



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

4

**MiWORC Report
July 2013**

Deborah Budlender



The opinions expressed in this work belong solely to the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the member groups of the Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC). Comments are welcomed and should be directed to the author(s).

Suggested citation: Budlender, Deborah (2013) *MiWORC Report N°4. 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*. Johannesburg: African Centre for Migration & Society, University of the Witwatersrand.

ISBN 978-0-9922133-3-6



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

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 is 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 contents	3
Table of tables	3
Abbreviations and acronyms	4
Introduction	5
Recommendations in respect of QLFS.....	7
Background: Module of third quarter 2012	7
Background: Bilsborrow et al model questionnaires.....	8
Outline of suggested QLFS module	13
Sampling for the QLFS	15
Possibilities for QLFS analysis	15
Recommendations for municipal level studies	17
Sector-specific studies.....	18
Establishment-based survey.....	19
References	21
Informants	22
Abstracts.....	23

Table of tables

Table 1. Discussion of individual questionnaire topics

9

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACMS	African Centre for Migration & Society
EA	Enumeration Area
ISCED	International Standard Classification of Education
PSIRA	Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority
QLFS	Quarterly Labour Force Survey
SALGA	South African Local Government Association
Stats SA	Statistics South Africa



Introduction

This report is the third in a set of three for work commissioned by the African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) in the framework of the Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC – www.miworc.org.za). The report’s aim is to assist with improving the quality of available statistics on foreign labour in South Africa. Such improvement is intended, in turn, to advance the understanding of the role played by foreign workers in the South African labour market.

The first report (MiWORC Report N°2) consists of 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. The second report (MiWORC Report N°3) provides recommendations in respect of the technical and institutional aspects of a longer-term improvement strategy. One of the main recommendations is that the Quarterly Labour Force Survey (QLFS) produced by Statistics South Africa (Stats SA) be used as the main source of stock data on foreign labour. It suggests that this be done by including a limited number of questions relating to migration in one of the rounds of the QLFS on a biennial basis.

This third report provides more detailed suggestions for the QLFS migration module. It does so by drawing on Bilsborrow et al’s (1997) suggestions for a migration survey. This third report also provides some guidance for municipal-level investigations. The guidance is, however, limited as more detailed recommendations will only be possible when individual municipalities or the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) have decided what specific issues they would like to investigate in particular municipalities, and what resources are available for these investigations.



Recommendations in respect of QLFS

Background: Module of third quarter 2012

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

Responses distinguishing 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

Background: Bilsborrow et al model questionnaires

Bilsborrow et al include model questionnaires for surveys in destination and source countries. The (lengthy) model for a survey in the destination country consists of the following sections (1997: 363-402):

- A basic household questionnaire that includes a roster of all members as well as basic information on the household's situation
- An individual questionnaire made of between four and six modules:
 - Section 1 identifies international migrants, here defined as a person who has lived in another country for at least six months, moved to the country of interview during the five years preceding interview and was at least 15 years of age when they moved.
 - Section 2 is asked only of migrants and focuses on the situation of the migrant and their household prior to moving.
 - Section 3 is asked only of migrants and focuses on the situation of the migration after arrival, but excluding questions on engagement in the labour market.
 - Section 4 is asked of both migrants and non-migrants and asks about engagement in the labour market.
 - There are two further optional modules. The first can be used to cover specific sub-sets of migrants, e.g. those who obtain jobs through intermediaries. The second covers fertility, family planning and child mortality.

Many of the questions in the modules proposed by Bilsborrow et al (1997) – and particularly those in the household questionnaire and section 4 – are already present in the QLFS. Fortunately, this already restricts the number of questions that need to be considered as possible additions for the migration module. In discussing the remaining questions, the discussion below takes into account (a) the need to restrict the number of questions added to the QLFS and (b) the fact that our main interest is to explore the contribution of foreign workers to the South African labour market. On these bases, sections 2 and the additional modules proposed by Bilsborrow et al are not of direct interest. Below we therefore consider only the questions contained in module 3.

A South African migration module needs to capture information about internal migrants as well as international migrants. This was the case with the module in the the third quarter 2012 and continue. The majority of proposed questions therefore need to be asked in a way that is relevant for both internal and international migrants.

The need to cover both internal and international migrants immediately raises the question of how one identifies migrants. In this respect, we suggest that the first two questions of the 2013 QLFS migration module – where the individual was born and when they moved to the current location – be retained. However, we suggest that the number of years for the second question be changed to two, to match the proposed biennial cycle for the module. We propose further that the question on exactly when they moved within these two (or five) years be dropped as experience suggests that the responses to such questions are often not accurate. In particular, respondents tend to identify their more recent activity (Rob Dorrington,



personal communication, February 2013). If our proposed questions are included, it would be preferable to add a third question asking when the person last moved to the current province or country; the responses to the other questions would not be meaningful without this.

