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ABSTRACT

For many years blacks have been restricted from occupying housing in the suburbs and inner parts of Durban. The Group Areas Act accommodated them in the rural and unserviced parts on the periphery of the city. Townships were later developed for them as far away from the city centre as possible. The scrapping of the Act in 1991 saw many of those people who could afford housing in the city and in the suburbs, moving into houses and flats in predominantly white areas. The aim of this dissertation was to examine the process of residential desegregation in a former white suburb. The study was conducted in Westville, a middle- to upper-class residential area which is presently inhabited by both blacks and whites. The severe shortages of land and housing, accompanied by the continuing unrest in the townships and changes in the family size and needs, influenced the migration of blacks to Westville. This migration started as early as 1987 despite the legal, financial and racist impediments prior to the repeal of the Group Areas Act in 1991. Most of the black households in Westville bought their houses through the estate agents. Income was the main criterion to determine whether blacks qualified for the purchase of property. Most of the buyers who qualified for loans and could afford to pay for services in the suburbs were those with more than one income earner per family. The process of residential desegregation was enhanced by the positive attitudes of the households towards their neighbourhood. The positive demographic and biracial social interaction among all residents also played an important role in the integration process. Problems were experienced when some whites showed signs of prejudice which emanated from the clash of cultures, such as blacks slaughtering cattle and Muslims sacrificing animals. Although the abolition of the Group Areas Act in 1991 was not wholeheartedly accepted by all whites, they were gradually accepting the right of blacks to choose any residential neighbourhood in which they wished to live.
1.1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 THE STATE AND HOUSING

While the root of South Africa's housing problem has been the government's apartheid policy, the rapid increase in population has exacerbated the problem. The provision of housing for blacks has been complicated and delayed by this policy. For many years the South African housing policy favoured whites over blacks, and the rich over the poor. There has always been an oversupply of housing for whites and a shortage of housing for blacks.

Blacks have for many years been denied access to urban land and housing by discriminatory restrictive laws. The Native (Urban Areas) Act of 1923 ensured control over the movement and residential rights of blacks. The Group Areas Act of 1950 strengthened this by providing for unprecedented state intervention in property rights and empowering local authorities in the whole country to impose a system of control to ensure that blacks remained in their segregated areas (Festenstein and Pickard-Cambridge, 1987). The high costs also made it difficult for blacks to purchase land or accommodation because of the inequality in income distribution between the race groups of the country.
Hence the majority of blacks were forced to live in mass-produced houses in townships on the urban periphery (Corbett, 1992). In these townships the state provided low standard houses and few amenities. Houses were initially rented. An option to purchase was introduced at a later stage. In 1976 the township construction programme ceased as the government was showing signs of failing to meet the demand for housing by low-income and unemployed blacks.

The privatisation of housing made the question of housing in South Africa more politically charged in that it catered more for whites than blacks. Whites could afford to buy housing because they had greater access to private sector finance and land. The aim of privatisation was to make people own houses. However, low-income blacks could not afford the high costs for building material and components charged by the private builders and developers. According to Hendler (1987:79), the primary aim of these building firms was the appropriation of profit. They strived at having political influence over the local government in order to collar a sizeable portion of the private market. The only option for poor people was to provide their own housing in informal shack settlements.

In late 1985 the state introduced mortgage subsidies which were supposed to help blacks in purchasing properties. Only the civil servants qualified and their applications were subject to an income restriction. This had a significant impact on who could afford a house. Black civil servants in the low-income group could not afford houses because the government only considered the income of the head of the household when evaluating loan applications (Parnell, 1992).
The financing of urban housing took place through a number of institutions. Most of the funds were from the private sector, mainly building societies and banks. These institutions have been for many years controlled by whites and with the passing of the Group Areas Act they operated only in the white Group Areas (Morris and van der Horst, 1981:90). In order for blacks to obtain these loans, some sort of security had to be provided. This was difficult for blacks because of their low incomes. The banks and building societies also considered giving loans to low-income people as a risk. This was because it was assumed that there was a greater chance of low-income earners failing to meet their commitments than in the case of rich white people (Swilling, 1990).

Since its introduction, the subsidy scheme was used as a mechanism to assist the low-income whites. This was evident in the government ruling that blacks should only use their subsidies to build from scratch and whites could use theirs to buy from the existing stock (Parnell, 1991). The impact that this had on prospective black buyers was that they could only afford small houses, which were similar in size to the public houses in the townships. Moreover, these houses were more expensive because of the high costs of building. In 1985 only about 12% of the blacks could afford a building society bond of more than R20 000, according to criteria relating to minimum living standards (SAIRR, 1986).
1.1.2 RESIDENTIAL DESEGREGATION

Many urban geographers have tried to explain residential segregation and desegregation in various ways, basing their arguments on the nature of the societies in which they were conducting their studies. The racial segregation in South Africa was mainly a result of the Group Areas Act which was introduced in 1950. However, black demand for accommodation in white suburbs since the 1980s brought about some desegregation, despite the apartheid laws. Among the many reasons for occupation of white group areas by ‘illegal’ residents, was the acute housing shortage in black areas created by the Group Areas Act, and the government’s housing policies (Cloete, 1991). Former chief economist of the building economics division in the National Building Research Institute, Dr T.J. de Vos, in 1986 clearly pointed out that the housing problem was directly attributable to the government and the private sector’s past unwillingness to provide housing in line with need (SAIRR, 1986). The surplus accommodation in white inner-cities forced property owners and estate agents to accommodate black people even though it was illegal.

The issue of desegregation attracted a great deal of criticism from ‘concerned’ whites, especially conservative city councillors. They expressed concern that the interests of the white working-class would be threatened. They feared that there would be an increase in the crime rate, decline in property values and a drop in standards. There was also a feeling that desegregation would not be to the advantage of low-income white tenants, who would be unable to afford the higher rents that would be brought in by a rising market (Pickard-Cambridge, 1988).
On realising that a greater number of blacks had greater access to better-paying jobs in the private sector and were moving in large numbers into the white suburbs, a number of forces combined to prohibit this movement. Among those who joined forces against desegregation were some government officials, the police, estate agents and landlords. Black tenants in the flats were evicted and fined for contravening the Group Areas Act. Those in the suburbs were continuously insulted and taunted by small groups of conservative whites. However, these evictions ended in 1982 because of the outcome of the Govender judgement, which barred the eviction of black tenants where alternative housing was unavailable. This prompted a sharp growth in black settlement in white suburbs (Pickard-Cambridge, 1988).

The failure of the Group Areas Act in the late 1980s was implicitly acknowledged by the government when it introduced the concept of Free Settlement Areas. The formal repeal of the Act in mid-1991 increased the pace of desegregation, but affordability on the part of the blacks was still a deciding factor.

In Durban, the desegregation of residential areas began in most middle-class white designated suburban localities prior to the repeal of the Group Areas Act, but accelerated after its repeal. For many years, organisations like the Durban Central Residents' Association (DCRA), fought for the desegregation of housing in the city. The occupation of the previously white-owned flats in Durban by blacks, marked the beginning of the desegregation of residential areas. Most of the studies on residential desegregation in South Africa (for example, Beavon, 1982; Rule, 1988), have been based mainly on the inner cities, especially the zone of decay which consist mostly of flats.
This study, however, besides focusing on historical, political, and socio-economic issues concerning residential segregation and desegregation, also gives specific attention to the attitudes and perceptions of persons who have all the time been subjected to racial segregation.

1.2 AIM

The aim of this study is to examine the process of residential desegregation in Westville, a suburb in Durban. The study attempts to trace the beginning of the process of desegregation in this suburb by focusing specifically on the period 1987 to 1993. Although 1987 was the year in which the local governments started using the flexible approach whereby permits were granted to members of other race groups who wished to reside in white areas, the status quo still existed in many white suburbs (Urban Foundation, 1990). The study examines the arrival of black households into Westville and how they purchased their properties. Their attitudes towards their environment will be assessed, and their social interaction patterns will be determined. Finally, attitudes of whites towards desegregation will be examined, and problems experienced by blacks in their neighbourhoods will be discussed.

1.3 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this study are to:

(i) determine the socio-economic status of blacks in Westville;
(ii) examine residential history of households;

(iii) identify problems experienced in the neighbourhood;

(iv) examine their attitudes towards their environment;

(v) determine their social interaction patterns; and

(vi) examine the attitudes of whites towards desegregation.

1.4 HYPOTHESES

It is hypothesised that:

(i) Most blacks began to move into Westville during the period 1991 to 1992;

(ii) Most of them bought their houses through the estate agents;

(iii) They previously lived in black townships surrounding Durban;

(iv) The main reason for their moving into Westville was the shortage of accommodation in the black townships;

(v) Most of them are young professional people between ages 35 and 45 years;
(vi) They have a positive attitude towards their present residential environment;

(vii) Most of the white neighbours have a positive attitude towards residential integration;

and

(viii) Blacks are all happy that the Group Areas Act has been removed.

1.5 HISTORY OF THE STUDY AREA

The history of Westville dates back to the late 1840's when German settlers first came into the then sandy and hilly area of Durban which had nothing but a lot of castor oil plants. Westville was initially a farming community until 1925, when its residential potential began to be appreciated. By 1942 the population of Westville had increased tremendously and its status was raised from a Local Administration Board Area to a township (Westville Annals, 1974:39).

Westville presently consists mainly of residences and public amenities and facilities for recreation, sport, education, and health. The area lies approximately to the west of Durban. It is bounded by Cowies Hill in the west, Chesterville in the east, Clermont and Reservoir Hills in the north and Queensburgh in the south (Fig. 1.1). Presently it comprises of nine wards namely, Atholl Heights, Chiltem Hills, Rouken Glen, Palmit, Wandsback, Berea West, Bervely Hills, Dawncliffe and Roosfontein (Fig. 1.2).
The process of selling and buying of houses in Westville was mainly controlled by the estate agents. Information collected by the researcher from the estate agents reveals that almost all the estate agents started selling properties to blacks prior to the repeal of the Group Areas Act in 1991, through a system of close corporations. In this system the estate agent sold to a company rather than directly to an individual buyer. After the repeal of the Act blacks could buy directly from the estate agent, but income was the main criterion used by the agents in qualifying the black buyers.
Fig. 1.1 Location of Westville in the Durban Metropolitan Region
Fig. 1.2 Wards in Westville
1.6 RESEARCH METHODS

Adequate analysis and explanation of the residential desegregation process in Westville will be given by the use of a combination of extensive and intensive research methods. According to Sayer (1984), extensive research methods are quantitative in nature since they describe and measure variables (for example, density of population) in numbers; whilst intensive research methods are qualitative since they have labels or names (for example, urban) rather than numbers. A social researcher should therefore work at learning to translate qualitative variables into quantitative variables.

In order to obtain relevant data from the study, two types of research processes have been used, viz., the direct research process and the indirect research process. The direct research process is characterised by observing, interviewing, and questioning and listening (Whyle, 1977:20). This involves the researcher, the respondent and the field situation. In this process the interviewer used an in-depth, person-to-person interview research method during which he interviewed a sample of black residents of Westville, and some estate agents.

The indirect research process involves the use of the media and documentary material as data sources (Pillay, 1990:47). According to Mann (1968), newspaper reports might be thought to be valuable, but unfortunately it has been shown only too often how little reliance can be placed on them. Byerley (1989) supports this statement by pointing out that it cannot be overemphasized that the press is a commercial enterprise intended first to generate money and thereafter supply information.
There is also a problem of bias in the newspapers, much of which emanating from the political stance taken by a newspaper in an uncensored society. In fact, such a problem arises where the state legislation constrain the media to a degree that it is often not clear where state legislation control ends and self censorship, for fear of state retribution, begins (Gerbner et al., 1969). In order to have control over such bias, social researchers are made aware of this problematic nature of media and are urged to de-problematise it by means of comparison of news reports with communications emanating from grassroots organisations and with primary resources such as interviews, minutes of meetings and reports (Reintges, 1986:27).

Documentary material which refers to any written material that contains information about a phenomena one wishes to study, falls under the category of secondary sources because it provides second-hand information culled from other people's original data. These include documents such as magazines, journals and newsletters, correspondence - private and public, historical documents, and books of fiction or nonfiction (Bailey, 1987).

In this study a single-case study approach was adopted. The value of a single-case study lies primarily in setting a framework and providing guidelines for further study. A single-case study is a comprehensive analysis and explanation of the many components of a given social situation (Babbie, 1990). Case studies are always carried out in a context, usually of existing knowledge and circumstances, and this context helps to determine the procedure and the end-result. A single-case study can be convincing, even probative; hence its scientific value (Bromley, 1986:23). Whereas most research attempts to limit the number of variables considered, the case study seeks to maximize them and these are measured in one group at one point in time (Dixon, Bouma and Atkinson, 1987:111).
1.6.1 QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND FORMAT

A standardized questionnaire, a fundamental necessity in empirically orientated social science research, was used to obtain data necessary for this study. The use of a standardized questionnaire makes it easy to obtain "aggregated and thus comparable results, it also ensures that the interviewer adheres rigidly to the given and predetermined questions" (Reintges, 1986:23).

Rigidity of the interview also becomes problematic in that it somehow limits interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee. Bailey (1987:93) reinforced this view by pointing out that in a number of instances a respondent will give erroneous information or fail to answer a question altogether because instead of the questionnaire being given to him, the interviewer reads the questions to him. An interview will be sufficiently meaningful, rewarding and enjoyable only if the respondent is motivated. Motivation to respond is dependent on both the question design and the interview characteristics and techniques (Smith, 1981:184). The respondent’s and interviewer’s personality, attitudes, and behaviour may affect the interview product (Fig. 1.3).

The questionnaire used in the study was designed and structured in accordance with the aim and objectives of the study. It consisted of four main sections (Appendix 1):

(i) Data on present dwelling

(ii) Residential History

(iii) Socio-Economic Data
(iv) Attitudes towards environment.

It also included three types of questions:

(i) Open-ended questions - which were used to allow the respondents to answer adequately, in all the detail they liked, and to clarify and qualify their answers. They also allowed more opportunity for creativity or self-expression by the respondent;

(ii) Close-ended questions - used to simplify certain situations by giving simple yes or no answers. Because such answers are standard, they can be compared from person to person, and they are much easier to code and analyse; and

(iii) Forced choice questions - used to involve the respondents in selecting from a list of given alternatives. The alternatives were spelled out in fairness to all sides of each issue in question, in order to reveal both pro and con sides of it (Smith, 1981).
Fig. 1.3 Motivational Model of the Interview as a Social Process

Westville is divided into nine wards, from which the sample frame was drawn and constructed. Constructing such a frame was not an easy task for the researcher in that the population which formed the frame was scattered all over the nine wards. However, with the assistance of the Westville Town Clerk, the researcher was able to identify all black residents by going through the property records, and also by using the latest valuation roll (1992/93).

Accordingly, one hundred and eighty black households (including Indians and Coloureds) could be identified within thirteen townships (as called in the valuation roll) in Westville. However, the black residents were not evenly distributed in the townships of Westville. The researcher also had a problem in not knowing where the townships' boundaries were because there were no physical demarcations, and the streets sometimes extended through more than one township. To alleviate such problems, the researcher chose to use the systematic sampling technique.

According to systematic sampling the sample frame should consist of a list on which all sample units comprising the population to be surveyed should be located and identified (Bailey, 1987:78). In order to construct an adequate sampling frame the researcher first arranged the townships in their alphabetical order and from this drew a list of all the one hundred and eighty households. Since it was impossible to collect information about every case in the sample frame, a systematic selection of households was done from the list. Residents' names were picked up at intervals of three and this resulted in sixty respondents (33.3 percent) being selected for interviewing.
1.7 INTERVIEW TECHNIQUE AND PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

The interviews were conducted personally by the researcher in July 1993. Before the researcher could visit the respondents, appointments were made by means of a letter of introduction (Appendix II) in which the respondents were requested to grant the researcher an interview at any time convenient to them. The respondents replied by phone and appointments were made, most of which were during the evenings and weekends. During the interviews, problems encountered by respondents in answering the questions in the questionnaire were verified by the interviewer.

The following problems were encountered before and during the interviews:

(i) Some residents did not in the first instance reply to the letters of request posted to them by the researcher. A reminder had to be posted to them for their response and they did respond.

(ii) Since some of the interviews were conducted in the evenings and on weekends, some of the respondents were not happy as it invaded their family time.

(iii) The researcher was not familiar with the geography of the area and finding streets and house numbers was hard work.

Although there was at first a poor response to the letters of request, there was afterwards a good response to all the reminders that were sent out. The interviews went fairly well because
the respondents were sincere and co-operative. All problems and queries that cropped up during the interviews were verified instantly.

1.8 STRUCTURE OF THESIS

The dissertation itself is divided into six chapters. Following the research design and methodology, the theories and approaches that have been used in the study of residential segregation and desegregation are explained and evaluated in chapter two in order to provide a conceptual framework for the study. In chapter three the international and national experiences on residential segregation and desegregation are presented. The residential desegregation process in Westville is analysed in chapter four. The results obtained in the analysis are evaluated in chapter five. In chapter six conclusions and recommendations emanating from the study are presented.
2.1 INTRODUCTION

The study of residential segregation is concerned with the uneven distribution of social groups across urban space. Little agreement exists to date regarding the causes of segregation. However, three distinct causes have been posited, and these are "class", "self-segregation", and "discrimination" (Farley, 1986; Galster, 1986; 1987; 1988). It is difficult to isolate each of these factors since they explain segregation in terms of personal preferences, socio-economic status and institutional prejudice, which are often inseparable in analyzing residential segregation.

In this chapter the theoretical framework for the study is presented. This chapter is divided into four sections. The four competing theoretical perspectives to housing and residential structure, that is, the ecological approach; the neo-classical approach; the institutional approaches (the managerialist and the locational conflict approaches); and the Marxist approach are discussed.
2.2 THE ECOLOGICAL APPROACH

The ecological approach can be traced back to the writings of the Chicago school in the twentieth century. It was mainly concerned with the description of spatial patterns of residential structure (Bassett and Short, 1980:1). Human ecology, which became the first comprehensive urban social theory, developed from the scientific ideas of people like Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer. It was presented as an attempt to develop an explanation of patterns of city growth and urban culture. It was concerned with the specific theoretical problem of how human populations adapted to their environments.

