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Abstract

In recent decades, internal migrants who are relocating themselves to urban areas in the vicinity of their original villages have caused a persistent urban-urban labour migration trend in Zambia. This study aims to give new insights into the social relations between urban migrants and their rural home communities by focusing on contemporary urban-urban labour migration to Mongu and Sesheke, two towns in Zambia’s Western Province. Semi-structured interviews with rural-urban-urban labour migrants, informal interviews, and participant observation were used as data collection methods during a three-month explorative fieldwork period.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, a comparative analysis was made of the labour migrants’ social relations with the rural kin in their first urban destination, and their social contacts with the village while residing in Mongu or Sesheke at the time of the research. After leaving the village, urban labour migrants and their rural kin continue to be connected through the economy of affection. Generally, it was found that social contact with rural relatives and mutual visiting and support relations have intensified after the labour migrants had moved to Mongu or Sesheke. Rural relatives attempt to ensure urban migrants’ compliance with their affective demands by applying the levelling mechanisms of value introjection, witchcraft practices, and social exclusion. In response, urban migrants utilise a range of coping mechanisms to improve their individual position in the economy of affection.

This study argues that contemporary socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to small towns in Zambia’s Western Province are resulting in a renegotiation of the economy of affection. Secondly, the study demonstrates how the interplay of two social mechanisms, namely the economy of affection and the arena of enforceable trust, results in urban labour migrants’ enhanced compliance with the affective demands of rural relatives.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Problem statement

1.1.1 Introducing the research topic

In the Livingstone Museum in Livingstone, Zambia, at one point visitors enter a space that displays a ‘typical Zambian village’. Amidst the cardboard cows, huts and farming equipment the following conservation is taking place between a young man and his uncle¹:

¹ Pictures were taken by the author in May 2014 with permission of the Livingstone Museum.
In itself, this conservation is a perfect example of a generational dissension that seems to be embedded in the course of time. Should we always strive to reach new horizons, emerging dimensions of happiness and wealth, especially when their contours are still vague? While some jump off modernity’s train along the way or refuse to board in the first place, others eagerly await the final station. As in many African countries, in Zambia migration to urban areas is often seen as an escape from a ‘boring’ village life. Stories of urban facilities, employment opportunities and wealth encourage youngsters to take the leap. But what are their chances of building a successful life in town? Do they remain connected to the village after leaving? And which factors determine the role and support of their rural relatives in the migration process?

1.1.2 Migration patterns in precolonial and colonial Zambia

In Zambia migration movements date back to precolonial times. These movements were primarily caused by war and natural disasters (Nchito, 2010). In the early 19th century, a range of well-organised ethnic groups was inhabiting the country. Their main livelihood source was agriculture, complemented by cattle-rearing, and hunting and gathering activities. Because of the widely spread slash-and-burn farming technique, internal migration had by then become a measure to ensure food security (Hedlund & Lundahl, 1983; Simatele & Simatele, 2009).

The arrival of the Europeans and the introduction of the colonial system in 1890 drastically changed the shape and direction of population movements in Zambia. The British South Africa Company utilised a variety of measures, predominantly the implementation of hut and poll taxes, to stimulate labour migration to mining areas in South Africa and the country’s own Copperbelt Province (Nchito, 2010; Ogura, 1991; Simatele & Simatele, 2009). During this time, the Copperbelt became the country’s prime economic area while the small village of Lusaka developed into the capital city. In 1924, the colonial administration of the country shifted from the BSAC to British colonial rule. A stronger emphasis was put on the internal circulatory labour migration of males (Simatele & Simatele, 2009). These men would leave their family in the villages and return to them after finishing their work contracts on the Copperbelt (Ogura, 1991), a situation that ‘instituted a foundation for a dual economy comprising of a relatively small modern sector and a large, predominantly subsistence rural sector’ (Simatele & Simatele, 2009: 65), resulting in a still persistent rural-urban income gap.

1.1.3 Population movements after independence

After independence in 1964, travel restrictions imposed by the colonial administration were lifted and a massive exodus from the rural areas commenced. The higher salaries and employment opportunities in urban areas attracted many villagers and the average length of stay in the city continued to increase (Ogura, 1991). With an urban population rising from 19% of the total population in 1963 to 40% in 1980, Zambia quickly became one of the most urbanised countries in Southern Africa (Nchito, 2010). In particular the capital city of Lusaka and the Copperbelt cities transformed into major migrant destinations in which large numbers of migrants are now living together with their families, often maintaining strong ties with their home villages (Ogura, 1991). The urban areas attract a substantial number of migrants from all over the country as average urban incomes are much higher than rural incomes (CSO, 2012a; Hedlund & Lundahl, 1983; Ogura,
Most newcomers enter the informal sector, a sector that employed 89% of the Zambian working population in 2008 (CSO, 2011).

