and retail trade.

The cited work is again one of SAMP's products, based on surveys in the three countries, which are widely cited by many other writers.

Table 7. Types of migration within Southern Africa

Type of migration	Characteristics	Origin	Destination
Permanent labour	Permanent residence status Naturalisation Amnesty beneficiaries	Rest of Southern Africa as well as Africa, Asia & Europe	South Africa, Botswana, Namibia
	Unskilled/semi-skilled	Rest of Southern Africa	South Africa (mines & farms)
	Skilled/professional	Rest of Southern Africa	South Africa, Botswana, Namibia
Refugees and asylum seekers	Clandestine (smuggled, undocumented)	Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Swaziland, Lesotho	South Africa
	Fleeing home country	Zimbabwe Namibia Swaziland	South Africa, Botswana South Africa, Botswana South Africa
	Repatriated or returning nationals	Botswana South Africa Rest of Southern Africa Rest of Africa	Namibia, Zimbabwe South Africa
Undocumented, illegal, clandestine, irregular, unauthorised	Lacking documents authorising stay or residence; overstayers; amnesty defaulters; unsuccessful applicants for refugee or asylum status	Rest of Africa	South Africa, Botswana
Itinerant traders and business person	Women traders Smugglers of goods	All countries	All countries

Source: Oucho, 1996: 50

Current government statistics

This section of the report is organised by the agencies that have roles in managing and producing statistics on foreign labour flows and stocks.

Department of Home Affairs

The Department of Home Affairs is the key agency responsible for development and implementation of policy in respect of migration and border control. It bears the main responsibility for, among others, issuing permanent and temporary residence permits (which include permits in respect of work), regulating movement into the country, and managing asylum seekers and refugees. Statistics on movements into the country are discussed in a later sub-section on Statistics South Africa (Stats SA), which has produced regular publications, referred to as "tourism" publications, on the related statistics over the years. This sub-section therefore provides the background on permanent and temporary residence permits and refugees, although the Stats SA sub-section contains further "numbers" in respect of the residence permits.

Administrative sources of data

The application form for a temporary residence permit (BI-1738) lists, among the 14 categories of permit that one can apply for, several that relate to work and are therefore important for the purposes of this investigation. The permits that relate to work are:

- Work: Quota
- Work: General
- Own business
- Intra-company transfer
- Corporate workers
- Exceptional skills

(Segatti (2012) reports that the Immigration Amendment Act of 2011 replaced the exceptional skills permit and quota permit by a single category, the "critical skills work visa".)

An appendix to a recent Stats SA publication (2012a) details the eligibility requirement for each of the categories. Where a permit for any of these categories is granted one would expect the person concerned to work after arriving in South Africa, thus the number of permits issued constitutes a potential source of both flow and stock statistics.

Crush (2001) notes that in 1996, the Department of Home Affairs decided that visitors would no longer be able to change the purpose of their visit after entering the country. This meant that all applications for work permits had to be made outside the country. If fully implemented, this would mean that that the work permits give a good estimate of the flow of "new" foreign workers.

The information asked for on the application includes (but is not limited to) title (but not sex/gender), date of birth, place of birth, marital status, current citizenship/s, country of usual residence, other addresses where the person has lived over the past ten years, previous applications for asylum or refugee status in South Africa or elsewhere, proposed duration of stay in South Africa (including whether the person wants to apply for permanent residence), funds available to maintain the person, and whether family members

will accompany the person. If the application is for a work permit, the employer must provide, among others, the occupation to be filled by the applicant, contract period, salary and benefits. All these fields are presumably stored on a database and could provide a profile of both all applicants and successful applicants.

Permanent residence permits are issued, among others, to individuals (and their spouses) who have been residing in South Africa on the basis of a work permit for at least five years, to those with a permanent work offer, to people with "exceptional skills and qualifications" and to those who qualify as refugees in terms of Section 27(c) of the Refugees Act of 1998 (Statistics South Africa, 2012a). All these categories of permanent residence applicants are likely to be employed after being issued the permit.

The application form for a permanent residence permit (BI-947) allows for inclusion of more than one person per form. Likely, this is intended to allow for family groupings. In addition to name, the list of applicants includes date of birth, gender, relationship (presumably to the "principal" applicant), the applicable section of the Immigration Act (which would show the type of permit), and the permit number.

For the principal applicant, information required includes, but is not limited to, country at birth, nationality at birth, marital status, permanent residential address (which would show location), occupation, and type of temporary residence permit held if applicable. Similar information is collected on the applicant's spouse and any children included on the application.

The details of documents that must accompany the application vary according to the section of the Act under which the application is made. The following are of particular interest from an employment perspective:

- 15.6 Category 27(a): Main applicant has received an offer of permanent employment which falls within the yearly limits of available permits prescribed from time to time for each sector of industry, trade and commerce in regulation 33 (10).
- 15.7 Category 27(b): Main applicant has extraordinary skills or qualifications.
- 15.8 Category 27(c): Main applicant intends to establish a business or to invest in an existing business.

According to DHA's annual report for 2011/12 (Department of Home Affairs, 2012), the total number of permanent and temporary residence permits issued in 2011/12 was 73 449 against a target of 193 000. The main reason given for the shortfall was lack of capacity (seemingly staffing) in the Permitting Chief Directorate. The table below shows the actual number – 13 261 – of work permits issued. (These numbers do not "add up" in that (a) the four types of temporary residence permits sum to 82 392, and (b) for 2011 the numbers are very much lower than those provided by Statistics South Africa, based on data provided by DHA (Statistics South Africa, 2012a, and discussion in later sub-section).

Table 8. Actual permits issued 2011/12

Visitor's permits	27 128
Permanent residence permits	1 322
Work permits	13 261
Study permits	14 060
Other categories	26 621

Source: Department of Home Affairs, 2012: 68

The DHA annual report does not give a target number for permanent residence permits, and also does not distinguish between categories. Instead, the target refers to process and is expressed as 70 per cent of permanent residence permits issued within 8 months of application. In 2011/12, average successful processing for all captured applications – whether current or backlog – was 38 per cent, but the report notes that for current applications the target was being reached.

The targets for temporary residence permits again relate to processing times rather than number of permits issued. For work, business and corporate permits the target was 70 per cent issued within 8 weeks, with a 41 per cent average achieved for the fiscal year. The target time period for intra-company transfer permits was 10 days, and the target time period for study, treaty, exchange and retired persons permits was one week.

In addition to the temporary and permanent residence applications, DHA keeps a separate database relating to asylum seekers and refugees as the relevant legislation is different to that which covers voluntary immigrants. Those awarded refugee status are provided with refugee identification documents and are eligible to apply for a permanent residence permit. Peberdy (2012a) notes that asylum seekers are allowed to work and study as if they were South Africans. Landau (2005) notes that previously asylum seekers could not work or study for the first six months after arrival, but this was overturned by a 2003 court judgement.

Departmental reports

The Department of Home Affairs annual reports provide some numbers, for example, in terms of services delivered. Researchers have, however, found inconsistencies between these and other estimates, including those from the Department itself. In at least some cases, these differences can probably be explained by exclusion or inclusion of particular categories of individuals, e.g. those affected by the special Zimbabwe dispensation. Further differences could be explained by use of different reporting years in that the annual reports use the financial year March to February while some other reports (such as that on asylum statistics) use the calendar year. Yet other differences might be explained by some DHA offices not submitting their statistics in time for the annual report, and incomplete capture of processes on the relevant information management systems (see, for example, Segatti, 2012). The annual report is thus not an ideal source of statistics although some of the statistics, trends and analysis reported on above has been done through other researchers' painstaking compilations from annual reports. Despite the drawbacks in terms of statistics the DHA annual report is nevertheless useful in providing an indication of the Department's achievements and plans in respect of performance, administration and special activities.

The Annual Report 2011-12 (Department of Home Affairs, 2012) notes that in recent years, the Department has focused attention on improving performance on "Civics", including issues such as providing identity documents, and birth and death registration for citizens. With marked improvements there, the focus is now shifting to Immigration Services, the area of direct interest for our purposes, with a dual interest in security, on the one hand, and service delivery on the other. Special emphasis will be placed on improving the permit system.

The first named area of challenge is the large number of applications for asylum by people who are "economic migrants" rather than those who would qualify for refugee status. These people are of direct interest for our purposes given that they will presumably do all they can to find work. The Department's work on this area has included a Survey of Immigrant Communities. A pilot survey, which covered 10 000

immigrants, was conducted in the Bushbuckridge and Nkomazi local municipalities of Mpumalanga during 2011/12. The ultimate objective of the project was to assist the Department to develop policy proposals that would help to regularise those immigrants who qualify to be in the country.

The pilot survey found that the majority of immigrants were from neighbouring countries, and in particular from Mozambique, Swaziland and Zimbabwe. Of the total, 85 per cent were in the country illegally, 49 per cent were not employed (implying 51 per cent were employed) and 22 per cent were formally employed. The overwhelming majority – 82 per cent – said that they did not want to give up their current citizenship. The Department has plans to do further surveys in all known "cross-border areas".

Deportations, asylum seekers and refugees

The DHA produces an annual report on asylum statistics. However, this report is not published on the web and is not easily available. The data are sourced from the National Immigration Information System database, and each report covers one year. Until recently, the reports covered a calendar year, but it seems that the reports might now be produced in respect of the financial year, i.e. from April of one year to March of the next. The set of tables and graphs presented differs somewhat from year to year, but generally provides detailed information on new applications for refugee status, and some information on decisions taken in respect of these applications.

The report on the 2011 calendar (Department of Home Affairs, 2012b), like previous reports, disaggregates the information provided by nationality, gender and offices where applications were made. The 2011 report excludes refugee determination statistics for the Musina Refugee Reception Office (which serves the Beit Bridge border post) as the office was not yet conducting interviews. The report makes explicit reference to the possibility that asylum might be used as a "camouflage" for labour migration (Department of Home Affairs, 2012b: 7), in particular for semi-skilled and unskilled work in agriculture or small, medium and micro-enterprises.

For 2011, a total of 106 904 applications are reported, all of whom were provided with asylum seekers' (section 22) temporary permits. Of the total, 31 349 (29 per cent) were female.

Table 9 shows the distribution of applications across the various offices that deal with refugees. The report notes that the geographical distribution of applications does not necessarily give a clear indication of where refugees will subsequently live.

Table 9. New applications for refugee status, 2010-2011

Office	Number 2011	Share 2011 (%)	Share 2010 (%)
Pretoria	36 018	34	45
Cape Town	30 182	28	18
Musina	17 626	17	18
Johannesburg	11 107	10	7
Durban	6 654	6	8
Port Elizabeth	3 618	3	3
Tshwane	1 699	2	1
Total	106 904	100	100

Source: Department of Home Affairs, 2012b: 5

Table 10 shows the trend in new applications over the period 1998 to 2011, a period in which the number increased more or less ten-fold from 11 135 to 106 904. The largest increase is recorded between 2007 and 2009, when the number reached 341 502. The 2011 number was only a third of this. This pattern reflects the impact of the ZDP, given that a large proportion of asylum seekers before the ZDP (as well as subsequently) were Zimbabweans (Amit, unpublished).

Table 10. New applications for refugee status by year, 1998-2011

Year	Applications
1998	11 135
1999	31 592
2000	12 226
2001	16 325
2002	24 187
2003	41 741
2004	41 369
2005	43 289
2006	53 361
2007	45 637
2008	207 206
2009	341 602
2010	124 336
2011	106 904

Source: Department of Home Affairs, 2012b: 9

In 2011, applications were received from nationals of 71 countries, with the majority of asylum seekers coming from countries in Africa and Asia. Table 11 shows, in descending order of number of applications, all countries which accounted for more than 1 000 applicants. Zimbabwe emerges as a clear leader, with more than 50 000 applications, close to half of the total. Ethiopia and Somalia together account for more than another fifth (21 per cent) of the total. Only three of the top fourteen countries are in the SADC region – Zimbabwe, DRC and Malawi.

Table 11. New applicants by country of origin, countries with 1000+ applicants, 2011

Country	Applications	% of total
Zimbabwe	51 031	48
Ethiopia	12 670	12
Somalia	9 986	9
DRC	7 668	7
Bangladesh	4 752	4
Malawi	3 774	4
Pakistan	2 929	3
Nigeria	2 156	2
Uganda	1 606	2
Congo Republic	1 581	1
Burundi	1 306	1
Ghana	1 221	1
China	1 204	1
India	1 159	1
Total all countries	106 904	100

Source: Department of Home Affairs, 2012b: 10ff

Combined, SADC countries accounted for 64 012 applicants – 60 per cent of the total (although shown as 58 per cent in figure 8 of the report). Table 12 gives the number per country.

Table 12. New SADC applicants by country, 2011

Country of origin	Applications
Zimbabwe	51 031
DRC	7 668
Malawi	3 774
Mozambique	560
Tanzania	473
Zambia	193
Lesotho	185
Swaziland	101
Angola	24
Botswana	2
Namibia	1
Total	64 012

Source: Department of Home Affairs, 2012b: 14-15.

All of the above numbers relate to applications. The 2011 report states that 43 953 asylum applications were adjudicated “at first instance” during 2011. This is substantially less than the number of applications in either of 2010 and 2011, suggesting a fast-increasing backlog. Of applications received during 2010, 20 275 were rejected as manifestly unfounded and 16 875 were rejected as unfounded whereas 6 803 were granted refugee status.

Both section 22 permits (temporary, renewable permits valid for 1-3 months) and section 24 Formal Recognition of Refugee Status permits (valid for two years) allow the person to work. Therefore, among those granted these permits, an unknown number would have worked and thus constituted "foreign labour".

The annual report records "flows" i.e. new permits issued or permits renewed. In terms of stock, Peberdy (2012a) – quoting a UNHCR web-site – puts the number of refugees at 57 899 in January 2012. Peberdy notes that these data do not match those reported by the Forced Migration Studies Programme (now the ACMS) fact sheet (Polzer, 2010) which put the cumulative number of recognised refugees in 2009 at 47 596 and the number of new applications for asylum at 223 324, of which 4 567 had been approved, 46 055 rejected and 172 702 added to the existing backlog of applications awaiting adjudication. However Peberdy notes that many of the 2009 applicants were probably Zimbabweans who might have subsequently applied in terms of the special dispensation.

The DHA's report on asylum applications does not include statistics on deportations. According to the Department's annual report for 2011/12, 75 336 foreign nationals were deported under the Immigration Act (Department of Home Affairs, 2012b: 59). Crush (2001) and others note that some individuals are deported many times even in the space of one year, as they return soon after being deported. The reported numbers are thus of deportations rather than of individuals. However, the fact that policing for deportation purposes tends to focus on workplaces, a large proportion of the deportees are likely to be employed people.

Table 13 shows the distribution, by country, of deportations for 2011 and 2012 as recorded by the Department. The table shows almost double the number of deportations for 2012 than for 2011. However, even in 2012 the total is less than the annual totals recorded in Table 3 above for earlier years. Table 13 shows further that seven countries accounted for 96 per cent of deportations in 2011 and 99 per cent in 2012. The top six countries are all SADC countries. Lesotho accounted for over half (56 per cent) of deportations in 2011, and a quarter (25 per cent) in 2012. Zimbabwe accounted for "only" 18 per cent in 2011, but this increased to 35 per cent in 2012, presumably after the ZDP ended, making Zimbabwe the most common country for deportations. The source data show the number per month. For 2011, there is a relatively even spread over the months. For 2012, January accounts for 13 per cent of deportations and December for 16 per cent, rather than the 8 per cent expected if deportations were spread evenly over the 12 months.

Table 13. Distribution of deportations by country of citizenship, 2011 and 2012 (%)

Country	2011	2012
Zimbabwe	15	35
Lesotho	47	25
Mozambique	22	20
Malawi	9	14
Swaziland	3	1
Tanzania	1	3
Nigeria	1	0
Other	3	1
Total (%)	100	100
Total (number)	65 383	103 529

Source: Compiled from DHA data provided by Adam Salmon, 2011

Scarce skills

The annual reports seem to be the only regular public source of information on the Department's activities – and the related numbers – in respect of scarce skills. The annual report for 2011/12 notes this as a second area of challenge. The Department's "key deliverable" is issuing of permits to skilled foreigners who have been recruited by businesses and institutions working in South Africa. In 2011/12, the Department issued 1 020 work permits in the exceptional skills category and 1 876 work permits in the quota category, giving a total of 2 896 permits for scarce skills. Waller (2006b) explains that section 19(1) of the Immigration Act provides for quotas in respect of work permits for categories of skills that the Minster of Home Affairs, after consulting with the Minister of Labour and Trade and Industry, declares as scarce within South Africa.

Waller notes that the total number of work permits approved each year is far below the quotas. Segatti (2012: 13) notes similarly, citing figures from Erasmus and Breier (2009), that the Department's quota list indicated a need for 24 100 people, while the National Scarce Skills List of the previous year indicated a need for 205 370. However, Erasmus (2009) discusses reasons why the skills lists are themselves open to question. Erasmus points, in particular, to reasons why the sectoral education and training authorities, which generate the base lists, may produce faulty information. A Department of Labour review of a few years ago summarises key aspects of the development of the approach to quotas, and the categories and numbers involved, over the years (Department of Labour, 2007: 25).

The numbers in respect of scarce skills does not include people issued permits in the Intra-Company Transfer and Corporate Permits categories as the system does not currently record the skills of people covered by the permits. According to the annual report, the system is being changed to record this information going forward.

The Department now has a separate unit that processes applications for study and work visas from educational institutions. The latter relate to applications for teachers and lecturers at both basic and higher education levels.

Comparison of actual achievement with targets reveals that the Department fell short in 2011/12 on various plans. Overall, the relevant strategic objective (2.4) in respect of skilled migration is: "To realise a positive skills migration trend of around 50 000 migrants annually" (Department of Home Affairs, 2012). In

2010/11, 12 000 scarce skills permits were issued. For 2011/12 the target was 18 000 permits, but in practice only 2 896 Exceptional skills and Quota permits were issued. While, as noted above, this does not include all categories, it is not clear why the number for these categories was so much less in 2011/12 than in 2010/11.

Anderson (2006) notes that the government's White Paper on Migration states that if no local people are available, preference should be given to people from other Southern African countries, and then to those elsewhere in Africa. However, this preferential system was not built into the Immigration Act of 2002.