In his work, Darwin concentrated on the evolution of plant and animal species in their struggle for survival. This struggle served to regulate the population size of different species and to distribute them among different habitats, according to their relative suitability. The species were adapted to each other and to their environment through competition for basic resources, and hence a balanced ecological system. Spencer argued that human societies could be studied in the similar evolutionary approach (Saunders, 1981:51).

Park et al (1925) argued that human society was an expression of nature and this was revealed in the competition for survival in which relationships with others were entirely utilitarian. Park, Burgess and McKenzie (1925), appeared to regard the city as a sort of

"man-produced, ecological complex within which the processes of social adaptation, specialization of function and life style, competition for living space, and so on acted to produce a coherent spatial structure, the whole being held together by some culturally derived form of social solidarity" (Harvey, 1973:131).
The ecological approach to residential segregation has in it an economic explanation which results from a housing market whose dynamics are controlled by the forces which govern supply and demand. The growth and success of the market, on the other hand, are dependent on the demographic growth which governs the level of demand (Darden, 1987:1). Human ecologists suggest that those structural features of the metropolitan areas which affect housing supply and demand influence the level of segregation.

This concept of impersonal competition between individuals acted out primarily through market mechanisms, results in a characteristic pattern of land rents and the consequent segregation of different types of people according to their ability to meet the rents associated with different sites and situations (Knox, 1981:60). In the course of time, the competitive power of the different groups alter and the attractiveness of different locations change. Therefore, the territories are seen to be shifting. Park et al (1925) referred to this process of shifting as 'invasion' and 'succession'.

Morris (1968) sees invasion and succession as arising in a situation where there is segregation of residential from commercial or industrial land-use, or of differing types of residential areas. "Invasion", he contends, "denotes the arrival in an area for the first time of other social groups. or of a new type of land user, who was not found there previously. The new group or user is usually unwelcome to the established user" (p.103). Succession refers to the process of neighbourhood change that occurs when a new ethnic group enters a residential area and displaces the original inhabitants (Massey, 1985:319).
The status of a group also influences its ability to compete for housing in an open market economy. Darden (1987:1) maintains that the low status groups tend to be spatially segregated from high status groups, because high status groups avoid locating their residences in the same areas and also because low status groups are less able to compete for the more expensive residential homes occupied by high status groups.

Despite its far-reaching effects on the orientation of a great deal of subsequent work in urban sociology and urban geography, the ecological approach has been criticised by a number of scholars (e.g. Alihan, 1938; Davie, 1937; Gettys, 1940; Firey 1945). One of the criticisms was that the explanations advanced by the ecologists were too mechanical with the result that human beings were perceived to be influenced by forces outside their control rather than seen as active agents (Pilkington, 1984). Schnore (1965) investigated the residential distribution of various income categories and concluded that the Burgess pattern of status distribution was only relevant to the older, large cities. In the modernised big cities the central city was for low and middle-status groups. Alihan (1938) attacked the fundamental distinction drawn by the human ecologists between the biotic and cultural levels of society. She argued that it was impossible to distinguish between biotic conflict and competition and culturally determined conflict and competition (Bassett and Short, 1980:15).

Firey (1945) pointed out that the Chicago school overlooked the role of ‘sentiment’ and ‘symbolism’ in people’s behaviour. He criticised the explicit assumption that cultural factors were mere superstructural elements in the determination of land use. To him human ecology explained locational activity purely in terms of economic maximization. He concluded by stating that social values could, and often did, override impersonal, economic competition as
the basis for socio-spatial organization (Knox, 1982:62). According to Rogers and Uto (1987:52) the Chicago school failed to explore the fact that the built environment and social space were constantly defined by systems of workplace-residence relations embedded in the larger association between production and reproduction.

The ecological paradigm was also criticised by Zeitz (1979:15) in that it did not consider the possibility of permanent poverty, nor did it acknowledge racism, manipulation, and coercion as factors influencing residential patterns. Furthermore, the assumption of spontaneous open market competition for space did not apply in cities where blacks were greeted with hostility, threats, and violence.

2.3 THE NEO-CLASSICAL ECONOMIC APPROACH

The neo-classical economic theory pre-dates that of the human ecologists by many years. According to Carter (1972:182) this model of urban structure can be traced back to the work of Hurd who in 1903 drew upon earlier work concerned with land values, and adapted the principles of Ricardo, propounded for agricultural land, to an urban setting. Models of urban structure based on neo-classical micro-economic theory stand, together with Burgess's ecological model, as the most widely known approaches to explaining the internal structure of cities. These models were essentially elaborations of the Von Thunen agricultural land-use model (Knox, 1982:165). Neo-classical economics began as a reaction to the classical economics of Ricardo and Marx. They were developed to shift the emphasis in economic analysis away from the circumstances and conditions of production, the terrain of the classical economists, towards the preferences and needs of individual consumers (Bassett and Short,
The neo-classical approach attempts to determine the pattern of land consumption through a process of competitive bidding. In this process households and firms compete for space in a way that maximizes satisfaction, within budget constraints, for every competitor (Knox, 1982: 166). The central role in this competitive bidding process is given to the relationship between location, ground rent and transport costs.

Alonso explained this by firstly introducing a set of individuals who enter into an urban land market seeking a home with some *a priori* preferences regarding land, housing and transportation (McCarthy and Smit, 1984: 30). Households will all the time attempt to maximize their utility (or satisfaction). Utility is assumed to increase with the quantity of residential land consumed, and to decrease with increases in transport costs between the home and various other destinations. However, the general hypothesis is that households trade-off travel costs (which increase away from the city centre), against housing costs (which are shown to decrease from the city centre) in an attempt to maximize utility subject to an overall budget constraint (Alonso, 1964; Muth, 1969; Wingo, 1961:).

Alonso (1960: 1964) suggested that each type of land user can be thought of as having a characteristic bid-rent curve. He defines a bid rent curve of a resident as a set of prices for land the individual could pay at various distances while deriving a constant level of satisfaction. It must be noted that a bid rent curve firstly refers to a given individual; secondly, it refers to a given level of satisfaction, and thirdly that a bid rent bears no necessary relation to the actual price that is charged for the use of land at the location.
Contemporary neo-classists have now incorporated within their terms of reference such phenomena as racially segregated housing markets, the concentration of poor environmental conditions in the central city, traffic congestion and polynuclear cities, etc. (McCarthy and Smit, 1984:32). Evans (1973) introduced the assumption that households in a given socio-economic group will prefer to locate in the same neighbourhood as others of the same status, with the result that the model takes on a sectoral dimension in relation to socio-economic residential differentiation.

According to Bassett and Short (1980:28) the more recent elaborations to the traditional neo-classical model have taken two directions. Firstly, the focus has been on the assumption that the low-income residents live near the city and therefore have higher bid rents, while the high-income residents who place higher emphasis on living space are located on the periphery of the city, and therefore have low bid rents. The extension here has been the introduction of the valuation of travel time, which simply means that there are some rich residents who are located close to city centre and also beyond the intermediate location of the poor. The rich residents who prefer to locate close to the centre are assumed to place a higher value on time and are associated with households at the early stages of the life-cycle while those rich located on the periphery place greater emphasis on space and are households in the middle stages of the life-cycle.

Secondly, the focus has been on the household decision-making process. The classic trade-off model assumed that the households traded-off accessibility and space in order to maximize utility, but the extended model also includes a trade-off between space and leisure, and between accessibility and environmental quality (Bassett and Short, 1980).
Despite the widespread influence of the neo-classical approach and the probability of many of its predictions, numerous urban scholars have expressed dissatisfaction with the bases of the model. Richardson (1971) directs his criticism to the inconsistencies between the assumptions of the trade-off models and the way in which people actually behave in the housing market. According to these models, the city inhabitants behave like 'economic man' whose behaviour is geared to profit maximization. Richardson (1971), however, stresses that such behaviour is conditioned by habit, convention, experience, deference, ignorance, etc. He further points out that the search for a place to live is constrained by limited time and money, imperfect information and relatively small proportion of residential sites available.

Another weakness of the models is that they fail to consider the structuring of a family's housing decisions. Bassett and Short (1980:32) contend that the housing choices by households are not made in a vacuum, but rather "the preferences that they express and the constraints that they experience are moulded by the nature of the wider social structure and by the more immediate effects of the specific character of certain systems of housing production and allocation".

In the neo-classical models of land use, the most turbulent events in the processes that are alleged to determine land use and land rents are those which are manifest in competitive attempts among land owners to serve competitive consumers of land-use services (McCarthy and Smit, 1984). In this dual competition within the city, the forces of supply and demand are alleged to balance each other delicately, hence the assumption of perfect competition. However, these models fail to deal adequately with the supply of land and housing because in reality this supply is constrained by national and even international economic fluctuations.
planning regulations and fiscal controls, intervention of special interest groups and by actions of key professionals and power-holders such as building societies, real estate agents and developers (Knox, 1982: 171).

In response to the deficiencies identified in the traditional approaches to housing and residential structure, alternative frameworks for the analysis of urban land use have been developed.

2.4 INSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES

The ecological and neo-classical approaches focus on household choices and preferences rather than constraints and ignore the influence of a number of diverse agents, such as estate agents, landlords, building societies, and developers involved in the housing market. Bassett and Short (1980: 45) argue that the analysis of the housing market by the two traditional approaches ignores the social realities of the housing market. In this section the managerialist and locational conflict approaches will be discussed.

2.4.1 THE MANAGERIALIST APPROACH

The development of the managerialist approach in relation to housing can be traced to the work of Rex and Moore (1967) in their study of housing and race relations in an inner-city area of Birmingham called Sparkbrook. They formulated and defined housing classes not solely by an individual’s ownership of capital, or market power of skill or labour, but by their degree of access to housing (Pahl, 1977). They based their ideas on Weber’s theory of social
and economic organisation, explaining his view that a class struggle was apt to emerge whenever people in a market situation enjoyed differential access to property.

According to Rex and Moore (1967) a problem would always arise because suburban housing, which was so widely desired, was a scarce resource and access to it was unequally distributed among the population. The scarcity of the desired housing made the means whereby it was allocated to these different social classes crucial to an understanding of the distribution of life chances in the city (Saunders, 1981). According to Weber (1947:424), life chances (defined as the supply of consumption goods, external living conditions and personal life experience) were moderated mainly through the market rather than in the sphere of production:

Life chances are the kind of control or lack of it which the individual has over goods or services and existing possibilities of their exploitation for the attainment of receipts within a given economic order.

Weber (1947), like Marx, used the ‘mode of production’ as his fundamental unit of analysis. However, he was of the opinion that class need not be specified solely in terms of wage-labour or ownership of capital. To him the type of social stratification found in any society derived from the unequal distribution of power which lies in the political, social and economic spheres (Badcock, 1984:46). Weber used the term "class" in the economic sphere, to distinguish individuals who had similar life chances and opportunities for gaining income. "These opportunities are predicated upon the existence of a market in which individuals compete for the purpose of exchange" (Bassett and Short, 1980:48).
According to Weber, any market situation led to the emergence of groups with a common market position and common market interests which could be called classes. This suggestion was qualified by Rex and Moore (1967) by including groups differentially placed with regard to a system of bureaucratic allocation, and then thus arrived at a notion of 'housing classes' as a basis of conflict. They identified the following housing classes which could be distinguished in large British cities:

(i) the outright owners of large houses in desirable areas;
(ii) mortgage payers who "own" whole houses in desirable areas;
(iii) council tenants in council built houses;
(iv) council tenants in slum houses awaiting demolition;
(v) tenants of private house-owners, usually in the inner ring;
(vi) house owners who must take lodgers to meet loan repayments, and
(vii) lodgers in rooms.

These housing classes each had a territorial distribution and were ranked according to their power to achieve access to public and private, scarce and desired housing resources. Two criteria were identified as governing these housing opportunities. The first was the size and security of income which determined the mortgage finance for which the household qualified. In the private housing market the population who desired to enter the owner-occupied sector must satisfy the entry requirements of the building society whose mortgage allocation policy is biased towards those with secure employment and with medium to high incomes. The second was the "housing need", length of residence and degree of affiliation to the politically powerful groups qualifications laid down by the local authority as entry rules to the public housing sector (Rex and Moore, 1967).
A number of criticisms have been directed against the work of Rex and Moore. Firstly, Rex and Moore's assumption that conflict occurred between classes because households desired the same type of housing was challenged. "Conflict is generated by struggles over universally desired objects but Rex and Moore have yet to prove that there is a unitary value system in the sphere of housing consumption" (Bassett and Short, 1980:49). Secondly, Haddon (1970) contended that the whole concept of housing classes was based on an incorrect reading of Weber. He maintained that class cannot be defined in terms of housing consumption patterns and uses which were only a reflection of social stratification and not of cause. He concluded that it was not the degree of access that was central to the analysis of housing but "the means of access and the way a differentiated population negotiates the institutions and the rules of eligibility of the 'housing market'" (Haddon, 1970:123). Finally, the delineation of classes was based on a static snapshot of the housing market (Bassett and Short, 1980:49).

The work of Rex and Moore and the subsequent criticisms shifted research towards the analysis of institutions and constraints in the housing market. Pahl (1970) developed the supply-constraint factor in a wider context. He highlighted the importance of the allocation policies of public and private housing institutions and laid the basis of the managerialist approach which emphasised that although urban resources will always be unequally distributed, the question of how they were distributed was largely a function of the actions of those individuals who occupied strategic allocative locations in the social system. Those individuals were referred to as the urban managers or 'social gatekeepers' and included diverse individuals like landowners, builders and developers, mortgage financiers, estate agents, and private landlords. The activities and decisions of these managers exerted a considerable impact on urban residential differentiation.
(i) THE LANDOWNERS

Landowners, like all other key actors or decision-makers in the supply and allocation of housing, exert a significant influence on the outcome of the process of residential development and redevelopment. This was because, since the pre-capitalist period, the landowner was the only non-worker who had a right to receive income because of his ownership and could therefore dispose of any particular piece of this property as he wished, and at any profit. However, the scope for landowners to influence the course of residential development in Britain has, since the ‘nationalization’ of the use-rights of land, obviously declined (Robson, 1975:53).

Robson further maintains that there are two principal ways in which landowners and the pattern of land-ownership can influence the course of residential development. Firstly, the size of the holdings held by different owners can determine the nature of development. Land can be sold or leased by the owner as large or fragmented parcels. If sold as large parcels, especially for large-scale developments like the building of extensive local authority estates, the legal costs and costs of time taken to assemble land are less. This was evident in Manchester in the nineteenth-century when railway companies purchased large unified holdings from landowners. Such landholding patterns helped to guide the location of the more comprehensively planned estates and routes of railway lines into the city (Kellett, 1969:156). In the case where ownership of land is fragmentary, the costs are higher and the developers are not allowed to benefit from economies of scale (Knox, 1982:228). The residential development will be piecemeal and haphazard and be of a lower residential status.
Secondly, landowners possess monopoly over the use of residential land. They impose their wishes as to the type of development which should take place, and whether or not development takes place (Knox,1982:228). Forman (1971:54) mentions the use of restrictive covenants through which landowners sometimes limit the nature of development. The covenant is a legally binding agreement made among property-owners not to convey or lease property to certain classes of people. "Restrictive covenants are the most dangerous of all the means used to effect residential segregation" (Forman,1971:54).

The landowners sometimes find themselves in a critical position when they have to determine whether or not land will be sold and at what price. As they are usually under no compulsion to sell unless they need to raise some capital, they will hold on to their land for purely speculative reasons, releasing the land for urban development as soon as the chance for substantial profit presents itself (Soni,1990:30). The decision to sell by the owners will be influenced by the attractiveness of other investment opportunities, and the prices they charge will be influenced by the type of development the developers have planned, and their own estimates of future expectations of house prices (Robson,1975:54).

It is therefore evident that both land speculation and residential land-use planning have together inflated the cost of living and accentuated housing stratification and social segregation (Mingione,1977:99).
(ii) THE BUILDERS AND DEVELOPERS

Although many decision-makers and institutions are involved in suburban residential development, the builders and developers play a much more active role as interveners and interpreters of what the market demands. They take the initiative by deciding to develop the land as a means of profit rather than relying on the land value appreciation for capital gain (Kaiser and Weiss, 1970:32).

According to Craven (1969:14) a developer's attitude to residential growth is as significant an indication of what, how, and where he will build as are the various constraints facing him. Such constraints are imposed by planning policies, land availability, land prices, housing demand, etc. But, despite these constraints within which he operates, the developer can act as an independent agent in the housing market. It has further been noted by many researchers that larger-scale companies are more concerned about profit-making in such a way that they will always go for cheaper land mostly in the inner city (Craven 1969; Robson 1975; Nicholls et al 1982). Their reaction against economic constraints has been to build houses at relatively higher densities, as well as to economize on construction costs by building these houses to relatively low standards (Robson, 1975:55). These cheap houses have to be consumed by lower-income families.

Housing opportunities for the broad spectrum of middle-income families tend to be limited in scope (Knox, 1982:232). This was because middle class groups were always looking for new housing. Harvey (1972:40) confirms this when he says that new housing at any one particular point in time is a very small proportion of the housing stock. The new housing
development will then be triggered by financial institutions who supply the upper and middle
class groups with mortgages.

Since most of the builders and developers are catering mainly for middle-income families, the
consequence of this is that low-income groups only gain access to old housing which is
passed down to them. This means that the builders and developers exert an important
influence on the location and segregation of the urban population. As Craven (1969:6)
comments, medium-income families looking for housing within their means in Kent-London,
were forced to move long distances from the central part of the city. In this way the rich
groups move to the newer suburbs while the poorer groups take up the older housing near the
city centre.

(iii) MORTGAGE FINANCIERS

Financial institutions or mortgage finance companies - banks, savings and loan companies,
insurance companies, and above all, building societies - have an important role to play as
intermediaries in promoting changes in urban residential structure. Unlike other social
gatekeepers, the mortgage financiers are in a rather difficult and different position for they
have to make and authorise decisions concerning financing and allocation of funds.

