Migrating out of Poverty
RESEARCH PROGRAMME CONSORTIUM

Social Polarisation and Migration to Johannesburg

Jacqueline Borel-Saladin

Working Paper 11

November 2013

About the Author

Jacqueline Borel-Saladin is a Researcher on Economic Performance and Development at the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC).

Acknowledgements

Financial assistance from the African Centre for Cities and the National Research Foundation (NRF) is gratefully acknowledged. The UK Department for International Development (DFID) which supports policies, programmes and projects to promote poverty reduction globally, also provided funds for this study, as part of that goal. However the views and opinions expressed are those of the author alone.

© 2013 by Jacqueline Borel-Saladin. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Migrating out of Poverty

Arts B, University of Sussex

Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QN, United Kingdom

tel: +44 (0)1273 873535

email: migrationrpc@sussex.ac.uk

web: http://migratingoutofpoverty.dfid.gov.uk/

Abstract

The manufacturing sector – once a major source of urban employment and consisting of a large percentage of skilled and semi-skilled, middle-income jobs – has declined, while the service sector – comprising predominantly either high-skill, high-pay or low-skill, low-pay jobs – has grown. Consequently, it has been argued, that the decline of manufacturing and the growth of the service sector are to result in a more polarised occupational structure. Growing numbers of low-wage, low-skill service sector jobs are also said to attract poorly educated, unskilled immigrants from rural areas and/or developing countries. The contention is that these migrants become trapped in the low-skill, low-wage service sector jobs, thereby exacerbating social polarisation. An alternative argument is that there is a trend towards professionalisation, with a general upgrading of skills among the employed workforce and a growth of non-manual clerical, sales, technical, professional and managerial jobs. Consequently, unskilled migrants experience a skills mismatch and are likely to be unemployed rather than employed in low-skilled jobs. Household survey and population census results for the Johannesburg region of South Africa from 1980 to 2007, were used to explore the relationship between migrants and social polarisation. The results show that migrants have a very similar occupation and education profile to natives and that their presence does not cause social polarisation but supports growing professionalisation instead.

Contents

Introduction 6

Competing conceptualisations of migrants and social polarisation 7

The role of migrants in social polarisation: evaluating a sample of evidence 8

A brief overview of migration in South Africa 10

Employment patterns amongst migrants and natives in the Johannesburg region 11

Migrants and education 16

Different groups of migrants and social polarisation 19

Increasing professionalisation with increasing unemployment? 26

Conclusion 27

References 29

Appendices: Immigrants to the Johannesburg region of South Africa, 1980-2007 31

- Table i. Occupational distribution of employed men by race in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (frequency distribution) 31
- Table ii. Occupational distribution of employed men by race in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution) 33
- Table iii. Occupational distribution of employed men by race in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (percentage distribution, column totals) 35
- Table iv. Occupational distribution of employed men by race in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (percentage distribution, column totals) 37
- Table v. Occupational distribution of employed women by race in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (frequency distribution) 39
- Table vi. Occupational distribution of employed women by race in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution) 41
- Table vii. Occupational distribution of employed women by race in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (percentage distribution, column totals) 43
- Table viii. Occupational distribution of employed women by race in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (percentage distribution, column totals) 45
- Table ix. High-skill occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (frequency distribution) 47
- Table x. High-skill occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution) 47

Table xi. Unskilled occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (frequency distribution) 48

Table xii. Unskilled occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution) 48

Table xiii. Semi-skilled Blue-collar occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (frequency distribution) 49

Table xiv. Semi-skilled Blue-collar occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution) 49

List of in-text tables

Table 1: Educational and occupational distribution, immigrants and natives 8

Table 2: Occupational distribution of migrants and natives, Johannesburg region, 1980, 2001 and 2007 ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**1

Table 3: Occupational distribution of migrants and natives, Johannesburg region, 1980, 2001 and 2007 ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**2

Table 4: Occupational distribution of migrants and natives, Johannesburg region, 1980, 2001 and 2007 ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**3

Table 5: Educational distribution of employed migrants and natives, Johannesburg region, 2007 ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**5

Table 6: Educational distribution of employed migrants and natives, Johannesburg region, 2007 ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**5

Table 7: Educational profile of all adult migrants and natives (employed, unemployed and economically inactive), Johannesburg region, 2007 16

Table 8: Educational profile of all adult migrants and natives (employed, unemployed and economically inactive) 16

Table 9: Percentage distribution of high-skill occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980 20

Table 10: . Percentage distribution of high-skill occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 2007 20

Table 11: Absolute change in high-skill occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980-2007 20

Table 12: Percentage distribution of unskilled occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980 21

Table 13: Percentage distribution of unskilled occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 2007 21

Table 14: Absolute change in the numbers of unskilled occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980-2001.....22

Table 15: Absolute change in the numbers of semi-skilled blue-collar occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980-2007.....22

Table 16: Absolute change in the numbers of semi-skilled white-collar occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980-2007....23

Table 17: Percentage distribution of employed workforce by race and gender in the Johannesburg region, 1980 and 2007.....24

Introduction

According to the polarisation hypothesis, both low- and high-skill service sector jobs are increasing. Most authors agree that global cities are points of concentration for the producer services, vital to managing global financial systems and the high-skill, high-pay workers that perform these tasks. If this was the only phenomenon in question, there would likely be an indisputable trend towards professionalisation and no debate about increasing polarisation. The theory of social polarisation is indeed an appealing one, however, as Fainstein *et al.* (1992: 13) point out '…the hard evidence for such a sweeping and general conclusion regarding the outcome of economic restructuring and urban change is, at best, patchy and ambiguous'. Chris Hamnett, too, states that 'the debate [around polarisation] has been characterised more by assertion than conceptual analysis and evidence' (Hamnett 1994a: 402), and that 'this uncritical acceptance of the existence of social polarisation means that its existence is frequently assumed rather than demonstrated' (Hamnett 2012: 361).

Many polarisation theorists also contend that while the native residents of the city fill the growing numbers of high-skill, high-wage service sector jobs, unskilled immigrants to the city fill the concomitantly increasing number of low-wage service jobs (Baum 1997; Chiu and Lui 2004: 199; Sassen 1994). Sassen (1991: 318) states that migrants tend to be 'disproportionately concentrated in lower-paying, more traditional service industries [...] and in the low-paying jobs of the producer services'. Yet very few scholars provide any evidence at all for these types of claims and where evidence is presented, it often does not support the social polarisation hypothesis and the role of migrants therein.

In this paper, I evaluate the evidence for the arguments about the role of migrants in social polarisation as well as present evidence for the impact of migrants on the occupational structure of the employed in the Johannesburg region of South Africa.[1] I argue that migrants to the Johannesburg region have an occupational and educational distribution that is very similar to the natives. They are well represented in high-skill, high-pay and semi-skilled, middle-income work, and not overwhelmingly uneducated and marginalised in low-skill service sector work. I will also examine evidence that individual immigrant communities have varied occupational outcomes.

Competing conceptualisations of migrants and social polarisation

Polarisation theorists argue that immigration to world cities is inextricably linked to the growth of the service sector, with its preponderance of high-skill, high-pay and low-skill, low-pay jobs. They assert that the high levels of migration to the US, both in the past and at present, can be explained only by the increased supply of low-wage jobs generated by major growth sectors such as personal services. Many view immigrants as part of the cause of social polarisation: poorly educated migrants provide the unskilled labour necessary to fill the growing numbers of low-skill, low-pay service sector jobs. These scholars maintain that

[1] I have used the term 'Johannesburg region' to refer to the Gauteng City-Region, a global city region comprising the Gauteng Province of South Africa, as the latter name may be unfamiliar to an international audience.

immigrants are greatly over-represented amongst low-skill, low-pay workers. Much of this demand is argued to be from high-pay professionals with disposable incomes but no time to maintain their households. It is argued they employ low-skilled immigrants, especially women, who are paid very low wages to clean their houses, care for their children and complete other domestic tasks (Baum 1997; Chiu and Lui 2004; Esping-Anderson *et al.* 1993; Gordon and Sassen 1992; Gu and Liu 2002; Sassen 1991).