Statistics South Africa

Past and present censuses

Hoffmann (2010) notes the United Nations' recommendation that, globally, censuses ask questions about country of birth; citizenship; and year of arrival in the country (either first or most recent) for residence. Eurostat further lists questions on "core topics". These include whether the person has ever lived elsewhere and year of arrival in the country, and previous place of usual residence and year of arrival. The "non-core" topics include the place of usual residence five years before the census, reason for migration, country of birth of parents and citizenship acquisition.

The Department of Labour's Labour Market Review of 2007 (2007: 5) tabulated estimates from pre-1990 census records, revealing a decreasing number of foreign-born Africans over the period 1951 (when the recorded number was 605 992), 1980 (376 483) and 1985 (317 010). However, it seems that these figures might be estimates as the years do not correspond with the census years. For all years, from 1921 onwards Lesotho recorded a higher number than any other country, with Mozambique the next highest.

Kok et al (2003) document the wording of the migration-related questions in the 1996 and 2001 censuses. They also suggest wording for future censuses.

The 1996 census asked for the country of birth of each person; whether they were a migrant worker (someone absent from home, wherever that home might be, for more than a month each year to work or to seek work); whether the dwelling where they were enumerated was the place where they usually lived (spent at least four nights per week) and, if not, where they usually lived; and the year in which they moved to the dwelling, and from where they moved.

For the household there was a series of questions about "usual" members of the household who were away for a month or more because they were migrant workers. For households reporting migrant workers, age, gender, relationship of the person to the head of household, and current living location of the person were requested.

The 2001 census asked for the country of birth of each person; the country of citizenship; and the usual living location (where they usually spent at least four nights a week), where the person was living five years prior to the time of the 1996 census and, if relevant, when they moved.

In addition to the full-scale censuses in 1996, 2001 and 2011, Stats SA conducted a very large-scale Community Survey in 2007.

Table 14, based on Broussard's (2012) tabulation of data from the three censuses, shows the share of the reportedly foreign-born labour force (population aged 15-65 years who are not enrolled in school or institutionalised) in the 1996, 2001 and 2007 exercises. (The total for 2007 is much less than for 1996 and 2001 because 2007 was a sample survey rather than a census.) The table shows an increase in the proportion of foreign-born workers this period, but the increase between 1996 and 2001 is so small that it would not be evident if the calculation was to a single decimal place.

The table also shows the percentage of foreign-born workers in each province. As expected, the percentage is much higher for Gauteng than any other of the provinces throughout the period, and lowest for Eastern Cape. The pattern for other provinces is not as clear. In Free State, for example, the percentage is 5,4 per cent in 1996, then falls to 2,6 per cent, but rises again to 4,5 per cent. Broussard (2012) notes that the three main source countries are Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and the United Kingdom.

Table 14. Foreign share of population 15-65 years not enrolled in school or institutionalised (%)

	1996	2001	2007
Eastern Cape	0,8	0,8	0,9
Free State	5,4	2,6	4,5
Gauteng	6,8	7,1	7,8
KwaZulu-Natal	1,7	1,5	1,5
Limpopo	2,8	3,3	2,7
Mpumalanga	3,3	3,9	3,9
North West	3,2	3,5	4,0
Northern Cape	0,9	1,2	2,7
Western Cape	2,7	2,6	3,6
RSA	3,39	3,44	3,95
Total immigrants	1 635 760	1 845 584	487 265

Source: Broussard, 2012: 20

Broussard (2012: 21) also presents a distribution by industry of the employed population in 2007. The distribution is provided for males and females separately within the African, coloured and white groups for South African-born and for immigrant employees. The information is not reproduced here as the percentage of the population for which the information is missing – 13 per cent for immigrant males and 18,4 per cent for African and coloured females – makes both the group profiles and any comparisons across categories unreliable. For immigrant males, Broussard's table shows 19,2 per cent employed in mining, 13,4 per cent in manufacturing, 10,6 per cent in trade and 10,2 per cent in construction. For immigrant females (for whom 16,7 per cent have unknown industry), it shows 11,3 per cent in private households and 10,6 per cent in both manufacturing and trade.

Broussard (2012) states that apart from the large share in the mining industry, immigrant males have a similar distribution to African and coloured South African males, while immigrant females have a similar industry distributions to African and coloured South African females. However, foreign-born female workers tend to be somewhat more educated than their African and coloured South African-born counterparts.

Broussard's analysis suggests that in 2007, immigrants recorded higher labour force participation rates than even white locally-born people, at 88 per cent for males and 62 per cent for females. Unemployment rates

for foreign-born males and females were higher than those for white South Africans, but lower than those for other population groups.

Census 2011

The 2011 Census questions asked about all individuals in respect of country of birth; citizenship (but not country of citizenship as in 2001); usual residence (including an option "Outside South Africa"); location of residence in 2001; year in which moved to current location, if moved since 2001; and previous location (including an option "Outside South Africa"), if moved since 2001.

Table 15 gives the breakdown by region of birth for the country as a whole. Birth outside South Africa is more common for males (8,4 per cent of all males reported as being born outside South Africa) than females (5,9 per cent). For those born outside South Africa, countries in the SADC region are the most common, apart from the "unspecified" grouping. At least 3,2 per cent of all males and 2,0 per cent of all females were reported to be born somewhere in Africa other than South Africa. Where "0,0" is recorded in the table, this indicates that less than 0,05 per cent of the population were reported to have been born in the region concerned. (The estimates that follow are drawn from available publications as well as from tables generated through PX-Web and the community profile facility on the Stats SA web-site.)

Table 15. Distribution of population by region of birth, by sex, 2011 (%)

	Male	Female	Total
Born in South Africa	91,6	94,1	92,9
SADC	2,8	1,9	2,4
Rest of Africa	0,4	0,1	0,3
United Kingdom and Europe	0,1	0,1	0,1
Asia	0,2	0,1	0,2
North America	0,0	0,0	0,0
Latin America and Caribbean	0,0	0,0	0,0
Oceania	0,0	0,0	0,0
Unspecified	4,8	3,6	4,2
Total	100	100	100
Number	25 188 792	26 581 770	51 770 562

Source: Statistics South Africa, PX-Web

Table 16 reveals that, by far, Gauteng has the highest proportion of foreign-born residents, while Northern Cape has the lowest. (The percentage of non-responses for this question ranges from 2,8 in Northern Cape to 5,5 in Western Cape.) Gauteng also has by far the highest proportion of people born in other SADC countries, while Gauteng and Western Cape have the highest proportion born elsewhere in Africa.

Table 16. Distribution of population by region of birth, by province, 2011 (%)

	South Africa	SADC	Rest of Africa	Other	Unspecified	Total
Eastern Cape	95,9	0,4	0,2	0,1	3,4	100
Free State	94,2	1,5	0,1	0,2	4,0	100
Gauteng	88,0	5,4	0,5	0,7	5,4	100
KwaZulu-Natal	95,2	0,7	0,1	0,1	3,8	100
Limpopo	94,7	2,1	0,1	0,1	2,9	100
Mpumalanga	94,0	2,3	0,1	0,2	3,4	100
North West	93,2	2,8	0,1	0,2	3,7	100
Northern Cape	96,0	0,8	0,1	0,2	2,8	100
Western Cape	91,8	1,6	0,5	0,5	5,5	100

Source: Statistics South Africa, PX-Web

As noted, the census also asked whether the individual was a South African citizen or not. This variable is not available on PX-Web or the community profile, and the available publications do not provide the information for the country as a whole. However, provincially the percentage of non-citizens ranges between 7,1 per cent in Gauteng (with 1,0 per cent unspecified) and 0,9 per cent in Eastern Cape and Northern Cape (with 0,7 and 0,4 per cent respectively unspecified).

The census asked for the population group of each individual. The population group classification specified was the one used during the apartheid years and thus should not be applicable to individuals who were not in the country during those years. Nevertheless, all individuals have a population group classification attached to them, with only 0,5 per cent of the total population being classified as “Other” than one of the four apartheid groupings. The same approach – or, indeed, one which does not provide the “Other” option – is adopted in other Stats SA investigations and it is therefore useful to investigate how foreign-born populations are classified. Table 17 provides this information.

The table shows that, as expected, those born in the SADC region and elsewhere in Africa are more likely than others to be classified as African. However, over a fifth of those born in Africa but outside of the SADC region are classed as “Other” and non-negligible proportions are classified as white or Indian. For the SADC region, a full 8,2 per cent are classified as white. Of those born in Asia, 66,9 per cent as classified as Indian or Asian, but almost a fifth (19,5 per cent) are classified as “Other” and 8,4 per cent as white. The classification was African for 16,0 per cent of Oceanians and 8,4 per cent of North American respondents. Overall, the table suggests that it is not valid to “read off” population group from country of birth or vice versa.

Table 17. Distribution of population by population group within region of birth, 2011 (%)

	African	Coloured	Indian	White	Other	Total
Born in South Africa	79,6	9,3	2,4	8,4	0,3	100
SADC	86,8	0,8	0,4	8,2	3,8	100
Rest of Africa	68,7	0,9	3,9	5,9	20,6	100
United Kingdom and Europe	5,1	0,8	0,7	88,3	5,1	100
Asia	4,2	1,1	66,9	8,4	19,5	100
North America	8,4	2,3	5,3	76,2	7,8	100
Latin America and Caribbean	9,8	3,4	3,2	64,1	19,5	100
Oceania	16,0	2,2	3,2	74,1	4,5	100
Unspecified	72,6	6,0	2,6	16,2	2,6	100
Total	79,2	8,9	2,5	8,9	0,5	100

Source: Statistics South Africa: PX-Web

The previous tables cover the full population. From a labour perspective, the age group of primary interest is those aged 15-64 years. Table 18 reveals that at least 8,8 per cent of individuals in this age group were born outside the country, with at least 3,2 per cent born elsewhere in the SADC region and a further 0,4 per cent born in the rest of Africa. If the distributions for the younger and older age groups are compared with the distribution for this working age grouping, it is clear that it is the working age grouping that is most likely to have been born in another African country.

Table 18. Distribution of population by region of birth within age group, 2011 (%)

	0-14	15-64	65+
Born in South Africa	97,0	91,2	90,7
SADC	0,7	3,2	1,2
Rest of Africa	0,1	0,4	0,1
United Kingdom and Europe	0,0	0,1	0,9
Asia	0,0	0,2	0,2
North America	0,0	0,0	0,0
Latin America and Caribbean	0,0	0,0	0,0
Oceania	0,0	0,0	0,0
Unspecified	2,1	4,9	6,8
Total	100	100	100
Number	15 100 089	33 904 480	2 765 992

Source: Statistics South Africa, PX-Web

As noted above, the 2001 census also asked whether each individual was, five years previously, living in the place where they were enumerated in 2001. Overall, only 2 per cent of individuals were said to have lived elsewhere outside of South Africa, with a further 2,1 per cent unspecified. The core working age group of 15-64 year olds was more likely to have lived elsewhere outside of South Africa – at 2,6 per cent, compared to 0,7 per cent for younger people and 0,4 per cent for older people. This finding confirms the greater mobility of working age people.

Of the working age people who had lived elsewhere outside of South Africa, a full 20 per cent said that they had moved to the place where they were enumerated in 2011, with a further 15 per cent moving in 2010,

13 per cent in 2009 and 12 per cent in 2008. This means that nearly six in ten respondents moved in 2008 or later.

While a census in theory is a full count of the population, in practice this is not the case. For the 2011 census, Statistics South Africa (2012c: 8) reports overall omission (under-count) rates of 14,6 per cent for individuals and 14,3 per cent for households. Provincially, Western Cape has the highest omission rate for both individuals (18,6 per cent) and households (17,8 per cent). For some of the smaller areas, such as municipalities, the omission rates were probably even higher. Groups who are unwilling to be counted, such as foreigners who are illegally in the country, are likely to be over-represented among those who are not counted.

The post-enumeration survey which provided the estimates of the under-count was used by Stats SA to derive weights that would attempt to correct for under-counting. However, Statistics South Africa (2012c: 5) notes that these corrections – and thus all the census numbers – are reliable only at national and provincial levels. For these reasons, the census is unlikely to provide reliable estimates of foreigners at municipal level or below.

Further, the reported results are based on "cleaned" data, with some values imputed on the basis of logic and others through "dynamic" (hot-deck) imputation. In the latter process, where a value is missing for an individual, the value reported for another randomly selected individual with similar characteristics (such as age, sex, population groups) is assigned to the individual with missing information. For the citizenship variable, for example, 3,2 per cent of the values are based on logical imputation (Statistics South Africa, 2012d: 6). If the logic is based on where the person was born or lived five years previously, comparisons of citizenship and location of previous residence will be affected by the non-independence of the values.

Labour market statistics from Census 2011

The census estimates above relate to the population, not only to those who are employed. In the 2011 census, the work status of an individual was based on three questions – one asking about work as an employee, the second about work as self-employed or an employer, and the third about work as an unpaid family worker. (There are further questions that can be used to identify those who are unemployed i.e. both wanting and having looked for work.) Of responses to the three work questions only 66,4, 60,6 and 59,4 per cent respectively did not require imputation. For all three questions about 30 per cent of respondents had non-blank responses which were changed through imputation because there were logical inconsistencies with other responses (Statistics South Africa, 2012d: 11). (The Quarterly Labour Force Survey (QLFS) data-set – reported on below – also has imputed values, but the extent of the imputation is not reported in the standard publications.) Again this suggests that one must allow a margin of error when using the census estimates.

Further, both internationally and in South Africa, labour force estimates produced by censuses are generally less reliable than those produced by the Labour Force Survey. The differences between the estimates from the two sources was recognised in respect of the 2001 census, and again in respect of the 2011 census (Statistics South Africa, 2011c: 49). The main release on the 2011 census suggests that the reason for the difference is that the census asked only about the first week of October, while the QLFS is conducted over the full three-month period. This reasoning is questionable as the QLFS, like the census, asks about employment only in the previous seven days.

The currently available statistical release (Statistics South Africa, 2011c: 49) compares the estimates from the census with those from the QLFS conducted in more or less the same period. The QLFS results are, as yet, not benchmarked (adjusted by weights so as to match the totals) to the census results, and this could account for some of the differences. However, the weighting cannot account for the fact that the census estimate of employment in the informal sector is 27,2 per cent less than that recorded in the census (1,6 million versus 2,2 million), while the estimate of those employed in private households is 34,2 per cent higher than that recorded in the QLFS (1,5 million versus 1,1 million). For the formal sector, the census records 4,0 per cent fewer employed people than the QLFS – 9,8 million versus 10,2 million. These differences are especially worrying for our purposes given that the largest deviations occur in the sectors – informal and private households – where we would most expect foreigners to be employed.

Table 19 provides the key labour indicators of employment rate (number employed divided by population 15-64 years), unemployment rate (number unemployed divided by sum of employed and unemployed) and labour force participation rate (sum of employed and unemployed divided by population) by region of birth. (The tables that follow are from special runs on the data done by Diego Iturralde of Stats SA in January 2012. Small differences from the PX-Web result from people with unspecified places of birth.) The employment and labour force participation rates are substantially lower – at 38 and 58 per cent respectively – for South Africans than for any other region of birth, while the unemployment rate is substantially higher (at 31 per cent) than for other regions. For the employment and unemployment rates those born in SADC countries are the next worst performers after South African-born respondents, but SADC's labour force participation rate is higher than for any other region. The best performers overall on these three indicators are those born in Asia.

Table 19. Key labour indicators by region of birth, population 15-64 years, 2011 (%)

Region of birth	Employment rate	Unemployment rate	Labour force participation rate
South Africa	38	31	55
SADC	62	20	78
Rest of Africa	68	12	77
United Kingdom and Europe	69	5	73
Asia	73	4	77
North America	67	4	70
Latin America and Caribbean	65	7	70
Oceania	72	5	76
Total	39	30	56

Source: Special run, Diego Iturralde, Statistics South Africa

Table 20 provides data on the same labour market indicators for 15-64 year olds from the ten most common countries of birth other than South Africa. The top six countries are all within the SADC region. In terms of population, Zimbabwe is shown as having close to double the number of people in this age range as the next most common country, Mozambique. In terms of labour market indicators, the employment rate is highest for Malawi (72 per cent) and lowest for Lesotho (51 per cent), the unemployment rate is lowest for India (6 per cent) and highest for Lesotho (30 per cent), and the labour force participation rate is highest for Malawi (84 per cent) and lowest for Swaziland (67 per cent). On each of the three indicators,

people from even the worst-performing of these ten countries perform much better than South African-born people.

Table 20. Population and key labour indicators by 10 most common countries of birth, population 15-64 years, 2011

	Total	Employment rate (%)	Unemployment rate (%)	Labour force participation rate (%)
Zimbabwe	515 824	66	18	80
Mozambique	262 556	58	24	76
Lesotho	124 463	51	30	73
Malawi	69 544	72	14	84
Namibia	29 653	67	10	74
Swaziland	27 471	52	22	67
India	23 780	64	6	68
Zambia	22 833	70	9	76
Nigeria	20 983	69	13	79
Congo	18 545	52	24	68

Source: Special run, Diego Iturralde, Statistics South Africa

Quarterly Labour Force Survey: Foreign workers

Stats SA's Quarterly Labour Force Survey (QLFS), as the name implies, is conducted every quarter. It is based on information collected from approximately 30 000 randomly selected households distributed across the country. It is regarded as the most reliable official source of labour statistics in the country. It is more reliable than the Quarterly Employment Survey, which is an establishment-based survey, as the latter covers only the formal sector. Theoretically, the QLFS should capture a representative sample of foreigners, including working foreigners, as long as they are living in households.

The sampling frame for the QLFS includes worker hostels. This is relevant for our purposes because mine workers (many of whom might be foreign), in particular, are more likely than many other categories of workers to live in worker hostels. However, although the sampling frame includes worker hostels, Stats SA acknowledges that the clustered nature of mining hostels probably means that the population living in mining hostels is not adequately captured (Peter Buwembo, personal communication, 18 December 2012).

The standard QLFS questionnaire does not include questions about nationality, country of birth or previous residence, or other factors related to migration. A short module with questions on migration was added to the questionnaire for the third quarter of 2012. Stats SA did this in line with its undertaking periodically to include questions on topics that were omitted in the standard questionnaire when the QLFS was introduced in 2008. Unfortunately, the results from the migration module were not available at the time of writing.

The standard QLFS questionnaire does include the following question on population group: "*1.5 What population group does ..... belong to?*" The main intention of this question is to enquire about the population group classification used during the apartheid era, namely the categories African, coloured, Indian and white. The answer options include a fifth option "Other", and space is provided for to specify what the "Other" is. The published reports on the QLFS and the raw datasets made available to the public have all individuals classified into one of the four standard apartheid groupings. Individuals for whom this

field is left blank or set as any other value than 1-4 have values between 1 and 4 imputed. This is necessary because Stats SA's weighting methodology has population group as one of the determining factors.