The building societies, as principal financiers of house purchase, have structured some lending
policies based on ground rules which are cautious and devised to ensure financial security
both in terms of the paying ability of potential borrowers and the future exchange value of
dwellings financed (Knox, 1982:233). Studies by Ford (1975), Harloe, Issacharoff and Mins
(1974), Bassett and Short (1980) and Forman (1971), maintain that these lending policies reinforce restrictive residential segregation. According to Forman (1971:67) these policies and practices are crucial in determining who lives where, what kind of property can be bought, how much new housing gets built, and what kinds of major improvements, if any, can be made to existing property.

In assessing mortgage application, the building society takes into account income, security of income, and general credit worthiness. Their mortgage allocation policy tends to be biased in a way that they try to avoid direct involvement with low-income households and households headed by manual workers (Bassett and Short, 1980:281).

The building societies' concern for security of loans results in bias against lending money for maintenance and improvement of older property because of high risks and low rates of return involved (Harvey, 1972). Much of the old housing is owned by low-income groups and this will lead to further deterioration of buildings which become less and less desirable for residence.

These lending agencies will at the same time try everything in their power to keep blacks from buying properties in white areas because of fear of a decline in value of property and that whites would withdraw savings and transfer their financial business elsewhere (Forman, 1971:68). The combination of residential segregation and economic differences will therefore confine the low-income blacks to these areas of decay. A policy of red lining or not lending money for home purchase or improvement and maintenance of property is used by these lending agencies.
This section can be summed up by suggesting that the process of racial residential segregation is greatly influenced by the following practices by building societies directed to low-income groups: restriction to certain areas of the city, higher interest rates, greater difficulty in obtaining mortgage financing, higher lending-agency charges (interim costs) and larger monthly payments.

(iv) ESTATE AGENTS

Estate agents influence social and residential patterns in many ways. They influence the segregation of races in most of the residential areas in the cities of the world. They see their role as controllers of residential opportunities because they act as a source of information in the house purchase process. As an intermediary between those who wish to buy and those who wish to sell, they should be as neutral as possible. However, studies by Forman (1971), Palm (1976a: 1985) and Hatch (1973) have revealed that real-estate agents have an interest in determining the patterns of racial occupancy of urban neighbourhoods.

According to Long and Johnson (1947:56) the real-estate agents in their selling and renting of housing to racial minorities, tend to apply the racial exclusion theory which determines where blacks and other minorities will be located. Galster (1987) simply calls this personal prejudice by estate agents against minority households. Agents carefully evaluate their clients' status in terms of race, ethnic origin, religion, occupation, income, education and personal appearance (Knox,1982:239). They will then perceive these minorities as inferior, unreliable, dangerous, or immoral and therefore develop discrimination against them. "Given such prejudices, an agent may attempt to extract compensation from the prospective minority
homeseeker by price discriminating" (Galster, 1987:87). This means that the agent will maintain a high rent as selling price.

As a source of information in home purchasing, the estate agents sometimes tend to introduce a deliberate bias by channelling households into, or away from, specific neighbourhoods. They provide information that limits the search of prospective buyers by advising clients on the social character of neighbourhoods (Palm, 1976a:269). In the USA for example, they do this because most of them still adhere to Article 30 of the "Code of Ethics" by the National Association of Real Estate Boards which assumed that property values are lowered when a black minority enters an all-white neighbourhood (Helper, 1969).

Finally, estate agents are seen as operating as gatekeepers when they adopt what is called the block-busting operations. According to Harvey (1972:36), the estate agents sometimes introduce black families to a white neighbourhood in order to force the prejudiced white residents to move away. As the white residents will be in a hurry to leave, they will sell at deflated prices, and the agent buy these houses and then resell them to blacks at a much higher price. This is merely a means of profit maximisation.

(v) PRIVATE LANDLORDS

Landlords, with their gatekeeping activities, contribute to the creation, consolidation and perpetuation of considerable economic disparities which are evident in the physical and social structure of urban residential areas. Although they are hedged with all sorts of legislation, like all other social gatekeepers, landlords do have power and ability to select or reject tenants and
to set the conditions of letting. They combine their many individual decisions to form obvious and well-established differences in the social composition of neighbourhoods (Elliot and McCrone, 1975:541).

Landlords can be defined as peculiarly rapacious profit seekers. They always tend to concentrate on the segments of the market that offer the highest returns (Bassett and Short, 1980:84). Only higher-income, childless and professional households will be able to pay higher rents charged by these landlords. There will therefore be no competition for accommodation between these households and those in the lower-income group who are outbid all the time.

Given the above activities by landlords, it is evident that class formation and residential segregation result in part, from the constraining conditions of letting and occupation set by the landlords. They cannot do away with the tenements and densely packed cottages in areas close to the city centres from which they obtain a great deal of profit. Therefore, a segregated community (that of low-income households near the city centre and that of high-income households in the suburbs) will always exist as long as the constraining activities by landlords are still practised.

2.4.2 THE LOCATIONAL CONFLICT APPROACH

The locational conflict approach is mainly based on what is called urban politics. Urban politics is essentially about the allocation of favoured locations between different individuals and groups. These individuals or groups have differential wealth and power which is derived
from their position in the occupational structure. The allocation of housing locations will mostly be influenced by accessibility to different types of facilities and opportunities, and this is mostly controlled by the wealthy and more powerful (Pahl, 1970; Cox and Johnston, 1982; McCarthy and Smit, 1984).

The urban residential structure is, therefore, a result of processes of residential segregation which involve conflicts over accessibility (Knox, 1982: 62). The locations of facilities can be seen as both the determinants and the outcome of community conflicts. The communities will all the time compete to gain access to these geographically-restricted packages of facilities. In other words, group competition and group conflict occurs over the organization of city neighbourhoods between dominant high-income groups and low-income or working class groups (Cox et al., 1974).

As the ethnic status plays an important role in determining the individual’s position in the occupational structure, conflict between communities will be based on race, nationality or culture. In most cities of the world blacks are the less privileged and therefore will always fight to maximize their net externalities. No matter how hard the less privileged have fought, the results have always been that the wealthy, powerful and knowledgeable are best placed to reap the benefits of accessibility to desirable and salutary amenities, and the less privileged are further deprived by being denied access to more desirable facilities (Pahl, 1970: 113).

It is therefore evident that spatial-externality effects (negative and positive), are a result of residential segregation and conflict in most cities. Studies of ethnic minority segregation (Boal, 1976; Massey, 1981; Peach, 1984) have shown that some blacks can compete at the
same level with some of the whites. A considerable amount of conflict therefore takes place between groups (mainly black and white) whose class and status are very similar (Knox, 1982:70). In such instances, where blacks compete with whites, the local state always intervenes in favour of white residents. Hence the "increasing and pervasive power of the 'local state' means that the location of few facilities is decided on purely 'private' criteria" (Knox, 1982:69).

In most United States and United Kingdom cities blacks have found themselves disadvantaged in many aspects. Among many disadvantages such as difficulty in gaining access to any public facility, allocation to poor-quality property and exposure to negative externalities, poverty has been most extensive. According to Coates et al (1977) the key factor in sustaining the localized cycle of poverty is bad location and the lack of accessibility. This type of location is mostly a result of deliberate discrimination through personal prejudices by poor conservative whites and managers in the housing market.

However, it must be mentioned in conclusion that while poverty and other disadvantages mentioned are intensified by location, low-income residents and their successive generations are always trapped in ecological niches where poor living conditions are endemic. Furthermore, public and private facilities are expensive or of poor quality because "they are consistently less effective, both in resisting threats to their own welfare and in initiating changes that would enhance their well-being" (Knox, 1982:70).
2.5 THE MARXIST APPROACH

The Marxist approach to the analysis of urban residential structure is based mainly on the works of Karl Marx. According to Marx no single aspect of reality can be analysed independently of the totality of social relations and determinations (Saunders, 1981:14). In other words Marx saw human needs and preferences as contingent to the social and economic structure that shapes it (Knox, 1982:279). Simply put, the Marxist approach sees the political structure of any society as a derivative of its economic system (Markusen, 1984:84).

The Marxist argument is that the economic structure of a society forms the base or foundation from which everything else, including the social superstructure, arises. According to Bassett and Short (1980:160) this economic structure is a definite mode of production to which all social phenomena are linked. The city is part of the capitalist superstructure in western society. It fulfils the imperatives of capitalism and is therefore characterised by conflict between opposing social classes (Knox, 1982:297).

Under capitalism, the state represents the views and needs of the dominant economic class and legitimizes its economic power over other people (the low-income group). The dominant class therefore owns the means of production and rules through wealth and power. According to Markusen (1984:84) the property rights of the dominant class are legalized and protected with police or military force by the state. This suggests that the state is not a neutral organisation standing above society and adjudicating between rival interests (Bassett and Short, 1980:162).
Marxists view racial oppression as a form of class exploitation and that racism is therefore a variant of class discriminatory practices and ideologies (Cox, 1959; Harris, 1964). According to Brown (1981) racial oppression and class exploitation are different in that racial oppression takes place beyond the point of production. On the other hand, "racism is a specific and dynamic ideological form which enables whites systematically to gain advantages in social, economic and other relationships at the expense of blacks" (Brown, 1981:195). It can further be viewed as a struggle to legitimize the practices of the ruling classes in the society.

The state, functioning as a legitimating agent helping to fulfil the imperatives of capitalism, will even go to the extent of clearing residential neighbourhoods to make way for boulevards, office developments and public buildings (Knox, 1982:298). This will lead to dissolution of inner-city communities and their displacement to other less publicly visible areas. Eventually, locational conflict results.

The Marxist explanation of residential segregation can be viewed as being mainly based on the idea that segregation of socio-economic classes is the end-result of racial discrimination. According to Marxist authors (Nikolinakos, 1973; Gabriel and Ben-Tovim, 1978), discrimination is a state in which a dominated group is denied equal status or rights with a dominating group, not only at the social but also at the economic level. They argue that racial exploitation and race prejudice developed among different races with the rise of capitalism and nationalism, and the development of a spirit of competition amongst businessmen. The low-income and dominated groups were then segregated from the high-income groups on the basis of wealth.
However, some criticisms have been levelled against the Marxist approach. Firstly, Marxists tend not to ‘examine the way city actors define their situation but simply portray their actions as determined by their opposition in the wider system’ (Pilkington, 1984:103). In this sense, the state is therefore conceptualised as necessarily promoting the long-term interests of the dominant class. Secondly, Marxists see individuals as being controlled by economic and socio-political structures. In fact, people are capable of generating important ideas and behavioural responses which give life and structure to the city (Knox, 1982:299).

2.6 CONCLUSION

The four sociological perspectives discussed in this chapter had different views regarding the distribution of residential land in the cities. The ecological approach concentrated on the struggle for survival where individual groups in the city competed for status and desirable spatial location. The competitive power of different groups changed with time and this made them seek new residential space in more attractive localities. Hence the process of ‘invasion and succession’.

The neo-classical approach had its emphasis on the process of competitive bidding which determined the pattern of land consumption. Competitive bidding catered for locational preferences of households in the city. The general idea in this approach was that households had to consider the ground rent and transport costs before making a locational choice.

The institutional approaches argued that the struggle and conflict among social groups in the cities was a result of unequal distribution of access to suburban housing. The type of social
stratification found in the city also resulted from the unequal distribution of power (Badcock, 1984). The Marxist approach, on the other hand, explained residential segregation as resulting from the racial practices of the dominant economic class which used its economic power over the low-income group. The dominant group had all the means of production and therefore ruled through wealth and power.
CHAPTER THREE

RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION AND DESEGREGATION: INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL EXPERIENCES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

For many decades urban geographers have studied residential segregation and desegregation in the cities. Residential segregation based on ethnic, racial and class lines is an ingrained feature of urban areas (Leitner, 1992). However, there are significant variations in the literature with respect to the kinds of questions asked and the conceptualisation of race and ethnicity. There has been a significant focus on the study of racial residential segregation. Residential integration or desegregation has been viewed by some academics as a move whereby a group once considered outside the polity, economy and society is now considered inside the polity, economy and society (Glazer, 1971:194).

The aim of this chapter is to provide a comparative analysis of segregation and desegregation in some of the capitalist and colonial cities of the world. For this analysis, literature from the USA, Britain, Namibia and South Africa, has been used. This chapter is divided into four sections. In the first section trends in the USA will be analysed. The second section looks at the trends in Europe. The Namibian and South African experiences are discussed in the third and fourth sections, respectively.
3.2 TRENDS IN THE USA

The USA has experienced segregation and discrimination for many decades. Its long-standing inclination to segregation and denial of equal rights to its black population led to the dissimilar distribution of residences of whites and blacks. Formal municipal residential segregation was fairly widespread, and was in all respects overtly supported by the Department of Housing and Urban Development through its subsidized or insured programmes. The problem of slums or ghettos originated from such institutional discriminatory practices and social inequalities. It was also noted that among the officials of this department, the tendency was generally to deny that race was a relevant factor in the operation of such programmes (Grier, 1964:4). However, a variety of sociological studies (Taeuber, 1968; Warren, 1975) revealed that racial residential segregation in the cities of the United States was much greater in degree than any other type of residential segregation.

As a result of discrimination blacks were concentrated in the decaying central districts where there was poverty, lower-quality housing, overcrowding and social pathology. The initial use of the term "ghetto" was associated with the settlement of East European Jews in northeastern cities and was later adopted to describe the association of deprivation with religious, ethnic, or racial minorities (Ward, 1989:95). Black ghettos were found in the Watts area of Los Angeles, the Twelfth Street area of Detroit, the Hough area of Cleveland, Milwaukee, Indianapolis, Washington, D.C., and Bedford-Stuyvesant in New York City (Warren, 1975:16).

Previous research has shown that racial segregation in the United States was persistent from 1950 to 1970 (Farley, 1983, 1986, 1991; Jakubs, 1986; Massey and Denton, 1987). However,
since the whole world was focusing its attention upon this issue of segregation and because of the vocal protests by the disadvantaged minorities, the Supreme Court in 1970 began to employ remedies which were aimed at undoing the previous practices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. One of these remedies was the use of benign quotas whereby individual applicants and residents were given a right to have equal access as others to housing without regard to race. Unfortunately, these remedies were only aimed at eliminating or reducing residential segregation rather than promoting and maintaining stable racially intergrated housing (Goering, 1985:220).

In 1974 the Department of Housing and Urban Development made its own effort to promote residential integration by introducing programmes which aimed at the spatial deconcentration of lower income and minority households from the decaying central districts (Goering, 1985:221). Deconcentration of these households meant displacing the poor black families in the ghettos from their homes in areas undergoing urban renewal by giving them housing subsidies. In order to ensure that these subsidies worked for most of these families, the principle of fair and open housing was developed to help promote black access to housing in all areas. However, this did not work quite well because of some conservative political pressure from various institutions and some government officials. This is echoed by Lief and Goering (1987:257):

Any successful change in the complexion of residential neighbourhoods would require altering the practices of real estate agents and brokers, mortgage lenders, insurers, appraisers developers-in sum, all the actors and institutions in the housing market.
These displacements (spatial deconcentration of poor black families), however, caused some problems because they were viewed by some pro-civil-rights groups as 'Negro removals' (Grier and Grier, 1964:6). The inner-city populations found themselves being displaced by high-rise non-residential development ventures, which were not always successful in financial terms (Urban Foundation, 1990:23). While the low-income black families were removed from the city centre to neighbourhoods which were substantially better in quality, the white residents in the adjoining neighbourhoods frequently moved out (Grier and Grier, 1964:7). This tendency of locating the displacees in these neighbourhoods was regarded by the Federal Housing Administration and some white conservative residents as a threat to social stability and an attempt to lower the quality of these adjoining neighbourhoods (Schlemmer and Stack, 1990:15).

Despite all the efforts to abolish racial discrimination, segregation in fact did not decline in many American cities. The move by middle-class blacks toward the predominantly white suburbs was slow and more rapid to suburbs with existing black populations. This led to blacks being concentrated in a few suburbs. The exclusion of blacks from predominantly white suburbs resulted from the fact that blacks were charged more for the same bundle of housing than whites, and they could not afford to purchase houses in these neighbourhoods. The Federal Housing Administration contributed to this by giving out instructions that refused governmental mortgage insurance to properties in racially mixed areas (Grier and Grier, 1964:8).

White attitudes towards desegregation were also a factor which contributed much to the exclusion of blacks from predominantly white suburbs. Although they strongly endorsed open
housing in principle, they were reluctant to accept it in practice. According to Massey and Gross (1991:15), a General Social Survey by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), revealed that a significant percentage of the white respondents expressed considerable ambivalence and hostility towards blacks. Blacks could only be tolerated as neighbours when they constituted a small proportion of the population (Bobo et al., 1986:161). Hence, the principle of open housing worked only when the number of potential black in-migrants was well within the limits of white tolerance, and if it was large, higher levels of racial segregation were imposed by the housing market in order to keep white-black contact at levels that were tolerable to whites (Lieberson 1980, 1981).

Such antipathy toward blacks by whites led urban researchers in the United States to generally conclude that the overall levels of urban racial segregation had not been markedly reduced (Urban Foundation, 1990:23). In urban areas where racial composition was such that open housing could be implemented without threatening white preferences for limited contact with blacks, desegregation would occur. However, where numbers of blacks were large, a high degree of black-white mixing would occur under an open market and racial segregation would therefore be maintained (Massey and Gross, 1991:16).

3.3 THE BRITISH EXPERIENCE

For more than forty years, racial segregation has been a politically constructed problem as well as the arena in which a majority of black minority groups of various origins experienced urban life in Britain (Smith, 1988:423). These minority groups had different racial characteristics, spoke different languages and practised different religions, yet they were
lumped together as coloured or black people (Smith, 1977:20).

Though most of the British white citizens regarded themselves as tolerant to British immigrants, prejudice against black people was widespread. More than two-thirds of Britain’s white population had a low opinion of black people or disapproved of them (Fryer, 1984:374). They regarded blacks as uncivilised, backward, illiterate heathens who practised black magic and spoke strange languages. Many of the white people believed that the immigrant groups were victims of poverty, ignorance, disease and malnutrition whose capacity to work and support themselves was severely impaired (Smith, 1988:424).