The table that follows lists the topics covered by the questions asked in module 3 and includes a discussion of whether and how each might be appropriate for a short QLFS module.

Table 1. Discussion of individual questionnaire topics

Question No.	Topic	Discussion
3.1	When came to country	<p>Initially this might seem like a better question than asking whether the person has moved in the last two years, as a foreigner might have moved more than once, for example, from outside and then within the country. In such a case, a question about the last two years will only capture the most recent move and not reveal that they are an international migrant. The second drawback of this framing of the question is that it does not work well for internal migration, which is a serious disadvantage in the South African situation where both internal and international migration is common. To make a question meaningful for internal migration, it would need to ask when they came to the province or country. However, a further argument against this question is that if the period covered is reduced to two years, then there is less of a chance than with five years of missing an international migration because there has been a subsequent internal move.</p> <p>What could be considered is to have both questions asked, with the question about <i>when</i> the move happened answered in respect of time periods e.g. last 12 months, between 12-24 months ago, between 24 and 60 months, and prior to that. Whether this is useful would, in part, depend on what other questions are added because – as discussed below – some of the other questions are only meaningful if this question is asked.</p> <p>Another issue that will need to be addressed is whether or not the questionnaire aims to capture circular or repeated migration. This is, for example, the pattern for migrant workers in mining and agriculture who come to South Africa on repeated one-year or shorter contracts.</p>

Question No.	Topic	Discussion
		One way to deal with this issue might be to add a further question asking whether the person now considers their current location as their “home”.
3.2	Reason/s for migrating	<p>This is already covered in QLFS 2013:3. The options offered by Bilsborrow et al are as follows:</p> <p><i>01 HIGHER WAGES, HIGHER INCOME LEVELS HERE, HOPED TO GET BETTER JOB</i></p> <p><i>02 OFFERED BETTER JOB HERE BEFORE I CAME</i></p> <p><i>03 TRANSFERRED BY EMPLOYER</i></p> <p><i>04 GOOD BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES HERE, GOOD PLACE TO INVEST</i></p> <p><i>05 TO OBTAIN MORE EDUCATION FOR SELF</i></p> <p><i>06 TO OBTAIN BETTER OR MORE EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN</i></p> <p><i>07 HAD SPOUSE WAITING FOR ME HERE</i></p> <p><i>08 BETTER PROSPECTS FOR FINDING TYPE OF SPOUSE I WANTED</i></p> <p><i>09 BETTER AMENITIES HERE</i></p> <p><i>10 BETTER MEDICAL AND HEALTH SERVICES HERE</i></p> <p><i>11 LESS INSECURITY IN THIS COUNTRY</i></p> <p><i>12 FEWER ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS</i></p> <p><i>13 THIS IS MY HOME COUNTRY</i></p> <p><i>14 HAVE FRIENDS AND RELATIVES HERE</i></p> <p><i>15 COULD OBTAIN ASYLUM IN THIS COUNTRY</i></p> <p><i>16 OTHER, SPECIFY:</i></p>
3.3-3.6	Border control, problems entering the country, types of visa and related issues	<p>These questions are of interest to various stakeholders who want to understand whether and how migration controls assists or hinders labour migration. However, these questions are not appropriate for the QLFS module as the latter focuses on the current profile of the labour force rather than on the factors that influenced the profile. Further, the questions are sensitive and thus likely to discourage respondents and/or elicit inaccurate responses.</p>



Question No.	Topic	Discussion
3.7	Whether a job was already “waiting” for the person at the time they moved to the country	This question might be worth considering. However, it would overburden the module to include the follow-up questions on whether the person had asked for a transfer and/or who helped them find a job. The word “country” would also need to be changed to “province/country” so as to be applicable to internal migration.
3.9	Relatives and friends living in the country prior to the individual moving, and assistance received from them	This is beyond the scope of a short module focused on the role of foreign labour in the South African labour market.
3.10	Main means of support after arrival, apart from relatives	This is beyond the scope of our focus.
3.11	Job search after moving to the country	This issue would already be covered elsewhere in the questionnaire for unemployed individuals. There is limited utility in adding this for employed foreigners as there would be no comparison with South African employed people in terms of how they searched for their current work.
3.12	Change in marital status since arrival	This is beyond the scope of our focus.
3.13	Simultaneous movement of immediate relatives (father, mother, spouse, children, siblings)	Bilsborrow et al’s (1997) model questionnaire asks about this issue in some detail. A simple version of the question would be to ask whether the individual moved alone or, instead, with at least one close relative.
3.16	Current level of education	This is covered elsewhere in the QLFS.
3.17	School (educational) attendance and qualifications received since arriving in the country	This question would be difficult to interpret unless we also know when the person arrived in the country. The standard QLFS already includes a question on current attendance at an educational institution.
3.18	On-the-job training received since arriving in the country	This question is not explored for non-foreigners, so including it for migrants would provide no opportunity for comparison. One reason why the question is not probed in the QLFS is the difficulty in defining what constitutes on-the-job training. Further, the QLFS focuses primarily on the current job rather than prior jobs or training

