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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Although urbanisation has potentially positive aspects with urban areas often viewed as necessary locomotives for development it is generally acknowledged that African towns and cities are characterised by a common set of problems related to poor housing and infrastructure facilities, a lack of formal employment opportunities, rapid degradation of urban environmental conditions, a growing incapacity of administrative structures to manage urban centres and an apparent ungovernability and insecurity of life (Swilling in: Tvedten and Moputola, 1995).

With strict control over informal settlement these problems were only experienced to a limited extent in the past. However, following the Independence of Namibia and the resultant freedom of movement and freedom of settlement, these problems increasingly manifested itself in Windhoek over the past five years.

The town planning department of the Municipality of Windhoek is responsible for the forward planning of the City. Realising the complexity of the task and the need for adequate and recent data to be able to guide the process of urbanisation, a resident census survey is performed every ten years. The 1995 survey was conducted with the objective of gaining information on the patterns and trends of urbanisation in Windhoek which will assist planners to more efficiently plan and manage the city. To afford improved understanding of the in-migration/informal settler situation a second survey was done concentrating only on the informal areas and being more qualitative in nature.

The main survey was a sample survey of 20% of all households in Windhoek and 30% of all households in the informal areas. The findings of this survey is presented in volume one of this report.

The second survey was a small additional survey of selected households already surveyed in the informal areas. Where the main survey dealt with census type basic demographic data, the second survey was designed to obtain a better understanding of migration, the migration process, motivation for migration, expectations of life in the city, the extent to which these have been met, reception systems and the general conditions and problems experienced by the informal settlers.

1.2. METHODOLOGY

Following the completion of the fieldwork for the main survey a sample of 160 informal settler units were drawn randomly from the completed questionnaires in the informal areas. The sample was drawn on a stratified basis in order to include all the informal areas in the sample.
Enumerators were assigned to the same areas where they worked in the main survey and were required to re-visit the households which were selected for the second survey. Four of the selected households could not be found again. They were resettled to another area during the time between the main and the second survey.

The interview schedule used for the second survey is attached to this report as annexure 1. It was designed to obtain more detailed and qualitative information regarding the informal settler situation and migration patterns to Windhoek. It consisted of twenty five questions and covered the following variables:

- The reasons for leaving the previous place of residence.
- The reasons for choosing Windhoek as a place to live.
- Expectations of what “good things” will be found in Windhoek.
- The extent to which these expectations have been met.
- Duration of stay at first stopover.
- Number of internal moves in Windhoek during the past 10 years.
- Previous places of residence during the past 10 years.
- Reasons for deciding to leave previous place of residence and move to the informal settlement/reception areas.
- Reasons for choosing current area of residence.
- Residual contact with place of origin.
- Locus of control/responsibility for own situation.
- Indication of the main problems faced by the community.
- Prioritising of problems.
- Preferred options of erven with various sizes and levels of service.

Questions were open ended to afford respondents the ability to state their own reasons and phrase responses in their own words. Completed questionnaires were coded by the project leader personally to ensure correct interpretation and classification of open ended responses. The data was entered together with the applicable data for the household as obtained in the main survey to form a single data base.

1.3 BACKGROUND FINDINGS FROM THE MAIN SURVEY

To put the findings of the second survey into perspective and afford easy reference, the following is a summary of the results of the main survey for the north western areas which comprise all the informal settlements to the north and north west of Windhoek.
1.3.1. Population size and growth

The 1995 population of all the informal areas combined is 28,000 representing 15.4% of the total population of Windhoek. The informal settler phenomenon has increased significantly since it began in 1990. Strict control over informal settlement before independence prevented this form of settlement quite efficiently causing families to double up in existing formal areas in the north of Windhoek. Relaxation of control opened up the possibility for many existing inhabitants to claim unused and open land to erect their own informal housing. New migrants responded by also moving to these areas.

1.3.2. Employment, Income and Affordability

Residents of these areas are characterised by low levels of household income with the majority earning between N$400 and N$600 per month. The average monthly household expenditure for these areas is N$427 per month. The Primary Household Subsistence Level for 1995 is N$860 which indicates that the majority of these households live below the level which is necessary to satisfy their basic human needs.

33.35% of the informal settler population are unemployed while 55.81% indicated that they are employed or worked in the informal sector. Of the employed population, the majority are employed as unqualified workers with a significant proportion being self employed in the informal sector. Levels of education are generally low in these areas with 81.76% of the population aged 15 years and older having a highest level of education of grade 10 and less while 12.62% of this group have never attended school.

Consequently, the levels of affordability of the informal settler population is very low, with 92.5% of the population not being able to afford a housing solution costing more than N$46 per month.

1.3.3. Demographic Characteristics

57.8% of the informal settler population are males while only 42.2% are females against a city wide average of 52% males and 47.8% females. The average age of the informal settlers is 23.78 years with an extremely abnormal age distribution. The vast majority (72.12%) of informal settlers are aged between 20 and 44 years of age with few older people and children aged 5-14 years. Children aged younger than 4 years, on the other hand are proportionally more than the average (Figure 2.7, Volume 1).

The average household size in these settlements is a low 3.715 persons against a city average of 4.069 while an unexpectedly high proportion of households (81.5%) are male headed and 18.5% female
headed. The average figures for the city as a whole is 74.4% male headed and 25.6% female headed households.

31% of all household members are other relatives with 27% heads, 22.5% children and 14% spouses. Most of the other relatives are aged between 20 and 34 years of age indicating the existing households as a reception system for new, mainly single, urban migrants who will in all probability set up their own households after a while.

1.3.4. Migration

The main sources of migrants over the past 10 years were the Omusati, Oshona, Ohangwena and Oshikoto regions. 31.89% of all migrants settled in the informal areas. 85% of all inhabitants of the informal areas came from the Omusati, Ohangwena and Oshikoto regions.

With most of these inhabitants coming from the northern regions of Namibia and settling in the informal areas, it is to be expected that the majority of future migrants will exhibit a socio-economic profile similar to that found in the north western areas. They have lower than average levels of education, high levels of unemployment, are younger than the average inhabitant of Windhoek, have high rates of illiteracy and are characterised by a high proportion of pre-school aged children.

Their incomes are low and they can afford to pay very little towards meeting their housing needs. This will further reinforce current informal settlement patterns.
SECTION 2: MOTIVATION FOR AND EXPECTATIONS OF MIGRATION

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Given the nature and current pattern of in-migration to Windhoek, it has been argued that the local authority must harness the positive effects of informal settlement and the reservoir of initiative found in the informal areas to design a "process oriented approach" rather than a "product oriented" approach towards the planning, development and management of the informal areas.