Many whites was extremely prejudiced and vehemently objected to having blacks as their neighbours. The British government seemed to be party to this, for it passed no sanction to prevent individual and institutional ‘gatekeepers’ affording longstanding whites a higher priority than black newcomers in the housing queue (Smith, 1988:427). Blacks were excluded by residence requirements and other qualifying hurdles, for example, the length of time on the waiting list (often a five or ten-year minimum period) from public sector housing (Deakin, 1964:19). This resulted in blacks having only two options, that is, to move into the overcrowded, multi-occupied remnants of an inner-city private stock, or occupy cheap properties on short leases in areas scheduled for slum clearance (Doherty, 1983:203). Both options confined black households to the deteriorating neighbourhoods of the inner-city.

Another major problem facing the black newcomers was their high rate of unemployment and the institution of colour quotas by some firms which limited black people’s access to skilled and supervisory posts, thus limiting income earning opportunities. Therefore they could not
qualify for private and local authority housing which were too expensive (Deakin, 1964:19). The housing they could rent was provided by the landlords who bought whole streets of dilapidated houses in order to make a profit. The result was that housing was built as cheaply as possible, maintenance was kept to a minimum and tenants were crowded into insanitary rooms and cellars in order to raise the total rental income to an acceptable market level (Dearlove and Saunders, 1984:386).

In an attempt to solve the problem of discrimination faced by blacks, the British government proposed to involve itself in housing and other 'private' areas of the nation's economy (Deakin, 1964:25). Although this intervention was accepted by many residents, some of the black organizations were reluctant to participate in activities which brought them into contact with the government. They needed full assurance of 'good neighbourliness' on the part of the whites.

However, the only way in which blacks could achieve some measure of equality was to involve themselves in talks with the government. These black organizations, therefore, had to compromise in some way and exhibit a willingness to work with the government and local agencies (Jacobs, 1986:41). Assimilation was regarded as inevitable and would act as an important prerequisite for immigrants to enjoy full social and political rights. What was expected of the blacks was to adopt an English and more 'civilised' way of life (Denney, 1985:56).
3.4 THE NAMIBIAN EXPERIENCE

In Namibia, as from the late 19th century, the form of social stratification and spatial organization were indistinguishable from those found within other colonial cities. In fact, the system of racial zoning in Namibia became entrenched as early as the 1920s when South Africa took over control from Germany. The primary legislation governing segregation in Namibia was the Natives (Urban Areas) Proclamation, No. 56 of 1951 (Urban Foundation, 1990:24). In 1968 Windhoek became physically divided into various racial group areas with the central city and suburbs being reserved for whites, and coloureds and blacks being housed in the townships at the periphery (Simon, 1986:291).

This legislation, together with a number of other laws, helped in giving residential segregation legal force. All aspects of social life, including politics, education, residence, recreation, social status, economic opportunity and freedom of movement were racially determined. The Windhoek Municipality acted as the local level champion of white interests and the authority charged with day to day administration of urban segregation (Simon, 1986:294). Blacks were only needed in the city when they were economically active, and as soon as they were not, they were sent back to their group areas. Permission was granted only to employees such as nurses, domestic workers, and contract labourers to board in the hostels and their employers’ premises.

Coupled with these acts that discriminated against blacks, were the activities of the capitalist land markets. Land values were always high for the lower class residents who were later allocated land in the various homelands that were created by the Development of Self-
Government for Native Nations in South West Africa Act of 1968 (Urban Foundation, 1990:24). There were also restrictive clauses in the title deeds of buildings and plots which precluded sale, transfer or occupation by blacks, coloureds or Asians. People who wanted to live outside their allotted group areas had to seek permission from the municipality (Simon, 1986:294).

The passing of the Abolition of Racial Discrimination (Urban Residential Areas and Public Amenities) Act, No.3 of 1979, heralded the demise of racial domination by the minority conservative whites, because it provided for the opening of their urban residential areas and public amenities to all races (Cilliers c.f.; The Urban Foundation, 1990:24). However, the abolition received vociferous opposition from right wing whites, both from inside and outside the National Assembly.

Desegregation was perceived by the white Afrikaner working class as a threat to their interests and a violation of their identity. Their main concern was that with the removal of apartheid legislation their domination over blacks could not be maintained. It was, however, different with the middle and higher income classes who saw few problems with integration because it posed no threat to their interests. Although most public amenities were opened to all races, there were two areas in which racial segregation was still maintained: health and education. It was in 1987 that the legislation concerning these areas was relaxed (Urban Foundation, 1990:25).
3.5 THE SOUTH AFRICAN EXPERIENCE

3.5.1 GROUP AREAS

"The geographical landscape in South Africa (physical, social and economic), has been profoundly influenced by the policy of apartheid, which constitutes an unparalleled example of state-aided socio-spatial structuring" (Maharaj, 1993:2). This policy, since its propagation by Afrikaner nationalists in the late 1940’s, has created a divided social and political space. Its roots, however, grew out of British-inspired, colonialist traditions of segregation (Christopher, 1983:148). Apartheid ideologues of the National Party, which came to power in 1948, believed that an open and common society with a greater range of contact where blacks and whites would compete for homes, jobs, access to services and amenities would create racial friction (Lemon 1990:195).

The implementation of apartheid in South Africa centred to a large extent on the control of residential location (Soussan, 1984:201). The area in which this policy has been effective was in the provision of separate residential areas for different race groups (Preston-Whyte, 1982:164). At a micro-scale, this policy involved the segregation of personal action space in the use of services and amenities (Lemon, 1990:195). What threatened the whites, prior to implementation of this policy, was the numbers of black people who have begun moving into the city. Christopher (1989) argued that the apartheid policy aimed at far more than straightforward racial residential segregation and empowered the whites to maintain total control over the black population.
It is true that even prior the passing of the Group Areas Act South African cities have always been characterised by high levels of de facto racial residential segregation, but the passing and implementation of the Group Areas Act rationalised and consolidated it. The Afrikaners used it very effectively to accentuate racial divisions. It gave the government the power to allocate specific areas for exclusive occupancy and ownership by a particular racial group, to force the "wrong" group to sell property to a member of the "right" group (Stadler, 1987:120).

The Group Areas Act enforced the imposition of planned racial segregation on all urban residential areas. The period post 1950 has been characterised by the redesigning of towns and cities which involved rezoning and reorganization of populations, mainly blacks (Christopher, 1989). In the process of redesigning the Nationalist Government ensured that Blacks were moved further away from the CBD. Group areas were separated by strong physical or man-made barriers, or by buffer zones. These barriers did not only serve as boundaries but also as means to inhibit contact between racial groups.

Besides the separation of consolidated areas, the Group Areas Act also ensured that each consolidated area be so placed as to have access to a growth hinterland for further development. The various race group had access to and from the industrial or work zone but in the process of movement no racial group should, however, cross the residential area of another group. Interaction among the racial groups was only permissible within the work zone (Urban Foundation, 1990:3).

What emerged from this process of social engineering was a more highly structured and quartered apartheid city (Davies, 1981:69). The designation of the apartheid city was largely
based at achieving a measure of residential separation between race groups where both the amount and desirability of land allocated to each race group reflected white dominance (Christopher, 1989:329; Lemon, 1990:200). It was also designed in such a way that it could allow some space for future growth of group areas in their allotted sectors (Fig. 3.1). According to Davies (1976:12) the apartheid city was an improvement and restructuring of a 'segregation' city which occurred before. The apartheid city introduced stricter and rigid primary controls than the 'segregation' city.

The application of the Group Areas criteria to cities aimed at relocating blacks to the periphery of the city thereby preventing them from gaining access to positions of power and authority in "white" areas. Government spokesmen in their speeches always chose to present this spatial manipulation as a well intentioned attempt to erase health hazards or slum conditions, under which the poorer black citizens have lived (Western, 1982:218). In this way white survival was promoted and the political power of the black majority was transferred from the metropolis to the areas where it posed less of an immediate threat (Fair and Davies, 1976:151).
Fig. 3.1 The original Apartheid City model (after Davies: 1981)
The city was structured in such a way that the consolidated white residential core could expand in environmentally desirable and accessible sectors in sub-urban localities. Black group areas, mainly consisting of low cost township housing and squatter camps on the low-value peripheral land were at a spatial disadvantage (Davies, 1981, 1986; Simon, 1984).

Although some of the victims of group areas have been physically better housed, they have been emotionally impoverished in that their homes and communities were destroyed. Life in the townships displayed many symptoms of social deprivation. Black families lived in poverty, suffered from inadequate educational, health, and recreational facilities, and were subject to high transport fares resulting from long journeys to and from work. Disruption and breakup of family life resulted in social pressures, anxieties, and instabilities (Fair and Davies, 1976:159).

In sum, the above analysis shows that amongst other forces that shaped the existing spatial forms of the South African cities, state intervention has been an especially significant factor used to ensure strict urban racial segregation. However, in the 1980s there was evidence of widespread violation of the Group Areas Act as blacks began to move into white areas.

3.5.2 ‘GREY AREAS’

While the residential segregation of race groups in South Africa has been extensively influenced by the rigorous enforcement of the Group Areas Act since 1950, the early 1980s brought about a change when de jure white residential exclusivity was contravened as large numbers of blacks moved into white group areas. This change which began in the centres of
the largest cities of Johannesburg, Cape Town and Durban, blurred the rigid race-space divisions (Maharaj, 1993). It eventually led to the formation of pockets of integrated residential settlements called 'grey areas'.

Among many reasons which led to the development of the 'grey areas', three have been frequently mentioned:

(i) The relative oversupply of housing in white areas and an artificial shortage of land and housing in black areas created incentives for people to ignore the law and take up housing in white areas. The landlords were forced to accept black tenants in response to market forces (Maharaj and Mpungose, 1994).

(ii) Statistical evidence from estate agents revealed that after the political shock of the Soweto uprising in 1976, there was a decline in prices of suburban housing because many upper-class white residents emigrated and their houses became affordable to whites who had previously been forced to live in the inner-city. This strengthened the trend of upwardly mobile white residents' departure from the inner-city areas to the suburbs (Cloete, 1991:93).

(iii) The socio-economic status of some had improved and they could afford better housing and a better quality of life, away from the strife-torn townships.

A situation where black, coloured, and Indian residents gradually and illegally infiltrated certain white suburbs was also stimulated by the repeal of the prohibitions on inter-racial marriages in 1985, and the abolishing of the influx control in 1986. A group of middle to
upper middle-class people (mainly of coloured and Indian descent) was the first to move as they could afford to pay exorbitant prices for ‘illegal’ accommodation in the ‘white’ inner cities (Cloete, 1991:94). The second group consisted of poor working-class blacks who were accommodated in overcrowded dilapidated buildings, for example Hillbrow in Johannesburg, Woodstock in Cape Town, and Albert Park in Durban.

Living in a white area was advantageous to most blacks, especially those employed in the inner cities, and that is why many black families risked prosecution and endured surveillance by moving into these areas (Urban Foundation, 1990:14). Given that the number of black employees was increasing in the central commercial and office zones, it became imperative for them to seek accommodation in the city in order to minimize distances between home and work. In some instances business firms, especially in Johannesburg, were buying houses for their black executives in affluent suburbs (Pickard-Cambridge, 1988:29).

Surveys conducted in steadily integrating suburbs in the country revealed that even though officials of various white-dominated committees, associations and even government structures had, in some instances, supported integration, there were mixed reactions from whites to the ‘greying’ process. Whites feared that residential mixing with blacks would lead to a decline in property values and health standards. An unspoken but real fear was that crime, unrest and violence engulfing the African townships would spread to white suburbs (Lemon, 1990:203).

All these feelings and fears by whites led to heightened white resistance to integration. A National Front was formed by British immigrants whose members visited apartment blocks, drew up lists of flats occupied by blacks, and handed these over to the group areas police, the
division of the South African Police responsible for the enforcement of the Act (Pickard-Cambridge, 1988:5). In Albert Park in Durban, blacks encountered serious problems such as curfews, evictions without notice, insults and use of dangerous weapons by caretakers, regular harassment from the police, and restrictions on family and social life (Maharaj and Mpungose, 1994).

Residents organisations were formed to protect the rights of black tenants living in white areas in defiance of the Group Areas Act. Two well-known organisations were the ACTSTOP in Johannesburg and the Durban Central Residents’ Association in Durban. The formation of an alliance between ACTSTOP and the public interest law groups at a later stage was mainly to respond to the threat of evictions and to fight for human rights in court. Mrs Gladys Govender who had taken up ‘illegal’ residence in a white suburb of Mayfair in 1979, successfully appealed against eviction in 1982. Her judgement was a great victory for the ACTSTOP and its lawyers for it barred evictions where alternative housing was unavailable (Pickard-Cambridge, 1988).

In response to the ‘greying’ of the cities, the government devised a set of transitional measures to try to synchronize some elements of a new policy approach within its still existing apartheid policies (Cloete, 1991:105). One of these transitional measures was the Free Settlement Areas Bill by which the government was attempting to contain and to channel the process of residential desegregation.
3.5.3 FREE SETTLEMENT AREAS

As a result of the emergence of 'grey areas', the government was forced to make a number of incremental adjustments to the Group Areas Act. The reasons for this flexibility derived from unprecedented pressures levelled on the government by various institutions in the country such as the estate agents, white city councils, and black residents associations (Urban Foundation, 1990). These institutions pressed for substantive reform or repeal of the group areas legislation because to the estate agents it was a constraint on the growth of their market; to the city councils it resulted to an increased number of abandoned and dilapidated properties; and to the black residents' associations it discriminated against blacks and denied them privileges in housing, education and employment (Lemon, 1990).

The Constitutional Committee of the President's Council was asked in October 1984 to consider possible consolidation and revision of group areas and related legislation (Cloete, 1991:95). Among the recommendations of this committee was the concept of 'local option', which proposed that existing racially segregated residential areas be maintained and that procedures for local application to make existing group areas open to all races be established (Rule, 1988:69). The local authorities were to create open residential areas in or near the CBD without the government having to become involved in this process. This, if implemented, would in effect legalise the status quo in these areas and create a process whereby other group areas could have been opened after full community participation at the local level. However, this did not guarantee the opening of group areas, but was an instrument through which this could be done (Urban Foundation, 1990).
As a response to the pressures by the various institutions, the government, acting consistently with the recommendations of the President’s Council, introduced the Free Settlement Areas Act of 1989. This Act provided for possible localised exceptions to the Group Areas Act (Urban Foundation, 1990:28). This meant that only a few areas would be opened to all races, while the Group Areas Act would be enforced more strictly in other areas. The provision by this Act for the creation of open areas was limited and that is what the government wanted for it feared that more widespread residential integration would lead to the development of cross-cutting social cleavages which could ultimately threaten the preservation of a distinct Afrikaner culture (Lemon, 1990:203).

All the political groupings on the left rejected the proposed modifications, and unanimously demanded that the Group Areas Act together with the Free Settlement Areas Act be repealed immediately. On the other hand, the groups from the right argued that the Free Settlement Areas Act eroded the provisions of the Group Areas Act and promoted racial integration. They demanded that the Group Areas Act be enforced more actively and rigidly, (Lemon, 1990).

The political reforms introduced by the National Party in 1990 led to the abolishing of the Group Areas Act in 1991. The repeal of the Act came at a time when many of the ‘white’ areas had already been invaded. Although many blacks had desegregated the white suburbs through de facto mechanisms, the demise of the Act was expected to have a major effect on the lives of the majority in the country.
The repeal was going to bring about change to the existing trends of urban residential location. Scores of middle-to high-income blacks would be free to move to 'white' areas of their choice. However, even after the repeal of the de jure segregation, a series of de facto mechanisms that perpetuated the status quo still existed (Saff, 1991). These mechanisms, such as blockbusting by estate agents and redlining by financial institutions, showed their influence on the pattern of residential desegregation. Estate agents steered blacks away from some upmarket white areas by screening them and financial institutions denied financial assistance to blacks. These practices led to middle-income blacks having limited opportunities to move to plush and affluent suburbs, and low-income blacks being totally excluded from such benefits of integration.

3.6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The analysis of segregation and desegregation has shown that in the United States and Britain, segregation of blacks was based on a combination of socio-economic factors and discriminatory practices. At first, the governments of these countries did not do much to prevent individual and institutional gatekeepers from denying blacks residential accommodation and giving whites a wider range of choice of housing in the suburbs. It was only after the disadvantaged minorities voiced their protests that these governments attempted to employ remedies which were aimed at reducing residential segregation.

In Namibia and South Africa, unlike in the United States and Europe, segregation was perpetuated by a number of acts which discriminated against blacks. The Native (Urban Areas) Proclamation Act of 1951 in Namibia, and the Group Areas Act of 1950 in South
Africa were the key instruments used in reinforcing the ideology of apartheid and emphasizing separate residential areas, educational services and other amenities for the different race groups.

Desegregation in both countries was obtained through the struggle and pressure for change at local level which eventually forced the governments of the day to respond by scrapping these acts. The abolition of these acts was opposed by the conservative white Afrikaners whose dominating position above blacks was threatened. In South Africa, even after the repeal of the *de jure* segregation, there was evidence that the status quo would still persist through a series of *de facto* mechanisms. In the next chapter the residential desegregation process in Westville will be analysed.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESIDENTIAL DESEGREGATION IN WESTVILLE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The process of residential desegregation in the 'white' residential areas has been greatly influenced by the residential needs and preferences of the black people in the townships and rural areas. The repeal of the Group Areas Act made it possible for blacks to fulfill these needs. In this chapter the effects of the repeal are discussed by analysing residential desegregation in Westville, Durban based on data collected from the research survey. However, where it was deemed necessary, use was made of some theory and surrogate information to add some insight to the factual data. A statistical package, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), was used to produce tabulations for the analysis. The data analysed in this chapter can be generally classified into four sections viz., the socio-economic characteristics, residential characteristics, services and facilities, and social environment.

4.2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

4.2.1 AGE-SEX CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS

In this study, the total sample population comprised of more males as family heads than females. About 90 percent of the respondents interviewed were males and 10 percent were
females. Table 4.1 also suggests that people who chose to live in the suburbs were grown ups who want a peaceful life away from the busy and noisy city. The sample population displays 61,7 percent being made up by the 30 - 39 year age-category, 35 percent being in the 40 - 49 year age-category, and 3,3 percent being in the 50 - 59 year age-category. The mean age of household heads was 49 years.