The question arises as to what happens to foreigners in this process. Fieldworkers are instructed that it is up to the respondent to decide how they and other household members are classified for this question. The responses thus reflect self-perception or identification rather than the fieldworker's perception or how the person might have been classified under apartheid. A Stats SA official with responsibility for the QLFS suggested that most black foreigners from the region would classify themselves as African. Further, the imputation process would probably "borrow" either the population group of the head of household or other members if this was within the 1-4 range, or the population group of a person with similar geographical and other characteristics. Effectively, this "hides" the foreign workers.

Stats SA kindly provided a file from the 2012 third quarter round of the QLFS showing all individuals who were originally allocated population group "Other". A total of 65 were so classified, of whom 54 had a narrative specification. If one uses the mean weighting at individual level, the 65 "Other" people represent just under 40 000 in the total population, clearly far less than the total number of foreign people in the country. Table 21 shows that 12 of the 54 were described as Portuguese, seven each as Ethiopian and Somalian, six each as Italian, Khoisan and Zimbabwean, and five as South African. This is clearly not a useful source of information on foreign labour – especially as the records include all individuals, regardless of work status, and some respondents might therefore not be economically active. What is interesting is that while the 65 "Other" people are distributed across 31 households, some of these households contain a mix of people classified as "Other" and people classified in one of the four standard population groups.

Table 21. Specified "other" population group, QLFS 2012:3

Specification	Number
Bangladeshi	1
Ethiopian	7
German	2
Italian	6
Khoisan	6
Pakistani	2
Portuguese	12
Somalian	7
South African	5
Zimbabwean	6
Total	54

Source: Own analysis, data supplied by Stats SA

Stats SA also provided the unedited data for the population group field for the QLFS of the third quarter 2012. The edited QLFS file contains a total of 188 individuals (107 214 after weighting) whose original population group weighting was either "Other" (5 individuals) or blank (183 individuals). The much smaller number of "Other" than in the analysis above – 5 rather than 65 – is a result of 60 of these records being dropped due to inadequate information across all fields combined. The fact that such a large proportion of those classified as "Other" population groupare dropped probably merits further investigation as to why the responses for these individuals tend to be incomplete.

Table 22 cross-tabulates, after weighting, the original unedited population group and the final population group. It shows that the "Other" and blank responses were distributed across all four official population groups.

Table 22. Edited and unedited population group in QLFS 2012:3

Unedited	Edited				
	African	Coloured	Indian	White	Total
African	68 520				68 520
Coloured		9 412			9 412
Indian			1 577		1 577
White				6 063	6 063
Other	4		1		5
Blank	153	21		9	183
Total	68 677	9 433	1 578	6 072	85 760

Source: Own analysis, data supplied by Stats SA

Only 83 (53 832 weighted) of the 188 blank or "Other" individuals are aged 15-64 years. Using weighted estimates, of this 15-64 "Other" population, only a little more than 16 000 are employed, while just over 13 000 are unemployed and more than 4 000 are discouraged workseekers. Again, this shows clearly that the population group variable in the QLFS is not a reliable source of information on foreign labour in South Africa.

The migration questions used for the third quarter 2012 QLFS were asked in respect of all individuals aged 15 years and above. They were as follows:

8.1 Where were you born?

Responses distinguish between "this province", another (specified) province, and "outside South Africa".

8.2 In which province (country) were you born?

Asked of those not born in "this" province.

8.3 Have you moved from one province to the other in the past 5 years?

Responses Yes or No

8.4 When did you move to this province (the most recent move)? Give the year and month.

Response in terms of year and month

8.5 In which province were you living before you moved to the province you presently reside in?

Reponses distinguish between the nine provinces and "outside South Africa (specify)".

8.6 What was the main reason for moving to the province you presently reside in?

Options as follows:

01=TO WORK

02=JOB TRANSFER

03=LOOK FOR PAID WORK

04=TO START A BUSINESS

05=LOOK FOR LAND FOR FARMING

06=FAMILY MOVED

07=MARRIAGE

08=SCHOOL/TRAINING

09=TO LIVE WITH A RELATIVE

10=DIVORCE/SEPARATION

11=ADVENTURE

12=OTHER, specify

Quarterly Labour Force Survey: The South African labour market

As noted above, the QLFS is based on information collected from approximately 30 000 randomly selected households distributed across the country and is regarded as the most reliable official source of labour statistics in the country.

The weighting for the QLFS produces estimates that – at the aggregate level – should be reliable at provincial level and, within each province for aggregated metro and non-metro areas. Because of the way the sampling is done, the results are not reliable at municipal level. The results are also not reliable when disaggregated finely within the province-metro clusters because the sampling and weighting are not done on the basis of the further disaggregation. The unreliability is relevant for general statistics on the labour market, even before attempting to identify foreigners. Even the most basic labour market indicators, such as the employment, unemployment and labour force participation rate, cannot be reliably derived at municipal level except for metros that are the only metro in their respective provinces, and for all Gauteng metros combined.

For the country as a whole, the third quarter 2012 QLFS gives an employment rate of 41,3 per cent, implying that only about two in every five of the 33,0 million people aged 15-64 years were employed (Statistics South Africa, 2012e). The labour participation rate stood at 55,5 per cent, and the unemployment rate at 25,5 per cent. In addition to the 4,5 million people unemployed and looking for work, an additional 2,3 million were discouraged work-seekers who wanted a job but had given up looking.

Of those who were unemployed in the strict sense of the term, 61,0 per cent had less than grade 12 education, 32,8 per cent had passed matric, and 5,9 per cent had some tertiary education. ("Other" education accounts for 0,3 per cent of respondents.) Among the employed, 49,1 per cent had less than grade 12 education, 30,8 per cent had passed matric, and 19,2 per cent had tertiary education (0,8 per cent "other"). Comparing the two education profiles gives a strong indication of the greater chances that an educated person will find a job, but also reveals that a worrying proportion of people with completed school education remain unemployed.

There are clear gender differences in labour outcomes in South Africa. For women, the employment rate stood at 35,0 per cent, labour force participation at 48,0 per cent, and unemployment at 48,0 per cent. The comparable rates for men were 48,0, 62,5 and 23,3 per cent respectively. There are also stark differences in terms of population groups. Comparing the two ends of the continuum, employment rates were 37,5 per

cent for Africans compared to 63,5 per cent for whites, labour force participation stood at 52,9 and 67,5 per cent respectively, and the unemployment rates were 29,1 and 5,9 per cent respectively.

The standard reports on the QLFS contain a wealth of further information on the characteristic of employed, unemployed and not economically active respondents, as well as the working conditions and situation of the employed. The data-set of the raw data can also be downloaded from Stats SA's web-site, at no charge, allowing for further detailed exploration. However, while such exploration can produce estimates below the provincial and metro level, the statistics will not be reliable.

Tourism statistics

Stats SA receives, processes and reports on administrative data received from the Department of Home Affairs in respect of movement into and out of the country. This is done in two ways. The first system covers "tourism" statistics, and is based on administrative data collected at border posts as people move into and out of the country. The second system covers (documented) "migration" and is based on administrative data in respect of temporary and permanent residence permits.

The first system, on "tourism" statistics, has been in place for some time. It includes monthly reports (statistical release series P0351) and an annual report that brings together the monthly statistics for a calendar year (report no. 03-51-02).

The system relies on data routinely collected at all road, air and sea entry ports. The data are first captured into the DHA's population Movement Control System (MCS). In most cases the data are captured directly from travel documents, with the information scanned or typed directly onto the port's electronic database. Unlike in the past, travellers no longer complete forms or cards when departing and arriving.

Peberdy (2012a) notes that the border crossing statistics do not count individuals who cross border posts without presenting documents. This could include people who arrive in buses and taxis where the driver does the border clearance and gets clearance for more people than there are passports through paying a bribe.

The data are transmitted from the individual ports to a national database at the DHA head office, and downloaded monthly by Stats SA. As part of quality control, Stats SA compares the statistics that result for air travel with statistics provided by the Airports Company of South Africa on the number of passengers arriving and departing on international flights. The Company's statistics are expected to exceed the DHA statistics because the former include people in transit who do not go through border posts. For August 2012 the DHA numbers were 8,7 per cent lower than those recorded by the Airports Company (Statistics South Africa, 2012b).

Clearly, only a small proportion of the people who move in and out of the country in any period can be considered "migrants", only a proportion of the "migrants" will migrate for work or labour purposes, and only a proportion of those who do so will report that as the reason. The tourism statistics thus need to be carefully interpreted to extract information that related to foreign labour in South Africa.

In these releases and reports, Stats SA uses a number of internationally accepted terms to refer to different concepts (Statistics South Africa, 2012a). The following list presents definitions of terms and also explains how each relates to our interest in foreign labour:

- **Traveller:** someone who moves between different geographical locations for any purpose and any duration. This definition includes those who travel for work purposes, and is therefore of direct interest. It would, for example, include people who plan to settle in South Africa, and would also include those who come here with temporary residence permits.
- **Visitor:** any person travelling to a place other than that of his/her usual environment for less than 12 months and whose main purpose of the trip is other than the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited. This definition explicitly excludes foreigners who work as employees if we assume that people correctly and honestly report their intention. It does, however, include at least some of those who do work in terms of another employment status. This would include self-employed people such as cross-border traders and those who come on business visits. However, for most purposes those on business visits would probably not be considered "foreign labour". The fact that it refers to "main purpose" means that it could include some people for whom work is a secondary purpose, such as students who also do some work while studying.
- **Same-day visitor:** someone who visits a place for less than one night. This definition excludes foreign labour unless we are interested in those who come into the country to do quick business, such as some cross-border traders.
- **Tourist** (overnight visitor): a visitor who stays at least one night in collective or private accommodation in the place visited. This definition excludes foreigners who work as employees because the term "visitor" excludes those who travel for work purposes.
- **Tourism:** the activities of persons travelling to, and staying in places outside their usual environment, for not more than one consecutive year, for leisure, business and other purposes. The "usual environment" of a person consists of a certain area around his/her place of residence, plus all other places he/she frequently visits. In line with the definitions above, this could include some foreign labour if we understand the term to include those who do business in South Africa.

The tourism statistics covers the movements of both South Africans and foreigners. Stats SA's reports also use the following terms to define local and foreign travellers:

- **South African resident:** either a South African citizen or a non-South African citizen with a South African permanent residence permit.
- **Foreign traveller:** a traveller who is not a South African citizen or permanent resident.

These definitions should, at least in theory, mean that one could exclude double-counting when using these reports together with those that document migration. However, while these definitions refer to citizenship, the tabulations in the report are done by country of residence.

The numbers reported for 2011 (Statistics South Africa, 2012b) give a sense of how the different terms and concepts relate to each other. Thus for 2011 a total of 34,1 million **travellers** were reported, made up of 17,9 million arrivals and 16,2 million departures. To be remembered here and in respect of other statistics on tourism, is that they measure border crossings rather than individuals as, for example, a person who came into and went out of the country four times in 2011 would have been counted eight times.

Of total arrivals, 12,5 million were foreigners, as were 10,7 million of the 16,2 million departures. At face value, this gives a "net" count of 1,8 million more foreigners in South Africa at the end of 2011 than were in

the country at the beginning of that year. The report notes that the number of foreign departures has been lower than the number of foreign arrivals for every year since 2000, with the difference between the two counts increasing since 2006. This pattern is clearly seen in Table 23 below. When summed across the 12 years, the *net* arrivals amount to close on 12,4 million – nearly as many as total foreign arrivals in 2011. One likely reason for this difference could be that border officials are more diligent in checking and recording entry into, than exit from, the country. This could, for example, be the case in respect of cross-border traffic in buses and other vehicles carrying relatively large numbers of passengers.

Table 23. Foreign arrivals and departures, 2000-2011

	Arrivals	Departures	Net arrivals
2000	6 000 538	5 466 128	534 410
2001	5 908 024	5 307 217	600 807
2002	6 549 916	5 822 136	727 780
2003	6 640 095	5 955 199	684 896
2004	6 815 196	6 093 313	721 883
2005	7 518 317	6 728 659	789 658
2006	8 508 805	7 501 755	1 007 050
2007	9 207 697	8 022 796	1 184 901
2008	9 728 860	8 474 663	1 254 197
2009	10 098 306	8 680 250	1 418 056
2010	11 574 540	9 908 518	1 666 022
2011	12 495 743	10 725 213	1 770 530

Statistics South Africa, 2012b: 18

Segatti and Landau (2011: 157) present a graph on arrivals (approved entries) that goes back to 1984, when the number was much less than 1 000. Their graph uses annual reports from the Department of Home Affairs published in 2005 through 2010 for the latter years. Their graph ends at 2009 and reflects numbers of around 14 000 or higher for 2007, 2008 and 2009, but numbers similar to those in the table above for the earlier period.

Crush and Williams (2010) note that the total number of legal entrants into the country, as measured by the tourism statistics, increased from 1 million in 1990 to over 5 million in 1996. As seen in the table, the number increased to over 12 million in 2011. Crush and Williams note further that the number of legal entrants from the rest of Africa rose from less than a million in 1990 to 3,8 million in 1996 and 7,4 million in 2008 (when the total number was 9,7 million). Not all of these would have been workers. However, Crush and Williams refer in this respect to a survey of migrants in five SADC countries conducted by SAMP in the late 1990s, which found that, overall, 29 per cent of all migrants migrated for labour purposes. The proportion who did so ranged from 10 per cent in Botswana to 67 per cent in Mozambique.

Crush (2001) suggests that the DHA's computerised MCS allows calculation, at any point in time, of how many people from each country are in South Africa with expired permits. (He refers to a Table 10 which is not included in the publication.) On 19 March 1997, this number stood at 658 875. For the period 1992-94, his calculations suggested that approximately 80 000 migrants per year remained in the country. However, he notes that some might have left the country without going through formal border posts. Others may have been deported.

Of the 12,5 million foreign arrivals in 2011, 12,1 million (97 per cent) were "visitors", of whom 3,8 million were same-day visitors with the remaining 8,3 million (69 per cent of the visitors) constituting tourists. Of the 12,5 million foreign arrivals, 193 844 (1,6 per cent) were for business purposes, 240 588 (1,9 per cent) for work purposes, and 92 171 (0,7 per cent) for study purposes. The overwhelming majority of entrants – 11,6 million – were for holiday purposes.

Table 24 is an extract from one of the appendices of the Stats SA's report on tourism in 2011 (Statistics South Africa, 2012b). The table elaborates on the foreign business visitors. It gives the total number of tourists, the number classified as travelling for business purposes, and the number traveling for business purposes as a percentage of the total. This information is given in respect of all tourists, overseas (i.e. non-African) and African tourists and, within Africa, total SADC tourists as well as numbers from each SADC country.

Overall, of 8,3 million tourists recorded in 2011, only 0,18 million – 2,1 per cent – were recorded as travelling for business purposes. While the percentage is small, it is higher in terms of actual people, than the 1,6 per cent recorded in respect of all foreign arrivals. The percentage of entrants reportedly travelling for business purposes was almost twice as high for overseas tourists as for African tourists (3,6 and 1,7 per cent respectively), and lower still for SADC entrants at 1,6 per cent. However, there was substantial variation between the SADC countries. Namibia stands out as a particular exception, with 12,2 per cent of tourists reportedly travelling for business purposes. Zambia also records a high 6,6 per cent. At the other end of the scale, for Lesotho and Botswana the percentage is only 0,3 and 0,4 per cent.

Despite the fact that business accounted for a lower percentage of African than overseas tourists, Africa accounted for 56,9 per cent of business tourists in 2011, and SADC countries alone for 52,4 per cent of the total. Mozambique and Namibia each accounted for more than 13 per cent of all business tourists.

Table 24. Country of residence of tourists by purpose of visit, 2011

	Total	Business	% business
Total	8 339 354	183 882	2,2
Overseas	2 176 719	77 835	3,6
Africa	6 136 835	104 590	1,7
SADC	5 951 261	96 294	1,6
Angola	39 217	864	2,2
Botswana	477 937	1 697	0,4
DRC	32 582	1 045	3,2
Lesotho	1 526 597	4 005	0,3
Madagascar	2 962	87	2,9
Malawi	135 577	2 592	1,9
Mauritius	16 545	452	2,7
Mozambique	1 076 753	24 766	2,3
Namibia	197 835	24 117	12,2
Seychelles	3 182	40	1,3
Swaziland	700 119	12 335	1,8
Tanzania	28 645	563	2,0
Zambia	160 302	10 590	6,6
Zimbabwe	1 553 008	13 141	0,8

Source: Statistics South Africa, 2012b: 53

Table 25 (re-calculated from a table in Crush and Williams, 2010) shows a clear increase in the proportion of legal Asian entrants into the country for work purposes over the period 1996 to 2008, but a more variable pattern in respect of entries from Africa, Europe and North America over the same period. Overall, it seems that for Africa the share at first decreases but then subsequently increases, while the pattern for Europe and North America is the mirror image. However, the patterns are further obscured by the relatively large percentage with unspecified country of origin for the earliest and later years.

Table 25. Distribution of those entering legally into South Africa for work by region, 1996-2008 (%)

	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008
Africa	45	29	25	29	35	37	34
Europe	23	39	38	36	30	27	25
North America	6	12	12	10	7	5	5
Central & S America	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
Australia	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
Middle East	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
Asia	7	10	12	12	17	21	21
Indian Ocean Islands	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Unspecified	15	5	7	6	6	6[1]	12
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	118 449	81 442	68 979	58 747	83 264	114 237	137 032

Source: Calculated from Crush and Williams, 2010: 17

Migration statistics

Stats SA does not currently produce regular reports on documented migration based on temporary and permanent residence permits issued. Publication of such reports was suspended after 2005, when the 2003 data were published, owing to concerns about the coverage and quality of the administrative registers. Stats SA does, however, have firm plans to re-start production of such reports in the future. In preparation for this, in late 2012 Stats SA released a discussion paper on documented migration (Statistics South Africa, 2012a). The document includes a discussion of the issues, the various types of permits, and some tabulations of statistics based on administrative data provided by DHA.