Such a "process oriented approach" should be based on active and effective participation of the informal settlers in all planning and management decisions for these areas. Joint decision making will improve the quality of solutions and increase the levels of acceptance of services provided by the local authority. However, it would be naive to expect such a process to be a success if too little or inadequate financial and human resources are allocated to such programmes.

Experience with community development projects all over the world has shown that the abilities and commitment of project leaders and project staff are critical to the success of such projects. It requires well trained and extremely dedicated staff, an excellent knowledge and understanding of the target group, the ability to operate and take decisions independently within set limits and full support from the authority under which is resorts.

This volume of the report is designed to provide a better understanding of the more qualitative characteristics of the informal settler population and the in-migration process. It will not provide the necessary data on which to base the contents of a "process oriented approach" nor was it designed for that purpose. Such data and knowledge only come with directly working and consulting with the beneficiary population.

This section deals with the sources of migration, reasons for migrating to the city, and the expectations migrants had when they moved to the city.

Section 3 deals with migratory patterns and characteristics including the reception systems, subsequent movements within the city, motivation for becoming informal settlers and prospects for out-migration.

Section 4 deals with rural-urban links including visits to the area of origin, core family members in the area of origin and monetary transfers between the rural and urban areas.
Section 5 deals with the problems, opportunities and preferences of the informal settlers including the main problems and priorities identified by the respondents, choices of settlement area and land options and locus of control which refers to the perception of the community on their own responsibilities regarding their settlement needs.

Section 6 contains a summary of the results and the planning implications of the results contained in this report.

2.2. SOURCES OF MIGRATION AND AREAS OF SETTLEMENT

When considering the sources of migration to Windhoek it is not limited to the informal areas only. Migrants settle in all areas of Windhoek and it is important to see it as such. Figure 2.1 provides a picture of the regional sources of migration to Windhoek over the past 10 years.

As can be seen from figure 2.1, 52,1% of all migrants came from the Omusati, Oshona, Ohangwena and Oshikoto regions. 7% migrated from the Hardap region, 5,5% from the Erongo regions, 8,9% from the Otjozondjupa and Omaheke regions and 4,8% from the Okavango and Caprivi regions. 11,8% of migrants came from outside the borders of Namibia.

Figure 2.2 provides data on the sources from where migrants who settled in each of the five areas came. Of the migrants who settled in the north western areas, 85,22% migrated from the regions of Omusati, Oshona, Ohangwena and Oshikoto (source 1). Only 10,56% migrated from Kunene, Okavango, Caprivi, Otjozondjupa, Omaheke and Erongo (source 2) while 2,68% came from the Khomas, Hardap and Karas regions (source 3) and 1,25% from outside the borders of Namibia (source 4).

Of the migrants who settled in the northern areas 60,42% came from the regions marked 1, 26,01% from the regions marked 2, 11,43% from the regions marked 3 and 2,12% from outside the borders of Namibia.

The majority of migrants who now live in the central areas came from the Khomas, Hardap and Karas regions (54,16%) while the majority of migrants who now live in the eastern and southern areas came from outside the borders of Namibia (49,12% and 41,05% respectively).

From this data it becomes clear that the major source of migrants is the four regions of Omusati, Oshona, Ohangwena and Oshikoto and that these migrants mainly settle in Katutura and the informal areas. These migrants do not, however, always settle directly into the areas where they now live. There are considerable internal movement of in-migrants within the city before they settle in the current area of residence.
FIGURE 12: 1996 WINDHOEK HOUSEHOLD CENSUS: SOURCES OF MIGRATION TO 5 AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH WESTERN AREAS</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN AREAS</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL AREAS</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN AREAS</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN AREAS</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Map showing migration sources to different areas]
Table 2.1 provides the total picture of residential movements to each of the five areas during the past 10 years.

### Table 2.1 Residential movements in Windhoek for five areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Current Residence</th>
<th>Eastern Areas</th>
<th>Southern Areas</th>
<th>Central Areas</th>
<th>Northern Areas</th>
<th>North Western Areas</th>
<th>Total no. of Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Areas</td>
<td>61.09%</td>
<td>15.21%</td>
<td>13.91%</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Areas</td>
<td>38.03%</td>
<td>25.37%</td>
<td>21.49%</td>
<td>11.84%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>7560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Areas</td>
<td>14.50%</td>
<td>5.46%</td>
<td>58.61%</td>
<td>23.36%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>19245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Areas</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>59.37%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>26665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Western Areas</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>94.44%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>18283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few interesting trends is highlighted by the data in Table 2.1. Regarding resettlement to the north western areas from within Windhoek, 94.44% of the current residents of the north western areas came from the northern area which consists of Katutura and its extensions, Wanaheda and its extensions, Hakahana and Okuryangava and its formally developed extensions. This suggest that the northern areas served as a reception reservoir for migrants from outside Windhoek. These migrants, following the relaxation of strict control measures by the local authority, set up their own shelters in the informal areas.

The northern areas are characterised by relative stability with 89.37% of residential movement being internal movement. There is very little residential movement from the other areas into the northern areas. However, there has been significant residential movement from the northern areas to the more affluent central (23.36%), southern (11.84%) and eastern areas (9.84%). (Percentages reflect the percentage of gain by each of these areas attributable to movement form the northern areas).

Movements in the central area were mainly internal with 23.36% of movement from the other areas coming from the northern areas, 14.5% from the eastern areas and 5.46% from the southern areas.

In the southern areas, 38.03% of people who moved internally during the past 10 years came from the eastern areas, 21.49% from the southern areas and 11.84% form the northern areas.

The main sources of internal migration to the eastern areas were the southern areas (15.21%), the central areas (13.91%) and the northern areas 9.84%.

To further elucidate these movement patterns, table 2.2 provides data on the proportions of the population in each of the five areas who (1) live in
Windhoek for more than 10 years, (2) live in Windhoek for less than 10 years and (3) who have moved internally during the past 10 years.

Table 2.2 Duration of Stay and Internal Residential Movement by Five Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Percentage of area population in Windhoek for 10 &gt; years</th>
<th>Percentage of area population in Windhoek for 10 &lt; years</th>
<th>Percentage of area population who moved internally at least once during past 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>60.24%</td>
<td>39.26%</td>
<td>58.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>64.34%</td>
<td>35.66%</td>
<td>60.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>64.04%</td>
<td>35.95%</td>
<td>66.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>68.91%</td>
<td>31.05%</td>
<td>33.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>42.03%</td>
<td>57.97%</td>
<td>71.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in this table further reinforces two patterns. One is the extremely low rate of internal migration among the current population of the northern areas. Against an average of about 61% in the eastern, central and southern areas, only 33.2% of the current population in the northern areas has moved internally at least once during the past ten years.