**TABLE 4.1: AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>61,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>35,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>3,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\bar{X} = 49$ Years

**4.2.2 EDUCATION LEVELS OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS**

It was the more highly educated blacks with better jobs who could afford to move to the suburbs. This was evident in the statistics which showed that 88,3 percent of the respondents in Westville had some tertiary qualification.
4.2.3 OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEADS

It was observed that almost two thirds (60 percent) of the heads worked as professionals. Table 4.2 further indicates that 13.3 percent were in marketing and self-employment, respectively; followed by 11.7 percent of heads who were technicians, and 1.7 percent who were clerks.

TABLE 4.2: OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 MARITAL STATUS OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS

It is evident from figure 4.1 that the majority of respondents were married. Statistics from the survey indicated that 88.3 percent of the parents were married; 3.3 percent were single; 1.7
percent were widowed; and 6.7 percent were divorcees (the majority of whom were women with children). Among the married households the majority of parents have been married for about 10 - 14 years (46.7 percent); 21.7 percent married for 15 - 19 years; 20.0 percent for less than 5 years; 6.6 percent for 5 - 9 years; and 5 percent for more than 20 years (Table 4.3).

Fig. 4.1 Marital Status of Household Heads
TABLE 4.3: NUMBER OF YEARS MARRIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>20,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9 years</td>
<td>6,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14 years</td>
<td>46,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19 years</td>
<td>21,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.5 NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE HOUSEHOLD

Table 4.4 indicates that about 40 percent of the households had three children per family. The table further shows that 26,7 percent of the households had four children per family; 8,3 percent had five children; 1,7 percent had six children; 15,0 percent had two children; and 8,3 percent had one child per family.
TABLE 4.4: NUMBER OF CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = 3.5

4.2.6 NUMBER OF INCOME EARNERS PER HOUSEHOLD

The number of income earners determines the household budget, and especially the type of housing that it can afford. About 78.3 percent of the households who had two income earners, and 21.7 percent had one earner per household. It is customary among urban dwellers that a wife works in order to contribute towards the total household monthly income. This was clearly indicated by 73.3 percent of married women that were employed, and only 26.7 percent who were not employed.
4.2.7 MONTHLY INCOME OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS

Table 4.5 indicates that 46.7 percent of the household heads were earning between R4 000 and R4 500 and above per month, and 40.0 percent earned between R3 500 and R3 999 per month. About 10.0 percent of the heads earned between R2 500 and R3 499 per month, and 3.4 percent earned from R1 500 to R2 499 per month. The average monthly income was R3 250.

**TABLE 4.5: MONTHLY INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (R)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1 000 - R1 999</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 000 - R2 499</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 500 - R2 999</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 000 - R3 499</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 500 - R3 999</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 000 - R4 499</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 500+</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = R3 250
4.2.8 TOTAL HOUSEHOLD MONTHLY INCOME

According to figure 4.2 only 3.3 percent of the households earned a total household income between R3 000 - R3 499 per month. About 15 percent of the households had incomes between R3 500 and R3 999; 3.3 percent earned between R4 000 - R4 499; 1.7 percent had between R4 500 - R4 999; 3.3 percent between R5 000 - R5 499; and 8.3 percent between R5 500 - R5 999. A significant proportion of the households (65 percent) earned more than R6 000 per month. The average total monthly household income was R6 000.

4.2.9 LOCATION OF PLACES OF EMPLOYMENT OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS

It was observed that about one third (36.7 percent) of the workers were employed in the Durban Central area. About 21.7 percent of the heads worked in the Congella - Dalbridge area. About 13 percent of the household heads worked in the Pinetown-New Germany area which is closest to Westville. It was also noticeable that about 15 percent of the heads worked in the townships of Umlazi and Kwa Mashu. Most of them were employed as professionals (teachers, lawyers, nurses, social workers, etc.) and as business owners. The rest of the heads (13.4 percent) were employed in places like Jacobs-Mobeni, Amanzimtoti, Phoenix, Tongaat, Umbongitwini and Clermont (Fig. 4.3).
Fig. 4.2 Total Household Monthly Income
Fig. 4.3 Distribution of Places of Employment of Household Heads
TABLE 4.6: PLACES OF EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durban-Central</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinetown-New Germany</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs-Mobeni</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congella-Dalbridge</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umlazi</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanzimtoti</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwa Mashu</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongaat</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbongirwini</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.10 PROPERTY PRICES

The property prices in Westville have been fluctuating a lot since the late 1980s when blacks began purchasing houses in this suburb. According to the information obtained from the estate agents interviewed in Westville, some white sellers who sold to blacks through close corporations prior to the repeal of the Group Areas Act, charged high prices because they
were selling to desperate and ignorant buyers. Figure 4.4 clearly shows the escalation in the average prices of properties from R200 000 in October 1990 to about R260 000 in November 1990. A decline in property prices was evident immediately after the repeal of the Act in 1991. This was because white sellers could not exploit black buyers anymore (Interview with estate agent, 22/7/93). This was confirmed by a representative from Brink Properties who commented that after the repeal of the Act some blacks came to Westville with no intention to buy but out of curiosity to examine the conditions and prices of the houses. But by 1992 prices went up again from between R190 000 and R220 000 in 1991 to above R270 000 in May (Fig. 4.4).

It must be pointed out that the influx of blacks into Westville was not uniform in all sections. However, there was a significant increase in Berea West which lies in the south-east end of Westville and Atholl Heights lying in the north-west end (refer Fig.1.2). This was because property prices were low in these areas. Table 4.7 shows that about 18.3 percent of the properties cost between R150 000 and R199 999. These were the lowest property prices. Such properties were situated adjacent to the black townships and were considered by some financial institutions as being in the high crime and high risk areas. About 20 percent of the property prices ranged between R200 000 and R249 999; while 38 percent were between R250 000 and R299 999. These properties were presumably big and closer to better quality amenities. Table 4.7 further indicates that 11.7 percent of the houses were sold at prices between R300 000 and R349 999; 8.3 percent were between R350 000 and R399 999, and 3.3 percent between R400 000 and R449 999. These were all properties in the upmarket area (Beverley Hills and Palmit). The average price for property paid by respondents was R325 000.
AVERAGE PRICE OF PROPERTIES
REGISTERED IN THE WESTVILLE AREA

Fig. 4.4 Property Prices

Source: Westville Town Office
When asked to comment on property prices in Westville most of the respondents said that it was high (78.3 percent), while 20 percent of them felt that it was average, and 1.7 percent said that it was low.

**TABLE 4.7: PROPERTY PRICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R150 000 - R199 999</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R200 000 - R249 999</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R250 000 - R299 999</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R300 000 - R349 999</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R350 000 - R399 999</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R400 000 - R449 999</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X = R325 000
\]

**4.2.11 MONTHLY BOND REPAYMENT**

Table 4.8 indicates that there was a wide range in monthly bond repayments for properties. About 3 percent were paying between R1 000 and R1 499 per month; 8.3 percent were paying between R1 500 and R1 999; 58.3 percent paying between R2 000 and R2 499; 16.6
percent paid between R2 500 and R2 999; 11.7 percent were paying R3 000 to R3 499, and 1.7 percent paid between R3 500 and R3 999 per month. The average monthly bond repayment was R2 750.

TABLE 4.8: MONTHLY BOND REPAYMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repayment</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;R1 000</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1 000 - R1 499</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1 500 - R1 999</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 000 - R2 499</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 500 - R2 999</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 000 - R3 499</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 500 - R3 999</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = R2 750
4.2.12 HOUSING SUBSIDY

Housing subsidy is a sum of money paid by an employer on a monthly basis towards housing for his employees. Respondents who were civil servants and those working for bigger companies received housing subsidies. About 66.7 percent of the household heads in the sample received these subsidies.

4.2.13 BOND APPLICATIONS

Before an estate agent can sell a buyer a house, an application for a bond has to be approved by a financial institution. It has, however, been noted that many blacks in the townships have been prevented from buying properties in the white suburbs by the policy of redlining by the banks which prevented them from selling their homes in the black areas. The reason that was put forward for the reluctance of the banks to grant loans in such areas was that they were close to squatter settlements and were prone to violence. According to the Weekly Mail (15-21/2/93), the policy of redlining was likely to "fuel racist fears of integration and maintain divided cities". Fortunately for the respondents in Westville, no application for bond approval was declined by any financial institution.

Almost all the household heads (96.7 percent) in the sample were financed by the well known financial banks and building societies in the country, namely Natal Building Society (NBS), First National Bank (FNB), Standard Bank, Permanent Building Society, and Nedbank. Only 3.3 percent of the heads were privately subsidised, that is by employers (1.7 percent), and organisations whose names were not disclosed (1.7 percent) (Table 4.9).
TABLE 4.9: SOURCE OF FINANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natal Building Society</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First National Bank</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Bank</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedbank</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 RESIDENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS

In this section the focus will be on the housing characteristics of black residents in the townships and rural areas around Durban before they moved in to Westville. Then their present location in Westville will be assessed. Concerning the present housing characteristics, both objective characteristics of the present dwelling, such as year of occupation, location of dwelling and length of stay; and subjective characteristics which refer to the manner in which the residents perceive their present environment, will be examined. Also, the analysis will
focus on the manner in which the residents obtained their dwelling, residents' preferred dwelling locations, estate agents' influence on choice of houses, quality of housing, and age of dwellings.

4.3.1 PREVIOUS RESIDENTIAL LOCATION

The survey revealed that the majority of residents in Westville (65.2 percent) had previously lived in black townships mainly around Durban (Umlazi, Kwa Mashu, Lamontville, Kwa Ndengezi, Reservoir Hills, Kwa Makhutha, Shallcross, Merebank, Chatsworth, Kwa Dabeka, Phoenix, Chesterville, Duff's Road and Redhill). Others (11.8 percent) were residents in black townships far away from Durban (Esikhawini, Imbali, Tongaat, and Mpumalanga townships). About 7 percent had previously lived in flats within the city, and 12.4 percent lived in rural areas (Umbumbulu, Empangeni, Umzinto, Portshepstone and St Wendolins). Only 1.7 percent lived in a squatter settlement (Bambayi) (Fig. 4.5).
Fig. 4.5 Previous Residential Location of Households
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Location</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Previous Location</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Previous Location</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arusha Flat (Dbn)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>KwaDabeka</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Portshepstone</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bambayi</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Kwa Makhutha</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Redhill</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatsworth</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Kwa Mashu</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Reservoir Hills</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterville</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Kwa Ndengezi</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Shallcross</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffs Road</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Lamontville</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>St Wendolins</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empangeni</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Merebank</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Tongaat</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esikhawini</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Umbumbulu</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbali</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Umlazi</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Point (Dbn)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Umzinto</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**                  | **100.0**|
4.3.2 PHYSICAL STRUCTURE OF PREVIOUS DWELLING

About 81.7 percent of the household heads described their previous dwellings as being too small to accommodate a big family, while 5 percent described their homes as being too big and expensive. About 3 percent stated that their dwellings were too small and costly. About 7 percent stated that they did not have amenities like a garage and swimming pool, and lastly 1.7 percent perceived their previous dwellings as representing a health hazard (Table 4.11).

TABLE 4.11: PHYSICAL STRUCTURE OF DWELLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Could not accommodate big family</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too big and expensive</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too small but expensive</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same size as the present house</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had no garage and swimming pool</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health hazard</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 TENURE OF PREVIOUS DWELLING

About two thirds of the respondents owned their previous dwellings either as township houses or structures in the rural and mission areas, and in squatter camps (66.7 percent). The owners of township houses had purchased their dwellings from the municipalities or had bought sites and built their dwellings. About 33.3 percent of the household heads had been tenants who had rented their dwellings in the townships. A very small percentage of these tenants previously rented flats in the city of Durban.

4.3.4 PERIOD OF STAY IN PREVIOUS DWELLING

The majority of household heads had lived in their previous dwellings for more than eight years. About 7 percent of households lived for less than two years in their previous dwellings; 13.3 percent for two to three years; 11.7 percent for four to five years; 18.3 percent for six to seven years; and 50 percent had lived there for more than eight years (Table 4.12). On average, households had lived in their previous dwellings for eight years.
TABLE 4.12: PERIOD OF STAY IN PREVIOUS DWELLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of stay</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2 years</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 years</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5 years</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7 years</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+ years</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = 8 years

4.3.5 REASONS FOR LEAVING PREVIOUS PLACE OF RESIDENCE

The main reason given by the household heads for leaving their previous places of residence was shortage of accommodation (33.3 percent). This shortage of accommodation resulted from the implementation of the Group Areas Act. Over the years housing problems of blacks had been ignored by local government and the municipalities, resulting in an escalating shortage of housing units in urban areas. Among other reasons that were given for last residential moves were the volatile situations in the townships where people no longer felt safe (13.3 percent), and the long distances people had to travel to work daily (13.3 percent). Other factors influencing the decision to move out of previous residential areas were poor
educational facilities (5 percent), marriage (5 percent), absence of entertainment facilities (5 percent), no financing in black townships (6.7 percent), job transfer (6.7 percent), steep driveway (1.7 percent), house not built up to standard (5 percent); need for a garage, swimming pool and servant's quarters (3.3 percent); and high rent (1.7 percent) (table 4.13).

4.3.6 RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY

It is noteworthy that the residential moves made by blacks were two-fold, that is, voluntary (for example, looking for improved accommodation) and induced (for example, violence in the townships). Residential mobility resulting from marriage was usually caused by changes in family composition and housing needs. To find improved accommodation, the household will eventually have to relocate. However, this has not been easy for blacks who were constrained by various activities related to the Group Areas Act such as the influx control measures and discriminatory activities in the housing market. Other constraints on residential mobility were directly related to income and attachment to property by occupants. For some people it was too costly to purchase property in the suburbs, while others were so attached to their environment and properties that they preferred to renovate and improve their existing dwellings than to move. Table 4.14 clearly shows that the majority of residents in Westville had only moved once since their marriage (58.3 percent); 25 percent of the residents had moved twice; 10 percent had moved three times; 5 percent had moved four times; and 1.7 percent had moved five times. The average number of moves after marriage was two.
### TABLE 4.13: REASONS FOR LAST RESIDENTIAL MOVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of accommodation</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor educational facilities</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not safe in black townships</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far from work</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of entertainment facilities</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No financing in black townships</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job transfer</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steep driveway</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not like the house</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed extra rooms and swimming pool</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rent</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.14: NUMBER OF MOVES SINCE MARRIAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of moves</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( X = 2 \)

4.3.7 REASONS FOR MOVING INTO PRESENT LOCATION

More than one third of the respondents (36.6 percent) moved into Westville because the houses were more spacious and met their families' needs. Most of the houses had three bedrooms, out-buildings, and big yards. Westville was central for many people working in Pinetown-New Germany, Clermont, Queensburg, Kwa Mashu, Rossburg, Umbilo-Congella, and the Durban central business district. Twenty-five percent of the respondents moved in order to be closer to their jobs. About 18.3 percent of them were taking advantage of racial residential desegregation and 15 percent wanted to enjoy access to better facilities. Westville also had many good schools which were accepting students of all races. Therefore, some...
parents wanted to take advantage of the better education facilities for their children (1.7 percent). Others moved into Westville to live a peaceful life (1.7 percent), and also because the rates there were more affordable (1.7 percent).

### TABLE 4.15: REASONS FOR PRESENT LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of house meets family needs</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closer to jobs</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking advantage of desegregation</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to facilities</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful place</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable rates</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.8 LOCATION OF PRESENT DWELLING

The sample was drawn from thirteen suburbs in Westville. These suburbs were grouped to form nine wards (chapter 1). Most of the households were not located near or in the centre
of Westville. The reason for this was the high property prices. Table 4.16 indicates that about 21.7 percent of the respondents lived in Berea West; 15 percent lived in Westville North; 16.7 percent lived in Chiltern Hills; 1.7 percent lived in Dawncliffe; 11.7 percent in Oceanlea; 23.3 percent in Atholl Heights; 3.4 percent in Beverley Hills, and 6.7 percent in Central Westville (refer to Fig. 1.2). Table 4.17 and figure 1.2 indicate that only 5 percent of the households were located in the upmarket area of Westville and 53.3 percent were located closer to the central amenities. The remaining 41.7 percent of households were located in the suburbs closer to the periphery of Westville.

TABLE 4.16: NAME OF SUBURB IN WESTVILLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atholl Heights</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berea West</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern Hills</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville North</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanlea</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Westville</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley Hills</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawncliffe</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.17: LOCATION OF DWELLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upmarket area of Westville</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to central amenities</td>
<td>53,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the periphery closer to black townships</td>
<td>41,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.9 YEAR IN WHICH THE HOUSEHOLD MOVED INTO WESTVILLE

According to the statistics only 3.3 percent of the households moved into Westville during the years 1989 and 1990 (Table 4.18). Furthermore, only a few black surnames could be identified from the valuation roll dating prior to 1991 as blacks bought properties under the close corporation system. A significant increase occurred in 1991 after the repeal of the Group Areas Act with 55 percent households taking residence. Thirty five percent arrived in 1992, and 6.6 percent in 1993.
4.3.10 ROLE OF ESTATE AGENTS

It is evident from table 4.19 that the majority of the households in Westville (48.3 percent) were directed to their properties by the estate agents, while 10 percent saw the properties advertised in local newspapers; 8.3 percent were introduced to the area by friends; 31.7 percent were driving around looking for accommodation; and 1.7 percent were introduced by their employers. About two thirds of the household heads contacted the estate agents specifically with regard to the houses of their first choice. All those who contacted the estate agents were taken to the houses of their choice, and were not in any way directed away from them to other houses (steering).
Interviews were conducted with five estate agents in Westville, namely Wakefields, J.H. Issacs, Pam Goldings, Brink and Unique Estate Agents. Three of these firms have been selling property in Westville for a period of between 10 to 15 years, while the other two have been selling for 42 to 55 years. Almost all estate agents started selling property to blacks prior to the repeal of the Group Areas Act. This was, at first, done through the system of permits which were obtainable from the Department of Home Affairs. This system, according to the Westville Town Council, did not work for many of the prospective black buyers because it used a particular criterion which resulted in most applications by blacks being rejected. Seeing that the system of permits was not working for them, black buyers and white sellers formed Close Corporations.