Other scholars contend that in most of Western Europe, the changes to the occupational structure point towards professionalisation, accompanied by growing numbers of the unemployed and economically inactive, rather than polarisation with a large, low-pay service class posited for the United States. The argument is two-fold, revolving around the nature and levels of immigration. These scholars maintain that different immigrant communities, with their divergent histories and differing degrees of social capital, each have a different experience with regards to finding employment in world cities. Certain ethnic immigrant groups prosper in specific occupations, and some in others (Bailey and Waldinger 1991; Cross and Waldinger 1992; Hamnett 2003). They argue there is no one standard employment trajectory for immigrants in world cities. The scale of immigration is also a point of contention. Many argue that the great and ever growing numbers of unskilled immigrants with poor job prospects and limited access to welfare benefits provide a large pool of cheap labour in the US. However, they dispute that this is the case in other countries, especially in Europe. Therefore, the employment outcomes for immigrants may also depend on the scale of immigration to a particular world city (Cross and Waldinger 1992; Hamnett 1994a, 1994b, 1996a, 1996b, 2003; Harloe and Fainstein 1992).

The role of migrants in social polarisation: evaluating a sample of evidence

A more recent critique of Hamnett argues that while his assessment of immigration to Britain in the 1990's may have been accurate, it is now out-of-date and no longer accurately reflects the economic position of migrants. May *et al.* (2007) contend that due to labour shortages, British migration laws were changed to allow greater numbers of not only highly skilled, but also unskilled workers into the country. They argue that due to a process of managed migration, where unskilled migrants are afforded only temporary admission rights to the country and no welfare benefits, the number of unskilled foreign-born workers in low-skill, low-wage jobs in London has increased. Thus, May *et al.* (2007) contend that London is becoming increasingly polarised, with new migrants disproportionately represented amongst low-skill jobs, representing a new 'reserve army of labour' (May *et al.* 2007: 162).

The data in support of this argument are problematic. First, in terms of the growth of low-skill, low-wage jobs, the authors refer to a 'small but significant rise in the proportion of low-paid jobs' (May *et al.* 2007: 152). However, the graph they present shows only a 13 per cent to 14 per cent rise in jobs in the lowest income decile, versus 70 per cent and 84 per cent increases in the number of jobs in the top two income deciles respectively. The increase in low-wage jobs hardly compares to the increase in high-skill, high-pay jobs, supporting a conclusion of growing professionalisation, not polarisation.

There is a greater problem with the data used to draw the conclusion of a 'new migrant division of labour' with 'an extraordinary preponderance of migrants in parts of London's low-paid economy' (May *et al.* 2007: 155 and 158). The data are drawn from a survey of 341 migrants working in four specific sectors in London that are known to employ high numbers of low-wage workers. Respondents were selected utilising the help of trade unions, through snowballing and some were 'randomly' selected, that is, approached on the street outside their places of work, i.e. technically not randomly sampled at all. Targeting certain sectors and using these methods of finding respondents, it is not surprising that the authors find such a disproportionate representation of foreign-born migrants in low-wage jobs in London. As May *et al*. (2007: 158) state: 'The relatively small number of people interviewed, the limited number of sectors investigated and mixed sampling frame mean that we cannot claim the data are representative of low-paid employment in London as a whole'. Given these constraints, the authors cannot make credible quantitative claims about London's workforce from these data.

Earlier in the same paper, *May et al.* (2007) give data from other studies that show that while foreign-born migrants form 35 per cent of London's working-age population, they are employed in 46 per cent of London's elementary occupations. While this does support the contention that migrants are over-represented in low-skill, low-wage work, an over-representation of only 11 per cent does not support the argument of the rise of a 'new migrant division of labour' with 'an extraordinary preponderance' of migrants being confined to low-skill, low-wage service sector work.

Dustmann *et al.* (2005) use occupational and educational data to argue that, unlike the US with its large contingent of unskilled immigrants, migrants to Britain are more similar to native Britons in terms of educational and skill levels (Table 1). While some of the disparities in the educational levels are more significant than Dustmann *et al.* (2005) acknowledge, more importantly, these data show that immigrants are not mostly uneducated, low-skilled workers. Migrants have higher percentages of intermediate education than the native-born workers and percentages of low education are very similar amongst natives, immigrants and recent immigrants. Fifty-five per cent of recent immigrants have an intermediate education and thirty per cent have an advanced education. These immigrants are by no means overwhelmingly uneducated and unsuitable for any work other than low-skilled service sector jobs.

Table 1. Educational and occupational distribution, immigrants and natives

Education	Advanced education	Intermediate education	Low education	Total
Natives	51	32	17	100
Immigrants	42	39	18	100
Recent Immigrants	30	55	15	100

Occupation	Skilled*	Semi-skilled†	Unskilled‡	Total
Natives	25	40	36	100

Immigrants	31	36	33	100
Recent Immigrants	31	36	32	100

Source: adapted from Dustmann, Fabri and Preston, 2005.
*Those with highest hourly wages, including employers and managers, professionals and the armed forces.
†Includes intermediate and junior non-manual workers, and foremen and supervisors.
‡Includes farmers and farm workers, manual workers and personal service workers.
Please note: original data presented to one decimal place, which have been rounded up here.

The occupational data presented by Dustmann *et al.* (2005) are even more consistent with the argument that immigrants' skill distribution is similar to that of native Britons. The greatest difference is between natives and recent immigrants in terms of skilled work. Even then, they are separated by a mere 6 per cent (Table 1). Amongst the other skill categories the difference between any two groups is no greater than 4 per cent. These data provide compelling evidence for the authors' claim that immigration to Britain has not led to a massive increase in unskilled or low-skilled labour (Dustmann *et al.* 2005).

The data in support of the argument for ethnic immigrant women being marginalised in domestic and personal service work in Sydney are also problematic. Baum (1997) asserts that there is evidence of a burgeoning household service economy in Australia, fuelled by the employment of poorly-paid, unskilled, foreign domestic servants, many of whom are women. On the evidence for Sydney, he states that 1991 census data indicate that 500 people were involved in domestic services work, 60 per cent of whom were women. He argues that this is a significant increase since 1986. This would mean that 301 women were engaged in domestic work in 1991 out of an employed workforce of 2,896,400, or 0.01 per cent of the working population. Even if this figure is an underestimate, and there is a large underground personal services sector in Sydney, as Baum argues, how significant a factor can female immigrant employment in domestic services really be in increasing social polarisation in Sydney? Baum (1997) also gives domestic and personal service worker figures for the whole of Australia for 1991. These figures show that 13,000 people were employed in domestic services in private homes, with a further 134,000 people in personal service occupations. It is suggested that a large proportion of these also consists of migrant women. Again, the significance of these numbers in comparison to the whole population is questionable, and 147,000 workers combined is a relatively small number in comparison to the total employed workforce of Australia. Arguably, then, this is not the best evidence for the claim that increasing immigration, especially of poor, unskilled women, has a significant impact on social polarisation.

A brief overview of migration in South Africa

Prior to the 20th century, many Africans were subsistence farmers (Portes 1978). This self-sufficient economy was destroyed by the establishment of protectorates and the imposition of hut taxes on African farmers, forcing Africans to enter the cash economy (Savage 1986). Dwindling opportunities to sell excess produce to generate income, land expropriations and discriminatory policies such as subsidies in favour of white farmers, resulted in most Africans eventually having no alternative but to migrate to urban areas to find work (Lipton 1989; Portes 1978). Very few of these migrants could take their families to the cities (Lipton 1989). Most moved to the reserves, which during segregation and Apartheid were

continually expanded to provide more land to accommodate the growing African population (Kok *et al.* 2006). African men would work in the cities, and remit their incomes to their families in the reserves, where there was a shortage of work to supplement these meagre remittances.

Many African men went to work in the gold mines of the Witwatersrand (Portes 1978). Because such a large supply of cheap labour was needed in order to extract low-grade gold ore in very deep mines, employers started to recruit beyond South Africa's borders as well (Breytenbach 1979). All workers, whether native or foreign born, were allowed to stay in the urban areas for a specified period of time only, while strict influx control laws prohibited their families from relocating to the cities (Lipton 1989). In addition, it became compulsory for migrant workers to return to their place of origin at least once a year, and when their contract was finished (Platzky and Walker 1985). Influx control was eventually abolished in 1986 and Africans were allowed to settle in the cities (Posel 2009). In South Africa today – in addition to contract mine migrants, documented circular migrants and undocumented migrants – international African migrants include skilled immigrants, consisting of highly-skilled, professional, semi-professional, managerial and technical workers (Wentzel and Tlabela 2006).

Employment patterns amongst migrants and natives in the Johannesburg region

First, it is important to establish the scale of migration to the Johannesburg region.[2] As the core of South Africa's economy and the country's centre of trade with rest of Southern Africa and beyond, the Johannesburg region has long attracted migrants from both South Africa's rural areas and other urban centres (Wray 2010). It has been the most popular destination for both migration from non-metropolitan areas and inter-provincial migration within South Africa (Casale and Posel 2006). Between 1980 and 2007, migrants constituted a significant proportion of the total population of the Johannesburg region: between 40 per cent and 43 per cent. Moreover, migrants formed the majority of the employed workforce, between 53 per cent and 60 per cent, a proportion of the total workforce that remained stable over this 27-year period (Table 4). Thus, there has been, and continues to be, a significant movement of people to the Johannesburg region.