The second is the high percentage of north western area residents who moved internally at least once during the past 10 years. This also suggest that many migrants move to the northern areas first to live with family or friends and then later establish their own households, mainly in the north western informal areas.

To put this into perspective, it is important to realise that 35.58% of all immigrants to Windhoek (during past 10 years) now live in the northern areas, 31.89% live in the north western areas, 14.89% live in the central areas, 6.37% settled in the southern areas and 11.26% settled in the eastern areas.

The trends in the northern and north western areas therefore, have a much larger impact on the structure of the city than those in the three other areas.

To summarise the findings on migration to Windhoek the following can be stated:

- In-migration to Windhoek accounts for a 3.92% per annum increase in the population of Windhoek.
- This means that an average of 595 people moved to the city every month since 1991.
- 52.1% of all migrants come from the Omusati, Oshona, Ohangwena and Oshikoto regions. 19.9% came from all the other western, eastern and other northern regions while 16.2% of all migrants came from the Khomas, Hardap and Karas regions. 11.8% of the in-migrants came from outside the borders of Namibia.
• Migrants from the regions of the former Owamboland mainly settled in the northern and north western areas. Migrants from the other northern, eastern and western regions have a varied settlement pattern but with a main thrust towards the northern areas. Migrants from the Khomas, Hardap and Karas regions mainly settled in the central and northern areas while migrants from outside the borders of Namibia mainly settled in the eastern, southern and central areas.

• There is considerable internal residential movement in Windhoek, the main characteristics of which is an outflow from the northern areas to both the informal areas and the more affluent areas. Seen together with a high in-migration rate and a current population who did not have much internal movement it is clear that the northern areas serve as a major reception area for in-migrants to find their feet before they move on to settle somewhere on their own. This will be explored further in section 3 of this report.

To provide a more qualitative understanding of the migration phenomenon sections 2.3 and 2.4 contains the findings of the second survey on the reasons why residents of the informal areas decided to move to Windhoek and what they expected to find in Windhoek.

2.3. REASONS FOR MIGRATING TO WINDHOEK

Respondents were asked to indicate the reasons why they decided to move to Windhoek. The question was open ended and allowed respondents to give their own reasons. Figure 2.3 provides a graphical summary of their responses.
Figure 2.3 shows unemployment in the area of origin to be the most important reason for moving away from those areas. Almost 63% of respondents cited unemployment as a reason for migrating away from those areas. Combined with "bad life in the regions", "poverty", and "bad housing conditions", it seems that a general perception of "low quality life" in the regions cause many people to look for alternative areas to settle where they perceive the chances to improve on the quality of life is better than in their areas of origin. It is also important to note that "economic" reasons (unemployment, poverty, bad life, and bad housing conditions) dominate the push factors away from the regions.

Asked for the reasons for choosing Windhoek as their new place of residence, responses as summarised in figure 2.4 were received.

**Figure 2.4: Reasons for Choosing Windhoek as New Place of Residence**

42,55% of respondents chose Windhoek because they perceive it to offer more employment opportunities while 15,25% felt that Windhoek is the capital city and offers more opportunities. 14,18% indicated that they chose Windhoek because family and friends were already living there. 10,28% chose Windhoek for the availability of better housing/accommodation, 7,8% because they are looking for a better life and 6,03% because they perceive Windhoek to be a nice place.

The responses summarised in figures 2.3 and 2.4 supports the notion that urbanisation is mainly motivated by employment considerations and the perceived "better" quality of life which can be found in the urban areas.
2.4. EXPECTATIONS OF NEW PLACE OF RESIDENCE

Respondents were requested to indicate what they expected to find in Windhoek when they decided to move there. Responses as reflected in figure 2.5 conform to a large extent to the responses reflected in figures 2.3 and 2.4.

![Chart](image)

43.18% of respondents expected to find employment, 26.95% expected better housing/accommodation, 14.6% expected “the good life” while 7.79% expected better opportunities for education. 7.46% cited an array of other expectations.
Figure 2.6 provides an indication of the extent to which these expectations were met.

**FIGURE 2.6: EXTENT TO WHICH EXPECTATIONS WERE MET**

Only 15.4% of respondents indicated that they found all of the good things they expected in Windhoek. 71.2% indicated that they only found some of the good things they expected while 13.5% indicated that they found none of the good things they expected.

It is significant to note that only one of those who indicated that they found none of the good things they expected also indicated that he will return to his area of origin within the next two years, while only 4.5% of all respondents felt that they may move back to their area of origin within the next two years.

This serves as an indication that, even though the quality of life in the city is not as good as expected, people are unlikely to migrate back to their areas of origin on a significant scale.
3.1. RECEPTION SYSTEMS

In order to improve understanding of the migration process it is useful to know how new urban migrants go about gaining a foothold in the urban areas. When they first arrive, where do they stay and how do they establish themselves in the urban areas?

Respondents were asked to indicate where they first stayed when they moved to Windhoek, for how long they stayed there and how many times they moved internally since they first came to Windhoek.

Figure 3.1 provides a summary of the responses on the first place of residence in Windhoek.

50.32% of respondents indicated that they stayed with family who already lived in Windhoek while 19.35% moved in with people they know and 16.77% with friends. Only 9.03% of respondents lived on their own while 4.52% were accommodated at their place of work. 86.44% of respondents therefore were received and accommodated by family, friends or people they know in Windhoek.
The northern area consisting of Katutura and its extensions, Wanaheda and its extensions, Hakahana and Okuryangava and its formally developed extensions served as a reception reservoir for migrants from outside Windhoek. As the existing informal areas grow, one can expect that this reception function will also increase in the existing informal areas and that more migrants will settle directly in the informal areas.

Duration of stay at the first place of residence is fairly long with an average duration of stay of 5 years, a median duration of 3 years and a mode of 2 years.

Regarding the subsequent residential movement, 9.6% of respondents did not move yet while 47.43% moved once since arriving in Windhoek (or during the past 10 years). 30.77% of respondents indicated that they moved twice while 8.97% moved three times. Only 3.2% move more than three times since arriving in Windhoek.

The findings depict a situation where new urban migrants move in with family and friends where they stay for a fairly long period of time. Once they move away, a place of residence is difficult to obtain with 52.57% moving more than once before they settled in the informal areas.

3.2. MOTIVATION FOR RELOCATING TO THE SQUATTER AREAS

Against the above background, figure 3.2 provides a summary of the reasons cited by respondents for moving to the informal areas.