With the Close Corporation, the estate agent sold to a company rather than directly to an individual buyer. The black buyer purchased property from the Corporation using the white partner’s name. White partners in such corporations owned about 50% of the shares. When selling to such Corporations, the estate agents had to check every detail of the sale with their attorneys before the deal was passed. Most of the estate agents started selling to blacks in late 1988. Records show that Indians were more determined to move into Westville at that time than other people of colour.

Responding to the issue of screening of buyers, all estate agents agreed that they screened their buyers before they could start selling to them. Screening was done to all prospective buyers irrespective of colour and this was based on the buyer’s occupation and income. Foreigners had to obtain a resident permit before property could be sold to them. All buyers were charged the same property prices.
TABLE 4.19: PURCHASING OF PRESENT DWELLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sold by estate agent</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertised in newspaper</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by a friend</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was driving around</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by employer</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.11 CHOICE OF RESIDENTIAL AREA

Taking cognisance of the high property prices near and in the centre of Westville, some households were constrained from buying houses in the areas of their first choice. About 76 percent of the households were happy about their location since it was their original choice. About 23 percent were not located in areas of their first choice. When asked which areas they preferred, given freedom of choice: 1.7 percent chose Kloof; 5 percent Durban North; 1.7 percent preferred to live closer to their businesses which were in town; 8.3 percent preferred Westville Central; 1.7 percent preferred Sherwood; 3.3 percent preferred Dawncliffe; 1.7 percent preferred Beverley Hills; and 76.7 percent were happy with their present location in Westville (Table 4.20).
### TABLE 4.20: PREFERRED RESIDENTIAL LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kloof</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durban North</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to my business</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville Central</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawncliffe</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy with present location in Westville</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.3.12 LENGTH OF STAY IN PRESENT DWELLING

The majority of respondents had not lived for a long time in Westville. The average period of stay for most of them was three years. According to Table 4.21, 46.7 percent were residents in the area for less than 2 years, while 51.7 percent were residents for 2 to 3 years, and only 1.7 percent for a period of 4 to 5 years.
### TABLE 4.21: LENGTH OF STAY IN WESTVILLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of stay</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2 years</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 years</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5 years</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.3.13 AGE OF PRESENT DWELLING IN YEARS

Almost all the houses in Westville were more than ten years old. About 61.7 percent of the houses were between 11 and 20 years old, whilst 18.3 percent were between 21 and 30 years old, and 5 percent were between 31 and 40 years old (Table 4.22). On average the dwellings were about 25 years old.
TABLE 4.22: AGE OF DWELLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10 years</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20 years</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 years</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40 years</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = 25 years

4.3.14 POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE DWELLING FEATURES

Table 4.23 shows that the most positive dwelling feature cited by almost all the heads of the households was that the buildings were spacious enough (96.6 percent). The negative dwelling features cited were that the buildings looked old (13.3 percent) and that the houses looked uniform to one another (53.3 percent).

4.3.15 TYPE OF ROOMS IN DWELLING AND OTHER FEATURES

In addition to the normal and standard room types, namely the kitchen, bedrooms, toilets, bathroom, lounge and diningroom, various other room types and other features such as a garage, servant’s quarters, and a swimming pool could be identified in most of the houses.
Only 5 percent of the houses had a garage; while 11.7 percent had a garage and servant’s quarters; 78.3 percent had a garage, servant’s quarters and a swimming pool; and 5 percent had a garage and swimming pool (Table 4.24).

**TABLE 4.23: QUALITY OF DWELLING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of dwelling</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacious enough</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks old</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform to others</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4.24: ADDITIONAL FEATURES IN DWELLING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage and Servant’s quarters</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage, Servant’s quarters, Swimming pool</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage and Swimming pool</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 SERVICES AND FACILITIES

4.4.1 STATE OF NEIGHBOURHOOD

The majority of respondents (73.3 percent) stated that their neighbourhood had not changed or improved since their arrival. This was related to the fact that the majority of the people had been living in the area for a relatively short period of time. The other 26.7 percent had identified some changes and improvements in the services and facilities provided.

4.4.2 TYPES OF SERVICES AND FACILITIES AVAILABLE

Table 4.25 below reflects that almost all the services and facilities (parks, recreation, schools, religious, and medical facilities) were available in most of the suburbs in Westville. All the people living in the area had access to all the facilities. The small percentage of respondents who claimed not to have all the facilities in their locality could use those which were closer to them.

4.4.3 CONDITIONS OF SERVICES PROVIDED

When given a chance to evaluate the services and facilities provided, the majority of the respondents (96.7 percent) rated their facilities between satisfactory and good. Only 3.3 percent of the respondents rated their facilities as being excellent (Fig. 4.6). These were probably facilities and services in the more upmarket areas which most of the black residents could not afford.
Fig. 4.6 Rating of Services
TABLE 4.25: AVAILABILITY OF SERVICES AND FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>86,7</td>
<td>13,3</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>45,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>86,7</td>
<td>13,3</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 RATES FOR MUNICIPAL SERVICES PER MONTH

Rates paid by the households varied between R100 - R160 and above per month. The majority of respondents (46.7 percent) paid between R120 and R139 per month. 35 percent paid between R100 and R119 per month, 11.7 percent paid R140 - R159, and 6.7 percent paid R160 and more per month (Table 4.26). The average monthly payment was R139.00. The majority of respondents (86.7 percent) were satisfied with what they were paying for the consumption of services. Only 13.3 percent felt that they were charged too much for the consumption of the services. This was because blacks paid very little as rates in their previous townships since very few services were provided.
TABLE 4.26: MONTHLY PAYMENT ON SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment (R)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R100 - R119</td>
<td>35,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R120 - R139</td>
<td>46,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R140 - R159</td>
<td>11,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R160+</td>
<td>6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = R139,00

4.4.5 USE OF FACILITIES

It is noticeable in Table 4.27 that the majority of the respondents preferred to use the facilities that were provided in Westville compared to the 26,3 percent who preferred to go to their previous places of residence for facilities. Some respondents did not change their doctors (21,6 percent), their hairdressers (83,3 percent), their sports teams (55 percent), and their churches (68,3 percent). It was not easy for them to leave their previous churches because they could not afford to miss all the activities they were involved in, such as singing in the choir and playing a leadership role. They were happy to use the modern facilities in Westville such as shopping centres, primary and secondary schools, creche’s, doctors, hospitals and cinemas.
### TABLE 4.27: FACILITY PREFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Previous Location</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville Shopping</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creche'</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haircut</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

4.5.1 THE NATURE OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

An indication of the level of social interaction between blacks and whites in Westville is revealed by the parties they had together, visits they paid one another and sports in which they engaged. However, only a small proportion of the respondents (8.3 percent) indicated that they had mixed parties often, while 41.7 percent seldom had parties, and the majority of 50 percent did not have mixed parties at all. Concerning visits, 18.3 percent of the respondents visited one another often, 73.3 percent seldom visited one another, and 8.3 percent never paid a visit. Greetings were the most common form of social interaction (76.7 percent). Ten percent of the respondents often played sports together, while 43.3 percent seldom played sports together. These statistics indicate that there was only limited social interaction among the blacks and whites of Westville. This was not surprising given the decades of apartheid separation and the associated social prejudices.
### Table 4.28: Social Interaction with Whites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Interaction</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5.2 Frequency of Visits by and to Relatives/Friends

When moving, people leave behind friends and relatives who will always be eager to know how they are coping with their new environment and neighbours. Those who move also want to be kept informed about developments in their old locations. A telephone call alone does not fully serve the purpose. In Westville the respondents were visited regularly by friends and relatives.
4.5.3 MEMBERSHIP IN NEIGHBOURHOOD/COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS

Since most of the black residents were new in Westville, they were unaware about local organisations in their new neighbourhood. They were more concerned about getting settled and being accepted by their neighbours. Ninety percent of the respondents said that they did not belong to any local organisation. Only 10 percent of the respondents said that they were members of some of the local organisations. The organisations that people belonged to varied from social and religious to political parties. This is reflected in Table 4.29 where 1.7 percent said that they belonged to church organisations, 5 percent belonged to the ANC and 3.3 percent belonged to Chiltern Park Social Club.

TABLE 4.29: NAME OF ORGANISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Organisation</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern Park Social Club</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Organisation</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.4 PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

Although blacks and whites in Westville were not interacting very well, no serious problems were experienced by the black residents. Although some of the whites displayed a negative attitude, the blacks had, nevertheless, very conciliatory attitudes towards them. When asked to explain the nature of problems they had come across, the respondents could not name even one.

4.5.5 RACE OF TWO NEAREST NEIGHBOURS

Reading from the statistics one will notice that there was positive racial mixing of and tolerance among all races in Westville. Table 4.30 reveals that about 56.7 percent blacks had white neighbours on both the sides; 36.7 percent had a white neighbour on one side and an Indian neighbour on the other; 3.3 percent had Indian neighbours on both sides; and 3.3 percent had an Indian neighbour on one side and a black neighbour on the other.
### TABLE 4.30: RACE OF TWO NEAREST NEIGHBOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White and White</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Indian</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian and Indian</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian and Black</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5.6 INITIAL RESPONSE OF NEIGHBOURS TO NEWCOMERS

According to the statistics, all black newcomers were welcome in Westville. The change of attitude on the part of the whites is revealed in Table 4.31 where not even one white neighbour acted in a racist or discriminatory manner towards the blacks. In fact, 86.7 percent of the white neighbours were friendly to newcomers, and 13.3 percent were very friendly. This positive attitude could be related to the fact that since February 1990 whites were forced to accept the reality that a democratic political transformation was inevitable in South Africa. Surveys conducted in Westville as early as 1989 showed that many whites were in favour of progressive moves away from discriminatory racial legislation (Tomaselli and Tomaselli, 1989).
TABLE 4.31: RESPONSE OF NEIGHBOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very friendly</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, 98 percent of the respondents stated that they would assist their white neighbours if there was need to do so. This indicated that although some whites were still in favour of segregation (Tomaselli and Tomaselli, 1989), blacks had a positive attitude towards their white neighbours. Furthermore, blacks did not only wish to help white neighbours with problems, but they also anticipated the same on the part of the whites, with 95 percent stating that their white neighbours would assist them if there was a problem.

4.5.7 PERCEPTIONS OF THE GROUP AREAS ACT

The passing of apartheid and its laws brought about a new life for most of the black people in South Africa. The Group Areas Act which acted as the cornerstone of apartheid has over the past years imposed restrictions on the natural expansion of residential areas. Its repeal early in 1991 was welcome by many citizens, especially blacks. This is clearly shown in Table 4.32 where all of the respondents said that they were happy that it was removed. Following its repeal, a number of once ‘whites only’ residential areas were opened to all racial groups. About 81.7 percent of the respondents said that there was absolute
desegregation in the areas in which they lived. Only 5 percent of them, as opposed to 95 percent, said that they had been threatened in one way or another by conservative people who were against desegregation. However, it could not be determined whether these conservatives were from the immediate neighbourhood or government officials. However, it was made clear that the town officials were in no way involved in such practices. About 93 percent of the respondents stated that they received the same treatment as whites from the Westville municipal officials.

**TABLE 4.32: ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE GROUP AREAS ACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you happy it was removed?</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the desegregation in Westville?</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been threatened?</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the treatment from town officials the same for all?</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.8 DESIRED FUTURE RESIDENTIAL LOCATION

When given freedom of choice to state whether they would prefer to move to another area within Westville or would rather stay where they were, only 23.3 percent of the respondents said they would prefer to move. The small proportion of respondents who desired to move were probably those who at first could not purchase houses of their choice because of financial constraints. The locational choices as indicated in Table 4.33 clearly show that the dissatisfied 23.3 percent of respondents were at first located in areas which were not desirable to most of the people. Areas like Beverley Hills, Central Westville and New Germany were the most sort after because they were easily accessible to all centres.

TABLE 4.33: DESIRED NEW LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No new locational choice</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley Hills</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Westville</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Germany</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.9 REASONS FOR CHOICE OF FUTURE LOCATION

Change is of vital importance in the movement of households from less desirable locations to more affluent and sought after residential areas. It should be remembered, especially with regard to blacks in South Africa, that change of tenure is not easy because of financial constraints. However, whenever they have managed to break through these constraints, blacks always wanted to move to relatively safer and more upmarket areas which are closer to amenities and services (Table 4.34). Although the majority of the residents were not eager to move from where they had located, they were nevertheless prepared to make some alterations and improvements on their houses in the future.

TABLE 4.34: REASONS FOR CHOICE OF FUTURE LOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatively safer</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closer to amenities/transport</td>
<td>6,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More upmarket area</td>
<td>11,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>76,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Plan</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move closer to Central Westville</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade to a more central area</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None so far</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live here until kids finish school</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire property in Dawncliffe area</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire property in La Lucia</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain here until retirement</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settle existing bond and buy another house</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend existing house</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build garage and swimming pool</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live where I am permanently</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve/Renovate my house</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get a bigger house</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay up the bond</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to Johannesburg</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring my business closer to where I live</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.10 FUTURE RESIDENTIAL PLANS

The respondents' future plans in Table 4.35 show that the majority did not intend to change their residences. They preferred to improve their houses by building extra rooms, garages and swimming pools. A very small percentage of them desired to move in the future.

4.6 CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

The analysis of data on racial residential desegregation in Westville revealed that most of the respondents in the sample were married males who were also family heads. Most of them were between the ages 30 and 39 years, and were highly educated with professional jobs, although there was a small percentage of business people. The survey also revealed that a significant proportion of the households had two income earners.

Most of the respondents in Westville previously lived in the townships around Durban. A significant proportion of them could not raise the deposit required for the purchase of houses and therefore depended greatly on housing subsidies and bond guarantees from their employers. When asked to comment about property prices, most of them felt that they were high and that very few blacks could qualify to buy housing in this suburb. Fortunately, those who had applied for financial assistance had their bond applications approved by most of the financial institutions. The statistics revealed that about 48.3 percent of the houses in Westville were purchased directly through the estate agents.
When questioned about the existence of any positive dwelling features, only one feature was cited by most of the respondents, and that was the spaciousness of the buildings. Most of the houses had extras such as garages, servants' quarters and swimming pools. The most noticeable negative dwelling features cited by a few of the respondents were that the buildings looked old and were almost uniform to others.

The type of services and facilities provided in their new neighbourhood were rated better than those provided in their previous locations by respondents. The rates paid for these services were also reasonable. Almost all the facilities were available and this reduced visiting their previous residential areas. They would visit the previous locations for services such as haircut and church.

Concerning social interactions between blacks and whites in Westville, it was clear that racial hatred among all residents was slowly being replaced by racial tolerance. This was supported by the parties, visits and sporting activities that blacks and whites participated in together. All the respondents were happy that the Group Areas Act was repealed. It made people feel free to mix at any place and time without the fear of contravening the act and going beyond the curfews. Blacks were willing to help whites if they had problems and believed that whites also felt the same way.
CHAPTER FIVE

EVALUATION AND SYNTHESIS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Residential segregation in South Africa was rationalised and consolidated by the passing and implementation of the Group Areas Act in 1950. The situation of racially segregated neighbourhoods in the country was alleviated by the changes to various acts since the mid 1980s which were aimed at desegregating a few white areas, especially the inner-city areas that had already become ‘grey’. The white suburbs were inaccessible to most blacks until 1991 when the Act was repealed. Against this background, this study was conducted to examine the process of residential desegregation in Westville, a traditional white suburb in Durban.

The purpose of this chapter is to evaluate the hypotheses presented, to provide a synthesis and to draw meaningful conclusions thereof. The hypotheses that were presented in this study were that:

(i) most blacks began to move into Westville during the period 1991 to 1992;

(ii) most of them bought their houses through the estate agents;

(iii) they previously lived in black townships surrounding Durban;
(iv) the main reason for their moving into Westville was the shortage of accommodation in the black townships;

(v) most of them are young professional people between ages 35 and 45 years;

(vi) they have a positive attitude towards their present residential environment;

(vii) most of the white neighbours have a positive attitude towards residential integration; and

(viii) blacks are happy that the Group Areas Act has been removed.

5.2 DWELLING DOMAIN

Housing is an essential component in the life of a human being. However, the type and quality of housing is determined by income. In South Africa, unemployment and income inequality, and the unjust distribution of land and resources have led to homelessness and a shortage of housing among blacks. A common result of the unequal distribution of income is unequal competition in the housing market and eventually residential segregation and the creation of ghettos or slums. The issue of unjust distribution is well summed up by Smith (1973:5) who stated that a "society is unjust if, by its actions, laws and mores, it unnecessarily impoverishes the lives of its members materially, aesthetically, or otherwise, by holding them at a level below that which some members at least might well attain by their own efforts".
5.2.1 HYPOTHESIS ONE : PERIOD OF ARRIVAL

Statistics revealed that the majority of respondents had not lived for a long time in Westville. About 51.7 percent of them had been living there for an average period of three years. This indicated that most of them arrived in this area during the early 90s. The occupation of white suburbs by blacks followed the year 1987 which marked the beginning of the use of the flexible approach by local government in granting of permits to members of other race groups who wished to reside in white areas (Urban Foundation, 1990). This flexible approach resulted from the incremental adjustments which were made by the government to the Group Areas Act and supporting legislation. The government started by opening the amenities, later amended the Group Areas Act (Free Settlement Areas), and finally formally repealing the Separate Amenities Act.

The hypothesis that "most blacks began to move into Westville during the period 1991 to 1992" is accepted.

5.2.2 HYPOTHESIS TWO : THE SEARCH PROCESS

When searching for a dwelling a household has to choose from a number of different information sources. The most used and informative people in these matters are the estate agents. As an intermediary between property buyers and sellers, they can determine the location of the urban population.

For the past decade or so, the estate agents have been criticised as being racist. They were
accused of sometimes having a deliberate bias by channelling households into, or away from, specific neighbourhoods. Harvey (1972) sums this up by pointing out that they sometimes also introduce black families to a white neighbourhood in order to force the prejudiced white residents out and therefore maximize profits on the sales for themselves, a method known as block-busting.