Similar to some of the results discussed above, internal migrants (those born in South Africa, outside of the Johannesburg region), while being over-represented in unskilled work, have not been relegated to low-skill, low-wage work exclusively, as many polarisation theorists would predict.[3] The data show that elementary occupations or unskilled work formed a similar percentage amongst natives and internal migrants in comparison to the working

[2] Immigration status is determined by birthplace. If the respondent was born in the Johannesburg region, he/she is a *native*. If the respondent was born in another province of South Africa, he/she is classed as an *internal migrant*. If the respondent was born outside South Africa, he/she is called a *foreign migrant*.

[3] Many authors classify clerical and sales and service worker occupations, and even some associate professional occupations, as low-skill, low-pay service sector jobs. Clerical and sales jobs are not classified as low-skill, low-income work here, but as semi-skilled, middle-income jobs, following the methodology of Borel-Saladin and Crankshaw (2009).

population as a whole in 1980: 21 per cent and 26 per cent respectively, versus 22 per cent amongst the whole population (Tables 2, 3 and 4). All migrants (internal and foreign combined) formed 60 per cent of the working population in 1980 and constituted a slightly higher percentage of unskilled jobs, 62 per cent. By 2001, all migrants together made up 53 per cent of the employed, but held 65 per cent of unskilled jobs.

Table 2. Occupational distribution of migrants and natives, Johannesburg region, 1980, 2001 and 2007 (frequency distribution)*

Occupation	Census 1980				Census 2001 10 per cent sample				Community Survey 2007			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	35,854	35,606	25,211	96,671	113,037	67,224	28,443	208,704	214,149	159,211	50,698	424,058
Professionals	65,638	59,159	24,098	148,895	143,206	99,205	32,769	275,180	235,197	180,896	39,820	455,913
Technicians and associate professionals	54,530	42,856	20,994	118,380	165,704	95,175	21,872	282,751	141,654	108,178	23,659	273,491
Clerks	176,439	133,901	34,330	344,670	230,310	128,963	21,073	380,346	182,564	118,357	15,534	316,455
Service, shop and market sales workers	103,046	106,180	24,370	233,596	150,768	154,006	29,034	333,808	145,450	183,403	28,042	356,895
Craft and related trades workers	163,664	240,192	107,068	510,924	144,606	167,561	49,235	361,402	145,908	207,433	52,168	405,509
Plant and machine operators and assemblers	131,437	164,759	28,819	325,015	96,247	122,880	17,438	236,565	98,047	155,421	16,336	269,804
Elementary occupations	201,838	309,318	17,531	528,687	209,514	347,488	40,889	597,891	195,546	337,873	43,643	577,062
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	49,052	75,651	10,412	135,115	123,207	96,475	22,011	241,693	271,591	275,222	50,263	597,076
Total	981,498	1,167,622	292,833	2,441,953	1,376,599	1,278,977	262,764	2,918,340	1,630,106	1,725,994	320,163	3,676,263

Sources: South African Population Census 1980, 2001 10 per cent sample and Community Survey 2007

* Includes only the employed and those respondents whose migrant status could be ascertained, i.e. excludes those whose place of birth was missing.

Table 3. Occupational distribution of migrants and natives, Johannesburg region, 1980, 2001 and 2007 (percentage distribution, column totals)*

Occupation	Census 1980				Census 2001 10 per cent sample				Community Survey 2007			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	4	3	9	4	8	5	11	7	13	9	16	12
Professionals	7	5	8	6	10	8	12	9	14	10	12	12
Technicians and associate professionals	6	4	7	5	12	7	8	10	9	6	7	7
(all high-skill occupations	17	12	24	15	30	20	31	26	36	25	35	31)
Clerks	18	11	12	14	17	10	8	13	11	7	5	9
Service, shop and market sales workers	10	9	8	10	11	12	11	11	9	11	9	10
Craft and related trades workers	17	21	37	21	11	13	19	12	9	12	16	11
Plant and machine operators and assemblers	13	14	10	13	7	10	7	8	6	9	5	7
Elementary occupations	21	26	6	22	15	27	16	20	12	20	14	16
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	5	6	4	6	9	8	8	8	17	16	16	16
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Sources: South African Population Census 1980, 2001 10 per cent sample and Community Survey 2007

* Includes only the employed and those respondents whose migrant status could be ascertained, i.e. excludes those whose place of birth was missing.

Table 4. Occupational distribution of migrants and natives, Johannesburg region, 1980, 2001 and 2007 (percentage distribution, row totals)*

Occupation	Census 1980				Census 2001 10 per cent sample				Community Survey 2007			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	37	37	26	100	54	32	14	100	50	38	12	100
Professionals	44	40	16	100	52	36	12	100	52	40	9	100
Technicians and associate professionals	46	36	18	100	59	34	8	100	52	40	9	100
(all high-skill occupations	43	38	19	100	55	34	11	100	51	39	10	100)
Clerks	51	39	10	100	61	34	6	100	58	37	5	100
Service, shop and market sales workers	44	45	10	100	45	46	9	100	41	51	8	100
Craft and related trades workers	32	47	21	100	40	46	14	100	36	51	13	100
Plant and machine operators and assemblers	40	51	9	100	41	52	7	100	36	58	6	100
Elementary occupations	38	59	3	100	35	58	7	100	34	59	8	100
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	36	56	8	100	51	40	9	100	45	46	8	100
Total	40	48	12	100	47	44	9	100	44	47	9	100

Sources: South African Population Census 1980, 2001 10 per cent sample and Community Survey 2007

* Includes only the employed and those respondents whose migrant status could be ascertained, i.e. excludes those whose place of birth was missing.

By 2007, all migrants combined formed 56 per cent of the working population but had increased their share of unskilled work to 67 per cent. Thus, migrants were overrepresented amongst elementary workers by 11 per cent, a similar percentage difference to 2001. This is not a particularly large disparity, and migrants certainly did not constitute the 'extraordinary preponderance' of low-wage workers as described by May *et al.* (2007) above. Also, that just under 19 per cent of all employed migrants held elementary-type jobs contradicts the argument that migrants are overwhelmingly concentrated in low-wage, low-skill work in comparison to natives: a finding inconsistent with what many polarisation proponents would contend regarding migrants.

In addition, while natives held a higher percentage of high-skilled jobs than migrants, this difference was also relatively small, and between 1980 and 2007, migrants experienced a similar increase in the percentage of high-skill jobs to that of natives. In 1980, 17 per cent of those native to the Johannesburg region held managerial, professional, associate professional or technical jobs, which increased to 30 per cent in 2001 and 36 per cent by 2007 (Tables 2, 3 and 4). The proportion of internal migrants employed in these same high-skill occupations was 12 per cent in 1980, but had grown to 20 per cent by 2001 and 25 per cent by 2007. Foreign migrants have been consistently overrepresented amongst high-skill, high-pay workers. High-skill work constituted 24 per cent of foreign migrant jobs in 1980, versus the 15 per cent of the whole population that these jobs accounted for. This grew to 31 per cent for foreign migrants in 2001, when high-skill occupations constituted 26 per cent of all employment, and 35 per cent in 2007, when managerial, professional, associate professional and technical jobs combined formed 31 per cent of the occupations of the employed workforce of the Johannesburg region. By 2007, high-skill, high-pay work constituted just over 27 per cent of work amongst all employed migrants: a higher proportion than the 19 per cent constituted by low-skill, low-pay work among migrants. Thus, migrants were hardly 'disproportionately concentrated in […] low-paying jobs' as argued by Sassen (1991) and other polarisation theorists.

Migrants and education

Many supporters of the polarisation theory argue that part of the reason migrants are restricted to low-skill, low-wage work is a result of their lack of skills and education. These scholars portray most immigrants to world cities as lacking adequate education or skills training. Given the similarity in the percentages of unskilled and high-skilled workers amongst natives and migrants in this study, it is not surprising that the educational credentials of these two groups are also quite similar (Tables 5 and 6). In 2007, 39 per cent of natives had some secondary schooling versus 38 per cent of internal migrants; 30 per cent of natives had completed secondary school versus 24 per cent of internal migrants; and 20 per cent of natives had tertiary education versus 21 per cent of all migrants combined.