The strong rural-urban migration trend in Zambia was weakened by a severe economic crisis that started in the late 1970s as a result of rising oil prices and declining copper prices, and that worsened in the 1980s because of inflation and inadequate government policies. As the national economy was largely dependent on copper, the implementation of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) was deemed necessary (CSO, 1980; Ito, 2010; Ogura, 1991). The first Programs were introduced in 1983 and predominantly hit the urban population by increasing food prices. Rural-urban migration was effectively reduced by the deterioration of urban living conditions and the stagnation of employment opportunities (Ito, 2010; Simatele & Simatele, 2009). Poverty became more prevalent in both urban and rural regions. The introduction of another SAP in 1991 increased poverty and unemployment by removing subsidies on food, agriculture, education, health and accommodation (Simatele & Simatele, 2009: 68), subsidies that were predominantly enjoyed in urban areas. In the last two decades, the shares of Zambia's population in urban and rural regions have stabilised on respectively 39.5% and 60.5% in 2010 (CSO, 2012b).

Table 1.1 Percentage distribution of individual Zambian migrants and direction of migration flow (CSO, 2012a; Simatele & Simatele, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of migration flow</th>
<th>Percentage of Zambian migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural to rural</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural to urban</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban to rural</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban to urban</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the rural-urban migration trend decreasing since the 1980s and currently stabilising at 15% of internal migration movements (see Table 1.1), other movements such as rural-rural and urban-urban migration have become the dominant migration patterns in Zambia (Ito, 2010; Simatele & Simatele, 2009). Following Table 1.1, urban-rural migration numbers have strongly increased as well, although this trend is partially caused by the return migration of retired urban workers to their villages (Ito, 2010).

Contemporary Zambian urban-urban migrants are more inclined to choose smaller cities and towns as their destinations (Ito, 2010; Potts, 2005). According to Nchito (2010), these smaller centres may offer a diversity of opportunities and services to migrants that is deemed satisfactory. At the same time the costs of living are much lower than in the major Zambian cities, the previous residences of many urban-urban migrants. However, the large influxes of migrants to smaller cities and towns lead to an increasing demand for land, water and electricity, and a potential ‘service squeeze’ (Hinderink & Titus, 2002; Nchito, 2010).

1.1.4 Urban-urban migration in Zambia’s Western Province

This research will centre on urban-urban migration to two towns in Zambia's Western Province. As can be deduced from Figure 1.1, the Zambian nation consists of nine provinces. Nation-wide,
Western Province can be denoted as the province with the second lowest socioeconomic development of Zambia, only exceeding Luapula Province. In 2010, Western Province’s population numbers were relatively low with 989,000 inhabitants and a 7.6 percentage share of the total population. A large majority of 86.3% of Western Province’s inhabitants lived in rural areas where subsistence agriculture is the major livelihood activity (CSO, 2012a).

Within the rural Western Province, migration movements are historically targeted on rural areas. Only after independence in 1964, rural-urban migration rates rose rapidly. This trend diminished during the economic crisis in the 1980s and 1990s, when population movements refocused on rural areas (CSO, 2011). However, an interesting shift has become visible in the last decade. In 2006, 79% of migration flows in Western Province was directed towards rural areas. In 2010, this number had reduced to 67%, meaning that rural-urban and urban-urban migration movements have increased from 21% in 2006 to 33% in 2010. This provincial trend is partially explained by a growth in the numbers of urban-urban migrants, who have come to settle in smaller urban areas as a consequence of economic hardship in the city. Considering the relative difficulty of the Silozi language and the low level of socioeconomic development in Western Province, it can be expected that the majority of these urban-urban migrants are original Lozi who are relocating themselves closer to their original villages. By focusing on this emergent trend of rural-urban-urban ‘return’ migration, it is possible to explore initial dynamics and potential changes in support patterns between urban migrants and their rural relatives in Zambia’s Western Province.

1.1.5 Research focus

This research aims to give new insights into the social relations between urban-urban migrants and their rural home communities in Western Province, Zambia. By researching and analysing
contemporary socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to two towns in Zambia’s Western Province, I hope to increase our general knowledge of mutual support patterns between urban-urban migrants and their rural relatives. In the remainder of this study, I will focus on two social mechanisms that balance the seemingly unequal dependency relationship between urban migrants and rural kin that emanates from a successful migration path. The first mechanism is the economy of affection (Hydén, 1980, 2006), the second the arena of enforceable trust (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993).

1.2 Research questions

As can be deduced from the foregoing, this study aims to answer the following main research question:

In what ways are contemporary socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to small towns in Zambia’s Western Province resulting in changes in patterns of enforceable trust, and in a renegotiation of the economy of affection that includes urban-urban migrants and their rural relatives?