In response to these accusations, the estate agents interviewed in Westville in 1993 stated that they did canvas for business, but this was done with all the residents irrespective of colour. A number of white households who were seen to be moving from one area to another within Westville were doing so because they were upgrading or were elderly residents with grown up children selling because they were moving into flats.

Estate agents also pointed out that they were not allowed to act on racially based mandates of their white clients. A white seller who wished buyers to be restricted on the bases of colour would not be accommodated by any estate agent. Agents did take orders from the sellers but did not promote them if they were racially based. As estate agents were paid on commission, it would be very difficult for an agent to do business with a seller whose house would not sell because of racially based mandates.

Most of the residents in Westville bought their property through the estate agents. This was a sign of trust in the estate agents by the people, following assurance given by the President of the Institute of Estate Agents, Mr. Viv Morris that they would promote the free enterprise system, and the right of all people, irrespective of race, colour or creed, to own property without undue encroachment or intrusion by Government, groups or individuals. (Sunday
Estate agents have lately become more willing to help by advising prospective black buyers before they sell to them.

The data also indicated that even those residents who first saw their properties in newspapers or when they were driving around, later contacted the estate agents about those properties. The reason for this was to get some advice from the agents and to be taken to the houses to view them before purchasing. Taking the client around to all the properties within his price range (determined by the fact that the bond repayment should not exceed 25% of the buyer's income), put the agent in a position to ascertain what the buyer could afford. These reasons mentioned above make the hypothesis that "most of them bought their houses through the estate agents" acceptable.

5.2.3 HYPOTHESIS THREE: PREVIOUS RESIDENTIAL LOCATION

The South African housing policy has, in the past, created a lot of problems in that it favoured some population groups more than others. Throughout the apartheid era, even in the declining years of apartheid, this housing policy has continued to favour whites over blacks, and the rich over the poor (Parnell, 1992:53). There has always been a persistent oversupply of housing for whites relative to the gross shortage of housing for blacks.

The 1960s Group Areas Act removals led to the creation of large townships of mass-produced low quality houses, and lower servicing standards on the urban periphery (Corbett, 1992). Despite the widely publicized and accepted concept of assisted self-help which was expected to make an impact on housing problems, massive informal settlements developed, in and
around the cities in the early 1980s. These settlements were adjacent to the townships in which many blacks lived. The repeal of Influx control legislation also increased the number of informal settlements.

The township unrest of 1984-5 created a stir among the blacks in the townships and informal settlements. Those who had purchased government subsidised houses felt that their property and lives were unsafe in such living conditions. In 1987, which was the year of incremental changes in apartheid laws, many of the middle-class blacks in the townships bought and occupied houses and flats in the city and the 'white' suburbs. Similarly, non-white students at the white universities who could not commute long distances each day from overcrowded homes in the townships, infiltrated "white" suburbs (Mandy, 1984).

The data in the present study indicates that the majority of the respondents in Westville (65.2 percent) had previously lived in black townships around Durban. Studies of Harare, Windhoek and Mafikeng by Pickard-Cambridge (1988) also indicated that before moving into these cities, blacks owned and rented houses from the municipalities in the townships set aside for them. The hypothesis that "blacks in Westville previously lived in black townships surrounding Durban" is therefore accepted.

5.2.4 HYPOTHESIS FOUR: REASONS FOR MOVING

A wide range of homes available for whites in a free market situation and a shortage of affordable housing for both middle and low-income blacks was a country-wide phenomenon in South Africa. Shortage of accommodation in the black townships and rural areas was a
result of discrimination against blacks by the previous central and local governments, mortgage companies, building societies, banks, and both public and private developers.

Among the reasons given by the respondents for their last residential move, shortage of accommodation was the most important (33.3 percent). The other reasons revealed by the data were the volatile situations in the townships which made people feel unsafe, lack of finance for housing in black townships, absence of facilities and many deficiencies in the properties they were occupying.

Concerning the volatile conditions in the townships, it has been noted that the apartheid government had, through its divide and rule policy, created conflict among many blacks. The violence between the hostel dwellers and township residents caused many of the township residents to leave their homes and flee to the cities. The high levels of violence and instability gave the financial institutions a reason not to finance housing in the black townships which they labelled as 'high economic risk areas'.

It was evident in most of the cities that the first blacks to move into the white suburbs included civil servants, entrepreneurs and government officials. These were the people who lived in subsidy homes in black townships which were secluded from the strife-torn municipality township houses (Morris and Van der Horst, 1981). These were the people whose main reason for moving was violence in the townships. It is true that there was shortage of housing in black townships, but most blacks, being constrained by the apartheid laws, could not do a thing about it. It was only when violence broke out that blacks disregarded the apartheid laws and moved into white suburbs.
Statistical data obtained from this study have clearly indicated that among other reasons for moving, marriage as resulting in a change in the family composition forced the family members to look for bigger houses. This was an indication that although the shortage of accommodation among blacks was as old as apartheid itself, it was not the only reason for blacks to risk criminal conviction by 'invading' the white suburbs. The hypothesis that "the main reason for their moving into Westville was the shortage of accommodation in black townships" is acceptable.

5.3 SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN

The study of the residential structure of cities has reflected an emphasis by urban social geographers on social organisation and behaviour of urban residents. The concept of social space proposes a hierarchy of spaces within which groups live, move and interact (Herbert, 1972). The definition of social space can therefore be based upon socio-economic status and stage in the life-cycle. To understand the socio-economic position of the respondents in Westville, four major factors were taken into consideration, and these were age and sex, marital status, education and occupation.

5.3.1 HYPOTHESIS FIVE: AGE AND OCCUPATION OF RESIDENTS

Roy Ainslie, Regional Director of the Progressive Federal Party in the Natal Coastal Region, commented that most of the black people who lived in central Durban were "young, bright, articulate and professional" (Sunday Times, 3/7/88). This was true of the studies of flat dwellers conducted in most of South African cities (Beavon, 1982; Rule, 1988; Maharaj and
Mpungose (1994) which showed a majority of young and single inner-city residents. However, this study presented a rather different data concerning the age and marital status of the residents in Westville. The sample indicated that the respondents in this suburb were grown-ups between the ages 30 and 59 years, and 88.3 percent of whom were married. It is normal for families to move into the suburbs during the child bearing phase. It was also evident from the Westville survey that most of the respondents were highly educated professionals. Eighty five percent of them had tertiary qualification.

Affordability in housing purchase is determined by the monthly income of the buyer. Until now government subsidies and loans from financial institutions have assisted part of the middle to lower income blacks to purchase properties in the suburbs and the city centres. Most of the buyers who qualify for loans are those who have more than one income earner per family. This was very evident in Westville where about 78.3 percent of the households had two income earners, most of them being husbands and wives. Their collective income was more than R6 000 per month.

It was discovered, during the survey, that the property prices and bond repayments were high in most sections of Westville. This caused a lot of people to end up buying lower quality housing than they would have preferred. The building societies, as principal financiers of house purchase, made it extremely difficult for low-income blacks to qualify for mortgage financing. The mortgage allocation policy of building societies "tends to be biased in a way that they tend to avoid direct involvement with low-income households and households headed by manual workers" (Bassett and Short, 1980:281).
However, statistics obtained from the estate agents and newspapers revealed that before the repeal of the Group Areas Act there had been a fluctuation in the property prices. Between 1990 and 1991, property prices went up to above R206 000; and in 1992 they went up to above R270 000. In 1993 they ranged from R150 000 in low market areas to R449 000 in upmarket areas. The average price for property was R325 000. Mr Ronald Ennik, director of Pam Golding Properties, in 1991 encouraged people who wanted to buy homes to do so because he saw an abundance of good properties on the market. He further warned buyers delaying their purchases of a shrink in the range they were exposed to once the market picked up (Sunday Tribune, 15/09/91). In 1993 the house prices bottomed out because of the political situation in the country. This was noted by John Brink, chairman of the Natal branch of the South African Institute of Estate Agents, who said that the prices were expected to go up after the April elections in 1994 (Sunday Tribune, 31/10/1993).

There was also a decrease in the bond rates in mid-1991. In Westville the average monthly bond repayment was R2 750. The cut in the bond rate was a positive signal that attracted a lot of buyers. Many estate agents anticipated that the bond rate cut would have a positive long-term effect on the housing market. However, this cut did not have that long-term effect when late in 1993 financial institutions began restructuring their mortgage bond policies. The restructuring stemmed from the realisation of the substantial losses the banks incurred because of the drop in the house prices. In restructuring their mortgage bond policies, the financial institutions considered the geographic location of properties and the bond for which a potential buyer qualified.
In sum, it can be mentioned that the fear of the mortgage bond being a millstone around the neck had since the late 1980s been alleviated by the gradual cut in the bond rate, although it unfortunately did not last long. The system of housing subsidy made housing in the white suburbs affordable for many blacks. The Westville survey also indicated that all of the respondents who applied for mortgage bonds qualified in getting them.

The hypothesis that "most of the respondents are young professional people between ages 35 and 45 years" is accepted.

5.4 NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

Neighbourhoods can be defined as social areas that come into existence whenever groups of people come together and share a place. These social areas provide for the restoring of interlocking relationships between families and the communities, and they can be considered as ways of preserving human dignity, identity and well-being in the impersonal environment of the urban conglomeration (Litwak, 1978). A neighbourhood generally implies a smaller spatial scale than a residential area, therefore neighbourhoods are studied as small segments of large inhabited areas. The study of neighbourhoods as social areas does not only imply the study of physical neighbours but also common social interests.

5.4.1 HYPOTHESIS SIX: ATTITUDE TOWARDS NEIGHBOURHOOD

"All the places around us have changed since they were built and are changing right now" (Farbstein and Kantrowitz, 1978:166). This statement may well refer to both physical and
social change of the neighbourhoods. This change may be perceived differently by individuals in their own environments. A person may develop either positive or negative attitudes to his or her whole neighbourhood. In South Africa, various neighbourhood effects have been experienced as different races finally got a chance to mix. "A neighbourhood effect is the result of a person's attitudes and activities being influenced by his or her local social environment" (Coates et al. 1977:179). These attitudes, whether good or bad, will spread through the neighbourhood and the whole population will be infected at a rate which will be determined by the proportion of the population with those particular attitudes.

The survey of Westville showed rather positive perceptions of the neighbourhood by the respondents. Despite the 73.3 percent majority of the residents who perceived their neighbourhood not to have changed, most of them were positive that things would improve to the satisfaction of everyone after the April elections in 1994. It had been evident in many studies of South African cities that many neighbourhoods in the suburbs have not changed or improved since the start of the negotiations towards a democratic and non-racial South Africa (McCarthy, 1991; Corbett, 1992). The reason for this was that most of the white residents were uncertain about the future of the country if a black government were to come into power. They were not prepared to renovate or improve their properties until such time that they were assured of the security of their lives and property.

The availability and provision of services and amenities such as parks, recreation facilities, schools, religious facilities and even hospitals also contribute significantly towards positive neighbourhood effects. However, the availability and provision alone are of no value if these are not accessible to the communities. The overwhelming majority of households stated that
they were provided with, and had access to, almost all the public sector amenities. These amenities were also rated as good to excellent by the majority of the households. The average monthly payment for the municipal services was R139.00, which was, to most households, reasonable. This positive attitude by the households towards their neighbourhood was further revealed when the majority of the households said that they preferred to use the facilities that were provided in Westville than those provided in their previous places of residence. This was probably because Westville facilities were more modern and advanced than those in the townships.

The hypothesis that "respondents have a positive attitude towards their present residential environment" is accepted.

5.5 SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Social scientists consider the role of the social environment to have an influence on individual attitude and behaviour (Birenbaum and Sagarin, 1973; Molotch, 1974). They also argue that good race relations could be created if members of all races were residentially mixed and formed racially integrated social groups. However, members of urban residential groups do not necessarily have to belong to one culture in order to be called a social group (Northam, 1979).
5.5.1 HYPOTHESIS SEVEN: RESIDENTIAL INTEGRATION

It has been observed that when people of different cultures are in a process of being residentially integrated they will simultaneously go through a process of racial integration. This integration can be mainly demographic, that is where a given setting contains both blacks and whites in some specified proportions; or biracial, meaning that some non-antagonistic social interaction is occurring between blacks and whites to some specifiable extent (Molotch, 1974:204). In the study it was evident that most of the respondents in Westville preferred to use the same services and facilities provided for the whites. This meant that there was positive demographic and biracial social interaction among all the residents. In order to measure the respondents' interaction in their new residential areas, four indicators were used and these included parties they had together, visits they made to one another, greetings and participation in sports.

Although the proportion of respondents who had regular parties, visits and sports with their white neighbours in Westville was low (36.6 percent), the mere fact that there was some interaction indicated that most of the respondents had very reconciliatory attitudes to their neighbours. However, there was no transracial solidarity, defined as "conditions in which blacks and whites interact freely and without constraint, and in a manner such that race ceases to function as an important source of social change or as a criteria for friendship and primary group selection" (Molotch, 1974:204).

When approached with the question of whether they belonged to any community organisation, 90 percent of the respondents replied negatively. This was probably because many of them
were new in Westville. It was also noticeable that although their interaction with whites was not yet fully developed, no problems such as harassment were experienced. An overwhelming majority of them were warmly welcomed when they first arrived in their new neighbourhood. This made them extremely willing to give assistance to white neighbours with problems and they expected to receive the same from the whites if any problems arose.

The hypothesis that "most of the white neighbours have a positive attitude towards residential integration" is accepted.

5.5.2 HYPOTHESIS EIGHT : PERCEPTION OF THE GROUP AREAS ACT

Studies of attitudes toward residential integration (Tomaselli and Tomaselli, 1989; Bobo, Schuman and Steeh, 1986; Schuman and Bobo, 1988) revealed that there was a gradual change in racial attitudes among the people that were interviewed, especially whites in the inner-city. This change in white racial attitudes was an indication of their gradual acceptance of the right of blacks to choose to live in any residential neighbourhood. However, their willingness to participate in integrated living situations had a condition that blacks should not form a majority in a neighbourhood (Schuman and Bobo, 1988).

The repeal of the Group Areas Act in 1991 was part of the political transformation process which had been initiated by the then State President F.W. de Klerk in February 1990 (Maharaj, 1993). The abolition, however, was not wholeheartedly accepted by all the whites, especially those who lived in suburbs. They feared that there would be a massive influx of blacks into their areas which would result in a decline in norms and standards. A Residential
Environment Bill with residential norms and standards clauses was introduced by the government to 'protect the privileges of the whites' (Leader, 7/6/91). The very same happened in Namibia when many whites "resisted the repeal of segregation, fearing that property values would fall; that blacks would inundate their areas, lowering standards; and, most important, that blacks would insist on desegregated schools" (Pickard-Cambridge, 1988:27).

In Westville, the survey conducted by the Westville Residents' Support Group (WRSG) in 1989 yielded results that were extremely positive and which justified the WRSG's belief that the majority of people who lived in Westville shared the perception that the Group Areas Act was unnecessary and should go (Tomaselli and Tomaselli, 1989). The majority of whites were in favour of progressive moves away from discriminatory racial legislation. However, in 1992 whites in Westville showed signs of prejudice which partly emanated from the clash of cultures, such as blacks slaughtering cattle and Muslims sacrificing animals on religious occasions (Maharaj, 1993).

The hypothesis that blacks were all happy that the Group Areas Act has been removed is accepted.

5.5.3 RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY

Households are always seeking better areas in which to live. The decision to change residences is greatly influenced by various factors, such as income, social status of household, availability of better housing, services and facilities. However, studies in residential mobility have revealed that household moves decline with age and affordability (Prichard, 1976). The
majority of moves are made by younger families in response to changing accommodation needs. In Westville more than two thirds of the respondents were not prepared to move because they thought they were well located in areas which they could afford.

When given freedom of choice of residential location, only a few respondents were prepared to move. They wished to be located in more affluent areas which they said were relatively safer and closer to amenities and transport. Some of them claimed to have been located in areas which were not desirable to most people. The majority that was not eager to move wanted to make some improvements to their dwellings. This was supported by Morrill (1970:8) who stated that "psychologically, the individual’s investment in the area, in his home, and in his associations tends to make him immobile; he would rather modify existing locations than create entirely new settlements".

5.6 THEORETICAL REFLECTIONS

Although the ecological and neo-classical approaches were adopted by some South African urban analysts of the 1950s to discuss urban land use and distribution in the cities, each approach was later subjected to criticism because the processes that shaped the South African cities differed a lot from those in North American cities. Burgess’s (1925) model emphasised on the process of ‘invasion and succession’ as causing the city to expand outwards. In such a process, the city became the outcome of a struggle for survival between the powerful and weak social groups.
Some authors, for example Harvey (1975) and Logan (1978), regarded this struggle as 'God-given' in origin. In South Africa, however, this was not the case because even prior to the implementation of the Group Areas Act, blacks were limited in their attempts to acquire housing in the 'white' areas. Whites used municipal by-laws and a variety of housing market measures to stop blacks from 'invading' their areas (McCarthy and Smit, 1984). The implementation of the Group Areas Act of 1950 legalized the use of racist and manipulative apartheid practices by whites in shaping their neighbourhood.

According to Alonso's neo-classical approach, competitive bidding determined the pattern of land consumption. Households located according to preference. Low-income groups preferred to locate near the city centre and high-income residents preferred to locate on the periphery of the city. In South Africa poor blacks were relegated to the unserviced areas on the periphery of the city and the rich whites were located near the city centre. The intervention of the state in housing supply, and the unjust and racial practices by key professionals and power-holders in South African cities created segregated neighbourhoods. Desegregation was impossible because blacks were denied the economic power to compete with whites in the housing market.