Table 5. Educational distribution of employed migrants and natives, Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution)

Level of Highest Education	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
No schooling	25,956	70,690	18,110	114,756
Some primary school	85,946	189,970	35,016	310,932
Completed primary school	46,048	79,481	17,055	142,584
Some secondary school	632,686	662,726	106,231	1,401,643
Completed secondary school*	492,884	414,090	61,362	968,336
Higher education†	324,558	284,026	78,802	687,386
Unspecified	22,027	25,012	3,585	50,624
Total	1,630,105	1,725,995	320,161	3,676,261

Source: Community Survey 2007
* includes certificates and diplomas with less than grade 12
† includes certificates and diplomas with grade 12, all university and technicon degrees and diplomas

Table 6. Educational distribution of employed migrants and natives, Johannesburg region, 2007 (percentage distribution, column totals)

Level of Highest Education	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
No schooling	2	4	6	3
Some primary school	5	11	11	8
Completed primary school	3	5	5	4
Some secondary school	39	38	33	38
Completed secondary school*	30	24	19	26
Higher education†	20	16	25	19
Unspecified	1	1	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100

Source: Community Survey 2007
* includes certificates and diplomas with less than grade 12
† includes certificates and diplomas with grade 12, all university and technicon degrees and diplomas

One might argue that this similarity in educational profiles amongst natives and migrants is not unexpected: in order to be employed, migrants would need similar credentials to natives to be able to compete in the labour market. What about the educational distribution of the entire adult population then, not just the employed? From the point of view of polarisation theory, one might presume that the adult migrant population taken as a group would be poorly educated in comparison to the native population, and that those migrants finding employment could be the small percentage with a similar educational profile to that of natives. However, the data do not bear this argument out. All adult migrants, aged 15-65 (the average ages between which most people work), whether employed, unemployed or

economically inactive have a similar educational distribution to that of natives in the Johannesburg region in 2007 (Tables 7 and 8). In 2007, 49 per cent of all adult natives had some secondary schooling versus 44 per cent of internal migrants; 25 per cent of natives had completed secondary school versus 23 per cent of internal migrants; 12 per cent of both natives and all migrants combined had a tertiary education.

Thus, while there has been large-scale migration to the Johannesburg region, these immigrants have similar levels of education to natives therefore, unsurprisingly, make up similar proportions of managerial, professional, associate professional and technical workers as well as unskilled workers. These data, therefore, do not support the idea of a growing service sector generating myriad low-skill, low-wage service jobs being filled by large numbers of uneducated, unskilled immigrants, as generally proposed by advocates of the polarisation hypothesis.

Table 7. Educational profile of all adult migrants and natives (employed, unemployed and economically inactive), Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution)

Level of Highest Education (all adults)	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
No schooling	83,111	140,271	31,332	254,714
Some primary school	249,161	354,479	55,542	659,182
Completed primary school	145,245	163,620	26,551	335,416
Some secondary school	1,752,009	1,382,685	175,097	3,309,791
Completed secondary school*	883,893	717,182	92,062	1,693,137
Higher education†	414,853	353,722	100,571	869,146
Unspecified	47,081	46,691	5,770	99,542
Total	3,575,353	3,158,650	486,925	7,220,928

Source: Community Survey 2007

* includes certificates and diplomas with less than grade 12

† includes certificates and diplomas with grade 12, all university and technicon degrees and diplomas

Table 8. Educational profile of all adult migrants and natives (employed, unemployed and economically inactive), Johannesburg region, 2007 (percentage distribution, column totals)

Level of Highest Education (all adults)	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
No schooling	2	4	6	4
Some primary school	7	11	11	9
Completed primary school	4	5	5	5
Some secondary school	49	44	36	46
Completed secondary school*	25	23	19	23
Higher education†	12	11	21	12
Unspecified	1	1	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100

Source: Community Survey 2007

* includes certificates and diplomas with less than grade 12
† includes certificates and diplomas with grade 12, all university and technicon degrees and diplomas

Different groups of migrants and social polarisation

In the more popular conception of the polarisation hypothesis, uneducated, unskilled immigrants are attracted in large numbers to major cities to work in a burgeoning low-wage service sector. This does not appear to be the case in the Johannesburg region. Taking a different approach to authors such as Sassen, Baum, etc., Hamnett (1994a, 1994b, 1996b, 2003) argues that a large and ever growing population of unskilled immigrants facilitates the expansion of the low-wage service sector, thereby leading to increasing polarisation, i.e. unskilled immigrants are not attracted by lots of low-wage service work, rather, their presence makes it possible for there to be large numbers of low-wage service sector positions. However, this process also does not appear to be happening in the Johannesburg region. Instead, the distribution of occupations amongst migrants is as diverse as amongst natives and they are not confined to low-skill work. There has always been and continues to be large-scale migration to the Johannesburg region. As the majority of these are internal migrants and therefore come from inside the borders of a country with many Third World characteristics itself, one would expect the migrants to be mostly poorly educated and unskilled manual workers. Following Hamnett's argument, this presence should lead to a greatly expanding low-wage service sector. But the data show that these migrants are not uniformly unskilled and their presence has therefore not led to a greatly expanded low-wage service sector.

While, on the whole, migrants to the Johannesburg region display a similar occupational distribution and educational profile to natives, this is not to say that at a finer level of disaggregation the diverse immigrant communities look the same. As has been discussed above, distinct groups of immigrants perform differently in the urban environments to which they migrate and are absorbed into diverse occupations and industries to varying degrees. However, in the context of the social polarisation and professionalisation hypotheses there is a more pertinent question: even though overall the occupational profile of immigrants shows that their presence does not lead to increasing social polarisation, how have the individual groups of immigrants either contributed to or detracted from the trend towards professionalisation in the Johannesburg region over time?

Although historically the vast majority of high-skill jobs were held by White men, and despite the greatest trend towards professionalisation occurring amongst Coloureds and Indians, it is in fact the increasing professionalisation of native and internal migrant African men and women and White women that has significantly changed the distribution of high-

skill occupations and contributed most in absolute terms towards increasing professionalisation in the Johannesburg region between 1980 and 2007.[4]

The greatest absolute growth in managers, professionals, associate professionals and technicians occurred amongst African men (Table 11). There was an increase of 90,041 high-skill jobs amongst native African men, while internal migrant African men made the biggest gains of all of the groups with an increase of 129,647. Therefore, combined, African native and internal migrant men accounted for 219,688 of the increase of over 700,000 high-skill occupations between 1980 and 2007. The biggest percentage point increase also occurred amongst internal migrant African men, who went from holding 3 per cent of high-skill jobs in 1980 to 12 per cent in 2007 (Tables 9 and 10). The second biggest contribution to the increasing numbers of high-skill occupations was by African women. The numbers of high-skill occupations held by African women increased by 96,565 among native African women and 86,218 among internal migrant African women between 1980 and 2007. Thus, combined, African native and internal migrant women accounted for 182,783 of the increase of over 700,000 high-skill occupations between 1980 and 2007.

Thus, some of the biggest contributions to the increase in the number of high-skill occupations between 1980 and 2007 in the Johannesburg region came from the 'previously disadvantaged' groups of African men and women. Moreover, far from appearing to be hindered by their migrant status, internal African migrant men and women showed some of the greatest growth. Internal migrant Africans had comparable gains to all other groups in terms of high-skill managerial, professional, associate professional and technical occupations.

The next highest gains in high-skill work were amongst White native and internal migrant women: 157,977 of the high-skill positions gained between 1980 and 2007 were occupied by White native and internal migrant women. This is not surprising, given the history of South Africa and the fact that whites were the most privileged and afforded the best opportunities in terms of education and available jobs through measures such as job reservation. However, by 2007, while white men still had the greatest share of high-skill work, although only marginally so, the percentages had dropped to 14 per cent amongst native White men, 8 per cent amongst White internal migrants and 4 per cent amongst foreign migrants. Of the 789,519 high-skill jobs added to the occupational distribution of the Johannesburg region between 1980 and 2007, only 81,926 were held by White native men and 6,141 were held by white internal migrants. The number of high-skill positions amongst White foreign migrant men actually decreased by 12,161 jobs. Thus, the growth in high-skill positions was not largely driven by the employment of white men.

That the data show that Coloureds and Indians have hardly any share of high-skill work is perhaps misleading, as the percentage of high-skill jobs increased the most amongst Coloured and Indian workers between 1980 and 2007 (see Appendices for detailed description and data from which these figures are derived). High-skill work represented just

[4] The racial categorisations used here are the official race groupings of the former Apartheid government of South Africa. Outside of South Africa, Whites could be called Caucasian, Africans would be Black, Coloureds would be Mulatto or mixed race and Indians could also be referred to as Asians.