The data from DHA, which was provided to Stats SA in two separate files, related to temporary and permanent residence permits issued in 2011. (It did not cover all applications for such permits, only those that were successful.) The files included only a limited number of variables as DHA has, to date, not captured all information on the application forms. However, the discussion document notes that DHA has plans to increase the number of captured variables. Sex and occupation are two variables that, while not currently captured, will be captured in the future. (As noted above, sex does not seem to be asked for on the application form.) Both sex and occupation are crucial variables for generating improved statistics on foreign labour.

The DHA data required some cleaning by Stats SA, which might have resulted in a small number of cases being rejected. Nevertheless, the tables in the discussion report are unlikely to be far off from the "real" numbers.

Temporary residence permits

Overall, the data reflected a total of 106 173 temporary residence permits issued to individuals from 184 countries. (There are 194 countries in the world). Of the total, several countries stand out as major "suppliers" of new temporary residents. Thus 15 628 permits (14,7 per cent of the total) went to individuals

[1] In the source data, 2006 "unspecified" is left blank. It is filled in here for consistency. As is the case with all rounding, numbers may not add up to 100.

from Zimbabwe, 12 210 (11,5 per cent) to Nigerians, 7 786 (7,3 per cent) to Indians, and 7 437 (7,0 per cent) to Chinese entrants. These four countries together with Pakistan and the United Kingdom accounted for more than half (50,5 per cent) of the permits issued in 2011. Of all the temporary residence permits issued, 86,4 per cent went to individuals aged 15-64 years of age, i.e. “working-age” adults.

Table 26 gives the number of temporary residence permits issued in 2011 by permit type and limited to those of interest for our purposes. The numbers are given for all countries combined, for overseas (not Africa), Africa, the SADC region and each of the SADC countries. The table shows that of the total 106 173 temporary permits issued, 19 per cent were for work purposes, 16 per cent for study, and 1 per cent for business. Of the permits issued for citizens of African countries, 15 per cent were for work purposes, 23 per cent for study and again 1 per cent for business. For the SADC countries combined, the percentages were 20, 25 and less than 1 per cent respectively.

In the key category of permits for work purposes, 42 per cent were for citizens of African countries and 31 per cent for SADC countries. Zimbabwe alone accounted for 25 per cent of all permits for work purposes. All other SADC countries accounted for less than 2 per cent of the total permits issued for work purposes.

Of the business permits, China accounted for 16 per cent, Pakistan for 14 per cent and Nigeria for 9 per cent. None of the SADC countries features among the top eight countries for this type of temporary residence permit.

The table does not include a column for corporate permits. The total for this category is 180 (only 0,2 per cent of the total), of which 64 are recorded as Africa and 58 as SADC recipients. Only four SADC countries have non-zero amounts recorded for this category – Mozambique (36), Zimbabwe (18), Lesotho (2) and Malawi (1).

Table 26. Temporary residence permit recipients by geography and type, 2011

	Business	Work	Study	Other	Total	Work as % of total
Total	1 346	20 673	16 928	67 226	106 173	100
Overseas	883	11 885	3 657	32 206	48 631	57
Africa	463	8 765	13 266	34 966	57 460	42
SADC	93	6 329	7 901	17 473	31 796	31
Angola	12	47	1 012	968	2 039	0
Botswana	3	97	206	425	731	0
DRC	17	214	1 072	1 298	2 601	1
Lesotho	3	107	536	2 060	2 706	1
Madagascar	0	7	27	45	79	0
Malawi	6	239	233	1 569	2 047	1
Mauritius	0	51	64	167	282	0
Mozambique	6	94	159	1 138	1 397	0
Namibia	0	14	325	465	804	0
Seychelles	0	1	9	20	30	0
Swaziland	1	87	318	689	1 095	0
Tanzania	2	62	129	511	704	0
Zambia	7	240	425	981	1 653	1
Zimbabwe	36	5 069	3 386	7 137	15 628	25
Other Africa	370	2 436	5 365	17 493	25 664	12

Source: Statistics South Africa, 2012a: 59

Permanent residence permits

The number of permanent residence permits issued in 2011 was 10 011, less than a tenth of the number of temporary residence permits issued. The recipients of permanent residence permits came from 128 countries. The same six countries which accounted for 50,5 per cent of temporary residence permits accounted for 44,1 per cent of permanent residence permits issued. The top contributors for permanent residence permits were Zimbabwe (1 131), Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) (1 054), China (807) and India (744). Of these only DRC was not among the top contributors in terms of temporary residence permits. Of all the permanent residence permits issued, 81,4 per cent went to individuals aged 15-64 years of age, and about half to individuals aged 30 to 44 years.

Of the permanent residence permits issued, 2 060 (21 per cent) were applications made for work purposes, and a further 316 (3 per cent) for business purposes. However, there is marked variation in this pattern geographically. Table 27 shows that over a quarter (27,4 per cent) of the permits issued to overseas individuals were for work purposes and 5,4 per cent for business purposes, while for Africa the work percentage was 15,9 per cent and for SADC it was 17,2 per cent, while the business percentages were 1,6 and 0,7 per cent respectively. The table confirms that in part this distribution pattern within geographical areas is explained by the relatively large percentage of permits for Africans issued within the refugee category. (It is not clear if all reports on permanent residence permits include the refugee category.)

Geographically, the table includes the broad categories of overseas, Africa and SADC, followed by African countries with substantial numbers of permanent residence permits in descending order of number of

permits, followed by the two additional SADC countries receiving more than 100 permanent residence permits. For Zimbabwe, the country with the most permits, there were extremely few refugee permits. In contrast, over nine in ten permits for Somalians, approximately three-quarters for people from Rwanda and DRC, and over half for people from Congo were refugee permits. Among the listed countries, permanent residence permits issued for the purpose of work were most common for Kenyans (42 per cent of all Kenyan permits), Zimbabweans (36 per cent) and Nigerians (25 per cent).

Table 27. Distribution of permanent residence permits by category (%)

	Work	Refugees	Business	Other	Total
Overseas	27	0	5	67	100
Africa	16	28	2	55	100
SADC	17	24	1	58	100
Zimbabwe	36	0	1	63	100
DRC	3	71	1	25	100
Nigeria	25	0	3	72	100
Somalia	0	92	0	8	100
Congo	4	55	1	40	100
Lesotho	4	0	0	96	100
Rwanda	1	76	0	23	100
Kenya	42	0	4	54	100
Zimbabwe	35	1	1	63	100
Malawi	15	0	1	84	100

Source: Statistics South Africa, 2012a: 39

Of the 2 059 work permits issued in 2011, China and Zimbabwe each accounted for 20 per cent and India for 15 per cent. Of the 1 664 refugee permits issued, DRC accounted for 45 per cent, Somalia for 24 per cent, and Congo for 14 per cent.

Department of Labour

Employment Equity system

Formal sector businesses are required to report to the Department of Labour on a regular basis on the profile of their workforce with respect to the Employment Equity Act. Profiling is done, in particular, in terms of population group, gender and disability. Larger companies (those employing 150 or more employees) are required to submit reports every year, while “designated” medium- and smaller-sized companies (employing fewer than 150 employees, but with 50 or more employees or annual income equal or more than a specified amount defined as the annual turnover of a small business) are required to submit reports every second year. Government departments and agencies and municipalities are required to report every year.

The core of the reporting is done using standardised forms. Initially the forms distinguished only the four official apartheid-era population groups. In 2006 the government realised that this did not adequately capture the extent to which the country was redressing apartheid disadvantage as the system did not distinguish foreigners who had not been discriminated against during apartheid from black people –

African, coloured and Indian – who were discriminated against by apartheid laws and practices. The Department of Labour thus began asking companies to distinguish non-South Africans from South Africans. The forms and accompanying regulations were amended officially in 2006. The regulations restricted the "designated groups" for affirmative action to South African citizens by birth or descent, those who were naturalised before the coming into effect of the 1993 Constitution, and those who became citizens after the coming into effect of that Constitution but would have been entitled to South African citizenship before that date if it were not for apartheid.

It was recognised that companies' personnel systems might not have previously provided for this distinction and several years were thus allowed for phasing in of the changed requirements. From the 2009 cycle onward, companies were required to distinguish non-South Africans from South Africans when reporting. The raw data from the Employment Equity system are not publicly available, but the annual reports of the Commission on Employment Equity contain tables that show foreign workers separately, according to the various "occupational levels". This classification is seen as being more or less aligned with the various job evaluation and grading schemes used in South Africa. For example, the senior management level is equivalent to Paterson grades E Upper and Lower; Peromnes 1, 2 and 3; Hay 1 and 2; and Castellion 13.

The occupational level forms completed by employers distinguish between top management; senior management; professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management; skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen (sic), and superintendents; and unskilled and defined decision making. Temporary employees (employed for three consecutive months or less) are listed separately from these categories. The narrative of the annual reports of the Commission discuss only the top four levels of employment – top management, senior management, professionals, and skilled workers, but the appendices provide information on all levels.

The Commission for Employment Equity's report for 2010/11 gives the findings from the submissions made by employers in October 2010. This, as an even-numbered year, was a year in which all employers were required to report. In 2010 a total of 18 534 companies submitted reports; 16 698 reports were of good enough quality to be included in the analysis. The number of companies reporting was a substantial increase over the 10 580 reporting in 2008 and the 6 876 reporting in 2006. The sharp increase means that comparisons of findings with those of previous years in which all companies were required to report is unlikely to be reliable.

Table 28 presents three sets of numbers for the various occupational levels. For 2010, the employers reported a total of 42 429 top managers, 97 967 senior managers, 386 482 professionals, 1 304 496 skilled employees, 1 876 777 semi-skilled, 970 413 unskilled and 601 473 temporary workers, with an overall total of 1,37 million workers. The "foreign share" rows indicate the proportion of foreign employees at each level in respect of the overall profile (those employed at the reporting date), recruitment, promotion and termination during the reporting year. For example, it shows that foreign employees accounted for 2,9 per cent of all top managers at the reporting date, but 6,2 per cent of those recruited during the year, 5,1 per cent of those promoted, and 2,3 per cent of those terminated. Combined, these percentages imply an increasing share of foreigners among top managers over time. A similar picture – with recruitment and promotion shares being higher than the profile share, and the termination share lower – is found for all four top occupational levels, but not for semi-skilled and unskilled workers.

The "foreign number" set of figures translates these shares into absolute numbers. For 2010, it shows, for example, a total of 1 223 top managers, as compared to 16 769 skilled employees. This, in turn, is translated into the "foreign profile" which indicates, foreach of the four categories, the distribution of foreign employeesacross occupational levels. This last set of shares suggests that it is the number of skilled foreign workers, in particular, which increased during this reporting period. As for skilled foreign employees, the percentages recruited and promoted are higher than for the profile while the percentage terminated is lower. There are also strong indications of an increase in the ranks of temporary foreign workers.

When one compares the shares for the different occupational levels among foreign workers with the shares for South African workers, the shares for the top three categories and for temporary workers are similar. However, for skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers the shares are 13,42 and 28 per cent respectively, compared to 25,35 and 18 per cent respectively for South African workers. Foreign workers are thus more likely than South Africans to be employed in semi-skilled and unskilled levels rather than in higher levels of labour.

Table 28. Foreign worker share, number and profile among all companies, 2010

	Level	Profile	Recruited	Promoted	Terminated
Foreign share (%)	Top management	2,9	6,2	5,1	2,3
	Senior management	2,3	3,8	3,1	2,2
	Professionals	2,0	3,3	2,6	1,7
	Skilled	1,3	2,1	1,9	0,8
	Semi-skilled	2,9	2,6	2,3	3,1
	Unskilled	3,8	3,1	3,0	3,1
	Temporary	1,9	2,1	1,8	1,4
	Total	2,5	2,5	2,3	1,9
Foreign number	Top management	1 223	185	198	46
	Senior management	2 277	447	416	223
	Professionals	7 892	1 534	1 335	692
	Skilled	16 769	3 855	3 591	931
	Semi-skilled	55 096	10 257	9 781	3 176
	Unskilled	37 134	8 993	8 033	717
	Temporary	11 407	9 235	6 568	134
	Total	131 798	34 506	29 922	5 919
Foreign profile (%)	Top management	1	1	1	1
	Senior management	2	1	1	4
	Professionals	6	4	4	12
	Skilled	13	11	12	16
	Semi-skilled	42	30	33	54
	Unskilled	28	26	27	12
	Temporary	9	27	22	2
	Total	100	100	100	100

Source: Commission for Employment Equity, 2011: Diverse tables

Table 29 provides similar information, but this time for the large companies who reported in 2011 for only the four top occupations. A total of 4 492 reports were received for this reporting period, and 4 370 reports were analysed. For 2009 and 2007 the numbers analysed were 3 369 and 1 493 respectively, showing a similar sharp increase in reporting over time as for all companies combined.

The total numbers of employees reported at the four levels were 19 352 top managers, 71 415 senior managers, 371 319 professionals, and 1 336 045 skilled employees. What is surprising is that the total for skilled employees within this group of large companies is higher than that reported for all companies combined the previous year.

Foreign workers accounted for 3,9 per cent of top managers, 2,5 per cent of senior managers, 2,1 per cent of professionals, and 1,3 per cent of skilled employees. As for all companies combined, the recruitment and promotion percentages are consistently higher than the profile percentages and the termination percentages lower except in the case of senior managers. This again suggests a growing share of foreign workers over time. For top and senior managers of this group of large companies, the foreign share is also higher than that for all other companies combined, suggesting that larger companies may be more likely to hire foreign managers.

In terms of absolute numbers, there are more foreign professionals and skilled workers reported for the large companies in 2011 than for all companies combined in 2010. If this is not some sort of error, it could in part reflect an ongoing increase in the number of companies reporting and/or it could indicate a growing number of foreign employees. The foreign profile is very similar to that for all companies.

Table 29. Foreign worker share, number and profile among large companies, 2011

	Level	Profile	Recruited	Promoted	Terminated
Foreign share (%)	Top management	3,9	7,1	5,3	2,1
	Senior management	2,5	3,8	4,2	3,7
	Professionals	2,1	3,7	3,0	1,6
	Skilled	1,3	2,3	1,9	0,7
Foreign number	Top management	752	120	105	24
	Senior management	1 809	300	380	284
	Professionals	7 867	1 527	1 350	671
	Skilled	17 341	4 000	3 341	790

Source: Commission for Employment Equity, 2012: Diverse tables

The Employment Equity reports include breakdowns by gender. Table 30 compares the female share of both local and foreign employees for 2010. It gives a consistent pattern in which a far larger share of local workers than of foreign workers is female. This is especially the case for semi-skilled and unskilled workers. It also shows – for both foreign and local workers – the expected pattern in which the female share is much lower among managers than at other occupational levels.

Table 30. Female share of South African and foreign employees, 2010 (%)

	Local	Foreign
Top management	19	13
Senior management	30	21
Professionals	40	26
Skilled	44	23
Semi-skilled	40	5
Unskilled	36	11
Temporary	43	29
Total	40	13

Source: Compiled from Commission for Employment Equity, 2012

Unemployment Insurance Fund

The Unemployment Insurance Act of 2001 applies to all employees in South Africa, regardless of citizenship, excepting public servants, those who work less than 24 hours in a month for an employer, learners (similar to apprentices), workers paid only through commission, workers who receive a monthly old age pension, and foreigners who are working on contract. All other foreign employees should be covered. Their details would therefore be recorded on the database, Siyaya, where they can be identified by their 13-digit passport number record.

Foreigners can claim Unemployment Insurance benefits if they become unemployed. Their names and details are, however, not recorded on the work-seeker database maintained by the Employment Services of the Department of Labour. The Fund began paying benefits to foreign nationals in 2011. The total number of foreign nationals recorded as claiming benefits by mid-February 2013 was 5 999, of whom 3 908 (65 per cent) were male (Judith Kumbi, personal communication, 21 February 2013). This number is negligible when compared with the 278 266 people reported as receiving ordinary unemployment benefits, 22 727 receiving illness benefits, 104 042 receiving maternity and adoption benefits, and 27 123 receiving dependant benefits in the 2011/12 financial year (National Treasury, 2012: 399-400).

Work permits

The Department of Labour plays a role in the approval process for work permits in that it is informed of applications by the Department of Home Affairs and must then advise DHA whether South Africans with the required skills are available. Within the Department of Labour, the International/Cross-border Labour Migration team is situated within the Public Employment Services directorate. The team performs its function by, among other ways, consulting its large database of employment-seekers, which includes all South Africans who claim Unemployment Insurance Fund payments as well as those who voluntarily submit their details for the system. The Department also consults with sector-specific bodies to assess availability of local skills. The Department advises DHA whether local people are available, but does not keep a record of the number of applications (and associated workers) considered and the numbers for which it recommends approval and rejection. However, a media report in late February 2013 noted that the number of applications for foreign labour in agriculture increased from 2 838 in January to 3 649 in February 2013. The increase was attributed to the announcement of a new minimum wage of R105 per day (Ensor, 2013).

Barrientos and Visser (2010) provide a glimpse of how the system works in practice in that all three large of their Western Cape farming site case studies made use of migrant labour because sufficient local labour was not available. Two of the companies employed internal migrants, while the third employed foreign migrants from Zimbabwe and Mozambique. The third company had applied for government-issued corporate permits to be able to employ the foreign workers. The Department of Labour responded that the farm had not tried hard enough to find South African workers but was then able to produce only 27 applicants rather than the 1 000 that they had said they would find. When the farm went to collect the 27 workers at the Department's office, only 17 got on the truck. A day later, 11 of the 17 went back to the city, complaining that they did not like the conditions on the farm. The company was subsequently given a corporate permit to recruit Mozambicans. At the time of the researchers' survey, 40 per cent of the third company's workforce consisted of Mozambicans and Zimbabweans.

South African Qualifications Authority

The South African Qualification Authority (SAQA) is responsible for evaluating foreign qualifications in order to determine the relevant comparator in the South African qualification framework. The application form for evaluation asks for the purpose of the evaluation, with the options being general employment, further study, quota or general work permit, professional registration or licensing, use in another country, and "other".

Table 31 shows a sharp increase in the number of qualifications assessed by SAQA each year between 2005/06 and 2007/08, but a more or less constant annual level from then until 2011/12.

Table 31. Number of foreign qualifications assessed by year, 2005/06-2011/12

Year	Number
2005/06	8 420
2006/07	14 382
2007/08	29 849
2008/09	29 347
2009/10	25 502
2010/11	24 665
2011/12	28 709

Source: South African Qualification Authority, 2012: 21

In 2009/10 Zimbabwe accounted for over half (57 per cent) of all applications, but the percentage from Zimbabwe had dropped to 26 per cent by 2011/12. India was the next biggest contributor, at 11 per cent of applications in 2011/12. Other countries in the top ten were United Kingdom, Nigeria, DRC, Pakistan, Lesotho, United States, Swaziland and Ghana. Overall, Africa accounted for 63 per cent of all qualifications evaluated in recent years.