FIGURE 3.2: MOTIVATION FOR MOVING AWAY FROM PREVIOUS RESIDENCE

"Why did you decide to leave the place where you lived before moving to this house?"
41.72% of respondents moved to the informal areas because they wished to be independent, while 25.17% moved because there were too many people living at the previous place of residence. 12.58% of respondents were relocated while 11.92% felt that the rent was too high. 8.61% moved because they had problems with their landlord or were chased away.

The results point to a situation of overcrowding in the formal areas with many informal settlers being motivated by the need to get away from these conditions. Many had problems with the people they stayed with and decided to rather move to the informal areas. Although the mere existence of the informal areas indicate a housing crises, these trends further reinforce the severity of the housing problem. However, it must be noted that informal settlement is a response of these people towards solving their own housing problems.

Asked about the reasons for choosing the informal areas as a place of residence, the following responses were received.

**FIGURE 3.3. REASONS FOR MOVING TO THE SQUATTER AREAS**

- **CHEAP, 3.2%**
- **FAMILY/FRIENDS THERE, 11.5%**
- **NEAR WORK, 5.1%**
- **RESETTLED, 12.2%**
- **NOT APPLICABLE, 3.2%**
- **SPACE AVAILABLE, 40.4%**

40.4% of respondents chose the informal areas because of the availability of space while 24.4% regarded it as the best available place. 12.2% of respondents were resettled there while 11.5% indicated that they chose the informal areas because family and friends were already living there. 5.1% chose the informal areas because it is close to their place of work while only 3.2% indicated that they took the decision because it was cheap to live there.
Relocating to the informal areas in Windhoek only became possible when
the strict control over informal settlement in Windhoek was relaxed after
independence. This opened the option to many people of settling on their
own rather than remaining in the overcrowded formal areas. Being the best
place available and the availability of space motivated 64.8% of informal
residents to relocate to these areas.

This trend is likely to continue in future but it can also be expected that new
in-migrants will take the places of those moving to the informal areas.

3.3. OUT MIGRATION

Given the high levels of influx and the high levels of unemployment in the
informal areas one would expect some out-migration from in-migrants who are
disillusioned by the actual quality of life in the city. However, this seems to
happen to a very limited extent. Asked whether they think that they will move
back permanently to their areas of origin 57.4% of respondents said no, while
42.6% replied in the affirmative. Asked when they think they will return they
responded as follows:

FIGURE 3.4: TIME WITHIN WHICH PEOPLE WHO THINK THEY MAY MOVE BACK WILL DO SO

- On retirement, 63.6%
- Within 2 years, 10.6%
- Loss of employment, 7.8%
- Within 4 years, 3.0%
- Within 6 years, 4.5%
- Within 10 years, 1.5%
- More than 10 years, 3.0%
- Don't know, 6.1%

Of the 42.6% of respondents who said they will return, 63.6% will only return
when they retire. 7.6% mean that they will return if they lose their jobs.
10.6% will return within the next 2 years while 9% indicated that they will
return within the next 3 to 10 years. 3% will not return within the next 10
years while 6.1% indicated that they don't know when they will return.

Of the total number of respondents, 85% indicated that they will never return
or only return upon retirement. 2% will return if they lose their jobs while
4.5% may return within the next 2 years.
SECTION 4: RURAL-URBAN LINKS

4.1. VISITS TO AREA OF ORIGIN

Despite the fact that only a small proportion of respondents contemplate returning soon to their area of origin, most still have strong ties with their area of origin.

Only 7.05% of respondents have no ties with their area of origin. 33.3% indicated that they visit their areas of origin at least once a year while 32% visit their areas of origin at least twice per year. 14.74% visit these areas three times a year, 6.41% four times a year, 1.92% five times a year and 4.48% more than five times a year.

Asked about their reasons for visiting their area of origin they responded as follows:

FIGURE 4.1: REASONS FOR VISITING AREA OF ORIGIN

54.5% go back to visit family and friends still living there while 15.4% visit to attend to their farming interests. 9.4% visit to solve problems when it arises. 6.8% of respondents visit because it is their place of birth while 6.4% visit to supply goods or money and 6.4% to go on holiday.

It is clear that residents of the informal areas still maintain fairly strong links with their areas of origin, visit these areas often and still have family, business or farming interest in those areas.
4.2. CORE FAMILY MEMBERS STILL RESIDING IN AREAS OF ORIGIN

A good indicator of the strength of the rural urban links maintained by the residents is the extent to which members of core families are still residing in the areas of origin.

50.32% of respondents indicated that their husbands/wives or children are still living in the area from which they migrated to Windhoek. Of these respondents an average of 3.8 core family members per respondent are still living in the area of origin.

This clearly illustrates that there are still very strong links with the areas of origin with core family members of 50% of these residents still residing in the areas of origin.

Of the respondents with core family members in areas of origin, 51.28% indicated that their spouses and/or children still residing in the areas of origin will also come to Windhoek while 48.72% indicated that their spouses and/or children will not join them in Windhoek.

Asked when they think their spouses and/or children will join them in Windhoek 65% indicated that they will come within a year. 12.5% indicated the they will come within two years, 5% within 3 years and 7% within 4 years.

This data clearly illustrates the strong links with their areas of origin and the practice of some family members migrating to the city where they first establish a foothold in Windhoek before the rest of the core family migrate to Windhoek.

During this period one would expect monetary transfers to the area of origin to support the family and more frequent visits to those areas.

4.3. MONETARY TRANSFERS

85.25% of respondents indicated that they still send money to their families living in the area of origin while 14.74% do not. This further illustrates the links between the rural and urban dwellers with the urban migrants contributing considerably towards the support of the rural family members.

The 133 respondents who indicated that they send money to their families collectively transferred N$114620.00 per year to the areas of origin. This is an average of N$861.80 per annum for each respondent! In the context of Namibia this is a fairly large amount of money that is transferred to the areas of origin.

If one projects these figures to the total population of the informal areas, more than N$5m flows from the informal areas to the areas of origin every year!
However, such flows do not only take place from the urban dweller to the rural areas. There is also a significant flow of products from the areas of origin to the urban dweller.

68.59% of respondents indicated that they receive money or other products from the region they came from. The main transfers from the regions are as follows:

**FIGURE 4.2: PRODUCTS RECEIVED FROM AREA OF ORIGIN**

- **Mahango, 33.3%**
- **Vegetables, 28.3%**
- **Other products, 8.7%**
- **Meat, 7.6%**
- **Maize/ Sorghum, 16.7%**

Mahango (33.3%), Vegetables (28.3%) and other maize/sorghum products (16.7%) are the main goods received from the areas of origin. Very little money is transferred from the areas of origin to the informal areas. The trend, therefore, seems to be a flow of money to the areas of origin and a flow of local produce from the regions to the informal areas.