8 per cent and 10 per cent of all employment amongst Coloured men and women respectively in 1980. By 2007, 36 per cent of Coloured men and 40 per cent of Coloured women held high-skill occupations. Thus, the percentage point increase in high-skill work was between 28 per cent and 30 per cent. The relative growth in high-skill work was even greater amongst Indians. High-skill work represented 22 per cent and 16 per cent of all employment amongst Indian men and women respectively in 1980. By 2007, 56 per cent of Indian men and 53 per cent of Indian women held high-skill occupations. This represents a percentage point increase ranging from 34 to 37 per cent, with by far the most growth occurring amongst internal migrant Indian men and women.

What could account for this impressive growth? With the change in government, presumably, changes to legislation and the institution of affirmative action policies facilitated the increased employment of not only Africans in higher-skilled occupations, but Coloureds and Indians as well. The reason for their growth being higher relative to Africans could be partly historical. While Whites were afforded the best opportunities and Africans arguably the worst, Coloureds and Indians were treated differently to both population groups. The Nationalist government, concerned about the prospect of a unified non-European resistance of Coloureds and Africans, deemed it necessary for Coloureds to see themselves as distinct from Africans (Goldin 1984; Marais 1984; Pickel 1997). Thus, various government initiatives such as development programmes and the Coloured Labour Preference Policy were designed to improve the standard of living of Coloureds (Pickel 1997). In comparison to Africans, Coloureds were relatively better off in several areas, but one of the most important areas for this discussion is education. Also, the preferential treatment of Coloureds arguably led to a 'better position' of Coloured workers at the expense of Africans (Goldin 1984). However, Coloureds were still kept out of many of the skilled and higher-skilled positions and jobs reserved for Whites. With the removal of institutional barriers to their advancement, Coloureds and Indians were arguably better positioned than Africans, due to more comprehensive education and comparatively higher-skilled previous jobs, to seize the opportunities for advancement into managerial, professional, associate professional and technical occupations.

However, these considerable gains are not reflected in the data because the absolute increases they represent are small in comparison to the overall increase in high-skill work. Of the 789,519 high-skill jobs gained between 1980 and 2007, only 103,940 are from all Coloureds and Indians combined. Therefore, even though arguably the most impressive growth in high-skill work occurred amongst Coloureds and Indians, this represents only a relatively small amount of the total absolute growth in these occupations.

Table 9. Percentage distribution of high-skill occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980

1980 High-skill	African			White			Coloured			Indian			Total
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	
Men	4	3	0	23	22	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	69
Women	5	3	0	9	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

Source: South African Population Census 1980

Table 10. Percentage distribution of high-skill occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 2007

2007 High-skill	African			White			Coloured			Indian			Total
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	
Men	9	12	2	14	8	4	1	1	0	1	2	0	55
Women	10	8	1	13	6	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	45

Source: Community Survey 2007

Table 11. Absolute change in high-skill occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980-2007

Absolute change between 1980 and 2007	African			White			Coloured			Indian			Total
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	
Men	90,041	129,647	26,320	81,926	6,141	-12,161	13,386	7,114	610	12,502	18,237	4,002	377,765
Women	96,565	86,218	8,314	117,624	40,353	14,591	14,647	7,148	432	8,287	15,809	1,766	411,754

Source: South African Population Census 1980 and Community Survey 2007

Table 12. Percentage distribution of unskilled occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980

Unskilled 1980	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Men	14	28	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Women	23	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	55

Source: South African Population Census 1980

Table 13. Percentage distribution of unskilled occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 2007

Unskilled 2007	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native
Men	9	19	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Women	22	37	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Community Survey 2007

Table 14. Absolute change in the numbers of unskilled occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980-2007

Unskilled	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**			
Absolute change between 1980 and 2007	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Men	-18,516	-38,647	11,363	6,771	1,915	1,160	680	161	24	359	542	507	-33,681
Women	1,292	64,344	12,112	2,791	1,362	569	-59	-1,356	145	388	236	233	82,057

Sources: South African Population Census 1980 and Community Survey 2007

Table 15. Absolute change in the numbers of semi-skilled blue-collar occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980-2007

Semi-skilled, blue-collar	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**			
Absolute change between 1980 and 2007	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Men	-21,818	-16,175	-42,680	-21,493	-41,213	-26,268	-2,090	-3,942	348	416	1,299	918	-172,698
Women	-5,938	18,760	1,611	3,198	19	-1,439	-3,293	-1,058	-21	-127	214	147	12,073

Sources: South African Population Census 1980 and Community Survey 2007

Table 16. Absolute change in the numbers of semi-skilled white-collar occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980-2007

Semi-skilled, white-collar	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**			
Absolute change between 1980 and 2007	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Men	18,367	70,125	10,706	-15,255	-40,825	-12,217	3,581	910	17	-1,500	192	374	34,475
Women	53,616	68,564	7,493	-18,395	-44,314	-22,028	5,614	2,617	231	2,502	4,409	298	60,607

Sources: South African Population Census 1980 and Community Survey 2007

Thus, it has been shown that migrants have clearly played just as important a part in the growth of high-skill jobs over time in this region as natives. What about unskilled/low-skill work though? First, it is important to keep in mind that unskilled work grew much less than high-skill work between 1980 and 2007; hence, the absolute growth in both high-skill and low-skill occupations is heavily skewed towards high-skill jobs, thereby resulting in more of a professionalising trend in the Johannesburg region.[5] Nonetheless, there was absolute growth in the number of low-skill workers between 1980 and 2007.

The most significant increase in the percentage of unskilled workers was amongst African internal migrant women (Tables 12 and 13). They formed the greatest percentage of unskilled workers in 2007: 37 per cent. There was an absolute increase of 64,344 unskilled workers amongst African internal migrant women, which represent the majority of the 82,057 unskilled jobs gained by all women between 1980 and 2007 (Table 14). The increasing numbers of African native and internal migrant women entering the labour market since 1980 contributed towards both high-skill and low-skill job growth. However, the greatest contribution by African native and internal migrant women was in high-skill occupations, as nearly 100,000 more high-skill jobs than low-skill jobs were added. Thus, overall there is still more of a professionalising trend in terms of absolute differences in the numbers of high- and low-skill jobs added between 1980 and 2007.

In contrast, African internal migrant and native men had substantial absolute decreases amongst unskilled workers of 38,647 and 18,516 respectively (Table 14). Considering that in total men lost 33,681 unskilled jobs between 1980 and 2007, this was entirely due to the losses amongst African internal migrant and native men. Furthermore, given the addition of 219,688 high-skill jobs both of these groups contributed overall, African native and internal migrant men arguably played an even more significant role than African women in the increasing professionalisation of the occupational distribution of the Johannesburg region.

Therefore, the Johannesburg region does not conform to the image painted by many polarisation theorists of large numbers of unskilled immigrants occupying a rapidly increasing number of low-skill, low-wage service jobs. Migrant women are over-represented in unskilled work; however, they are also well represented amongst high-skill, high-pay occupations, not to mention the other main occupational groups. Thus, the occupational distribution of the different immigrant groups is diverse, and they are on the whole not marginalised in low-skill, low-wage jobs.

Increasing professionalisation with increasing unemployment?

At first glance, one might interpret the reduction in the share of unskilled work held by internal migrant and native African men as a sign of their upward occupational mobility. As has been demonstrated, there is evidence of increasing professionalisation of these two groups between 1980 and 2007. The percentage of high-skill managerial, professional, associate professional and technical work amongst African internal migrants and native men

[5]The potentially artificially low numbers of unskilled workers in 2007 aside (due to a greater number of undetermined occupations in 2007), the increase in numbers of low-skill occupations has been shown to be much lower than the increase in high-skill occupations between 1980 and 2010.

increased by 15 percentage points and 18 percentage points respectively. However, the percentage of African men employed in almost all other occupational groups dropped. In addition, the absolute number of semi-skilled, blue-collar workers also decreased amongst African men by 80,673 workers (native, internal and foreign migrant men combined) in the same period (Table 15).

Table 17. Percentage distribution of employed workforce by race and gender in the Johannesburg region, 1980 and 2007

Race and Gender	Percentage of employed workforce		Percentage point difference
	per cent in 1980	per cent in 2007	
African men	45	40	-5
African women	18	28	10
White men	21	14	-7
White women	12	12	0

Source: South African Population Census 1980 and Community Survey 2007

Even though all African men combined (natives and migrants) gained 99,198 semi-skilled, white-collar jobs between 1980 and 2007 (Table 16), given the fact that their overall share of the employed population dropped 5 percentage points during this period (Table 17), it seems more likely that, far from being a positive sign, the large decreases in unskilled and semi-skilled, blue-collar work are actually indications of increasing unemployment amongst African men in the Johannesburg region between 1980 and 2007.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to critically assess the social polarisation hypothesis using the case of the Johannesburg region of South Africa. The evidence does not support Sassen's (1994) and others' conceptualisation of the social polarisation hypothesis, namely, that changes in sectoral structure have led to equal increases in high- and low-skill work, at the expense of skilled middle-income, manual employment. As Hamnett (1994a) contends, the dominant pattern is one of increasing numbers of high-skill, high-pay jobs. Thus, while the numbers of low-skill workers did increase in the Johannesburg region between 1980 and 2010, the absolute growth in the numbers of higher-skilled, higher-paid managerial, professional, associate professional and technical workers was two and a half times greater than that amongst low-skill workers. This led to a marked skewing of the occupational distribution towards high-skill work.