Question No.	Topic	Discussion
		experience.
3.19	Visits by individual or family members to hospital on account of injury or illness	This is beyond the scope of our focus.
3.20	Receipt of benefits or assistance by individual or family members from government	Employment-related assistance (such as contributions to medical aid and unemployment insurance) are already covered in the standard QLFS. Other forms of migrant-specific benefits and assistance are beyond the scope of our focus.
3.21	When did the individual or any other household member visit their previous country of residence	If this question is included, it should apply only to the individual respondent. The question might be useful for dealing with the issue of circular migration. If it is included, it would need to apply to both previous province and previous country.
3.22-3.24	Citizenship at time of moving and intentions in respect of changes in citizenship	This is again a question that is likely to be sensitive. If the specific country of citizenship is asked, this will impose a substantial additional burden in terms of coding and time. One possibility is, as in Census 2011, to ask simply whether or not the person is a South African citizen. The question may, of course, not always be answered honestly.
3.25	Ability to speak and understand local languages	This question is not asked of non-foreigners and would have limited utility given that South Africa has 11 languages. Further, self-rating of ability is very subjective.
3.26	What the individual would tell friends or relatives in their previous country about South Africa	This is beyond the scope of our focus.

The table above suggests that there are, in fact, only a limited number of questions that would need to be added to the QLFS migration module to be able to cover the most relevant issues.

The suggested questions will not provide information about all aspects of migration. It will not, for example, reveal whether those who migrated came to South Africa from their country of birth or from elsewhere. Nevertheless, even without this information the relatively small set of additional questions would provide much more information about foreign labour in South Africa than is currently available.



Where individuals have moved to South Africa from outside of the country, and subsequently moved between provinces, the questions about the 'last move' would reflect the move between provinces. However, the question on when people born outside the country last moved to South Africa will allow identification of their foreign descent.

Outline of suggested QLFS module

The following outline combines the questions used for the third quarter 2012 QLFS with the additional questions motivated above.

Added: Are you a citizen or permanent resident of South Africa?

1= Yes, citizen

2= Yes, permanent resident

3= No

4= Do not know

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.

Added: For those born outside South Africa: In what year did you last arrive in South Africa? (Exclude short visits home or outside the country in answering this question.)

Responses to be specified in five-year categories.

Added: For those born outside South Africa or this province: When did you last visit the country/province in which you were born? (Exclude the first arrival in South Africa/province.)

Responses to be specified in one-year categories for the past five years and five-year categories for periods further in the past. Option of "Never" to be included.

8.3 Have you moved from one province to another in the past five (or two) years?

Responses Yes or No

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

Response in terms of year

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

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

8.6 What was the main reason for moving to the country/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

Added: When you moved to this country/province, did you have a job waiting for you?

1= Yes

2= No

3= Thought there would be a job but there was not.

Added: When you moved to this country/province, did you move alone or together with (a) close relative/s? (Close relatives are parents, children, spouse and siblings.)

1= Moved alone.

2= Moved alone, but close relative/s followed me within three months.

3= Move alone, but close relative had moved here in the previous three months.

4= Moved with close relative/s.

5= Do not know.

In addition to these changes to the migration module, and making it a regular biennial add-on module to the QLFS, another suggested change is that Stats SA reframe the question on education into categories that can be easily answered by people who have received their education in other countries. The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) could be used for this purpose. Adopting this approach may mean losing the detail of exactly which South African grade a person had completed. This could be a worthwhile trade-off as this detail is not often used.

Another suggested change is that Stats SA make available the earnings data for the quarter in which the migrant module is done. Currently Stats SA asks the earnings questions in each quarter, but produces analysis only on an annual basis, using data from all four quarters. For analysis of earnings of migrants



versus non-migrants, earnings data from the quarter with the migration module will need to be used. Provision of quarterly earnings data would also be welcomed by researchers who do other types of analysis of QLFS data.