A separate system, managed by the Department of Higher Education and Training, covers foreign teaching qualifications of those who want to teach in public schools. Table 32 gives the number of applications for recognition of foreign teaching qualifications received and adjudicated by the Department of Higher Education and Training over the period 2009-2012. Overall, the table shows an increasing trend, with more than twice as many qualifications approved in 2012 as in 2009. If – as is probable – most of the teachers whose qualifications are approved begin to teach in the country, the table suggests an increase over this period of about 7 500 foreign teachers working in South Africa.

Table 32. Foreign teaching qualifications received for evaluation, 2009-2012

Year	Approved qualifications	Not approved qualifications	Total
2009	1 277	364	1 641
2010	1 049	175	1 224
2011	2 320	356	2 676
2012	2 875	241	3 116

Source: Selby Mudau, Department of Higher Education, January 2012

For health workers, the Department of Health has a Foreign Workforce Management Programme that regulates the registration, recruitment and employment of foreign health professionals. The system provides for non-renewable employment contracts for up to three years, one-year paid exchange programmes for registrars, and internships alongside a range of training programmes which can include unpaid employment. The primary aim is to attract professionals who will be placed in under-serviced, remote and rural areas of South Africa. The professions covered include medical doctors, professional nurses, pharmacists and dentists (Department of Health, undated). Statistics covering the programme as a whole were not available for this report, but a newspaper article in February 2013 reported that in 2008 South Africa "hired" 2 000 doctors from Tunisia and 600 from Cuba (Griffiths, 2013).

Recent non-government sources

The Employment Bureau of Africa (TEBA)

Bilsborrow et al (1997) report that the Chamber of Mines, as the main employer of foreign workers in South Africa, annually publishes data on the average number of contract foreign workers from each of the countries of origin employed by member gold and coal mines. However, when contacted for this study, the Chamber of Mines said that TEBA, rather than the Chamber, collected such statistics (Elize Strydom, personal communication, 7 December 2012).

TEBA sources both national and foreign migrants for the mining industry, including for both the mining companies and independent contractors who do mining work for mining companies. Table 6 above shows the numbers recruited each year up until 2006. The table does not distinguish between those recruited for mining companies and those recruited for independent contractors.

Crush (2001) notes that the number of workers employed by mine-subcontractors increased from 5 per cent of the mine workforce in 1987 to 10 per cent in 1994. In 1999, the proportion of workers on South African gold mines who were working for contractors was estimated at 10 per cent and growing. Although the National Union of Mineworkers and Chamber of Mines reached an agreement in 1995 to share information on sub-contracting, Crush et al (1999) report that by 1999 the agreement did not seem to have been implemented and very little information was available.

In their research, Crush et al found that sub-contractors hire their labour in three ways – directly, through labour brokers, and through TEBA. TEBA was involved in two ways – both recruiting workers itself through its rural offices and processing workers who came to them with established employment offers from sub-contractors.

TEBA currently recruits approximately 80 per cent of employees of gold and platinum producers as well as employees for coal mines (Graham Herbert and Kevin Cotterell, personal communication, 16 January 2013 for information in this section). The workers it recruits fall in Paterson grades 3-8 within the A and B bands. TEBA probably accounts for a higher percentage of foreign workers than of local workers employed on the mines because of the requirement in the Immigration Act that foreign workers must have a work permit. The percentage for foreign workers is likely to be higher because the Immigration Act compels each employer to have a work permit. There must also be a BI, which is an authorisation certificate, for each individual. In the mining industry the individual companies acquire corporate work permits that stipulate the number of foreign workers that they can employ, the DHA uses TEBA to validate the information in the company's application form and TEBA then manages the process further for the companies once the permit has been issued by DHA. In particular, TEBA manages the process of ensuring that each worker has a BI form.

All TEBA contracts are for a maximum of 12 months, after which the worker must go home. However, an estimated 95 per cent of contracts are subsequently renewed. Workers are free to visit home during the 12-month contract. Workers from Lesotho visit home on average ten times during a single contract, while those from Mozambique – because of the greater distance – make an average of three visits.

According to TEBA, since the Immigration Act of 2002 came into force, the mines may no longer recruit novices. The inevitable result is that over time the number of foreign workers has declined. The second last column of Table 33 shows how the percentage of TEBA recruits on South African gold, platinum and coal mines fell from 32 per cent in 2006 to 22 per cent in 2012. Lesotho's share fell from 14 per cent to 11 per cent over the period, while Mozambique's fell from 15 per cent to 11 per cent.

Table 33. Mineworkers recruited by TEBA for mines and sub-contractors, by country of origin, 2006-2012

Year	RSA	Lesotho	Botswana	Swaziland	Mozambique	Total	% foreign
2006	218 137	46 078	2 992	7 123	46 706	321 036	32
2007	225 949	45 608	2 845	7 099	44 879	326 380	31
2008	243 701	42 851	2 654	6 397	43 004	338 607	28
2009	224 544	38 559	2 357	5 855	39 090	310 405	28
2010	228 370	35 179	1 800	5 009	35 782	306 140	25
2011	240 896	34 583	1 783	4 779	34 940	316 981	24
2012	244 842	30 519	1 527	4 485	31 596	312 969	22

Source: Tim le Roux, TEBA, January 2013

Over this same period the percentage of TEBA recruits employed by the mines themselves, rather than by sub-contractors, ranged between 69 per cent (2007 and 2008) and 76 per cent (2009). In 2002 the percentage stood at 75 per cent. For the period 2006 through 2011 TEBA was not able to provide a breakdown by country for these workers. In 2012, sub-contractors recruited 12 155 workers from Mozambique, 7 522 from Lesotho, 420 from Swaziland and 45 from Botswana.

Table 34 breaks down the number of recruits by the type of mine, but with the analysis restricted to 2012 and the mining companies i.e. excluding the sub-contractors. The table reveals that the numbers of workers recruited by TEBA in 2012 for gold and platinum mines were very similar, while the number for the coal

mines was much smaller. The proportion of foreign workers differed across the mine types, at 26 per cent among gold mine recruits, 16 per cent among platinum mine recruits and only 5 per cent for coal.

Table 34. Mineworkers recruited for mines by TEBA by mineral, 2012

Year	RSA	Lesotho	Botswana	Swaziland	Mozambique	Total
Gold	86 719	16 653	804	3 247	10 447	117 870
Plantinum	85 510	5 947	678	801	8 602	101 538
Coal	13 915	397		17	392	14 721
Total	186 144	22 997	1 482	4 065	19 441	234 129

Source: Tim le Roux, TEBA, January 2013

The number of women workers recruited by TEBA is minimal.

TEBA is obliged to provide foreign governments with statistics relating to workers recruited from their country, but does not have a similar obligation to the South African government. TEBA previously fell under the Chamber of Mines, but was bought out by a black consortium at the end of 2005. Since the buy-out, statistics such as those on the number of workers recruited are regarded as part of the intellectual property of the company and are therefore available on a commercial basis, on payment of a fee.

TEBA is not the only official recruiting agency. In Lesotho, for example, three others were licensed in the late 1990s – ER Ramsden Bleskop, Ribaneng Recruiting Agency and Anglo-Colliery Recruiting Organisation Lesotho. TEBA was the main recruiting agency for gold mines, while the other three agencies recruited specialised tasks in gold mines, such as shaft sinking. Algos is a major recruiter in respect of workers from Mozambique and does recruitment for both the mines and agriculture.

National Income Dynamics Study (NIDS)

The 2008 National Income Dynamics Study (NIDS) Wave 1 survey was designed and conducted by the Southern African Development and Research Unit (SALDRU) (SALDRU, 2009) with financial support from the Presidency. The sample size was over 7 000 households with 28 000 resident members. A follow-up Wave 2 survey was conducted by SALDRU in 2010. The 2008 Wave 1 data are used here because of the panel nature of NIDS. In a panel survey, subsequent rounds of the investigation target households and/or individuals who were covered in earlier rounds of the survey. Inevitably, there are some individuals who cannot be interviewed in the subsequent round. Because foreign workers will tend to be mobile there will be more new arrivals who would not have had the possibility of being captured in Wave 1 and thus followed up in Wave 2. Wave 1 data are therefore likely to present a more reliable profile of foreign Africans than those from Wave 2.

The survey covered the full country and the NIDS data were weighted so as to match the 2008 mid-year population estimates produced by Stats SA, including matches for (five-year) age-sex-race totals and for provincial totals.

The questionnaire administered to “adults” (those aged 15 years and above) asked where the person was born, with the name of the country to be provided where the person was not born in South Africa. Of the (weighted) total of 30,2 million adults whose information was provided by themselves rather than proxy respondents, 1 million (3,3 per cent) provided the name of a country. Of these 0,83 million (82 per cent) named an African country and 0,79 million (78 per cent) named a country within the SADC region. Table 35

shows that Zimbabwe was named for 26 per cent of all those naming a country, Mozambique for 20 per cent, Lesotho for 10 per cent and Malawi and Namibia each for 7 per cent.

Table 35. Country of birth of persons 15+ years born elsewhere in Africa, 2008

Country	Count of foreign-born	% of foreign-born
Lesotho	103 652	10
Namibia	68 801	7
Botswana	10 425	1
Zimbabwe	259 486	26
Mozambique	203 750	20
Swaziland	21 785	2
Angola	10 359	1
DRC	40 163	4
Malawi	67 278	7
Zambia	4 172	0
Burundi	4 149	0
Cameroon	13 187	1
Congo	905	0
Ethiopia	17 184	2
Kenya	1 701	0
Nigeria	7 832	1

Source: Own analysis, NIDS 2008 data

As with Stats SA's QLFS, the population group question is asked of all individuals in NIDS, including those who were born outside South Africa. Cross-tabulation of population group with place of birth reveals that 67 per cent of foreign-born people are categorised as African, 28 per cent as white, and less than half a per cent each as coloured and Indian. For 2 per cent of foreigners this information is missing, while a further 2 per cent refused to answer the question. This suggests that non-negligible numbers of those born elsewhere in Africa are white.

If analysis is restricted to individuals aged 15-64 years, those who are foreign-born remain at 3,3 per cent of the total, but the percentage born in Africa falls to 78 per cent and those born in SADC countries falls to 74 per cent. With the restriction in the age group the percentages born in particular African countries remains more or less the same or increases slightly. Zimbabwe now accounts for 27 per cent, Mozambique for 21 per cent and Lesotho for 11 per cent, while Namibia and Malawi each remain at 7 per cent. This implies that most of the foreign-born over the age of 64 years were born overseas. This makes intuitive sense as many older people would have migrated during the years when apartheid restrictions made it very difficult and unattractive for would-be African permanent migrants.

Within the 15-64 year age group, 57 per cent of the foreign born are recorded as being employed, compared to only 30 per cent of South African born people. Among the foreign-born, the percentage employed is 67 per cent for men and 41 per cent for women.

The small numbers of foreign workers mean that further disaggregation becomes less and less reliable. The following tables must thus be interpreted with caution. Table 36 shows rather similar patterns in respect of industry for South African- and foreign-born employed people for most industries. The two big differences

are in community, social and personal services and mining (the latter is more likely to employ men). The former includes government employment, and it is therefore not surprising that this sector accounts for a much larger percentage of South Africans than of foreigners. As expected, mining accounts for a relatively large proportion of foreign-born (15 per cent) workers in contrast to only 4 per cent of South Africans.

Table 36. Distribution by industry of employed people, by country of birth (%)

Industry	South African	Foreign
Agriculture	7	4
Mining and quarrying	4	15
Manufacturing	15	13
Utilities	1	1
Construction	5	6
Wholesale and retail	13	14
Transport and related	4	2
Financial intermediation	11	11
Community social personal services	23	13
Private households	9	10
Don't know	4	4
Missing	5	5
Total	100	100

Source: Own analysis, NIDS 2008 data

Table 37 suggests that, at least to some extent foreign-born workers are likely to be more skilled than South African-born workers. The share of foreign-born workers who are craft and related trade (i.e. skilled production) workers is higher than for South African-born workers, as is the share of professionals, while the share of elementary (unskilled) workers is lower. South African-born workers are more likely than foreign-born workers to be managers and high-level decision-makers and also more likely to be service and sales workers.

Table 37. Distribution by occupation of employed people, by country of birth (%)

Occupation	South African	Foreign-born
Legislators, managers, senior officials	6	1
Professionals	13	17
Technicians and associated	5	4
Clerks	11	10
Service and sales workers	13	9
Skilled agricultural	5	2
Craft and related trade workers	14	33
Plant and machinery operators	10	8
Elementary occupation (low-skilled)	21	15
Don't know	2	1
Missing	0	0
Total	100	100

Source: Own analysis, NIDS 2008 data

Up until this point the analysis has focused on the place of birth. Many of those who were born elsewhere might have moved to South Africa many years ago. Many might have permanent residence or citizenship status in South Africa. Another way of exploring foreign labour is to base the definition on those who were not in South Africa five years before the survey. This categorisation does, however, have weaknesses as, for example, it includes some South Africans who spent time outside the country. We therefore disaggregate the group into those who were born in South Africa and those who were not. South African-born persons who were in South Africa five years before the survey then account for 93,2 per cent of the 7,8 million employed adults, while foreign-born persons who were not in South Africa five years prior to the survey account for 2,7 per cent of employed adults and foreign-born persons who were in South Africa five years ago account for 4,1 per cent.

Disaggregation is now even less reliable, especially as the proportion with missing information for industry stands at 13 per cent for the recently-arrived foreign born. What the data do suggest is that foreign-born persons who have arrived relatively recently cluster in wholesale and retail trade, private households (more or less equivalent to domestic work) and construction work, while foreign-born persons who were already in South Africa five years previously cluster in mining, financial intermediation and manufacturing.

In terms of occupation, there is less stark clustering. Nevertheless, recently arrived foreign-born persons are clustered in craft and trade work, elementary (low-skilled) work, professional and service and sales workers, while other foreign-born persons are found in these same occupations but also among operators.

Table 38 suggests that recently-arrived foreign-born workers are far more likely to be living in Gauteng, Western Cape or Limpopo, than either South African-born or foreign-born workers who arrived more than five years ago. The clustering in Limpopo is perhaps explained by the fact that this province borders on several neighbouring countries and is thus more accessible to new arrivals.

Table 38. Distribution by current province of employed, by country of birth and time of arrival (%)

Province	South African-born	Foreign-born recent arrival	Foreign-born old arrival	Total
Eastern Cape	8	2	4	8
Free State	6	0	9	6
Gauteng	31	52	32	32
Kwazulu-Natal	15	1	9	14
Limpopo	7	12	1	7
Mpumalanga	8	7	18	9
North West	8	0	10	8
Northern Cape	3	0	0	3
Western Cape	13	26	16	14
Total	100	100	100	100

Source: Own analysis, NIDS 2008 data

Gauteng City-Region Observatory (GCRO)

The fieldwork for the GCRO's quality-of-life survey in Gauteng was conducted over the period August to December 2011 and involved interviews with 16 729 residents. The survey covered the full province, with 600 or more interviews in each municipality. Each of the province's 20 "priority" townships was over-sampled, so as to have 100 or more interviews in each one. One interview was conducted with an individual aged 18 years or older in each household, with the respondent randomly selected where more than one individual in a household was eligible.

Weighting was done to correct for deviations from the intended sampling frame rather than to "weight up" to the total estimated adult population of the province. Where the ward information was known, weighting was done according to the targeted ward sample. Where ward information was not known, weighting was done at municipal level. While Peberdy (2012b) notes that it is not possible to claim that the sample was representative of the province's population, it did achieve good coverage of all parts of the province. Because the weighting was to the targeted sampling frame rather than the full provincial population, results are presented in terms of percentages rather than absolute counts. The results presented below are drawn from Peberdy (2012b) as well as from analysis of the raw data kindly supplied by the GCRO.

Section 2 of the questionnaire contains a series of questions that allows identification of migrants. The series starts with the question: *Were you born in Gauteng or did you move into Gauteng from another province or country?* If the person was not born in Gauteng, they are then asked from where they moved into Gauteng.

Of all respondents, 38% said that they were not born in Gauteng. Six per cent of those who were not born in the province did not say from where they had moved. Of those who provided information, 18 per cent (6 per cent of all respondents) moved from another country. Westonaria and Merafong, both of which hold mining as important, had higher proportions of internal (South African origin) and cross-border (other country origin) migrants than other municipalities. (The term cross-border here appears to be used in the broader sense of anyone from outside South Africa, rather than only those who crossed a land border from a neighbouring country.) If the focus is restricted to migrants from other countries, the percentage ranged from less than half a per cent in Ekurhuleni to 15 per cent in Westonaria. Other municipalities with relatively high proportions were Merafong (9 per cent), Johannesburg (9 percent) and Midvaal (8 per cent).

Over three quarters (76 per cent) of cross-border migrants came from countries within SADC, with a further 12 per cent from elsewhere in Africa and 7 per cent from Europe.

All those who were not born in Gauteng were asked when they moved to the province. Over 12 per cent of the cross-border migrants said that they had moved in 2010 or 2011, 54 per cent had moved between 2000 and 2009, and a further 21 per cent had moved in the 1990s. The majority of the migrants had thus moved relatively recently.

Unexpectedly, 52 per cent of migrants from outside South Africa were women. (In the sample as a whole, 55 per cent of respondents were women.) This contradicts common wisdom that the majority of migrants are male. The pattern might, at least in part, be explained by fieldworkers choosing to interview people who were at home when they visited the household rather than a randomly selected person. Of the cross-border migrants, 80 per cent were recorded as African and 14 per cent were recorded as white in terms of population group.

In terms of highest level of education, cross-border migrants were as likely (21 per cent) to have tertiary education as Gauteng-born respondents, but more likely to have primary or less education (21 per cent in contrast to 13 per cent for Gauteng-born).

Half (50 per cent) of the cross-border migrants reported that they were employed, as compared to 34 per cent of Gauteng-born respondents. However, while 15 per cent of employed Gauteng-born people were in the informal sector, this was the case for 26 per cent of cross-border migrants. In terms of industry, cross-border migrants were far less likely than Gauteng-born and internal migrants to be employed by government or in the financial sector, far more likely than Gauteng-born to be employed in private households (primarily as domestic workers), and more likely than internal migrants to be in trade. Cross-border migrants were also somewhat more likely than internal migrants or Gauteng-born respondents to be employed in mining.