The role of migrants in social polarisation was also considered. In much of the polarisation literature, migrants are portrayed as mostly poor, unskilled workers, unable to access anything but low-skill work in the cities to which they migrate. Many proponents of the polarisation hypothesis contend that, with increasing levels of migration, there are more and more migrants to fill these low-wage jobs, while natives fill the growing number of high-skill positions, thereby leading to increasing social polarisation. Other scholars contend that migrants do not only occupy low-skill, low-wage jobs exclusively. The data for the

Johannesburg region show that migrants have similar occupational distributions to natives, and that all migrants have contributed significantly in absolute terms to the growth of managerial, professional, associate professional and technical occupations, and, therefore, to the trend towards increasing professionalisation. In the case of Johannesburg, not only does large-scale migration not appear to lead to increasing social polarisation, but migrants in fact form a substantial proportion of the ever-growing numbers of high-skill, high-pay workers. The presence of migrants in this case could be argued to be more relevant to the process of the skewing of the occupation distribution towards increasing professionalisation than goring polarisation.

However, as South Africa is a country with large numbers of unskilled adults, it would not be unreasonable to expect that the growth in high-skill occupations would be accompanied by a concomitant growth in low-skill work. Hamnett (1994a) has argued that the presence of a large number of unskilled migrants makes an expanded low-wage service sector possible. He refers to the case in many European countries where only a relatively small migrant population is present and there is sufficient welfare provision which negates the need for people to seek low-skill service sector worker. Thus, growing professionalisation is accompanied by growing unemployment and a large outsider surplus population. Arguably, this is also the case in the Johannesburg region, but not due to adequate welfare benefits making it unnecessary for workers to hold low-wage jobs and choose unemployment instead. Rather, there has simply not been sufficient economic growth and job creation in comparison to labour force growth in South Africa. This has also resulted in growing professionalisation accompanied by increasing unemployment and a large outsider surplus population.

The above findings highlight two points: first, that professionalisation is not a process that occurs only in Western, developed economies, and second, that professionalisation can be accompanied by unemployment under quite different circumstances to those proposed by other authors. These points are linked though. It is perhaps not surprising that the professionalisation observed in Johannesburg is occurring alongside very high levels of unemployment, much higher than those recorded in most developed countries (25 per cent by the strict definition and over 40 per cent with an expanded definition). Arguably, welfare benefits in many developed countries are of a level that allows a reasonable standard of living for the unemployed. In South Africa, even though this is not the case, the unemployment levels are much higher. Why are the unemployed not taking up low-skill, low-wage jobs? Because there simply are not enough low-skill, low-wage jobs for the large unskilled labour force. This perhaps underscores a fundamental difference between developed countries and developing countries: vastly different levels of wealth. Arguably, even though there are increasing numbers of high-skill, high-pay workers, the percentage of the total population they form, and the amount of money they earn, is not enough to generate the demand for the low-skill, low-pay service sector jobs necessary to create employment for the majority of unskilled workers. Unlike the situation in a developed country, where increasing professionalisation and increasing levels of wealth of the middle-classes occur alongside a smaller percentage of the economically inactive (those who are unemployed, but still able to live a reasonable quality of life due to adequate welfare benefits), a developing country may show increasing professionalisation alongside a growing mass of economically inactive, poor, unskilled workers. Professionalisation may occur in both developed and developing countries, but the differing contexts in which the process

takes place may lead to very different outcomes for those excluded from the economically active workforce.

References

Bailey, T. and Waldinger, R. (1991) 'The changing ethnic/racial division of labour', in Mollenkopf, J. and Castells, M. (eds.) *Dual City: Restructuring New York.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 43-78.

Baum, S. (1997) 'Sydney, Australia: a global city? Testing the social polarisation thesis', *Urban Studies,* 34(11): 1881-1901.

Borel-Saladin, J. and Crankshaw, O. (2009) 'Social polarisation or professionalisation? Another look at theory and evidence on de-industrialization and the rise of the service sector', *Urban Studies*, 46(3): 645-64.

Breytenbach, W.J. (1979) *Migratory Labour Arrangements in Southern Africa*. Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa.

Casale, D. and Posel, D. (2006) *Migration and Remittances in South Africa. Background Document on Migration and First Set of Draft Questions for Inclusion in the National Income Dynamics Study.* University of KwaZulu-Natal: Department of Economics.

Chiu, S. and Lui, T. (2004) 'Testing the global city-social polarisation thesis: Hong Kong since the 1990's', *Urban Studies*, 41(10): 1863-88.

Cross, M. and Waldinger, R. (1992) 'Migrants, minorities and the ethnic division of labour', In Fainstein, S., Gordon, I. and Harloe, M. (eds.) *Divided Cities: New York and London in the Contemporary World*. Oxford: Blackwell, 151-74

Dustmann, C., Fabri, F. and Preston, I. (2005) 'The impact of immigration on the British labour market', *The Economic Journal*, 115(507): 324-41.

Esping-Anderson, G., Assimakopoulou, Z. and van Kersbergen, K. (1993) 'Trends in contemporary class structuration: a six-nation comparison', in Esping-Andersen, G. (ed.) *Changing Classes: Stratification and Mobility in Post-Industrial Societies*. London: Sage, 32-57.

Fainstein, S., Gordon, I. and Harloe, M. (1992) 'Introduction: London and New York in the contemporary world', in Fainstein, S., Gordon, I. and Harloe, M. (eds.) *Divided Cities: New York and London in the Contemporary World*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1-28.

Goldin, I. (1984) *Coloured Preference Policies and the Making of Coloured Political Identity in the Western Cape Region of South Africa, with Particular Reference to the Period 1948 to 1984*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Oxford University.

Gordon, I. and Sassen, S. (1992) 'Restructuring the urban labour markets', in Fainstein, S., Gordon, I. and Harloe, M. (eds.) *Divided Cities: New York and London in the Contemporary World*. Oxford: Blackwell, 105-28.

Gu, C. and Liu, H. (2002) 'Social polarization and segregation in Beijing', in Logan, J. (ed.) *The New Chinese City: Globalization and Market Reform*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 198-211.

Hamnett, C. (1994a) 'Social polarization in global cities: theory and evidence', *Urban Studies*, 31(3): 401-24.

Hamnett, C. (1994b) 'Socio-economic change in London: professionalization, not polarization', *Built Environment*, 20(3): 192-203.

Hamnett, C. (1996a) 'Why Sassen is wrong: a response to Burgers', *Urban Studies*, 33(1): 107 10.

Hamnett, C. (1996b) 'Social polarization, economic restructuring and welfare state regimes', *Urban Studies*, 33(8): 1407-30.

Hamnett, C. (2003) *Unequal City: London in the Global Arena.* London: Routledge.

Hamnett, C. (2012) 'Urban social polarization', in Derudder, B., Hoyler, M., Taylor, P.J. and Witlox, F. (eds.) *International Handbook of Globalization and World Cities*. Gloucestershire: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 361-68.

Harloe, M. and Fainstein, S. (1992) 'Conclusion', in Fainstein, S., Gordon, I. and Harloe, M. (eds.) *Divided Cities: New York and London in the Contemporary World.* Oxford: Blackwell, 255-71.

Kok, P., Gelderblom, D. and van Zyl, J. (2006) 'Introduction', in Kok, P., Gelderblom, D., Oucho, J.O. and van Zyl, J. (eds.) *Migration in South and Southern Africa: Dynamics and Determinants.* Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 1-25.

Lipton, M. (1989) *Capitalism and Apartheid: South Africa, 1910-1984*. Cape Town: David Phillip.

Marais, F. (1984) *The Coloured Labour Preference Policy*. Unpublished B.A. (Hons) thesis, University of Cape Town: Department of Economic History.

May,J., Wills, J., Datta, K., Evans, Y., Herbert, J., and McIlwaine, C. (2007) 'Keeping London working: global cities, the British state and London's new migrant division of labour', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 32(2): 151-167.