Sampling for the QLFS

Our proposal is that, as in the third quarter of 2012, the module on migration be included in the standard QLFS on a biennial basis. This implies that the standard QLFS sampling, based on the master sample, will be used. Using quota sampling, or another method to ensure a set number of migrants, is not possible within the framework of the QLFS.

Stats SA did not make any special efforts to locate migrants when conducting the QLFS 2012:3. Special efforts in respect of sampling would have been inappropriate. This is different from the situation in Census 2011, when Stats SA officials made specific efforts to capture responses from migrants and, in particular, those not living in standard dwelling units. In Johannesburg, for example, the Randburg office made special efforts on the night of the census to visit the Central Methodist Church where migrants were sheltering; the responses of these essentially homeless people would not otherwise have been captured. Stats SA also worked together with agencies such as the Johannesburg Migration Advisory Council so as to encourage full and accurate responses from migrant respondents (Maurice Mommen, personal communication, 15 March 2013). This sort of effort is not possible or appropriate with the QLFS because random sampling determines which dwelling units are approached by fieldworkers. Once a dwelling unit is selected, the fieldworker asks about all individuals living in that dwelling unit, whether or not they are foreign. However, what could be useful is for the Stats SA fieldworkers to receive special training on the new module, including ways to encourage trust and elicit full and accurate responses to what may be sensitive questions. One example would be assuring respondents from the start that no information is passed on to other government authorities, whether the South African Revenue Service (regarding taxes), the Department of Home Affairs, or other authorities.

The QLFS covers people living in private dwelling units as well as those living in worker hostels. To date, there have been weaknesses in the way sampling of worker hostels has been done. This has implications for our understanding of foreign labour as foreign workers are over-represented among those living in mine worker hostels, and perhaps others. Stats SA is aware of this problem and is planning to improve the sampling of worker hostels for the QLFS, independent of migration module changes.

Possibilities for QLFS analysis

If the module is revised as suggested, many new tabulations will be possible. Which of the tabulations will produce reliable analysis, and to what extent further disaggregation is possible, will depend on how many migrants (and foreign migrants in particular) are captured by the QLFS. This cannot be specified in advance as the migrants (and foreigners among them) will be captured (or not) through the standard sampling procedure used for the QLFS.

Below are some of the new tabulations that would be possible with the revised migration module. All the analysis should be disaggregated by sex, unless the number of migrants is considered too small.

For full population:

Disaggregation by place of birth (province for South African-born, and country and/or region for others)

- Full population of working age
- Employed, unemployed and not economically active (also derived labour force participation rates and unemployed rates)
- Employed, unemployed and not economically active (and derived rates) by broad education levels
- Employed by:
 - Status in employment (employee, employer, own account, etc)
 - Formal/informal sector
 - Formal/informal employment
 - Occupation
 - Industry
- Employees by:
 - Earnings (categories, mean and median) – disaggregated further by education and occupation if sample size is adequate
 - Access to benefits (Unemployment Insurance Fund, medical cover, leave, etc)
 - Trade union membership

Similar tables to those specified above for citizenship (South African and non-South African).

For migrants (both internal and international) where migration is defined based on movement within the last two years:

Disaggregated by internal/international

Further disaggregated by province and international region if numbers allow

- Reason for moving to current location by work status (employed, unemployed, not economically active)
- Whether job waiting when moved by work status
- Whether moved alone or together with close relative/s by reason for moving
- Whether moved alone or together with close relatives by work status

The above lists by no means exhaust the possibilities offered by the proposed questions. However, what is possible will ultimately be determined by the number and profile of migrants captured by the QLFS.



Recommendations for municipal level studies

If the recommendations above are implemented, there will still be a number of issues that the QLFS module will not explore, as noted in the question-by-question table above. These include: experiences in respect of border control and permits, whether migrants joined family or friends and what forms of assistance they received from them, main means of support after arrival, job search after arrival, changes in marital status after arrival, job-related training received before and after arrival, and language ability. Some of these questions may be of interest to municipalities, while others may not. Some of these questions relate fairly directly to the labour market (the topic of the three reports), while others are more peripheral. While all of the questions are interesting, any planned investigation will need to decide which questions are crucial for the topic being investigated. If this is not done, research instruments will become overburdened, likely resulting in deterioration in the quality of the results.

MiWORC Reports N°2 (Data set review) and 3 (Recommendations for long-term improvement) repeatedly point out that Statistics SA instruments, including the Census, cannot be expected to produce reliable estimates at the municipal level. Several informants said that SALGA, in collaboration with municipalities and other actors, was exploring the possibility of using other existing sources of data, in particular administrative data. Unfortunately, a report detailing such possibilities is not available. Administrative data are, indeed, a potentially rich source of data that should be utilised wherever possible. In respect of migrants, one potential challenge is that much of the administrative data at municipal level is likely to deal with households rather than individuals. Such data might thus be of limited use in providing information about migration and, in particular, foreign labour. A second potential challenge is the quality of administrative data, as evidenced by the difficulties that some municipalities experience with billing. Nevertheless, it is important that these possibilities be explored.