4.4. THE REGIONAL HOUSEHOLD

The findings suggest that most urban migrants have extensive links with their areas of origin. They live and support themselves with one foot in the urban area of Windhoek and the other in their areas of origin. An intricate support system exist between the urban and rural areas.

With the majority of migrants migrating from the Omusati, Ohangwena, Oshana and Oshikoto regions, this high level of migration could be partly caused by the extensive changes in economic conditions in those regions.

Following independence and the withdrawal of the South African Defence Force from these regions it is generally acknowledged that the flow of cash in these regions were greatly reduced.
Where primary urbanisation took place in those regions during the war years, urban migrants were suddenly left in an economic void following the withdrawal and had to devise other means to survive. This may have motivated many to move to other urban areas rather than returning to the drought stricken rural areas.

The fact that many family members migrated to Windhoek without their spouses and children creates a de facto situation where the household survives through rural and urban means and live in both rural and urban areas at the same time. One can describe this phenomenon as a "regional household" system. This makes forecasting for town planning purposes fairly difficult since it is very difficult to establish if and when core family members will also migrate to the city. It can, however, be assumed that certain conditions will stimulate such migration while others will delay or even deter other members of household to also migrate to the city.

Conditions stimulating migration of dependants may include access to formal employment, successful settlement and acquisition of accommodation and access to educational and medical facilities.

Conditions which may delay or deter other members of household from also migrating may include difficulty in obtaining formal employment, unacceptable or difficult housing conditions and the need of rural support to survive.

If the pioneering migrant perceives the ability to survive and support his/her family to be good, motivation for the migration of the other members will be high and vice versa.

The social effects of this situation on the fabric of society are devastating. Children grow up without support of both parents, secondary households are often formed which must also be supported. With 50% of respondents with dependants still living in the areas of origin indicating that those dependants will not join them in Windhoek, this situation seems to be permanent in many cases.

Concerted efforts to stimulate economic development in the regions is of the utmost importance in order to stem the tide of rural to urban migration on the one hand and to maintain and enhance the core family as the main building blocks of society.
SECTION 5: PROBLEMS, OPPORTUNITIES AND PREFERENCES

5.1. MAIN PROBLEMS AND PRIORITIES IDENTIFIED BY THE COMMUNITY

To be able to evaluate the existing situation and to devise projects and programmes to improve the quality of life of the informal residents it is important to know how they perceive the main problems they face and which they regard as priorities.

Respondents were requested to name the biggest problems they see facing the community they live in. Provision was made for four problems to be mentioned by each respondent. Figure 5.1 is a summary of the combined responses received.

FIGURE 5.1: MAIN PROBLEMS FACING THE COMMUNITY

74.36% of respondents regarded the lack of adequate housing as one of the four main problems with 65.38% mentioning the lack of their own water supply as a main problem while 45.51% of respondents regarded unemployment as a major problem.

Toilet facilities were regarded as a major problem by 36.35% of respondents while 19.23% and 18.59% regarded educational facilities and a police station/security respectively as a major problem. 17.95% of respondents mentioned an array of other problems with 13.46% regarding a lack of medical facilities and 6.41% regarding gravel roads as a major problem.

Although these are not prioritised it seems as if housing and services conditions in the informal areas are viewed as the major problems to contend with.
In a follow up question respondents were asked to indicate which problem they would tackle first if they could do something to solve such problems. Figure 5.2 is a summary of responses received.

**FIGURE 5.2: FIRST PROBLEM RESPONDENTS WILL ATTEND TO**

29.8% of respondents will firstly tackle the unemployment/poverty problem while 25.6% of respondents indicated that they will tackle the housing problem first. 19.2% will first attempt to get their own water supply while 7.1% will tackle the security situation as a priority and a further 7.1% will first attend to better toilet facilities.

**FIGURE 5.3: SECOND PROBLEM RESPONDENTS WILL ATTEND TO**
Regarding second priority problems 30,3% of respondents will tackle the housing problem as a second priority while 23,0% will tackle individual water supply as a second priority. These are followed by toilet facilities (11,86%) unemployment/poverty (7,9%) security (6,6%) and security of tenure (6,6%).

**FIGURE 5.4: THIRD PROBLEM RESPONDENTS WILL ATTEND TO**

24% of respondents regarded electricity provision as the third priority, 18,6% regarded own water supply as the third priority and 17% regarded housing as the third priority to be attended to.

The provision of medical facilities (7,7%) unemployment and poverty (7%), toilet facilities (6,2%) and resettlement fears (6,2%) complete the third level priorities while 13,2% identified various other problems.

From the above results it is clear that unemployment/poverty, housing, individual water supply, electricity and toilet facilities represent the major problems experienced by the informal settler communities. From the local authority point of view the provision of township services are the most important problems experienced by these communities with housing and unemployment not the direct responsibility of the local authority.

**5.2. CHOICE OF AREAS OF SETTLEMENT AND SETTLEMENT OPTIONS**

One of the issues often commented on by analysts is the issue of the distance the informal settlements are located from the centre of town. From section 5.1 is can be seen that distance from town never featured as one of the main problems identified by respondents.

Various other locations for settlement were identified and respondents were requested to indicate in which area they would prefer to settle if erven were
available in all of these areas. They could choose “further from town to the north of the Okuryangavas”, “in Otjomuise, closer to town”, “next to Rocky Crest closer to town than Okuryangava but further away than Otjomuise”, and “in Cinchebasia south of Windhoek closer to town than Okuryangava”.

These locations were shown to respondents on a map of Windhoek where distances and locations could be identified. Figure 5.5 clearly shows that most respondents 74.4% prefer to stay even further away from town to the north of Okuryangava. This is where most family and friends are and few would like to live elsewhere. 12.8% indicated that they prefer Otjomuise which is closest to town while few preferred Rocky Crest (6.4%) or Cinchebasia (3.2%).

**FIGURE 5.5: PREFERRED AREAS OF SETTLEMENT IF ERVÉN WERE AVAILABLE IN ALL OF THESE AREAS**

![Pie chart showing percentage preferences:]

- **Otjomuise**: 12.8%
- **Rocky Crest**: 6.4%
- **Cinchebasia**: 3.2%
- **None of these**: 3.2%
- **North of Okuryangava**: 74.4%

The distance to the city centre does not seem to be a very important criterion in settlement preference. The fact that a high percentage of informal settlers indicated that they get picked up by business vehicles and taken to work (p53, Volume 1) may have an influence on these decisions. However, in various discussions the impression was gained that they prefer to live in the present informal areas because of a feeling of belonging to the communities they now live in. They do not favour the idea of moving too far away from the communities they are now part of.