Peberdy (2012b) observes that the responses in respect of income suggest that cross-border migrants are not under-cutting earnings of South Africans as the groups have similar income profiles. However, because close to half of respondents did not answer the questions on income, this conclusion is thus open to question.

On the qualitative side, 2 per cent of respondents identified “foreigners” as one of the two biggest problems facing their community – 0,5 per cent as the first mention and 1,8 per cent as the second mention. Respondents were also asked to respond to the following:

> *Imagine that there are three friends who are talking about life in Gauteng.*
>
> - *The first one says: "Gauteng should be for South Africans only. They must send foreigners back to their countries."*
> - *The second one says: "A lot of foreigners came to work in South Africa for poor wages under apartheid. We all suffered under the same system. They should be allowed to stay."*
> - *The third one says: "Foreign people living in Gauteng are alright, but only if they have got legal permission from the government."*
>
> *Which one person best describes how you feel?*’

Less than half (47 per cent) said that those who have legal permission from the government should be allowed to stay. Just over a fifth (21 per cent) said that foreigners should be allowed to stay, while close to a third (32 per cent) said that foreigners should be sent back to their countries. As expected, cross-border migrants were least likely to say that Gauteng should be for South Africans only. Work status did not affect responses.

Among cross-border migrants, 58 per cent said that those with legal permission should stay, 29 per cent said all foreigners should be allowed to stay, and 10 per cent said that foreigners should be sent home. Indian and white cross-border migrants were more likely than African and coloured cross-border migrants to say that all foreigners should be sent home. Of those who arrived in Gauteng before 1994, 15 per cent said that all foreigners should be sent home, while this was the view of 9 per cent of those who arrived in 1994 or later.

African Centre for Migration & Society (formerly Forced Migration Studies Programme)

In the mid-2000s, the Forced Migration Studies Programme (now the ACMS) co-ordinated a multi-country study into internal and international migrants in four African cities, namely Johannesburg, Lubumbashi, Maputo, Nairobi (see Gindrey, undated). The fieldwork for the South African survey was done in 2006. The surveys proper were preceded by pilots done in areas where the researchers thought migrants were more likely to be located. In Johannesburg, sampling was done with the help of listings and aerial photographs provided by Stats SA.

In each enumeration, six immigrants (i.e. people not born in the county) and two "natives" (i.e. migrants to Johannesburg born in South Africa) were interviewed, with a maximum of one person to be interviewed per dwelling. Sampling within households was done on a convenience basis. For example, if the person who opened the door fell within the quota specifications and was comfortable with a language spoken by the fieldworker, that person was interviewed. The questionnaire used was very similar to that used in an earlier FMSP project done together with Tufts University in 2003 (see Jacobsen and Landau, 2003, for discussion of challenges faced in the earlier survey).

The earlier survey interviewed a similar number of migrants and "natives" in six African countries and migrants were interviewed regardless of their country of birth. In contrast, for the 2006 survey only migrants from DRC, Somalia and Mozambique were chosen for the Johannesburg component. In implementing the survey, it was realised that the question on where the person was born came too late in the questionnaire. There was also lack of certainty as to whether the questions on the respondent's household referred to those with whom they lived or their family.

In implementing the 2006 survey in Johannesburg, there was confusion between the areas where people were commercially active and those where they lived, which made achieving the targeted proportions difficult. There were also the usual security-related problems associated with access when implementing surveys in South Africa, such as respondents in wealthier areas having high walls and security that prevent contact, or fear for the safety of interviewers in some poorer areas. A further challenge was the finding that foreigners changed residence frequently even within one suburb.

Because the interviews were conducted mostly in the central city, the results were not representative. The focus on particular migrants also reduced representivity. For example, Somalians constituted 29 per cent of those interviewed but, according to the 2001 census, constituted only 0,2 per cent of migrants living in Johannesburg. (By 2006, this proportion might well have increased.) Further, Gindrey (undated) notes that the fact that the survey was conducted door-to-door during the day (for security reasons) could have resulted in over-representation of middle-class migrants, and also of women, as the latter were more likely to be at home. In the survey there was some over-representation of women and youth (those aged 26-35 years) when compared with the migrant profile produced by Census 2011. Overall, 40 per cent of respondents were female – 52 per cent among South African-born migrants and 37 per cent among foreign-born migrants.

The achieved sample in Johannesburg was 842 respondents (832 in Gindrey), with 191 (191) South African-born, 202 (200) born in Mozambique, 186 (186) in Somalia and 253 (251) in DRC, with a further 14 recorded as "other not born in South Africa". (Information on the survey is sourced from the report as well as from

analysis of the data-file kindly provided by ACMS.) The profile is, in fact, less biased towards women than some others although – as noted – women are over-represented when compared with the Census profile.

Table 39 shows that foreign-born migrants were far less likely than South African-born migrants to be unemployed. They were also more likely – but with a much smaller difference – to be working full-time (implied "as an employee"), whether in the formal or informal sector. Among the foreign-born respondents, slightly more were working full-time than were unemployed, whereas among South African-born respondents, far more were unemployed than were working full-time (as an employee). Only one South African-born and one foreign-born respondent said that they were self-employed in a small business or income-generating project.

Table 39. Distribution by work status, by place of birth (%)

Status	SA	Foreign	Total	Number
Unemployed	43	28	31	264
Working part-time (formal/informal)	7	9	9	75
Working full-time (formal/informal)	25	31	30	251
Casual employment/temporary	6	3	4	34
Doing casual jobs	12	16	15	126
Self-employed	1	1	1	10
Voluntary worker (unpaid)	2	3	3	22
Housewife/homemaker	4	7	6	52
Tertiary student	1	0	0	1
Other	0	1	1	7
Total	100	100	100	842

Source: Own analysis, ACMS data

Table 40 shows the work profile for male and female foreign-born migrants. Surprisingly, the same percentages of male and female migrants report themselves to be homemakers. However, the percentage of female migrants who report themselves to be unemployed is almost twice that of male migrants (39 and 21 per cent respectively). Further, women outnumber men in all the employed categories except self-employment. The gender difference is largest for full-time workers (employees). While no men report working voluntarily, i.e. for no pay, this is the case for 7 per cent of women.

Table 40. Distribution by work status of foreign-born migrants, by sex (%)

Status	Male	Female	Total
Unemployed	21	39	28
Working part-time	11	8	9
Working full-time	37	22	31
Casual employment/temporary	5	1	3
Doing casual jobs	17	14	16
Self-employed	1	2	1
Voluntary worker	0	7	3
Housewife/homemaker	7	7	7
Other	1	1	1
Total	100	100	100

Source: Own analysis, ACMS data

Human Sciences Research Council 2001-02 Migration Survey

In 2001-02 the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) undertook a major survey-based investigation that focused on migration. The survey was done as part of two initially separate projects – one on the causes and consequences of cross-border migration and the other on causes of internal migration (see Kok et al, 2006). The combined effort involved two stages.

The preparatory stage included detailed analysis of 1996 census data, but the analysis focused on internal migration. The other aspect of the preparatory stage was a pilot survey to investigate the usefulness of various questionnaire items. The pilot survey covered 1 000 households across 125 census enumeration areas. The sample was stratified into three categories on the basis of Census 1996 data – areas with 31 per cent or more former migrants, areas with 11-30 per cent former migrants, and those with 10 per cent or fewer former migrants. One individual aged 18-69 was selected from each household for a full migration schedule. The report on this survey is not publicly available.

For the survey proper, the total sample was 4 266, again with one adult household member randomly selected in each household. Worker hostels and residential hotels were included in the sample, with every worker in a hostel and every long-term hotel resident (and family members, if with the resident) regarded as a separate household.

Unfortunately, the HSRC experienced enormous problems in implementing the survey (see van Zyl, 2006, for full discussion). Contributing factors included a very long questionnaire and seriously poor fieldwork by several, if not all of the five data collection companies contracted to do the work. In particular, there was strong evidence that many fieldworkers had not followed the prescribed method to select the household respondent randomly, which would have resulted in bias in the results. The fieldwork problems were serious enough that two of the companies agreed to repeat the survey at no further cost to the HSRC. However, the HSRC did not have sufficient additional resources to be able to conduct an evaluation of the re-done surveys.

Even after the efforts to address problems, the total non-response rate (i.e. targeted individuals who refused to answer any questions) was 43 per cent for cross-border migrants (defined as those from neighbouring countries) and 28 per cent for other foreign migrants. There was further non-response on

specific questions among those who did respond. Given the extent of the problems, it does not seem wise to rely on the findings of the survey.

Wentzel et al (2006a) provide analysis of the survey in respect of cross-border migrants. However, the analysis is based on a total of 18 migrants. Given this small number, their use of percentages is especially misleading.

Society, Development and Work Institute (SWOP)

In 2009, the then Minister of Economic Development in Gauteng commissioned SWOP at the University of Witwatersrand to develop a policy framework through which decent work could be progressively realised in the province. One aspect of SWOP's subsequent approach involved surveys of workers in three "vulnerable" sectors – security, agriculture and hospitality. The Community Agency for Social Enquiry assisted with these surveys, which were conducted in late 2010 and early 2011 (Society, Development and Work Institute, 2012). The survey results reported below were calculated from the raw data.)

All three sectors presented difficulties in deriving a sampling frame and determining a method of sampling as the researchers aimed to cover both formal and informal workers. For the security sector, 80 enumeration areas were randomly selected, and within each EA fieldworkers were required to find 15 guards to interview. To assist with this, they were given a list of 12 types of sites in which one would commonly expect to find security workers. To avoid clustering of responses, only two guards from each type of site were allowed within a single EA, and only one guard could be identified at any particular site.

For agriculture, clusters of enumerator areas classified as commercial farming were randomly selected. In each of the selected areas fieldworkers were asked to try to locate farm workers in locations where they were likely to gather, such as churches, shebeens (informal taverns), sports grounds and informal settlements where those living off-farm stayed. To avoid clustering, no more than three workers from any single farm could be interviewed and fieldworkers were asked to ensure that they interviewed both male and female workers.

For hospitality, the on-line Yellow Pages were used to compile a sampling frame of tourist hotels (non-residential), restaurants and coffee shops. Field workers were to interview up to four types of worker per each sampled establishment. Waitrons and cooks/chefs were to be interviewed in all three types of establishment, with kitchen staff interviewed in all types except coffee shops, and housekeeping staff interviewed only in hotels.

All three questionnaires included a question that asked simultaneously about citizenship and population group (for South Africans). The question read as follows: *"Are you South African? If YES, what is your race? If NO, what is your nationality?"* Of the 1 206 security workers, 93 (7,7 per cent) were foreign. Legally, all security companies are required to register with the Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority, and registered companies are not allowed to employ foreigners. In the survey, 23 of the 51 self-employed security guards were foreign, but there were also 24 foreign guards among the 495 employed by identified registered companies.

Of the 600 farm workers surveyed, 98 (16,3 per cent) were foreign. Of the 947 hospitality workers surveyed, 228 (24,1 per cent) were foreign. Zimbabweans clearly predominated among foreigners in all three sectors, with at least 52 Zimbabweans in security, 41 in agriculture, and 190 in hospitality. Among farm workers there was also a high proportion – 29 in absolute terms – of Mozambicans.

Sustainable Livelihoods Foundation

Charman et al's research focuses on a small geographical area within the Western Cape. It is interesting for several reasons. First, it is based on an enterprise- rather than household-based survey. Second, the focus is primarily on informal sector businesses. Third, foreigners constitute a substantial proportion of the working people investigated, without their having been an explicit target in sampling. Fourth, the research suggests that foreigners' share of the work has increased markedly in the space of five years.

The research focused on spaza shops i.e. small, home-based grocery shops, in the relatively poor township of Delft in the city of Cape Town. The study found that foreign "entrepreneurs" – most of whom were Somalian – owned approximately half of these shops.

Delft was chosen as the site for the study because it was known to be an area where foreign shopkeepers operated. The area is also interesting as the population includes a mix of coloured and African (South African) people. The township was established as a new housing development in the mid-1990s and at the time of the study was estimated to have a population of about 50 000.

The research included a mapping process which attempted to capture every shop through a street survey in which researchers drove through the streets on bicycle noting the co-ordinates of all publicly recognisable micro-enterprises. Interviews were subsequently conducted with all shopkeepers of shops that had signage, had branding with an identifiable name, and sold at least four of a pre-specified list of grocery items. (The research included a subsequent small household survey, but that is of less interest for our purposes.)

The research identified a total of 818 (registered and unregistered) micro-enterprises, compared to the 123 businesses identified by the City in a recent strategic planning survey. Of the 818 micro-enterprises, 179 were classified as spazas and 124 as "house shops". Of the 179 spaza shops, 90 were operated by foreigners, including 80 that were operated by Somalians. The remainder of the foreign operators included people from Bangladesh, Egypt, Ethiopia, Rwanda and Tanzania.

Many of the foreign-owned spazas operated on premises that their owners rented from South Africans. Many of the landlords previously operated spazas themselves but, according to the research, now find it more profitable to rent the space or business to a foreigner. The research explores the differences in the "business models" utilised by foreign and South African spaza operators.

Synthesis and appraisal

This report initially aimed to answer the following questions:

- Can the current state of stocks and flows of foreign labour in South Africa be estimated?
- What is foreign labour's participation rate to the South African labour market? (This can be interpreted to mean both (a) foreign workers' share of employment or the economically active population of South Africa and (b) the labour participation rate of foreign people of working age in South Africa.)
- Can the unemployment rate be measured for foreigners? Is gender/sex disaggregation available in respect of different measures? Is there a mismatch between foreigners' skills and the jobs in which they are employed?
- Can sectoral trends be identified?
- How does South African compare with similar migration hubs in developing countries in terms of overall, sectoral, gender participation?

This section attempts both these tasks. However, it does so briefly because essentially the answer to the first four questions is "no" unless we are talking about very crude and approximate trends. The synthesis in this section thus summarises the crude trends which seem to be confirmed by various sources, but also points to the wide areas of uncertainty about the size of these trends, and the absence of answers to many of the interesting questions raised.

Given the "no" response to the first four questions, attempts to compare estimates for South Africa with other countries is open to question. The hesitation arises not only because of the lack of availability of estimates for South Africa, but also because this lack is evident in virtually all other countries, although to varying degrees.

In this respect, Hoffmann and Lawrence (1995) note that countries with a large number of entry ports face particular difficulties in producing reliable statistics on foreign labour, as do countries with relatively large flows of travellers across its borders. Overall, they have a sober view of what has been achieved to date even in well-endowed countries. For example, in respect of stocks of foreign migrant workers, they note as follows (Hoffmann and Lawrence, 1995: 26-7):

> *Realistically speaking, the only cost effective strategy for generating reliable statistics on the stock of foreign workers on a regular, i.e. annual, basis is through the exploitation of the records in a coordinated system of general population registration, entry visas and work permits, with appropriate control mechanisms both for compliance and for proper implementation by the respective local offices. However, it is also clear that very few countries, if any, have been able to establish the necessary institutional infrastructures, capacities and procedures.*

Crush (2011) points to the very different estimates in respect of South Africa's migrant population from three sources that most people would consider trustworthy, namely the Sussex University Global Migrant

Origin Database (GMOD); the 2001 census; and the World Bank. The GMOD and census have more or less identical totals for 2001, but very different patterns in respect of country of origin. The World Bank database is reportedly based on GMOD but provides estimates for only six countries and assumes the same rate of increase over the years for all of them.

Given the above observations, any comparisons of South Africa with other countries must be treated with great caution.

The terms of reference suggest Brazil, Kenya and Singapore as possible comparators. Additional countries suggested for comparison were Spain, Argentina, Chile and South Korea.

Table 41, drawn from the UN Population Division database (United Nations, 2011), reveals that these countries and South Africa differ widely in the overall share of international migrants in their population, from 0,4 per cent in Brazil to 40,7 per cent in Singapore. Singapore is clearly an outlier, as the next highest percentage, in Spain, is 14,1 per cent. In all four countries the proportion of migrants is higher for working age adults than for children. The proportion of migrants among the oldest age group – those aged 65 years and above – is higher than for working age adults in Argentina, Brazil and South Africa. This is a very different pattern than the one found in Singapore and Spain, the two countries with the highest proportion of international migrants, where the percentage of international migrants in the oldest age group is far lower than the percentage among working age adults. This could be read to imply that South Africa's migration is less clearly temporary migration for work purposes than is the case in Singapore and Spain. South Africa's 2000 proportion of 3,7 per cent for 2010 can be compared with an estimated proportion of 3,3 in 1990 and 2,3 in 2000.

Table 41. International migrants as percentage of total population by age group, select countries, 2010

Ages	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Kenya	Singapore	South Africa	South Korea	Spain
0-4	0,4	0,1	1,1	1,2	21,3	0,7	0,5	4,2
5-9	0,7	0,1	1,1	1,4	25,0	0,9	0,4	11,5
10-14	1,1	0,1	1,3	1,8	29.4	1,3	0,4	14,5
15-19	1,7	0,1	1,6	2,1	35,3	2,0	0,6	15,2
20-24	2,6	0,2	2,3	2,2	61,1	3,3	1,0	23,1
25-29	3,5	0,2	2,8	2,4	68,1	4,5	1,0	28,0
30-34	4,0	0,3	3,3	2,7	74,2	5,5	1,1	23,6
35-39	5,0	0,4	2,8	2,9	66,2	6,0	0,9	20,8
40-44	5,3	0,4	2,1	2,9	46,8	6,1	0,6	17,3
45-49	5,2	0,4	1,6	2,6	35,5	6,0	0,4	13,0
50-54	5,0	0,5	1,4	2,2	29,2	5,6	0,5	10,3
55-59	5,4	0,7	1,4	2,3	29,2	5,4	1,1	8,9
60-64	6,3	1,0	1,5	2,8	32,5	6,3	2,2	7,6
65+	6,9	1,4	1,6	2,2	24,0	7,9	3,7	4,8
All ages	3,6	0,4	1,9	2,0	40,7	3,7	1,1	14,1

Source: Compiled from United Nations, 2011

In terms of gender, South Africa is also unusual, in that the female share of migrants is 42,7 per cent, while among the other countries the percentage ranges from 46,3 per cent in Brazil to 65 per cent in Singapore.

Broussard (2012) cites a publication emerging from a collaboration of the World Bank with the African Development Bank (Ratha et al, 2011) which reports that in 2010, South Africa was the third most popular destination country for African emigrants (behind France and Cote d'Ivoire). South Africa was estimated to account for more than 6 per cent of the total stock of African migrants.