The second report in this series suggests that municipalities with particular concerns about or interest in foreign labour could themselves commission specific studies. It points to two prototypes that municipalities can investigate, namely a set of sector-specific surveys in Gauteng (Society, Work and Development Institute, 2013), and an establishment-based survey in Delft (Charman et al, 2012).

It is not possible at this stage to give specific recommendations for municipal-level studies. Such recommendations would only be appropriate once municipalities had decided on the specific issues they wanted investigated and the resources available, among other factors. One of the major challenges that will arise with any such investigations involves sampling. This will present a challenge because the proportion of migrants in the general population is relatively small, so standard sampling is unlikely to generate a sizeable sub-sample of migrants. An added difficulty is that migrants are not evenly distributed in the population, whether geographically, by industry, by occupation, or by other variables. If the sampling focuses on a segment of the population in which foreigners are over-represented, the findings could not be generalised to the population as a whole.

This section of the report therefore describes the ways in which the sampling was done for the three sectors that the Gauteng Department wanted investigated as well as for the Delft study. These descriptions are offered as an illustration of innovative ways in which sampling needs to be adapted to particular circumstances. The descriptions seem appropriate as these studies were able to say something meaningful about foreign labour in the sectors and geographical area studied.

Sector-specific studies

The Gauteng surveys were undertaken as a core part of studies commissioned by the Gauteng Department of Economic Development. Although the studies did not have foreign labour as a core topic, they included questions that allowed identification of foreign workers within the sectors studied. This, in turn, allowed comparison of foreign and local workers in the analysis.

The Gauteng study covered three sectors – security, agriculture and hospitality.

In security, all companies are required to register with the Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority (PSIRA). However, when asked, PSIRA was not prepared to provide a list and contact details of registered companies. There are also many companies that do not register with PSIRA. It may be these non-registered companies, in particular, that employ foreign workers as registered companies are, legally, not allowed to do so. Unregistered companies are more likely to ignore labour legislation. In addition, the Gauteng study aimed to include workers who do security duty in public places, and particularly in parking areas, and who are self-employed rather than employees.

Using an alternative sampling approach, the researchers compiled a list of 12 types of sites in which one would commonly expect to find security workers. These included, for example, parking lots, shopping malls, office blocks and schools. The researchers then randomly selected 80 enumeration areas (EAs) using the full list of EAs for Gauteng provided by Stats SA. Fieldworkers were dropped off in the selected EAs and asked to find 15 guards to interview. They were advised to start with some of the 12 common types of sites and then, through asking these guards, identify further places where they might find other guards. In doing so, they were not restricted to the 12 identified types of sites. 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.

Agriculture is a notoriously difficult sector to investigate as some employers will not allow outsiders to come onto their farms. A further difficulty with agriculture is that it is concentrated in particular parts of Gauteng, which is an overwhelmingly urban province. The first step taken by the study team was to obtain a list of the sub-places (which consist of a varying number of EAs) classified as commercial farming from Stats SA. This list was used for sampling purposes, and Stats SA then provided maps 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. (Fieldworkers were advised to ensure that only sober workers were interviewed at shebeens.) The fieldworkers then asked each interviewee where else they might find other farm workers. To avoid clustering, both the fieldworkers and fieldwork supervisors were asked to ensure that no more than three workers from any single farm were interviewed. They were also asked to ensure that they interviewed both male and female workers.

Regarding the hospitality sector, one of the first challenges in sampling was the sector's diversity in terms of the type of business and worker. Neither the Sector Education and Training Authority or Gauteng Tourism Board was able to provide a useable list of companies for sampling purposes. Instead, the researchers used the Yellow Pages, which is available on-line and can be searched by geography (for example, Gauteng) as well as type of service.



To ensure a range of types of establishment, the research focused on three types – tourist hotels (non-residential), restaurants and coffee shops. One of each of up to four types of worker was interviewed in 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.

The main challenge relating to hotels, was that many hotels listed in the Yellow Pages were no longer operating, or provided only a bed (and therefore did not have a sufficient range of workers), or refused to participate. The plan to interview each type of worker was also not as neat as was hoped for, in that some workers did more than one of the four tasks identified.