In order to establish an idea of the preferences of residents regarding erf and shelter options, respondents were requested to indicate their preferences on 12 erf/shelter options. The following options were put to respondents together with the approximate monthly costs of each option.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Small erf (150m²) with no services and only water available from a tap, shared by 40 houses. Costing N$ 46.32 / month.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with water on the erf. Costing N$ 83.22 / month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with water and a aqua privy on the erf. Costing N$ 148.33 / month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with water and a flush toilet on the erf. Costing N$ 171.62 / month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5</td>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with water, a flush toilet and electricity on the erf. Costing N$ 229.04 / month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6</td>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with water, a flush toilet, electricity and tarred roads. Costing N$ 293.56 / month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 7</td>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with no services and only water available from a tap shared by 40 houses. Costing N$ 68.39 / month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 8</td>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with water on the erf. Costing N$ 126.78 / month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 9</td>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with water and a aqua privy on the erf. Costing N$ 191.95 / month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 10</td>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with water and a flush toilet on the erf. Costing N$ 242.59 / month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 11</td>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with water, a flush toilet and electricity on the erf Costing N$301.62 / month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 12</td>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with water, a flush toilet, electricity and tarred roads. Costing N$ 341.95 / month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of responses are given in figure 5.6. The first observation that can be made is that the majority of respondents chose the small erf options. 88.4% of respondents opted for those options which include small erven.
Although it is doubtful that respondents have a clear understanding of what a 150m² erf size is, one only has to look at the areas which informal settlers normally claim for themselves to realise that 150m² erf sizes is a definite option provided that it has significant cost benefits over 300m² erven.

**FIGURE 5.6: ERVEN OPTIONS PREFERED BY RESPONDENTS**

Considering the levels of services it is significant to note that 22.4% of respondents indicated a preference for erven with no individual services and only communal water supply shared between 40 erven.

19.2% of respondents opted for erven with individual water supply but no other services while 17.3% opted for erven with individual water supply and a water borne toilet on the erf. 14.8% opted for erven with individual water supply together with an aqua privy toilet on the erf.

21.2% of respondents indicated a preference for erven serviced with water, a flush toilet and electricity while only 5.1% of respondents opted for erven serviced fully with tarred roads.

Future provision of services should take these preferences into consideration but care must be taken to link such preferences to individual levels of affordability within housing and services provision programmes designed in consultation with the target communities.

**5.3. LOCUS OF CONTROL**

Locus of Control refers to the extent to which people accept responsibility for their own lives, for what happens to them and for their own progress in life. In designing community based programmes locus of control is one of the
important variables one can use to forecast the effort and dedication people will put in to ensure the success of such programmes.

With high levels of participation and dedication a necessity for successful settlement and upgrading programmes, two questions were asked to obtain an indication of how people perceive the importance of their own efforts to improve their quality of life.

Respondents were asked to respond to the following question:

"To improve the condition of life in the community some people say that the people must get together to help themselves. Others say that it will require the help of the government. What do you think?"

Figure 5.7 provides a summary of responses received.

FIGURE 5.7: CENTRE OF RELIANCE TO IMPROVE LIFE IN THE COMMUNITY

ON THEMSELVES ALONE, 10.9 %
ON GOVERNMENT ALONE, 2.6 %
MAINLY ON THEMSELVES, 19.9 %
MAINLY ON GOVERNMENT, 66.7 %

The majority of respondents (66.7%) felt that people should rely mainly on the Government to improve the quality of life in their community. 19.9% of respondents felt that people should mainly rely on themselves while 10.9% felt that people should rely on themselves alone. Only 2.6% felt that one should rely on the Government alone.

While many people felt that one should rely mainly on the government a significant proportion 30.8% felt themselves mainly responsible to improve the quality of life in their communities.

With good leadership and proper involvement, this core of people who feel that they themselves can and should contribute to the enhancement of their
own quality of life can and should be used extensively in the design of community based self-help programmes.

Their success will soon enough demonstrate the value of one's own efforts and involvement in improving the quality of life in their communities.

Responses received to a question on whether getting ahead in life depends more on luck than on one's own efforts indicate that people in general realise their own responsibility in improving their own quality of life.

**FIGURE 5.8: FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE POSITION A MAN REACHES IN LIFE**

75.6% of respondents believe that one should depend on your own effort to get ahead in life while 24.4% believe that getting ahead in life is determined by luck rather than on one’s own efforts.

To put these responses into perspective one must consider a few other issues. Firstly, all of these settlers took charge of their own lives by (1) deciding to migrate to Windhoek to improve their quality of life and (2) set themselves up independently (against major obstacles) in the informal areas.

Many are living in difficult conditions and, one can imagine, can easily become despondent about their lives and their own ability to change or improve it. It is indeed encouraging that such a large proportion feel that they could contribute to improving the quality of life in their communities.

The development of projects and programmes to manage and improve conditions in these communities should explicitly acknowledge the difficult conditions existing in the informal areas and concentrate on regenerating self confidence and enthusiasm which is of the utmost importance in ensuring the success of such programmes.
its extensions, Hakahana and Okuryangava and its formally developed extensions serve as a reception area for new migrants.

- As the informal areas grow, more and more in-migrants will settle directly in the informal areas. Initially they will probably stay with family or friends only to establish their own informal settler households as soon as they gained a foothold in the urban area.

- Up to now this transition period (from arriving in the city to establishing an own household) has been fairly long but it can be expected that it will decrease with time as information on the ease and advantage of informal settlement is disseminated more effectively.

- People move away from the formal areas because they want to be independent from the family/friends with whom they lived after arriving in Windhoek. Overcrowded conditions in the formal areas, high rents and differences with their landlords also contributed to the decision to move to the informal areas.

- Informal residents chose the informal areas because of the availability of space, because family or friends were already living there and because it is regarded as the best and cheapest alternative available.

- Most informal residents maintain strong links with their areas of origin. They make fairly frequent visits to those areas to visit family and friends and to attend to their farming and property interest.

- Many residents left spouses and/or children behind in their areas of origin. They often intend to reunite in the city once the pioneering migrant gets a proper foothold in the city and can support his/her dependants. However, in many cases respondents do not intend to bring the rest of their dependants to the city.

- There is definite indications of many households living with one foot in the urban and the other in the rural areas. This "regional household" is characterised by an intricate support system with regular flows of money from the urban to the rural areas and a flow of produce from the rural to the urban areas.

- This may be indicative of the formation of regional survival systems to counter the unfavourable agricultural conditions, the collapse of the economic base in the northern regions following the withdrawal of the SADF and the struggle to find permanent employment in the urban areas.