Pickel, B. (1997*) Coloured Ethnicity and Identity: A Case Study in the Former Coloured Areas in the Western Cape/South Africa.* Hamburg: LIT.

Platzky, L. and Walker, C. (1985) *The Surplus People: Forced Removals in South Africa.* Johannesburg: Ravan Press.

Portes, A. (1978) 'Migration and underdevelopment'*, Politics and Society*, 8(1): 1-48.

Posel, D. (2009) *Discussion Paper No.1, Migration: Analysis of the NIDS Wave 1 Dataset*. Cape Town: Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit (SALDRU).

Sassen, S. (1991) *The Global City: New York, London and Tokyo.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sassen, S. (1994) *Cities in a World Economy*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

Savage, M. (1986) 'The imposition of pass laws on the African population in South Africa', *African Affairs*, 85(339): 181-205.

Wentzel, M. and Tlabela, K. (2006) 'Historical background to South African migration', in Kok, P., Gelderblom, D., Oucho, J.O. and van Zyl, J. (eds.) *Migration in South and Southern Africa: Dynamics and Determinants*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 71-96.

Wray, C. (2010) *Working Towards a Successful Gauteng City-Region*. Pretoria: Gauteng City Region Observatory.

Appendices: Immigrants to the Johannesburg region of South Africa, 1980-2007

Table i. Occupational distribution of employed men by race in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (frequency distribution)

Occupation	**African**				**White**			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	1,339	1,207	118	2,664	28,844	29,741	22,209	80,794
Professionals	6,704	4,888	546	12,138	27,079	28,387	16,551	72,017
Technicians and associate professionals	5,542	4,609	323	10,474	27,341	23,216	15,319	65,876
Clerks	41,500	31,783	2,213	75,496	25,215	30,140	6,294	61,649
Service, shop and market sales workers	25,914	52,652	5,226	83,792	23,453	24,708	10,445	58,606
Craft and related trades workers	71,272	182,784	77,937	331,993	54,096	39,322	26,980	120,398
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	87,965	132,972	21,646	242,583	18,508	21,208	6,065	45,781
Elementary occupations	72,072	148,391	11,042	231,505	1,587	2,157	511	4,255
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	29,752	62,125	7,146	99,023	5,412	5,399	2,219	13,030
Total	342,060	621,411	126,197	1,089,668	211,535	204,278	106,593	522,406

Table i. Continued

Occupation	Coloured				Indian			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	311	202	12	525	1,065	531	350	1,946
Professionals	878	466	19	1,363	1,227	643	198	2,068
Technicians and associate professionals	660	365	14	1,039	865	544	183	1,592
Clerks	3,226	1,476	12	4,714	3,863	2,282	419	6,564
Service, shop and market sales workers	978	770	36	1,784	3,680	1,660	1,463	6,803
Craft and related trades workers	8,700	6,153	183	15,036	1,572	1,107	468	3,147
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	5,052	2,992	23	8,067	750	497	64	1,311
Elementary occupations	1,283	1,142	40	2,465	408	210	74	692
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	1,179	1,051	29	2,259	226	180	56	462
Total	22,267	14,617	368	37,252	13,656	7,654	3,275	24,585

Source: South African Population Census 1980

Table ii. Occupational distribution of employed men by race in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution)

Occupation	African				White			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	36,204	50,051	11,019	97,274	67,808	39,360	21,317	128,485
Professionals	34,982	47,671	9,853	92,506	61,130	29,753	13,268	104,151
Technicians and associate professionals	32,440	42,629	6,435	81,504	36,252	18,372	7,333	61,957
Clerks	31,291	36,629	3,682	71,602	13,535	5,235	1,139	19,909
Service, shop and market sales workers	54,490	117,931	14,463	186,884	19,878	8,788	3,383	32,049
Craft and related trades workers	68,427	162,416	43,291	274,134	41,225	15,135	5,721	62,081
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	68,992	137,165	13,612	219,769	9,886	4,182	1,056	15,124
Elementary occupations	53,556	109,744	22,405	185,705	8,358	4,072	1,671	14,101
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	86,351	141,005	25,755	253,111	46,917	18,303	8,300	73,520
Total	466,733	845,241	150,515	1,462,489	304,989	143,200	63,188	511,377

Table ii. Continued

Occupation	Coloured				Indian			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	5,830	3,223	182	9,235	7,021	8,546	2,501	18,068
Professionals	5,220	3,118	266	8,604	5,458	7,320	1,791	14,569
Technicians and associate professionals	4,185	1,806	207	6,198	3,180	4,089	441	7,710
Clerks	4,229	1,324	0	5,553	2,626	1,801	433	4,860
Service, shop and market sales workers	3,556	1,832	65	5,453	3,417	2,333	1,823	7,573
Craft and related trades workers	7,931	3,628	500	12,059	1,997	1,781	980	4,758
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	3,731	1,575	54	5,360	741	1,122	470	2,333
Elementary occupations	1,963	1,303	64	3,330	767	752	581	2,100
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	6,598	3,527	194	10,319	4,685	4,368	794	9,847
Total	43,243	21,336	1,532	66,111	29,892	32,112	9,814	71,818

Source: Community Survey 2007

Table iii. Occupational distribution of employed men by race in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (percentage distribution, column totals)

Occupation	African				White			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	0	0	0	0	14	15	21	15
Professionals	2	1	0	1	13	14	16	14
Technicians and associate professionals	2	1	0	1	13	11	14	13
Clerks	12	5	2	7	12	15	6	12
Service, shop and market sales workers	8	8	4	8	11	12	10	11
Craft and related trades workers	21	29	62	30	26	19	25	23
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	26	21	17	22	9	10	6	9
Elementary occupations	21	24	9	21	1	1	0	1
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	9	10	6	9	3	3	2	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table iii. Continued

Occupation	Coloured				Indian			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	1	1	3	1	8	7	11	8
Professionals	4	3	5	4	9	8	6	8
Technicians and associate professionals	3	2	4	3	6	7	6	6
Clerks	14	10	3	13	28	30	13	27
Service, shop and market sales workers	4	5	10	5	27	22	45	28
Craft and related trades workers	39	42	50	40	12	14	14	13
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	23	20	6	22	5	6	2	5
Elementary occupations	6	8	11	7	3	3	2	3
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	5	7	8	6	2	2	2	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: South African Population Census 1980

Table iv. Occupational distribution of employed men by race in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (percentage distribution, column totals)

Occupation	African				White			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	8	6	7	7	22	27	34	25
Professionals	7	6	7	6	20	21	21	20
Technicians and associate professionals	7	5	4	6	12	13	12	12
Clerks	7	4	2	5	4	4	2	4
Service, shop and market sales workers	12	14	10	13	7	6	5	6
Craft and related trades workers	15	19	29	19	14	11	9	12
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	15	16	9	15	3	3	2	3
Elementary occupations	11	13	15	13	3	3	3	3
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	19	17	17	17	15	13	13	14
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table iv. Continued

Occupation	Coloured				Indian			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	13	15	12	14	23	27	25	25
Professionals	12	15	17	13	18	23	18	20
Technicians and associate professionals	10	8	14	9	11	13	4	11
Clerks	10	6	0	8	9	6	4	7
Service, shop and market sales workers	8	9	4	8	11	7	19	11
Craft and related trades workers	18	17	33	18	7	6	10	7
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	9	7	4	8	2	3	5	3
Elementary occupations	5	6	4	5	3	2	6	3
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	15	17	13	16	16	14	8	14
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Community Survey 2007

Table v. Occupational distribution of employed women by race in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (frequency distribution)

Occupation	African				White			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	451	212	15	678	3,626	3,612	2,469	9,707
Professionals	10,927	5,833	99	16,859	17,508	17,924	6,623	42,055
Technicians and associate professionals	8,122	3,894	115	12,131	11,206	9,714	5,022	25,942
Clerks	18,788	4,610	155	23,553	76,376	60,496	25,113	161,985
Service, shop and market sales workers	35,780	14,451	486	50,717	10,674	10,485	6,509	27,668
Craft and related trades workers	22,486	7,515	326	30,327	1,816	1,464	1,135	4,415
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	13,979	3,939	191	18,109	1,768	1,635	809	4,212
Elementary occupations	123,432	151,414	5,482	280,328	985	1,720	351	3,056
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	10,055	5,007	254	15,316	1,456	1,322	696	3,474
Total	244,020	196,875	7,123	448,018	125,415	108,372	48,727	282,514