In Westville, residential desegregation was achieved through market forces. The subsidy program for professional and government employees created a black middle-class that competed with whites in the housing market. Black households could bid for housing in areas of their choice. However, they had to consider the price of housing, accessibility to jobs and neighbourhood characteristics before choosing where to live. Low-income blacks who could not afford to move remained in the townships and ghettos.
The managerialist and locational conflict streams of the institutional approach both agreed that struggle and conflict emerged as a result of unequal distribution of access opportunities to facilities and urban housing among various social classes. Access to such facilities was controlled by wealthy and powerful groups through the manipulation of social and political institutions. This was evident in some South African cities where institutions like building societies and estate agents barred blacks from purchasing houses in the white suburbs by adopting the policies of redlining and block-busting (Pahl, 1970; Cox and Johnston, 1982; McCarthy and Smit, 1984). The Marxist argument, on the other hand, was that in a capitalist country the state represented the views and needs of the dominant economic class which owned the means of production, and legitimized its economic power over the low-income people.

The socio-political changes of the 1980s brought about a change in the attitudes of whites towards blacks (Tomaselli and Tomaselli, 1992). In Westville whites were willing to have blacks as their neighbours. No incidents of racial violence were reported. The majority of blacks were satisfied with the assistance they received from the estate agents. There was also no evidence of manipulation of estate agents and financial institutions by dominant economic groups.

5.7 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The provision of housing means providing shelter to families and it helps to develop stable communities. Homeless communities will always be on the move looking for accommodation to suite their needs. Income constraints led to the development of overcrowded low class
residential areas. Middle-income residents in such overcrowded areas will therefore move to seek better housing in the suburbs or the inner-city areas. This study has revealed that a massive shortfall in the provision of housing in the black townships resulted from the failure of the state to provide housing to needy and low-income blacks. This has led to highly educated and wealthy middle-class blacks deciding to move into integrated neighbourhoods.

In Westville blacks and whites, despite the pre-conceived fears of integration, were interacting fairly well. The majority of them agreed that change was inevitable. They were all happy that the Group Areas Act was removed, which gave them a chance to experience living together as different races. Almost all the blacks bought their properties through the estate agents. They were also happy with the properties they had bought and intended improving them in the future. This was an indication of change of a racially biased attitude on the side of the estate agents and developing of trust in the agents on the side of the black purchasers.
6.1 INTRODUCTION

The analysis of the process of residential desegregation provides important insights into the history and politics of the development of South African cities. An understanding of the racial practices of the white government in its planning policies explains the origins of racially segregated neighbourhoods. According to the earliest urban analysts, residential segregation was merely a product of class or status differentiation in society (Kuper et al., 1958). However, more recent extensive studies of South African cities, vividly reflected that the main cause of segregation was racism and racial practices (Western, 1981; Maharaj, 1992).

At first desegregation of neighbourhoods came about as a result of contravention by blacks of the government policies such as the Group Areas Act of 1950 and the Separate Amenities Act. However, with the socio-political changes which began in the mid-1980s, residential desegregation became a less sensitive and volatile issue. The scrapping of the restrictive apartheid laws in mid 1991 made desegregation a norm in many of the white suburbs. It must, however, be pointed out that with low incomes and the high rate of unemployment in the country, very few blacks could manage to purchase houses in white suburbs.

By the end of 1993 a number of black names could be found in the Borough of Westville Valuation Roll. The process of eroding segregated suburbs was initially hampered by the
white minority low-income groups and some right-wing government officials. Their fears that order and peace would be disturbed, the crime rate would escalate, and property prices and health standards would be lowered, were alleviated by the manner in which blacks conducted themselves once they were inside the suburbs.

The main conclusions of the study are discussed in this final chapter. General proposals which would facilitate residential desegregation in all suburbs are advanced.

6.2 CONCLUSION

The scrapping of the Group Areas Act in mid 1991 brought hope and joy to many South Africans, and fear and anxiety to minority conservative whites. Black South Africans, in particular, were rejoicing because they hoped that the repeal will bring freedom that they were denied for many decades by the apartheid regime. They will be free to choose any residential neighbourhood in which they wished to live. They will decide for themselves whether or not to integrate with other racial groups. The conservative whites in the previous ‘white’ residential areas felt threatened about the whole issue of integration. With the demise of the Group Areas Act, black entry into white suburbs became lawful, but much work needed to be done in these areas in bringing people of all races together on a social basis. There was therefore an urgent need to address feelings of mistrust, suspicion and fear among the racial groups in the country.

It was evident in previous studies conducted in South African cities that blacks were denied access to white areas by use of the discriminating policies of the previous government. the
mortgage companies, building societies, and public and private developers (Kuper et al., 1958, Davies, 1976; McCarthy and Smit, 1984). Despite these problems, this study revealed that relatively harmonious residential integration was possible in Westville. This was supported by previous studies of white attitudes towards integration in Westville (Tomaselli and Tomaselli, 1989), where many whites were in favour of progressive moves away from discriminatory racial legislation.

There was also clear evidence from the study that the decision to buy property in Westville was a result of various problems in the black townships. One of these problems was the shortage of accommodation. The previous state was responsible for this because of its failure to provide sufficient housing in the townships. However, very few people could afford to purchase properties in Westville because of the high selling prices. Only those people who received state housing subsidies could well afford to buy in this suburb.

The allegations that financial institutions still practised red lining and estate agents practised block-busting were not evident in Westville. All the respondents' applications for bond approval in Westville were approved by the financial institutions. The registered estate agents were faced with a great task of proving that they were not involved in the activities of block-busting and that they were doing their job according to the new code of conduct which was introduced on 1 April 1993. The majority of households in Westville who bought their properties through the estate agents proved that there were no acts of discrimination.

The process of residential desegregation in Westville was contrary to the speculations of some conservative government officials and policy-makers that crime rate and conflict would
escalate. A lot of tolerance and acceptance was displayed by households despite the fact that there was little social interaction. A survey of the white attitudes (Tomaselli and Tomaselli, 1989) proved that white households had no objection to having blacks as their neighbours. They shared all the services and facilities that were provided in Westville. Ray Swart, a retired Member of Parliament supported the idea of sharing when he said, "We all loved Westville, and the privileged white way of living, but realise that now the time has come to learn to share it" (Highway Mail, 16/11/1990).

Although there was no longer any restricting policy to black permanence in urban areas, the continuing shortage of housing and the dwindling material assistance to blacks in the townships continued. The Government of National Unity which came into power after the elections of April 1994, inherited a tremendous backlog in housing and related fields. It was faced with a problem of providing shelter to millions of homeless and jobless people. Only the high-income and self-employed blacks managed to acquire housing in Westville. The majority of unemployed and low-income blacks remained in the townships.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Generally, this study has focused on the adjustment of black families' housing requirements in a racially divided city that is undergoing change towards a non-racial democracy. Much emphasis has been placed on the desegregation process in Westville and the socio-economic and political factors that influenced the individual's decision to move to this suburb.
Seemingly, the process of integration has only been uni-directional, that is, the mobility has only been cityward and not countryward. The reason for this has simply been the oversupply of housing stock in the cities and undersupply in the black areas. The recommendations that are made in this chapter are therefore aimed at suggesting means of desegregating white suburbs by making them accessible to all people irrespective of colour, religion, and education. A number of general policies are suggested to improve the situation.

6.3.1 FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The limited access to finance has resulted in the division of black communities into various class categories. It has created a middle-class black population both in the townships and in the suburbs. The financial institutions have in the past been very selective in their granting of loans in such a way that the majority of the black people's applications have been turned down. Many of the black townships have been ruled off as risk areas whose residents could by no chance be financed for building purposes. This has resulted in the shortage of accommodation and the development of squatter camps in the townships, and lately, in the cities.

It is recommended that the financial institutions relax their rules and regulations and grant loans that can be afforded even by the low-income group. Loans should also be provided for people who want to improve their township dwellings. People will have bigger dwellings and this will possibly lead to a reduction in the rate of shack building. In order to encourage low-income groups to improve their dwellings the financial institutions should make special arrangements when it comes to determining interest rates and repayment periods.
6.3.2 IMPROVED STANDARDS OF LIVING

One of the fears of the whites about integrating with blacks in the suburbs was that the standards will be lowered. Even today some whites still consider black living standards low and unacceptable. The blame for such low standards should be put on the apartheid government which denied blacks access to decent jobs and education in the past. Whites were provided with, and had access to, first class jobs, education and amenities.

If the vast gap in the standards of living is closed, and the dreadful discrepancy in educational standards and provision of employment is bridged, the country would be a peaceful place in which to live. To close this gap people need to be educated about the diverse cultures in the country so that tolerance could prevail. Once tolerance is there, people should start sharing the amenities that are provided and at the same time involve blacks in the community projects aimed at improving and keeping the standards high.

On the part of the present government, it is recommended that all black townships should be upgraded to the standard of the white suburbs. First class amenities as in the white areas should be provided and blacks should be educated on how to use them properly.

6.3.3 PROPERTY PURCHASING

House purchasing is something that has recently been introduced to black communities. Blacks were either relegated to the rural areas far away from the cities or housed in the dormitory townships and hostels. When housing loans and subsidies were provided to
qualifying blacks, they could only build or buy in the townships through the developers.

The scrapping of the Group Areas Act opened chances for blacks to buy in the white suburbs. Their problems were how to go about purchasing a house and who to talk to when they wanted to buy property. The estate agents were the people who could give advice and assistance in the purchasing of property. Owing to the ignorance of the black buyers in these matters, they were in the past abused by some of the estate agents who took advantage of the situation (Sunday Tribune, 29/4/90). Even today, blacks are made to enter into agreements with sellers and financial institutions knowing little about the conditions of sale and terms of the loans. This sometimes leads to failure by the purchaser to repay the loan and repossession of the house.

To overcome this ignorance, prospective black home buyers in particular, need to be educated about home purchasing and what it entails before they get into an agreement with financial institutions. Workshops could be set up by the Estate Agents Board and conducted by managers of various estate agents. At these workshops people who are interested in buying properties should be enlightened about the code of conduct of the estate agents and what their work entails.

At the time of writing (September 1995) there were hopes of a housing boom in South Africa, following a landmark decision by the Government to grant subsidies to poorer households. This subsidy scheme which came into effect on June 5 1995 would only support first time homeowners who earned less than R3 500 a month and would grant them subsidies up to R15 000. In order to allow people to qualify for loans, the Government had brokered a deal
with banks whereby the banks would help buyers save some money towards the five per cent loan deposit (RDP News, July 1995). This scheme would help alleviate the housing shortage and promote home ownership among the blacks.

This study concludes with the following suggestions for future research on residential desegregation:

(i) Comparative case studies of desegregation and analysis of desegregation experiences in different localities should be conducted.

(ii) More comprehensive studies on social interaction patterns in desegregated neighbourhoods need to be done.

(iii) More information should be obtained with regard to the role of institutions, such as the estate agents and financial institutions, in the desegregation process.

Although the Group Areas Act has been scrapped its impact on segregated suburbs will still be evident for many decades. Class segregation has replaced race segregation in most South African cities. However, the majority of blacks are still at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder. Hence only a few blacks will be able to move into white suburbs. The desegregation of social space is a challenge for those involved in the process of reconstruction, development and planning.
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APPENDIX 1

UNIVERSITY OF DURBAN-WESTVILLE
GEOGRAPHY MASTERS RESEARCH
SURVEY ON RACIAL DESEGREGATION:
WESTVILLE - DURBAN

A: DATA ON PRESENT DWELLING:

1. What is the name of your section/township? ______________________

2. In which year did you move to Westville?

|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|

3. Is the location of your dwelling: (Mark with an "X"
   - In the centre of Westville?
   - Close to central amenities?
   - On the periphery near a Black area?

4. How were you introduced to this area/house?
   (Mark with an "X")
   - Sold to me by an estate agent
   - Advertised in a newspaper (Name?)
   - Introduced by a friend
   - Was driving around
   - Other (Specify)

5. Was this area your first choice? Y/N
   If no, which area did you prefer? ______________________

6. Did you phone/contact the estate agent specifically with regard to this house? Y/N

7. If yes, did he/she try to direct you to another area/suburb? Y/N

8. If yes, what were the possible reasons for this? __________________________________________

9. Quality of dwelling: (Mark with an "X")
   - Building spacious enough
   - Looks old
   - Uniform when compared to others
   - Dilapidated

Yes | No
10. Age of building in years: (Mark with an "X")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;10</th>
<th>11 - 20</th>
<th>21 - 30</th>
<th>31 - 40</th>
<th>41+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Do you have: (Mark with an "X")

- A garage?
- Servant’s quarters?
- A swimming pool?

B. RESIDENTIAL HISTORY

1. For how long have you occupied your present dwelling in years. (Mark with an "X")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;2</th>
<th>2 - 3</th>
<th>4 - 5</th>
<th>6+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Previous residential location and name?

Mark with an "X"  
Name

- In a township
- In a rural area
- In a squatter camp
- Other (State)

3. Physical structure of previous dwelling:

- Could only accommodate a small family
- Was too big and expensive to own
- Was too small with high costs

4. Was your previous residence:

- Owned
- Rented
- Other (Specify)
5. Period of stay in previous residence (in years):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 2</th>
<th>2 - 3</th>
<th>4 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 7</th>
<th>8+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Reason for last residential move: (Mark with an "X" but if more than one write numbers 1, 2, 3 in order of preference)

- Shortage of accommodation
- Poor educational facilities
- Not safe in the black townships
- Far from work
- Marriage
- Absence of entertainment facilities
- No financing for houses in black townships
- Other (Specify)

7. No. of residential moves since your marriage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How many times have you moved in the past 10 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Reasons for present location:

- Closer to jobs
- Size of house meets family needs
- Access to facilities
- Taking advantage of racial desegregation.
- Other (Specify)
C. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA: (Family head)

1. Sex: Male/Female

2. Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Level of education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Occupation: (Mark with an "X")

- Labourer
- Clerical
- Marketing
- Professional
- Technical
- Retired
- Other (Specify)

5. Marital status:

- Married
- Single
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Never Married

6. Number of years married:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;5</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Number of children:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Number of income earners in the family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Is your spouse also employed? Y/N ______

10. Total monthly income of head of household:

< R1000
R1000 - R1499
R1500 - R1999
R2000 - R2499
R2500 - R2999
R3000 - R3499
R3500 - R3999
R4000 +

11. Total monthly household income:

< R2500
R2500 - R2999
R3000 - R3499
R3500 - R3999
R4000 - R4499
R4500 - R4999
R5000 - R5499
R5500 - R5999
R6000 +

12. Place of employment:

Durban - Central Point
Pinetown - New Germany
Jacobs - Mobeni
Congella - Dalbridge
Other (Specify)
13. Mode of transport used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Property Prices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Range</th>
<th>Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; R 150 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 150 000 - R 199 999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 200 000 - R 249 999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 250 000 - R 299 999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 300 000 - R 349 999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 350 000 - R 399 999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 400 000 - R 449 999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 450 000 - R 499 999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 500 000 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Compared to your previous location, are home prices in this area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Monthly bond repayments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repayment Range</th>
<th>Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; R 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1000 - R 1499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1500 - R 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2000 - R 2499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2500 - R 2999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 3000 - R 3499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 3500 - R 3999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 4000 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Do you receive a housing subsidy? Y / N

18. Does your employer contribute towards your housing costs? Y / N
19. Did any financial institution refuse to approve your bond? Y / N 

20. If yes, Name the institution ________________________

21. Reason(s) for refusal: ________________________________
   _____________________________________________
   _____________________________________________

22. Name of present mortgager (bank or building society):
   _____________________________________________

D. ATTITUDES TOWARDS ENVIRONMENT:

1. Since you moved in, has your neighbourhood:
   Improved? [ ]
   Remained the same? [ ]
   Deteriorated? [ ]

2. Are the following facilities available in your neighbourhood?

   Parks [ ] Yes [ ] No
   Recreation facilities [ ] Yes [ ] No
   Schools [ ] Yes [ ] No
   Religious facilities [ ] Yes [ ] No
   Medical facilities [ ] Yes [ ] No

3. Are services that are provided:
   Poor [ ]
   Satisfactory [ ]
   Good [ ]
   Excellent [ ]
4. Rates for municipal services per month:

R100 - R119
R129 - R139
R140 - R150
R160+

5. Is the amount you pay towards services:

Too much?
Little?
Reasonable?

6. If you want to use the following facilities, would you go to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Westville</th>
<th>Previous Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creche'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haircut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Social interaction with whites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do your relatives and friends from the township/previous location visit you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Do you visit your friends/relatives in the township/previous location?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Regarding the Group Areas Act:

- Are you happy that it was removed? Yes No
- Is there absolute desegregation in Westville? __________
- Have you ever been threatened in any way? __________
- Is the treatment from town officials the same for all residents? __________

11. Do you belong to any local organisation (religious, social, political) in this area? Y/N ______

12. What is the name of the organisation? __________

13. Have you experienced any problems such as harassment in your neighbourhood? Y/N ______

14. If your answer is Yes, explain:

______________________________

15. What is the race of your nearest two neighbours?

1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________

16. What was the initial response of your neighbours towards you and your family?

Racist/ Discriminative _______

Unfriendly _______

Friendly _______

Very friendly _______
17. If your white neighbour had a problem would you assist?  

Y/N ____

18. If you had a problem, do you think your white neighbour would assist.  

Y/N ____

19. Have any of your Black friends/relatives purchased houses in this area?  

Y/N ____

20. Did you influence them in any way to do so?  

Y/N ____

21. Did they influence you in any way to do so?  

Y/N ____

22. If you were given a choice, would you prefer to move to another area within Westville or you would rather live where you are?  

Y/N ____

23. If yes, to which township and why?  

______________________________________________________________

24. What are your future residential plans?  

______________________________________________________________
Dear Resident

MASTER'S RESEARCH PROJECT

I. JABULANI EVEREST MPUNGOSE (Reg. Number 9263127), am a bona fide student in the Department of Geography at the University of Durban-Westville. I am currently engaged in researching Racial Desegregation in the Durban Area with an emphasis on Westville for the Master's degree in geography.

As part of my research, I will be conducting interviews in the Westville area. I will be grateful if you would kindly grant me an interview at a time convenient to you but preferably between the 19.07.93 and 26.07.93.

My supervisor is Dr B Maharaj and he may be contacted at Tel:8202319 (W)/421887 (H) for any verification which you might require.

You assistance in this matter will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully

J.E. MPUNGOSE (MR)
(Tel: 704 6914)

Dr B Maharaj
SUPERVISOR