- Conditions in the informal areas are precarious. It is characterised by a lack of urban services and utilities such as water provision to each site, sewerage provision, refuse removal, informal shelter structures, low incomes and high levels of crime.

- The provision of urban services such as water, toilet facilities and electricity are regarded as major problems facing the informal communities. Inadequate housing provision and unemployment are also regarded as major problems needing attention.
- Informal settlers seem generally reluctant to move away from the areas they currently occupy. It is suggested that a fairly strong sense of "community" already exists in most areas. Moving to an area closer to the city centre carries less importance than remaining in the current area of residence or in close proximity thereto.

- Residents are generally keen to obtain some form of security of tenure. If linked with cost, most residents prefer small erven with a fairly even spread of the various levels of services (from communal water supply only to full township services).

- Although it seems if the locus of control of most people are regarded as outside themselves, there seems to be a strong belief with many respondents that they themselves can do a lot towards the improvement of the conditions in their communities. Careful planning and consultation with the communities is necessary to harness the apparent preparedness to work with the authorities towards improving conditions in the informal areas of Windhoek.

6.2. PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

6.2.1. Introductory Remarks

The overriding importance of current in-migration patterns in Windhoek is clear. Compared to the problems brought about by rapid in-migration, other issues become insignificant. There is no doubt that the major future planning effort in Windhoek should be directed toward the planning and management of rural-urban migration and the resultant informal settlements built by these migrants to accommodate themselves.

Where Volume I concentrated on the broad planning implications of the study, Volume 2 focuses on the more specific planning implications of the in-migration and informal settler situation in Windhoek.

6.2.2. In-Migration

In general the findings of this study supports the findings of Bradshaw (in: American Sociological Review, 1967, Vol. 52 : 224-239) that rural inhabitants are drawn to the City when they perceive that it will offer them a superior quality of life.

With no indication that the current rate of in-migration to Windhoek will decrease, planners must plan actively to accommodate this flow of urban migrants to Windhoek. Physical planning alone is clearly not the answer. Local Authorities simply do not have the capacity (financial and technical) and in-migrants do not have the means to build and afford formal accommodation in the City. There is no alternative to the informal settlement and the phenomenon is likely to increase as more in-migrants vacate their reception
residences to set up independently in the informal areas. As has been argued in Volume I, the validity of the informal settlement process in the face of the abject failure of conventional housing programmes must be appreciated by the local authority. The positive aspects of informal settlement must be recognised and harnessed by the planner and it should be looked upon as an opportunity for a positive solution to current housing problems. The sheer number of informal settlers in the Third World emphasises the failure of traditional economic and construction systems to provide basic shelter for all.

6.2.3. Informal Settlement in Windhoek

Informal settlement and the management thereof in Windhoek went through two distinct stages. Before independence, informal settlement was strictly controlled and policed by the local authority. Informal settlement was perceived as a health and security risk. This negative stereotypes of informal settlers have been supportive of one of the major techniques used to deal with them. This simply involved forced evacuation of such settlements forcing these settlers to move on. Fear of this technique caused major overcrowding in the formal areas with conditions little, if at all, better than in informal settlements.

Following independence, these strict control measures were relaxed and significant informal settlements soon developed. The local authority responded positively with well intended attempts to control and order these settlements and to provide adequate basic services. The sheer growth in these communities linked with inadequate resource allocation inhibited the ability of city officials to respond to the growth in informal settlements. Current growth can only be managed partially leaving no capacity to concentrate on improving the existing situation of the informal settlements in Windhoek.

Following a review of the existing situation, Council recently adopted a strategy on informal settlement in Windhoek. This consists of informal settlement guidelines acknowledging the need for community consultation and participation and community driven decision making and action. This new strategy represents a new direction, the success of which must be pursued at all costs.

The results of the second survey provides important guidelines which can assist in the successful implementation of the proposed informal settlement strategy.

6.2.4. Expectations and Needs

By nature, planning is imperfect because the needs of the users of a proposed environment are imperfectly known to the planners. Informal settlers expressed their needs and expectations fairly clearly in this
study. Their chief practical problems appear to be the installation of basic utilities and services such as sewerage, water supply and electricity. Inadequate housing provision and unemployment are also regarded as major problems needing attention.

However, care should be taken not to see these findings as a consensus decision of all informal settlers. Informal settlers are not homogeneous in their needs and this fact should be provided for in the design of programmes to address the needs in informal communities. Effective control over the content of such programmes must be devolved to the community to ensure that decisions really reflect solutions which are acceptable to the community.

Public involvement in the planning process should not be an attempt to secure popular support for a plan already formulated. It should also not consist of a choice between a number of pre-formulated alternatives. The ultimate ideal is a layman-expert relationship which might approximate popular planning. It should no longer be possible for the planner to take the elitist view and boldly state: "The planner must understand people and anticipate their every need". Nor should the citizen continue to act as a cheerful robot, always willing to accept environmental change by delegating his responsibility to the expert with the phrase: "Of course, I'm not in a position to criticise". (Porteous, 1980: 368) Consciousness raising among both the citizen and the planner in this regard is essential.

Another important issue that needs to be addressed sensitively is the feeling of powerlessness prevailing within the informal community. There seems to be a general belief that people themselves cannot do much to change or improve their own situation. Programmes must be designed such that it will clearly demonstrate the power people have to influence the decisions affecting their groups or communities.

In addition, time consuming and frustrating bureaucratic processes should be eliminated as far as possible. Simplicity should be the key word in order to facilitate ease of understanding by the often inarticulate target group. Unnecessary complicated processes can easily enhance feelings of powerlessness and negatively affect the self-esteem of project participants. This, in turn, may inhibit active participation in and identification with proposed actions and solutions.

6.2.5. Variety of Preferences

Results regarding the choice of areas of settlement and settlement options proved to be more homogeneous than expected. It does, however, show that a variety of preferences exist and complete homogeneity and consensus is not achievable.
designed such that these differences can be accommodated effectively. Dissenting participants can often jeopardise the success of projects especially when cost-recovery measures are implemented. The key endeavour should be "solutions that participants like a lot rather than solutions everybody likes a little."

This is more readily achievable in smaller groups with more homogeneous needs than in larger heterogeneous groups.

6.2.6. The Concept of Community Participation

Community participation is widely accepted as a necessary ingredient in the planning and management of informal communities. However, Porteous (1980 : 365) states that experience with community participation produced a number of valid criticisms of citizen involvement.

- Lack of political and technical prowess among community groups makes them easy prey for co-option by politicians or bureaucracies. This involves the neutralisation of opposition by including dissenters as participants without surrendering control over the decision-making process.