Table v. Continued

Occupation	Coloured				Indian			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	103	48	3	154	115	53	35	203
Professionals	843	711	17	1,571	472	307	45	824
Technicians and associate professionals	520	352	11	883	274	162	7	443
Clerks	4,520	1,844	34	6,398	2,951	1,270	90	4,311
Service, shop and market sales workers	1,371	931	16	2,318	1,196	523	189	1,908
Craft and related trades workers	3,259	1,694	11	4,964	463	153	28	644
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	3,070	1,433	10	4,513	345	83	11	439
Elementary occupations	1,929	4,093	26	6,048	142	191	5	338
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	814	503	3	1,320	158	64	9	231
Total	16,429	11,609	131	28,169	6,116	2,806	419	9,341

Source: South African Population Census 1980

Table vi. Occupational distribution of employed women by race in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution)

Occupation	African				White			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	33,270	24,543	3,650	61,463	55,813	25,339	11,123	92,275
Professionals	57,385	49,915	3,352	110,652	58,889	31,283	10,344	100,516
Technicians and associate professionals	25,410	21,699	1,541	48,650	35,262	14,981	7,238	57,481
Clerks	64,936	44,956	2,356	112,248	51,666	19,827	7,377	78,870
Service, shop and market sales workers	43,248	42,669	5,778	91,695	16,989	6,840	2,217	26,046
Craft and related trades workers	18,851	20,489	1,339	40,679	5,288	2,236	214	7,738
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	11,676	9,725	789	22,190	1,494	882	291	2,667
Elementary occupations	124,724	215,758	17,594	358,076	3,776	3,082	920	7,778
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	78,231	83,031	8,620	169,882	38,934	17,829	6,162	62,925
Total	457,731	512,785	45,019	1,015,535	268,111	122,299	45,886	436,296

Table vi. continued

Occupation	Coloured				Indian			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	4,914	2,476	53	7,443	3,290	5,674	853	9,817
Professionals	8,246	3,901	310	12,457	3,886	7,936	636	12,458
Technicians and associate professionals	2,953	1,882	100	4,935	1,972	2,721	364	5,057
Clerks	8,999	3,817	214	13,030	5,282	4,767	333	10,382
Service, shop and market sales workers	2,506	1,575	67	4,148	1,367	1,435	244	3,046
Craft and related trades workers	1,686	1,411	0	3,097	503	337	123	963
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	1,350	658	0	2,008	178	113	63	354
Elementary occupations	1,870	2,737	171	4,778	530	427	238	1,195
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	6,004	2,977	55	9,036	3,869	4,182	382	8,433
Total	38,528	21,434	970	60,932	20,877	27,592	3,236	51,705

Source: Community Survey 2007

Table vii. Occupational distribution of employed women by race in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (percentage distribution, column totals)

Occupation	African				White			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	3
Professionals	4	3	1	4	14	17	14	15
Technicians and associate professionals	3	2	2	3	9	9	10	9
Clerks	8	2	2	5	61	56	52	57
Service, shop and market sales workers	15	7	7	11	9	10	13	10
Craft and related trades workers	9	4	5	7	1	1	2	2
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	6	2	3	4	1	2	2	1
Elementary occupations	51	77	77	63	1	2	1	1
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	4	3	4	3	1	1	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table vii. Continued

Occupation	Coloured				Indian			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	1	0	2	1	2	2	8	2
Professionals	5	6	13	6	8	11	11	9
Technicians and associate professionals	3	3	8	3	4	6	2	5
Clerks	28	16	26	23	48	45	21	46
Service, shop and market sales workers	8	8	12	8	20	19	45	20
Craft and related trades workers	20	15	8	18	8	5	7	7
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	19	12	8	16	6	3	3	5
Elementary occupations	12	35	20	21	2	7	1	4
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	5	4	2	5	3	2	2	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: South African Population Census 1980

Table viii. Occupational distribution of employed women by race in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (percentage distribution, column totals)

Occupation	African				White			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	7	5	8	6	21	21	24	21
Professionals	13	10	7	11	22	26	23	23
Technicians and associate professionals	6	4	3	5	13	12	16	13
Clerks	14	9	5	11	19	16	16	18
Service, shop and market sales workers	9	8	13	9	6	6	5	6
Craft and related trades workers	4	4	3	4	2	2	0	2
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Elementary occupations	27	42	39	35	1	3	2	2
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	17	16	19	17	15	15	13	14
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table viii. Continued

Occupation	Coloured				Indian			
	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Legislators, senior officials and managers	13	12	5	12	16	21	26	19
Professionals	21	18	32	20	19	29	20	24
Technicians and associate professionals	8	9	10	8	9	10	11	10
Clerks	23	18	22	21	25	17	10	20
Service, shop and market sales workers	7	7	7	7	7	5	8	6
Craft and related trades workers	4	7	0	5	2	1	4	2
Plant/machine operators and assemblers	4	3	0	3	1	0	2	1
Elementary occupations	5	13	18	8	3	2	7	2
Skilled Agriculture and Undetermined	16	14	6	15	19	15	12	16
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Community Survey 2007

Table ix. High-skill occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (frequency distribution)

High-skill	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**			
1980	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Men	13,585	10,704	987	83,264	81,344	54,079	1,849	1,033	45	3,157	1,718	731	252,496
Women	19,500	9,939	229	32,340	31,250	14,114	1,466	1,111	31	861	522	87	111,450

Source: South African Population Census 1980

Table x. High-skill occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution)

High-skill	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**			
2007	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Men	103,626	14,0351	27,307	165,190	87,485	41,918	15,235	8,147	655	15,659	19,955	4,733	63,0261
Women	116,065	96,157	8,543	149,964	71,603	28,705	16,113	8,259	463	9,148	16,331	1,853	523,204

Source: Community Survey 2007.

Table xi. Unskilled occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (frequency distribution)

Unskilled	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**			
1980	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Men	72,072	148,391	11,042	1,587	2,157	511	1,283	1,142	40	408	210	74	238,917
Women	123,432	151,414	5,482	985	1,720	351	1,929	4,093	26	142	191	5	289,770

Source: South African Population Census 1980

Table xii. Unskilled occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution)

Unskilled	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**			
2007	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Men	53,556	109,744	22,405	8,358	4,072	1,671	1,963	1,303	64	767	752	581	205,236
Women	124,724	215,758	17,594	3,776	3,082	920	1,870	2,737	171	530	427	238	371,827

Source: Community Survey 2007.

Table xiii. Semi-skilled Blue-collar occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 1980 (frequency distribution)

Semi-skilled	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**			
Blue-collar 1980	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Men	159,237	315,756	99,583	72,604	60,530	33,045	13,752	9,145	206	2,322	1,604	532	768,316
Women	36,465	11,454	517	3,584	3,099	1,944	6,329	3,127	21	808	236	39	67,623

Source: South African Population Census 1980

Table xiv. Semi-skilled Blue-collar occupations across the four main race groups and men and women in the Johannesburg region, 2007 (frequency distribution)

Semi-skilled	**African**			**White**			**Coloured**			**Indian**			
Blue-collar 2007	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Native	Internal migrant	Foreign migrant	Total
Men	137,419	299,581	56,903	51,111	19,317	6,777	11,662	5,203	554	2,738	2,903	1,450	595,618
Women	30,527	30,214	2,128	6,782	3,118	505	3,036	2,069	0	681	450	186	79,696

Source: Community Survey 2007

About the Migrating out of Poverty Research Programme Consortium

Migrating out of Poverty is a research programme consortium (RPC) funded by the UK's Department for International Development (DFID). It focuses on the relationship between migration and poverty – especially migration within countries and regions - and is located in five regions across Asia and Africa. The main goal of ***Migrating out of Poverty*** is to provide robust evidence on the drivers and impacts of migration in order to contribute to improving policies affecting the lives and well-being of impoverished migrants, their communities and countries, through a programme of innovative research, capacity building and policy engagement. The RPC will also conduct analysis in order to understand the migration policy process in developing regions and will supplement the world renowned migration databases at the University of Sussex with data on internal migration.

The ***Migrating out of Poverty*** consortium is coordinated by the University of Sussex, and led by CEO Professor L. Alan Winters with Dr Priya Deshingkar as the Research Director. Core partners are: the Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit (RMMRU) in Bangladesh; the Centre for Migration Studies (CMS) at the University of Ghana; the Asia Research Institute (ARI) at the National University of Singapore; the African Centre for Migration & Society (ACMS) at the University of the Witwatersrand in South Africa; and the African Migration and Development Policy Centre (AMADPOC) in Kenya.

Migrating out of Poverty

University of Sussex

Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QN, United Kingdom

tel: +44 (0)1273 873535

email: migrationrpc@sussex.ac.uk

web: http://migratingoutofpoverty.dfid.gov.uk/

Twitter:@migrationrpc