Kok et al (2006: 10) present a table, based on United Nations estimates, that compares international migration stocks in Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, Swaziland and South Africa. For 2003, the latest year shown, foreigners are shown to account for 7,5 per cent of the Namibian population, 4,0 per cent of Swaziland's, 3,0 per cent of Botswana's and South Africa's and 0,3 per cent of Lesotho's. In this sense, South Africa is far from exceptional in the number of foreigners. In absolute terms, however, South Africa had 1,3 million foreigners, compared to 143 thousand in Namibia, the country with the next largest foreign population. This apparent anomaly is explained by the very different sizes of the overall populations of the five countries. The table shows the absolute number of foreigners in South Africa falling from 1,8 million in 1986 to 1,4 million in 1996, and then to 1,3 million in 2003. Census 2011's estimate of foreign born residents is 1,5 million.

In terms of flows, Segatti (2012: 12-13) uses estimates from the United Nations' *Trends in International Migrant Stock* of 2009 to compare the annual rate of change in migration stock (or "migration rate") and other indicators for six regions within South Africa over the four five-year periods between 1990 and 2010. She finds that the migration rate for Southern Africa increased steadily from negative growth (-2,2 per cent per year) in 1990-1995 to an estimated 7,3 per cent per year in the period 2006-2010. Further, while the numbers were higher in Eastern and Western African than in Southern Africa, international migrants

constituted a higher percentage of the population in Southern Africa than in other sub-regions. For 2006-2010 the estimate for international migrants was 3,7 per cent of the population. Segatti identifies South Africa as an exception to the pattern in all other countries where the percentage of international migrants is either constant or decreasing. For South Africa, she records the percentage increasing from 3,3 per cent of the population to a predicted 3,7 per cent in 2010.

At a more aggregated level, a recent factsheet produced by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2012) suggests that in 2010, approximately 73 million international migrants who were born in the South were residing in the South, only slightly less than the 74 million international migrants from the South living in the North. More than four in every five (81 per cent of) international migrants residing in Africa were born on the continent – a percentage higher than for any other continent or broad region. In addition, Africa hosted 2,4 million of the global total of 15,6 million refugees.

The term "North" refers to the more developed regions or developed countries and the term "South" refers to the less developed regions or developing countries. The more developed regions include Europe and Northern America plus Australia, New Zealand and Japan. All other regions constitute the "South".

The research reveals that South Africa has multiple sources of data in respect of both flows and stocks of foreign labour. However, the available data do not allow any firm estimates of even the most basic indicators, such as the percentage of South Africa's population that is foreign, the percentage of the workforce that is foreign, or the percentage of foreigners (however defined) that is employed and unemployed. At most, what is available are stylised facts that are supported across several sources. These include the following:

- **Most sources that reflect stock suggest that foreigners (regardless of work status) account for less than 10 per cent of the population**, whatever definition is used, and also for less than 10 per cent of employed people. In particular sectors, such as agriculture, mining and hospitality, foreign workers might account for a higher percentage.

- There are also **wide variations spatially**. All sources confirm Gauteng as having a much higher rate of foreigners in its population than any of the other provinces. Western Cape is generally ranked second or third in this respect, and Limpopo also tends to rank high. Landau (2005) cites a 2003 survey of 1 100 residents in central Johannesburg which found that nearly a quarter of residents were foreign-born.

- Several sources confirm that **foreigners are concentrated in the working age group** – 15-64 years – and especially in the younger age ranges within this broad group. The share of foreigners is definitely higher among adults than among children but the extent to which this pattern holds for older people is less clear.

- **Most sources** – whether stock or flow – **are biased towards recording formal employment rather than informal employment** (whether defined in terms of formal versus informal sector, or formal versus informal employment more generally). This results in undercounts as foreigners almost certainly constitute a greater share of informal than formal employment.

- Similarly, **most sources focus on employees rather than the self-employed**. This again is likely to result in an undercount of foreigners.

- Several of the flow sources confirm Crush's (2001) observation of **two "major changes"**, namely a noticeable increase in migrants from the region coming to South Africa for work purposes as well as a marked increase in entrants from elsewhere in Africa. This pattern is also found in respect of entries more generally.
- Several of the flow as well as stock sources confirm that **SADC citizens are very numerically dominant among African migrants**. Zimbabwe has also become increasingly dominant over the last decade, with Mozambique having high numbers over a longer period.
- Several stock sources confirm Standing et al's observation (quoted in Crush, 2001) that **unemployment rates tend to be lower for migrants than for local people**.
- Several stock (and some flow) sources confirm that the **male: female ratio is higher among foreigners** – and probably especially among employed foreigners – than among South Africans.
- Most sources record sex although sex disaggregation is not always provided when estimates are published. One notable exception is that the application forms for temporary residence do not seem to ask for sex.
- **Reliable comprehensive statistics on skills levels and the skills profile of foreigners are scarce**. The Employment Equity data suggest that, at least in formal sector establishments, foreign workers are more concentrated at the unskilled and semi-skilled levels than South African workers.
- In terms of industry, the **NIDS data suggest similar distributions at broad industry level for foreign and South African workers except for community, social and personal services (more common for South Africans) and mining (more common for foreign workers).**
- **Reliable statistics on foreign labour at local level are extremely scarce** and, where they exist, likely to be subject to **wide error margins**.

Recommendations for improving future statistics on foreign labour in South Africa

Five main recommendations arise from this report. Further discussion and motivations for each of the recommendations can be found in two technical reports developed as supplements to this main report (Budlender 2013 a and b). The five recommendations are as follows:

1. **In respect of stock measures, Stats SA should build on its experience of piloting a migration module in the third quarter 2012 QLFS.** Stats SA should consider including in the current module a small number of additional questions to be drawn from the model questionnaires found in Bilsborrow et al (1997). The module could be conducted on a two-yearly basis and should capture both inter-provincial and cross-border migration. Regular inclusion of the module in the QLFS will allow for description of the labour market characteristics of foreigners as well as comparison of the situation and characteristics of foreigners with South Africans in respect of the labour market. Inclusion of the module in the QLFS will also save on costs as many of the important questions for an investigation into foreign labour are included in the standard questionnaire.

2. **In respect of flow measures, the relevant government agencies – more specifically the Department of Home Affairs, Department of Labour, and Statistics South Africa – should continue to improve the reliability and up-to-dateness of administrative information systems.** The agencies should also ensure that key variables are included across these systems. The relevant systems are those which capture and record details of the various categories of foreign migrants, including temporary and permanent movers and asylum seekers and refugees. The relevant agencies, with the Department of Home Affairs in the lead, should also create or improve mechanisms to make these data publicly available.

3. **The QLFS will not be able to provide reliable local-level statistics. Instead, individual municipalities should commission studies on key topics of interest.** The methodology and instruments for these studies would need to be developed in line with the purpose, scope and available resources and should, wherever possible, use the same concepts and definitions as used by Stats SA. Because of the paucity of past local-level studies on this issue, the South African Local Government Association should encourage sharing of learning across municipalities and the government and non-government agencies and individuals with whom they work.

4. For measures in respect of **skills**, the Department of Labour should set up systems to collate and combine data from the general skills-based work and residence permit systems falling under the Department of Home Affairs and the sector-specific skills accreditation, registration and approval programmes in respect of health and education.

5. The Department of Labour should establish a **permanent forum** for relevant actors to meet, share and discuss achievements and challenges in respect of improving statistics on foreign labour. This forum would also provide the opportunity to explore ways to collaborate and harmonise approaches.

References

Amit, R. The *Implementation and Effects of the Zimbabwe Documentation Process in South Africa.* Unpublished manuscript.

Anderson, B.A. (2006) Migration in South Africa in comparative perspective. In Kok et al (Eds). *Migration in South and Southern Africa: Dynamics and determinants* (pp. 97-119). Pretoria, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.

Barrientos, S. & Visser, M. (September 2010) South African horticulture: opportunities and challenges for economic and social upgrading in value chains (Working Paper No. 12). Manchester and Cape Town: University of Manchester and University of Cape Town.

Broussard, N.H. (2012) *Immigration and the Labour Market Outcomes of Natives in Developing Countries: A Case Study of South Africa*. Unpublished paper.

Budlender, D. (2013a) Improving the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa: Recommendations for an improvement strategy. MiWORC Report N°3. African Centre for Migration & Society. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand

Budlender, D. (2013b) Improving the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa: Suggestions for a Quarterly Labour Force Survey migration module and municipal-level surveys. MiWORC Report N°4. African Centre for Migration & Society. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand

Bureau for Economic Research re Bantu Development. (1976) *Black Development in South Africa: The economic development of the Black peoples in the homelands of the Republic of South Africa*. Pretoria: Benbo.

Charman, A., Petersen, L. & Piper, L. (2012) From local survivalism to foreign entrepreneurship: the transformation of the spaza sector in Delft, Cape Town. *Transformation* 78, 47-73.

Commission for Employment Equity. (2012) *11th Commission for Employment Equity Annual Report 2011-2012*. Pretoria: Department of Labour.

Commission for Employment Equity. (2011) *11th CEE Annual Report 2010-2011*. Pretoria: Department of Labour.

Crush, J. (2001) Making Up the Numbers: Measuring "Illegal Immigration" to South Africa (Migration Policy Brief No. 3). Cape Town: Southern African Migration Project.

Crush, J. (August 2011) Complex Movements, Confused Responses: Labour migration in South Africa (Policy Brief No 25). Cape Town: Southern African Migration Project.

Crush, J., Ulicki, T., Tseane, T., Jansen van Vuuren, E. (1999) Undermining Labour: Migrancy and sub-contracting in the South African gold mining industry. Cape Town: Southern African Migration Project.

Crush, J. & Williams, V. (March 2010) Labour Migration Trends and Policies in Southern Africa (Policy Brief No. 23). Cape Town: Southern African Migration Project.

Department of Health. (Undated) Guidelines to apply to the Foreign Workforce Management Programme for an initial letter of endorsement. Pretoria.

Department of Home Affairs. (2012a) *Annual Report 2011/12*. Pretoria : Department of Home Affairs.

Department of Home Affairs. (2012b) *Annual Report on Asylum Statistics*. Draft. Pretoria: Department of Home Affairs.

Department of Labour. (2007) *Labour Market Review: Towards a fairer deal for migrants in the South African Economy*. Pretoria: Department of Labour.

Ensor, L. (2013, February 13) More work permits sought. *Business Day*.

Erasmus, J. (2009) The identification of scarce and critical skills in the South African labour market. In Erasmus, J. & Breier, M (Eds). *Skills Shortages in South Africa: Case studies of key professions* (pp. 22-34) . Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Erasmus, J. & Breier, M. (Eds). (2009) *Skills Shortages in South Africa: Case studies of key professions*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Gindrey, V. (2010) *La Migration et la Nouvelle Ville Africaine.* Johannesburg: Forced Migration Studies Programme, University of Witwatersrand.

Griffiths, M. (2013, February 15-21) Dearth of doctors cripples healthcare. *Mail & Guardian Health*, pp. 4.

Hoffmann, E. (2010) Statistics for monitoring and regulating international migration: reflections on how they may be obtained. Note prepared for IOM Migration Research & Training Center, Goyang City, Republic of Korea, 30 November 2010. Oslo: Norwegian Directorate of Immigration.

Hoffmann, E. & Lawrence, S. (1995) *Statistics on International Labour Migration: A review of sources and methodological issues*. Geneva: International Labour Office.

International Labour Office. (1998) Labour Migration to South Africa in the 1990s. (Policy Paper Series No. 4). Internation. Southern Africa Multidisciplinary Advisory Team: Harare.

Jacobsen, K. & Landau, L.B. (July 2003) The Dual Imperative in Refugee Research: Some methodological and ethical considerations in social science research on forced migration (Working Paper #19). Johannesburg: Forced Migration Programme, University of Witwatersrand.

Kok, P., O'Donovan, M., Bouare, O. & van Zyl, J. (2003) Post apartheid patterns of internal migration in South Africa. Pretoria, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.

Kok, P., Gelderblom, D., Oucho, J.O & van Zyl, J. (eds). (2006a) *Migration in South and Southern Africa: Dynamics and determinants*. Pretoria: HSRC Press.

Kok, P., van Zyl, J. & Pietersen, J. (2006b) The history and methodology of the HSRC surveys. In Kok et al (Eds). *Migration in South and Southern Africa: Dynamics and determinants* (pp. 292-306). Pretoria, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.

Landau, L. (2005) Migration, Urbanisation and Sustainable Livelihoods in South Africa (Migration Policy Brief No. 15). Cape Town: South African Migration Project.

National Treasury. (2012) *Budget 2012: Estimates of National Expenditure*. Pretoria: National Treasury.

Oucho, J.O. (2006) Cross border migration and regional initiatives in managing migration in Southern Africa. In Kok et al (Eds). *Migration in South and Southern Africa: Dynamics and determinants* (pp. 47-70). Pretoria, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.

Peberdy, S. (October 2012a) Numbers of migrants in South Africa. Johannesburg: Gauteng City-Region Observatory, University of Witwatersrand.

Peberdy, S. (2012b) Gauteng City-Region Quality of Life Survey Results: Migration. Johannesburg: Gauteng City-Region Observatory, University of Witwatersrand.

Polzer, T. (2012, September) Zimbabweans and South Africa's immigration and asylum crisis: Problems and Solutions. Presentation prepared for South African Institute for International Affairs, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Polzer, T. (2010, June) Population Movements in and to South Africa (Migration Fact Sheet No. 1). Johannesburg: Forced Migration Studies Programme, University of Witwatersrand.

Ratha, D., Sanket, M., Caglar, O., Sonia, P., William, S. & Abebe, S. (2011) *Leveraging Migration for Africa: Remittances, Skills, and Investments*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Segatti, A. (September 2012) Immigration policy development under the Zuma administration: The security – labour market impasse. Prepared for the Centre for Development and Enterprise. Johannesburg: African Centre for Migration & Society, University of Witwatersrand.

Segatti, A. (2011) Reforming South African Immigration Policy in the Postapartheid Period (1990–2010). In Segatti, A. & Landau, L.B. (Eds). *Migration to South Africa: A regional development issue* (pp. 31-66). Washington, D.C.: Agence Française de Développement and the World Bank.

Segatti, A. & Landau, L.B (Eds). (2011) *Migration to South Africa: A regional development issue*. Washington D.C.: Agence Française de Développement and the World Bank.

Simkins, C. (1983) *Four Essays on the Past, Present & Possible Future of the Distribution of the Black Population of South Africa*. Cape Town: Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit, University of Cape Town.

Society, Work and Development Institute. (2012) Decent Work and Development: The decent work deficit challenge in Gauteng. Prepared for the Gauteng Department of Economic Development. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand.

South African Qualifications Authority. (2012) *Annual Report 2011/12*. Pretoria: South African Qualifications Authority.

Southern African Labour and Development Research Unit. (2009) *National Income Dynamics Study Wave 1: User document*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.

Statistics South Africa. (2012a) *Documented immigrants in South Africa 2011: Discussion paper D0351.4*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.

Statistics South Africa. (2012b) *Tourism and Migration August 2012. Statistical Release P0351*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.

Statistics South Africa. (2012c) *Census 2011. Statistical release P0301.4*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.

Statistics South Africa. (2012d) *Data Quality Report*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.

Statistics South Africa. (2012e) *Quarterly Labour Force Survey, Quarter 3 2012. Statistical Release P0211*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (June 2012) *Population Facts. No. 2012/3*. Population Division.

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2011) *Trends in International Migrant Stock: Migrants by Age and Sex*. United Nations.

van Zyl, J. (2006) Evaluating the 2001-02 HSRC Migration Survey. In Kok et al (Eds). *Migration in South and Southern Africa: Dynamics and determinants* (pp. 147-169). Pretoria, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.

Vigneswaran, D. (2011) Migration Control, Documentation, and State Transformation. In Segatti, A. & Landau, L.B. (Eds). *Migration to South Africa: A regional development issue* (pp. 105-120). Washington D.C.: Agence Française de Développement and the World Bank..

Waller, L. (2006a) Irregular Migration to South Africa During the First Ten Years of Democracy (Migration Policy Brief No. 19). Cape Town: Southern African Migration Project.

Waller, L. (2006b) Migration of Skills in South Africa: Patterns, Trends and Challenges (Migration Policy Brief No. 20). Cape Town: Southern African Migration Project.

Wentzel, M., Viljoen, J. & Kok, P. (2006a) Contemporary South African migration patterns and intentions. In Kok et al (Eds). *Migration in South and Southern Africa: Dynamics and determinants* (pp. 171-204). Pretoria, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.

Wentzel, M. & Tlabela, K. (2006b) Historical background to South African migration. In Kok et al (Eds). *Migration in South and Southern Africa: Dynamics and determinants* (pp. 71-95). Pretoria, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.

Informants

Roni Amit, African Centre for Migration & Society
Mantombi Bobani, Department of Labour
Peter Buwembo, Statistics South Africa
Kevin Cotterell, The Employment Bureau of Africa
Graham Herbert, The Employment Bureau of Africa
Eivind Hoffmann, Norwegian Directorate of Immigration
Judith Kumbi, Unemployment Insurance Fund, Department of Labour
Sophia Lawrence, International Labour Organisation, Geneva
Tim le Roux, The Employment Bureau of Africa
Ian Macun, Department of Labour
Ntsoaki Mamashela, Department of Labour
Malerato Mosiane, Statistics South Africa
Selby Mudau, Department of Higher Education and Training
Nomusa Ngwenya, South African Local Government Association
Roman Page, Statistics Canton of Zurich
Sally Peberdy, Gauteng City-Region Observatory
Tara Polzer Ngwato, independent consultant
Vimal Ranchhod, University of Cape Town
Adam Salmon, Parliament
Joe Samuels, South African Qualifications Authority
Aurelia Segatti, African Centre for Migration & Society
Elize Strydom, Chamber of Mines
Maletela Tuoane-Nkhasi, Statistics South Africa
Susanna Ubombo-Jaswa, Statistics South Africa
Margareet Visser, University of Cape town
Francis Wilson, University of Cape Town
Chris Wray, Gauteng City-Region Observatory

Abstracts

ENGLISH – MiWORC Report N°2. Improving the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa: Existing data-sets

This report was commissioned by the African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) on behalf of the Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC). It aims to assist with improving the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa. Such improvement is intended, in turn, to advance understanding of the role played by foreign workers in the South African labour market.