- Community groups are frequently undisciplined in their pursuit of goals, and are frequently torn by internal dissension or conflict with potential allies, usually over issues of status.

- In participation situations one or more non-representative self interest groups is often able to manipulate the decision process to serve its own ends.

- Lack of expertise, inertia, and fear of the results of novel proposals impel citizens to oppose whatever is proposed. The goals pursued by citizen participation thus tend always toward the preservation of the status quo.

- Interest groups veto each other's proposals because it is always easier to organise resistance than to reach agreement. Full participation is often a prescription for non-decision or may lead to wasteful delays in implementation.

The group who will be responsible for the implementation of the informal settlement strategy must take cognisance of these pitfalls because it can seriously jeopardise the success of the strategy.

In spite of these pitfalls, community participation is likely to be embraced increasingly by planners, politicians and the public. It is through this process only that planners can become acutely aware of the needs of the informal settlers that they will work and design with. Participation, moreover, have beneficial effects upon both individual and society, including the broadening of the intellect, the
enhancement of self-esteem, the promotion of independence and initiative, improved sensitivity to the needs of others, greater political equality for the underprivileged, greater involvement in and responsibility for decisions on the part of the public and the provision of a permanent and effective counterweight to the power of politician and bureaucrat (Porteous, 1980: 367).

6.3. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The results of the second survey should serve as background information and indicators of the nature and conditions in the informal areas. The development of strategies and projects should be based on a much more intimate knowledge of the specific needs and patterns within each of the informal sub-communities. This knowledge is best gained through participatory action research where people supply information, the results of which is fed back immediately and then used to continue with the design of appropriate solutions with continued participation of the target group or target community.
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Windhoek Residents Survey 1995

You have already been so kind to supply us with your information for the Census Survey. We now have a great need to learn more about you and your problems/dwelling conditions in Windhoek. Please be so kind as to answer the following questions for us.

1. If you moved to Windhoek within the past ten years, please tell us why you decided to move away from the place where you were staying then.

   Reason 1.
   Reason 2.
   Reason 3.
   Not applicable

2. Why did you choose to come to Windhoek? Please tell us the main reasons for deciding to come to Windhoek.

   Reason 1.
   Reason 2.
   Reason 3.
   Reason 4.
   Not applicable

3. What good things did you expect to find in Windhoek when you decided to move here?

   1.
   2.
   3.

   Did you actually find the "good things" you expected to find in Windhoek?

   Yes, but only some of the "good things" 1
   Yes, all of the good things I expected 2
   No, none of the good things I expected 3

4. When you first moved to Windhoek, where did you stay?

   With family 1
   With friends 2
   With other people I know 3
   On my own 4
   At work place 5
   Other
   Specify:

5. For how long did you stay at that place?

   _______ years _________ months

6. How many times did you move since you came to Windhoek or during the past ten years?

   _______ times
8. Please name all the areas or places where you lived for longer than 3 months since you came to Windhoek or during the past ten years?

1. ___________ 2. ___________ 3. ___________

4. ___________ 5. ___________ 6. ___________

7. ___________ 8. ___________ 9. ___________

9. Why did you decide to leave the place where you lived before moving to this house?

- Wish to be independent
- Overpopulation (too many people living there)
- Chased away
- Rent too high
- Differences with landlord
- Was relocated by Government/Municipality
- Other

10. Why did you decide to move to this area?

- Space available
- I was told this is the best place
- Because it is cheap
- Because family or friends were already living here
- Other

11. How often do you go back to visit the place you originally came from?

- ______ times a year

12. Why do you go back there? Please give the three main reasons.

1. __________________________________________

2. __________________________________________

3. __________________________________________

13. When you go back there for how long do you stay each time?

- ______ weeks

14. Do you send money to your family still living in the region you came from?

- Yes 1
- No 2

If yes, how much and how often?

- ______ NS every ___________
15. Do you think you will permanently move back to where you came from?

Yes  [ ]   No [ ]

Why do you say so?

1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________

3. ____________________________

If you said yes, when will you return?

Within next _____ months/ _____ years.

16. Is your husband/wife and/or children still living in the region where you came from?

Yes [ ]   No [ ]

How many people are they?

_____ husband/wife  _____ children

Will they come to join you in Windhoek?

Yes [ ]   No [ ]

If yes, when do you think they will come?

Within next _____ months _____ years

17. To improve the condition of life in the community some people say that the people must get together to help themselves. Others say that it will require the help of the government. What do you think?

To Improve this community should the people rely:

- On themselves alone [ ]
- Mainly on themselves [ ]
- Mainly on the Government [ ]
- On the Government alone [ ]

18. Would you tell me what are the biggest problems you see facing this community that you live in?

Problem 1

Problem 2

Problem 3

Problem 4

19. If you could do something to solve these problems which one will you tackle first?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

and secondly

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
20. Some people say that getting ahead in life depends on good luck. Others say it depends on one's own efforts. Do you think the position a man reaches in life depends:

- More on luck [ ]
- More on one's own efforts [ ]

21. Which of the following is more true of you?

- I would prefer to live my life in the village (country) with only occasional visits to the big city. [ ]
- I would prefer to live my life in the city with only occasional visits to the country or village. [ ]

22. If good work was available everywhere in Namibia, where would you prefer to stay?

23. Do you receive money or products (like meat, grain, mahango, vegetables etc.) from the region you came from?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

If yes, what do you normally receive?

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

24. If you can get an erf further to the north in Okuryangava, in Otjomuise, next to Rocky Crest or in Gimbabasi to the south of Windhoek, which area would you choose?

- Further from town north from Okuryangava [ ]
- In Otjomuise closer to town [ ]
- Next to Rocky Crest closer to town than Okuryangava but further away than Otjomuise [ ]
- Gimbabasi south of Windhoek closer to town than Okuryangava [ ]
26. If there were even available to purchase which one of the following options will you prefer to buy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with no services and only water available from a tap, shared by 40 houses.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 48.32 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with water on the erf.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 63.22 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with water and a aqua privy on the erf.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 148.33 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with water and a flush toilet on the erf.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 171.62 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with water, flush toilet and electricity on the erf.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 229.04 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small erf (150m²) with water, flush toilet, electricity and tarred roads.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 293.56 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with no services and only water available from a tap shared by 40 houses.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 68.39/month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with water on the erf.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 126.78 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with water and a aqua privy on the erf.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 191.95 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with water and a flush toilet on the erf.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 242.59 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with water, a flush toilet and electricity on the erf.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 301.62 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger erf (300m²) with water, a flush toilet, electricity and tarred roads.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing N$ 341.95 / month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>