As is clear from the descriptions above, snowball sampling was used in these surveys. This method involves asking a first respondent to refer the researcher to further possible respondents who fit the characteristics required by the study. The method is used when there is no available sampling frame of all individuals with the required characteristics. The danger in this approach is that it generally results in a biased sample, as individuals refer the researcher to others who are like themselves in key characteristics.

This method of sampling might seem particularly attractive in studies of migrants because individuals from the same country are more likely to know each other. However, South Africa has migrants from a very large number of countries and there are many other forms of diversity among those sharing a nationality; therefore, the dangers associated with snowball sampling are substantial. In the studies for Gauteng, while snowball sampling was used, the dangers were to some extent avoided by placing restrictions on the number of informants within each “snowball”, with respect to the type of location for the security study, and each particular farm for the agriculture study.

Establishment-based survey

The first and second papers in this series refer to the research reported by Charman et al (2012) in Delft in the Western Cape. The Western Cape paper is of particular interest from the perspective of foreign labour as it found that a substantial percentage of the small businesses in the Delft settlement were foreign-owned. Similarly stark findings are unlikely in many other settlements. However, the methodology used is worth exploring regardless of the prevalence of foreign labour.

The first step in the establishment survey was to conduct a street survey in which all publicly visible micro-enterprises were recorded. A five-person team conducted this survey, using bicycles to cover Delft street by street. One of the team members was a Somali national. This person was included because a large number of Somalis were known to run businesses in Delft. Whenever a researcher came across a micro-enterprise, they recorded its location (using geographical positioning system coordinates) and a description of its activities.

Once the street mapping was completed, the results were analysed and the businesses classified. Maps were then developed showing the location of all businesses and the distribution of enterprises by category. Interviews were then conducted with each shopkeeper about the products sold and their prices. The questionnaire also asked about the nationality of the storekeeper and whether the business was run on a day-to-day basis by the owner or his/her employees.

Alongside the establishment survey, the study included a small 50-household survey that explored attitudes through in-depth interviews and focus groups with key informants, including the Somali Association of South Africa. The household survey, in-depth interviews and focus groups were not intended to be representative, but instead to inform interpretation of the results of the establishment survey.



References

- Bilsborrow, R.E., Hugo, G., Obérai, A.S. & Zlotnik, H. (1997) *International Migration Statistics: Guidelines for improving data collection systems*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
- 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.
- Society, Work and Development Institute. (2012) *Decent Work and Development: The decent work deficit challenge in Gauteng*. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand. Prepared for the Gauteng Department of Economic Development.
- Statistics South Africa. (2012) Quarterly Labour Force Questionnaire 2012:3. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa. Retrieved from:
<https://www.statssa.gov.za/Publications/P0211/P02113rdQuarter2012.pdf>

Informants

Peter Buwembo, Statistics South Africa

Rob Dorrington, University of Cape Town

Maurice Mommen, Statistics South Africa, Randburg Branch



Abstracts

ENGLISH – MiWORC Report N°4. 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.

This report is the third in a set of three for work commissioned by the African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) on data on behalf of the Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC). This third report provides more detailed suggestions for improvement of the QLFS migration module. It does so by drawing on Bilsborrow et al's (1997) suggestions for a migration survey. This third report also provides some guidance for municipal-level investigations. The guidance is, however, limited as more detailed recommendations will only be possible when individual municipalities or the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) have decided what specific issues they would like to investigate in particular municipalities, and what resources are available for these investigations.

العربية – تقرير اتحاد الهجرة للبحث عن عمل (MiWORC) رقم 4: تحسين نوعية الإحصاءات المتاحة عن العمالة الأجنبية في جنوب أفريقيا: اقتراحات لوحدة نمطية عن الهجرة لمسح القوى العاملة الفصلية و الدراسات الاستقصائية على مستوى البلديات .

هذا التقرير هو الثالث في مجموعة من ثلاثة للعمل على البيانات بتكليف من المركز الأفريقي للهجرة و المجتمع (ACMS) بالنيابة عن اتحاد الهجرة للبحث عن عمل (MiWORC) هذا التقرير الثالث يقدم اقتراحات أكثر تفصيلاً للتحسين من الوحدة النمطية للهجرة QLFS و ذلك بالاستناد إلى اقتراحات شركة Bilsborrow et al's (1997) لدراسة الهجرة . ويقدم هذا التقرير الثالث أيضا بعض التوجيهات لإجراء تحقيقات على مستوى البلديات. ومع ذلك لا تزال هذه التوجيهات محدودة نظرا لكون أي توصيات أكثر تفصيلاً لن تكون ممكنة إلا عندما تقرر البلديات الفردية أورابطة الحكومات المحلية في جنوب أفريقيا ما هي القضايا المحددة التي تود التحقيق فيها في بلديات معينة وما هي الموارد المتاحة لهذه التحقيقات-

ESPAÑOL – Informe MiWORC N°4. Mejorando la calidad de las estadísticas disponibles de mano de obra extranjera en Sudáfrica: Sugerencias para un módulo de migración de Sondeo de Población Activa Trimestral y sondeos a nivel municipal.