The core of this report is an assessment of the scope and relevance of existing statistical data sets in South Africa. The term "foreign labour" is understood as referring to foreign nationals who are either involved in economic activity or seeking to be involved in such activity. In terms of time period, the focus is on the period 1980 to date. However, more emphasis is placed on current data sources given that the ultimate aim is to contribute to improving available data for future use. Geographically, special attention is given to statistics on foreign labour originating within the Southern African region.

The report concludes that South Africa does not currently have adequate data for reliable estimates of the stocks and flows of foreign labour in South Africa. Nevertheless, the report reveals that the country has a wide range of different sources of data that, if improved, present the potential for more reliable estimates. The available data sets allow identification of crude trends which are confirmed by several sources, although there are wide areas of uncertainty about the size of many of the trends.

العربية– تقرير اتحاد الهجرة للبحث عن عمل (MiWORC) رقم 2: تحسين نوعية الإحصاءات المتاحة عن العمالة الأجنبية في جنوب أفريقيا: مجموعات البيانات الموجودة

هذا التقرير كان بتكليف من المركز الأفريقي للهجرة والمجتمع (ACMS) بالنيابة عن اتحاد الهجرة للبحث عن عمل (MiWORC). ويهدف إلى المساعدة في تحسين نوعية الإحصاءات المتاحة عن العمالة الأجنبية في جنوب أفريقيا. ويهدف هذا التحسين ، بدوره، إلى تعزيز فهم الدور الذي يلعبه العمال الأجانب في سوق العمل في جنوب أفريقيا..

جوهر هذا التقرير هو تقييم نطاق وأهمية مجموعات البيانات الإحصائية الحالية في جنوب أفريقيا. ومن المفهوم أن مصطلح "العمالة الأجنبية" أنها تشير إلى الرعايا الأجانب الذين إما شاركوا في النشاط الاقتصادي أو يسعون إلى المشاركة في مثل هذا النشاط. من حيث الفترة الزمنية، يتم التركيز على الفترة من 1980 حتى الآن. ومع ذلك، ينصب تركيز أكثر على مصادر البيانات الحالية نظراً لأن الهدف النهائي هو الإسهام في تحسين البيانات المتاحة للاستخدام في المستقبل. جغرافيا، يتم إيلاء اهتمام خاص للإحصاءات المتعلقة بالعمالة الأجنبية الناشئة داخل منطقة جنوب أفريقيا.

ويخلص التقرير إلى أن جنوب أفريقيا ليس لديها حاليا بيانات كافية لتقديرات موثوقة لأرصدة وتدفقات اليد العاملة الأجنبية في جنوب أفريقيا. . ومع ذلك، فإن التقرير يكشف عن أن البلاد لديها مجموعة واسعة من مصادر مختلفة من البيانات التي إذا تحسنت قد **تؤدي** إلى إمكانية الحصول على تقديرات أكثر موثوقية. مجموعات البيانات المتاحة تسمح بتحديد الاتجاهات الأولية التي يتم تأكيدها من عدة مصادر، على الرغم من أن هناك مناطق واسعة من عدم اليقين بشأن حجم العديد من الاتجاهات.

ESPAÑOL – Informe MiWORC N°2. Mejorando la calidad de las estadísticas disponibles de la mano de obra extranjera en Sudáfrica: Conjunto de datos existentes

Este informe fue encargado por el Centro Africano de Migración y Sociedad (ACMS) de parte del Consorcio de Investigación de la Migración por Trabajo (MiWORC). Tiene como objetivo contribuir a mejorar la calidad de las estadísticas disponibles sobre la mano de obra inmigrante en Sudáfrica. Ello a su vez contribuirá a una mejor comprensión del papel que juegan los trabajadores extranjeros en el mercado laboral de Sudáfrica.

El núcleo de este informe es la evaluación del alcance y relevancia del conjunto de datos estadísticos existentes en Sudáfrica. El término "mano de obra inmigrante" se entiende en referencia a personas extranjeras involucradas en actividades económicas o que buscan involucrarse en dichas actividades. El periodo de tiempo en que nos enfocamos es de 1980 hasta la fecha, aunque hemos puesto más énfasis en fuentes de datos actuales, ya que el objetivo principal es contribuir a mejorar los datos disponibles para su futuro uso. En terminos geográficos, prestamos más atención a estadísticas sobre la mano de obra extranjera proveniente de la región del Sur de África.

El informe concluye que Sudáfrica no tiene actualmente los datos adecuados para estimar de forma confiable la existencia y flujo de mano de obra extranjera en el pais. No obstante el informe revela que el país tiene una gran variedad de fuentes de datos diferentes, las cuales, si son mejoradas, presentan potencial para estimativas más confiables. Los conjuntos de datos disponibles permiten la identificación de tendencias gruesas s, las cuales han sido confirmadas por varias fuentes, aunque existen amplias áreas de incertidumbre sobre el tamaño de muchas de las tendencias.

FRANÇAIS – Rapport MiWORC N°2. Améliorer la qualité des statistiques disponibles sur la main-d'oeuvre étrangère en Afrique du Sud : Bases de données existantes

Ce rapport commandé par l'African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) pour le Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC) a pour objectif de contribuer à l'amélioration de la qualité des statistiques disponibles sur la main-d'œuvre étrangère en Afrique du Sud. Cette amélioration devrait faire progresser la compréhension du rôle joué par les travailleurs étrangers sur le marché du travail sud-africain.

Le rapport consiste essentiellement en une évaluation de l'étendue et de la pertinence des bases de données statistiques disponibles en Afrique du Sud. Le terme « main-d'oeuvre étrangère » désigne ici les ressortissants étrangers qui sont soit engagés dans une activité économique soit en recherche d'activité. Le rapport couvre la période 1980 à 2013. Toutefois, l'accent est plutôt mis sur les sources actuelles afin de contribuer à l'amélioration future des données. Au plan géographique, le rapport se concentre plus particulièrement sur les statistiques traitant de la main-d'œuvre étrangère originaire des pays d'Afrique australe.

Le rapport conclut que l'Afrique du Sud ne dispose pas aujourd'hui de données adéquates permettant de fournir des estimations fiables des stocks et des flux de main-d'œuvre étrangère en Afrique du Sud. Cependant, le rapport révèle aussi que le pays dispose d'un nombre étendu de sources de données qui, si elles étaient améliorées, permettraient d'aboutir à des estimations plus fiables. Les bases de données

disponibles permettent d'identifier des tendances générales confirmées par différentes sources, mais il demeure de nombreuses zones d'incertitude sur la dimension de ces tendances.

PORTUGUES – Relatório MiWORC N°2. Melhorando a qualidade das estatísticas disponíveis da mão-de-obra imigrante em África do Sul: Conjunto de dados existentes

Este relatório foi encomendado pelo Centro Africano de Migração e Sociedade (ACMS) de parte do Consórcio de Investigação de Migração por Trabalho (MiWORC). O seu objectivo é ajudar a melhorar a qualidade das estatísticas disponíveis sobre a força de trabalho imigrante na África do Sul. Esta melhoria ajudaria a entender o papel dos trabalhadores estrangeiros no mercado de trabalho da África do Sul.

O núcleo deste relatório é a avaliação do alcance e relevância dos conjuntos de dados estatísticos existentes na África do Sul. O termo "força de trabalho imigrante" é entendido como referindo-se aos estrangeiros que estão envolvidos em atividades econômicas, ou aqueles que pretendem estar envolvidos em tais atividades. O período de tempo em que nos concentramos seria de 1980 até hoje, ainda que nós colocamos mais ênfase em fontes de dados atuais, já que o principal objectivo é contribuir para melhorar os dados disponíveis para uso futuro. Geograficamente, será prestada mais atenção às estatísticas sobre mão-de-obra estrangeira proveniente da região da África Austral.

O relatório tem como conclusão que África do Sul não têm os dados apropriados para estimar de forma confiável a existência e o fluxo de mão-de-obra estrangeira na África do Sul. Ainda assim, o relatório revela que o país tem uma grande variedade de fontes de dados diferentes, que, se forem melhoradas, têm potencial para estimativas mais confiáveis. Os conjuntos de dados disponíveis permitem a identificação de tendências inexperientes, que foram confirmadas por diversas fontes, ainda que existem grandes áreas de incerteza sobre o tamanho de muitas das tendências.

SESOTHO – MiWORC Tlaleho ya N°2. Ntlafatso ya boleng ba dipalopalo tse fumanehang ka basebetsi ba tswang mafatsheng mona Afrika Borwa: Disete tse Teng tsa Dipalopalo

Tlaleho ena e laetswe ke African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) lebitsong la Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC). Sepheo sa yona ke ho thusa ka ho ntlafatsa boleng ba dipalopalo tse fumanehang ka basebetsi ba tswang ka ntle ho Afrika Borwa. Sepheo sa ntlafatso eo sona ke ho kgothaletsa kutlwisiso ya seabo sa basebetsi ba tswang mafatsheng a mang ho basebetsi ba kahara Afrika Borwa.

Moko wa tlaleho ena ke ho hlahloba tekanyo le ho tshwaneleha ha dipalopalo tse teng mona Afrika Borwa. Mantswe ana "foreign labour" (ke hore "basebetsi ba tswang ka ntle") a utlwisiswa a bolela baditjhaba ba leng mesebetsing ya moruo kapa ba batlang menyetla ya ho ba mesebetsing eo. Ho latela nako, ho shejwa dilemo tsa ho tloha 1980 ho fihla jwale. Le ha ho le jwalo, kgatello e eketsehileng e behwa ho mehlodi ya dipalopalo tsa jwale, ha ho shejwa hore sepheo seo e leng sona ke ho ntlafatsa dipalopalo tse fumanehang hona jwale hore di sebediswe nakong e tlang. Ha ho shejwa ka dinaha, ho shejwa haholo dintlha tsa basebetsi ba tswang dinaheng tsa Afrika e ka Borwa.

Tlaleho e phethela ka hore Afrika Borwa nakong ya jwale ha e na dipalopalo tse lekaneng bakeng sa ditekanyo tse kgotsofatsang tsa bongata le phallo ya basebetsi ba tswang ka ntle mona Afrika Borwa. Le ha ho le jwalo, tlaleho e senola hore naha e na le mehlodi e mengatangata e fapaneng eo, ha e ka ntlafatswa, e ka nehelanang ka menyetla ya ditekanyo tse kgotsofatsang haholwanyane. Dipalopalo tse fumanehang di thusa ka ho supa ditshekamelo tsa motheo tse tiiswang ke mehlodi e mmalwa, le hoja ho na le dibaka tse ngata tsa qeaqeo ka boholo ba bongata ba ditshekamelo tsena.

KISWAHILI - Ripoti Namba 2 ya MiWORC. Kuboresha ubora wa takwimu zilizopo kuhusu ajira ya kigeni nchini Afrika Kusini: Seti za taarifa zilizopo

Ripoti hii iliandikwa na Kituo cha Afrika cha Uhamiaji & Jamii (ACMS) kwa niaba ya Muungano wa Utafiti kuhusu Uhamiaji kwa ajili ya Kazi (MiWORC). Inakusudia kusaidia na kuboresha ubora wa takwimu zilizopo kuhusu ajira ya kigeni nchini Afrika Kusini. Kuboresha huko kunalenga, kwa upande wake, kuendeleza uelewa wa jukumu la wafanyakazi wa kigeni katika soko la ajira la Afrika Kusini.

Msingi wa ripoti hii ni tathmini ya nafasi na umuhimu wa takwimu za seti za taarifa zilizo katika Afrika Kusini. Neno "ajira ya kigeni" linaeleweka kama linahusiana na raia wa kigeni ambao aidha hushiriki katika shughuli za kiuchumi au hutafuta kushiriki katika shughuli kama hiyo. Katika suala la kipindi cha muda, lengo ni juu ya kipindi tangu 1980 hadi sasa. Hata hivyo, mkazo zaidi uliwekwa kwenye vyanzo vya taarifa ya sasa iliyotolewa kwamba lengo kuu ni kuchangia katika kuboresha taarifa inayopatikana kwa ajili ya matumizi ya baadaye. Kijiografia, tahadhari maalum imetolewa kwa takwimu juu ya ajira ya kigeni inayotoka ndani ya kanda ya Kusini mwa Afrika.

Ripoti inahitimisha kwamba Afrika Kusini haina taarifa za kutosha kwa sasa kwa ajili ya makadirio ya kuaminika ya hifadhi na mtiririko wa kazi za kigeni nchini Afrika Kusini. Hata hivyo, ripoti inaonyesha kwamba nchi ina vyanzo mbalimbali vya taarifa tofauti ambazo, kama zikiboreshwa, huonyesha uwezo kwa ajili ya makadirio ya kuaminika zaidi. Seti za taarifa zinazopatikana huruhusu utambulisho wa mwelekeo mbovu ambao huthibitishwa na vyanzo kadhaa, hata hivyo kuna maeneo mbalimbali ya kutokuwa na uhakika juu ya ukubwa wa wingi wa mielekeo.

ISIXHOSA – INgxelo yesi-2 yakwa-MiWORC. Ukuphucula umgangatho wengqokelela yamanani akhoyo malunga nabasebenzi abasuka kumazwe angaphandle eMzantsi Afrika: Iingqokelela ezikhoyo zoovimba abangeenkcukacha

Le ngxelo igunyaziswe yi-African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) egameni le-Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC). Injongo yayo kukuncedisa ekuphuculeni umgangatho wengqokelela yamanani akhoyo abasebenzi abasuka kumazwe angaphandle eMzantsi Afrika. Uphuculo olunjalo lwenzelwe nokwandisa ukuqonda indima edlalwa ngabasebenzi abasuka kumazwe angaphandle kurhwebo lwabasebenzi boMzantsi Afrika.

Undoqo wale ngxelo luvavanyo lobungakanani nokubaluleka kweengqokelela zamanani oovimba abangeenkcukacha ezikhoyo eMzantsi Afrika. Eli gama “abasebenzi abasuka kumazwe angaphandle” laziwa njengelibhekiselele kumagosa asuka kwezinye izizwe athatha inxaxheba kwimisebenzi yezoqoqosho okanye

afuna ukuthatha inxaxheba kwimisebenzi enjalo. Ngokwexesha lokwenzeka koku, ingqwalaselo ikwixesha elisuka kunyaka ka-1980 kude kube ngoku. Kodwa ke, ugxininiso olukhulu lubekwe kwimvelaphi yovimba ongeenkcukacha ezikhoyo njengoko eyona njongo ibalulekileyo ikukuphosa igalelo ekuphuculeni uvimba ongeenkcukacha okhoyo ukuze usetyenziswe kwixesha elizayo. Ngokwemida, ingqwalaselo eyodwa ikwingqokelela yamanani abasebenzi abasuka kumazwe angaphandle besuka ngaphakathi kummandla we-Afrika esemaZantsi.

Ingxelo igqibe ekubeni eMzantsi Afrika ngokwangoku abekho oovimba abangeenkcukacha zengqikelelo ethembekileyo yeempahla ezikhoyo (isitokhwe) nokungena kwanokuphuma kwabasebenzi abasuka kwamanye amazwe eMzantsi Afrika. Kodwa ke kunjalo, ingxelo ivelise ukuba ilizwe linoluhlu olubanzi lwemithombo eyohlukeneyo yoovimba abangenkcukacha abanokuthi xa benokuphuculwa, babonise ubukho boqikelelo oluthembekileyo oluninzi. Ingqokelela yoovimba abakhoyo abangeenkcukacha ivumela ukuphawulwa kwentsingiselo yobukho bekhrudi nengqinisiswe yimithombo eyohlukeneyo, nangona kukho imimandla ebanzi yokungaqiniseki malunga nobungakanani besininzi sale ntsingiselo.

ISIZULU - Umbiko i- MiWORC Report N°2. Ukwenza ngcono iqophelo lezibalo zocwaningo ezikhona ngabasebenzi bakwamanye amazwe eNingizimu Africa: Amaqoqo olwazi olukhona

Lo mbiko wagunyazwa yi-African Centre for Migration & Society (i-ACMS) egameni le-Migrating for Work Research Consortium (i-MiWORC). Inhloso yawo wukusiza ekwenzeni ngcono iqophelo lezibalo zocwaningo ezikhona ngabasebenzi bakwamanye amazwe eNingizimu Afrika. Inhloso yokwenza ngcono lezi zibalo wukuqhubezela ukuqondwa kweqhaza elibanjwe ngabasebenzi abavela kwamanye amazwe emakethe yabasebenzi baseNingizimu Afrika.

Ingxenye enkulu yalo mbiko ingukulinganisa ubukhulu nokufaneleka kwamaqoqo olwazi lwezibalo zocwaningo olukhona eNingizimu Afrika. Itemu “abasebenzi bakwamanye amazwe” liqonde izakhamuzi zakwamanye amazwe ezibambe iqhaza emisebenzini ephathelene nezomnotho noma ezifisa ukubamba iqhaza kuleyo misebenzi. Isikhathi okubhekiswe kuso yisikhathi esisukela onyakeni we-1980 kuze kube namuhla. Kodwa kugxilwe ikakhulukazi emithonjeni yolwazi yesikhathi samanje ngoba inhloso enkulu wukusiza ekwenzeni ngcono ulwazi olukhona oluyosetshenziswa esikhathini esizayo. Kugxilwe, ikakhulukazi, ezibalweni ngabasebenzi abaqhamuka esifundeni i-Afrika eseNingizimu.

Lo mbiko uphetha ngokuthi iNingizimu Afrika, okwamanje, ayinalo ulwazi olwanele olungasetshenziselwa ukuhlawumbisela ngendlela enokwethenjwa inani labasebenzi bakwamanye amazwe kanye nokuphuma nokungena kwabo eNingizimu Afrika. Kodwa lo mbiko uveza ukuthi leli lizwe linezinhlobonhlobo zemithombo yolwazi olungasinika okunye ukuhlawumbisela okunokwethenjwa uma lwenziwa ngcono. La maqoqo olwazi esinalo asisiza ekuhlonzeni izimo eziningi ezingahlaziyiwe ezinokuqinisekiswa yimithombo enhlobonhlobo, nakuba kunezindawo ezingaqondakali kahle ezimeni eziningi kulezo zimo ezihlonziwe.

Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC)

African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS),
University of the Witwatersrand, Private Bag X3, Wits 2050, South Africa
T: +27 11 717 4033 **F**: +27 11 717 4039

Project funded by the European Union EU-South Africa Dialogue Facility EuropeAid/132200/L/ACT/ZA.
Coordinated by the African Centre for Migration & Society, University of the Witwatersrand

www.miworc.org.za