Este informe es el tercero de tres trabajos encargados por el Centro Africano de Migración y Sociedad (ACMS) sobre los datos del Consorcio de Investigación de la Migración por Trabajo (MiWORC). Este tercer informe proporciona sugerencias más detalladas para la mejora del módulo de migración QLFS. Lo hacemos apoyándonos en las sugerencias de Bilsborrow et al (1997) sobre una encuesta de migración. Este tercer informe también proporciona orientación para la investigación a nivel municipal. Esta orientación es de todas formas limitada, ya que recomendaciones más detalladas serán posibles solamente cuando las municipalidades individuales o la Asociación de Gobierno Local de Sudáfrica (SALGA) decidan qué problemas específicos son los que quieren investigar, en particular las municipalidades, y qué recursos se encuentran disponibles para estas investigaciones.

FRANÇAIS - Rapport MiWORC N°4. Améliorer la qualité des statistiques disponibles sur la main-d'œuvre étrangère en Afrique du Sud : Suggestions pour l'amélioration du module migration de l'Enquête trimestrielle sur le marché du travail (QLFS – Stats SA) et pour des enquêtes municipales.

Ce rapport est le troisième d'une série de trois rapports sur les données statistiques commandés par l'African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) dans le cadre du Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC). Ce troisième rapport fournit des propositions plus détaillées pour l'amélioration du module migration de la QLFS (Stats SA). Les propositions sont essentiellement tirées des recommandations de Bilsborrow et al. (1997) pour les enquêtes migration. Ce troisième rapport fournit également des indications sur les enquêtes réalisées au niveau municipal. Ces indications demeurent cependant limitées tant que des municipalités ou l'Association sud-africaine du gouvernement local (SALGA) n'ont pas décidé des questions spécifiques qu'elles aimeraient voir traiter, et des ressources disponibles pour entreprendre ce travail.

PORTUGUES – Relatório MiWORC N°4. Melhorando a qualidade das estatísticas disponíveis da mão-de-obra imigrante em África do Sul: Sugestões para um módulo de migração de Pesquisa da População Activa trimestral e Sondagens a nível municipal.

Este relatório é o terceiro de três, para o trabalho encomendado pelo Centro Africano de Migração e Sociedade (ACMS) de parte do Consórcio de Investigação de Migração por Trabalho (MiWORC). Este terceiro relatório fornece sugestões mais detalhadas para a melhoria do módulo QLFS de migração. Descreve em Bilsborrow et al's (1997) sugestões para um estudo de migração. Este terceiro relatório também fornece orientação para a investigação a nível municipal. Essa orientação ainda é limitada, já que só serão possíveis recomendações mais detalhadas quando as municipalidades individuais ou a Associação de Governo Local da África do Sul (SALGA) decida que problemas específicos são aqueles que querem investigar, em particular, municípios, e que recursos estão disponíveis para estas investigações.

SESOTHO – MiWORC Tlaleho ya N°4. Ntlafatso ya boleng ba dipalopalo tse fumanehang ka basebetsi ba tswang mafatsheng mona Afrika Borwa: Ditshisinyo bakeng sa mojulo wa Quarterly Labour Force Survey (QLFS) wa phuputso ya phallo ya batho le boemo ba bommasepala.

Tlaleho ena ke ya boraro ho tse tharo tsa mosebetsi o laetsweng ke African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) ka dipalopalo lebitsong la Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC). Tlaleho ena ya boraro e nehelana ka ditshisinyo tse ding tse keneletseng ka ntlafatso ya mojulo wa phallo wa QLFS. E etsa jwalo ka thuso ya ditshisinyo tsa Bilsborrow et al's (1997) bakeng sa phuputso ya phallo. Tlaleho ena ya boraro e nehelana hape ka tataiso bakeng sa diphuputso tsa boemo ba bommasepala. Le ha ho le jwalo, tataiso ena e a haella ka ha ditshisinyo tse keneletseng haholwanyane di tla ba teng feela ha mmasepala ka mong kapa South African Local Government Association (SALGA) (e leng Mokgatlo wa Mebuso ya Lehae ya Afrika Borwa) o nkile qeto ka dintlha tseo ba ka thabelang ho di fuputsa ho bommasepala ba itseng, le hore ke matlotlo afe a fumanehang bakeng sa diphuputso tsena.



ISIXHOSA – INgxelo yesi-4 yakwa-MiWORC. Ukuphucula umgangatho wengqokelela yamanani ekhoyo malunga nabasebenzi abasuka kumazwe angaphandle eMzantsi Afrika: iiNgcebiso malunga ngemodyuli yemfuduko yoVavanyo lwaBasebenzi yarhoqo ngeKota kwakunye novavanyo kumgangatho woomasipala.

Le ngxelo yeyesithathu kwiingqokelela ezintathu zomsebenzi ogunyanziswe yi-African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) ngoovimba abangeenkukacha egameni le-Migrating for Work Research Consortium (MiWORC). Le ngxelo yesithathu inikezela iingcebiso ezineenkukacha ezininzi zokuphucula imodyuli yemfuduko ye-QLFS. Ikwenza oko ngokujonga iingcebiso zovavanyo lwemfuduko zika-Bilsborrow et al's (1997). Ingxelo yesithathu ikwanikezela isikhokelo esingephi kuphando olukumgangatho kamasipala. Isikhokelo, kengoko, asibanzanga njengoko izindululo ezineenkukacha ezininzi ziya kufumaneka kuphela xa oomasipala abazimeleyo okanye uMbutho kaRhulumente weNgingqi eMzantsi Afrika (i-SALGA) ugqibe ekubeni yeyiphi na imiba eyodwa abanqwenela ukuyiphanda koomasipala abathile, nokuba ngabaphi oovimba abakhoyo bokwenza olu phando.

KISWAHILI – Ripoti Namba 4 ya MiWORC. Kuboresha ubora wa takwimu zilizopo kuhusu ajira ya kigeni nchini Afrika Kusini: Mapendekezo kuhusu sehemu ya Robo Mwaka ya utafiti wa uhamiaji na utafiti wa ngazi ya manispaa.

Ripoti hii ni ya tatu katika seti ya tatu kwa ajili ya kazi iliyofanyiwa Kituo cha Afrika cha Uhamiaji & Jamii (ACMS) juu ya taarifa kwa niaba ya Muungano wa Utafiti kuhusu Uhamiaji kwa ajili ya Kazi (MiWORC). Ripoti hii ya tatu inatoa mapendekezo ya kina zaidi kwa ajili ya uboreshaji wa kipimo cha uhamiaji cha QLFS. Inafanya hivyo kwa kutumia mwongozo inayopata toka mapendekezo ilivyotolewa na Bilsborrow na wengine (1997) kuhusu utafiti wa uhamiaji. Ripoti hii ya tatu pia hutoa baadhi ya mwongozo kwa ajili ya uchunguzi wa ngazi ya manispaa. Uongozi ni, hata hivyo, mdogo kwa kuwa mapendekezo ya kina zaidi itawezekana tu wakati mtu binafsi au chama cha serikali za mitaa ya manispaa za Afrika Kusini (SALGA) wameamua nini masuala maalum ambayo wangependa kuchunguza hasa katika manispaa, na ni rasilimali zipi zilizopo za kutosha kwa ajili ya uchunguzi huo.

ISIZULU - Umbiko i-MiWORC Report N°4. Ukwenza ngcono iqophelo lezibalo zocwaningo ezikhona ngabasebenzi bakwamanye amazwe eNingizimu Afrika: Izincomo zohlaka lokuya kwelinye izwe (i-migration module) locwaningo lwekwata lwabasebenzi kanye nezingcwaningo zomasipala.

Lo mbiko ungowesithathu eqoqweni lamaqoqo amathathu omsebenzi ogunyazwe yi-African Centre for Migration & Society (i-ACMS) egameni le-Migrating for Work Research Consortium (i-MiWORC). Lo mbiko wesithathu uhlinzeka ezinye izincomo ezinemininingwane ekwenzeni ngcono uhloko lokuya kwelinye izwe locwaningo lwekwata lwabasebenzi (i-QLFS). Lo mbiko uhlinzeka lezo zincomo ngokusebenzisa izincomo zika-Bilsborrow owabhala nabanye (1997) ngocwaningo lokuya kwelinye izwe. Lo mbiko wesithathu ubuye uhlinzeke ezinye izeluleko zokucwaninga ezingeni likamasipala. Kodwa lezi zeluleko zinemikhawulo, kwazise izincomo ezinemininingwane zingaba khona kuphela uma oomasipala noma abe-South African Local Government Association (abe-SALGA) sebezithethe izinqumo ngokuthi yiziphi izihloko abathanda ukwenza ucwaningo ngazo komasipala abathile, nangokuthi yiziphi izinsiza ezikhona ezizosetshenziselwa lezo zingcwaningo.



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