To answer the main question, five sub questions were formulated:

1. What are the contemporary socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to small towns in Zambia’s Western Province?
2. Which levelling mechanisms are used by rural relatives to balance their position in the economy of affection vis-à-vis their urban kin?
3. Which coping strategies do urban-urban migrants apply to balance their position in the economy of affection vis-à-vis their rural kin?
4. How are these dynamics changing the economy of affection that involves rural relatives and urban-urban migrants?
5. How can we use the concept of ‘enforceable trust’ in relation to economic fluctuations to understand these dynamics?

The first four sub questions have been explored during the fieldwork period in Zambia. Complementary, secondary literature was used to find a suitable answer to last sub question.

1.3 Research method in brief

This study is based on qualitative, explorative research that was conducted in two towns of Zambia’s Western Province in the months of March, April and May, 2014. An interpretative approach was applied to understand the social reality of the research participants in their contexts. Because of the enormous cultural variety that constitutes the country of Zambia, the research findings cannot be expanded to fit the whole nation. The scope of this research is restricted to towns in Zambia’s Western Province.

The primary source of data were semi-structured interviews with 33 rural-urban-urban migrants who have moved from a larger urban destination to the towns of Mongu (13) or Sesheke (20). The participants were selected through snowball sampling. Afterwards, the semi-structured
interviews were transcribed and analysed in accordance with the five stages of the Framework Approach. During the fieldwork period, informal interviews and participant observation were applied to increase the richness of the data and to strive for methodological data triangulation. Furthermore, on two occasions urban migrants were joined on visits to their home villages, and more extensive though unstructured interviews were conducted with a number of government officials. A more extensive outline of the research methods can be found in Chapter 3.

1.4 Thesis outline

From this introductory chapter, the report will continue with the theoretical framework of the study, in which several theories of migration, the economy of affection and the arena of enforceable trust are introduced. Chapter 3 will take up the methodology and the methods that have supported the conduct of the study. This is followed by an overview of the research findings, which are subsequently discussed in Chapter 5. A brief conclusion finalises the report.
2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Theories of migration

2.1.1 Migration and mobility

The movement of people between different geographical places is commonly conceptualised as either 'migration' or 'mobility'. Migration can be defined as 'the temporary or permanent movement of individuals or groups of people from one geographic location to another' (Hagen-Zanker, 2008: 4). Whereas the definition of mobility is less clear-cut, the concept could be preferred over the concept of migration because it is not solely directed towards the analysis of human mobility. As argued by Van Dijk et al. (2001), using the concept of mobility allows for the inclusion of alterations of non-human and non-material elements, such as ideas and values that result from human mobility. Moreover, the concept of mobility is more suitable for situations where mobility is a way of life, e.g. in the cases of nomadic pastoralists, traders, and tramps (Ibid.). Ellis (2005: 144-145) agrees that migration cannot be depicted as 'a simple, linear, one-way ticket from one state of being to another' as it is 'a mobility of many different distances and durations and purposes'.

This study focuses on urban labour migration within Zambia. It targets people who have originally migrated from their home villages to cities to find work, before relocating themselves to smaller urban centres. Labour migration is consequently defined as 'migration undertaken with the aim of getting employment in the destination towns and cities' (Ito, 2010: 47). By using this definition, the purpose and direction of movement are clearly demarcated while all possible distances and durations of stay are included. For the sake of theoretical clarity, in this research migration as a concept is preferred over mobility, while realising that the migration of individuals or groups of people is a diverse, flexible, non-linear process of mobility that may result simultaneously in the movement of non-human and non-material elements.

2.1.2 Theories of migration

In the last 150 years, a rich and diverse field of migration theories has come into existence. This subsection will give a brief overview of some main theories that have influenced the course of migration literature. A preference was given to theories of migration that are applicable to internal labour migration patterns.

2.1.2.1 Neo-classical theories of migration

Migration theories developed between the 1880s and the 1980s have predominantly centred on the integration of migration in economic development, and consequently on the economic motives of migration. Examples of influential neo-classical macro-level theories of migration are the theories of Ravenstein and Lewis (Hedlund & Lundahl, 1983; Simatele & Simatele; 2009), in which is set forth how workers of the traditional rural sector are encouraged to migrate by higher wages in urban centres. As a consequence, the traditional sector runs out of labour, and the unskilled wage rate increases until a national equilibrium is reached in the division of labour over the traditional and modern sector. Subsequently, Todaro and Harris (1970) incorporated the existence of urban unemployment into this macro-economic model by arguing that rural-urban
migration is initiated by expected higher urban incomes, rather than actual earnings. Despite the risk that the migrant might not find employment in the urban centre, rural-urban migration is a rational decision as long as the expected real income differential is positive (Hagen-Zanker, 2008).

Two important neoclassical micro-level migration theories were developed by Sjaastad (1962) and Lee (1966). Both theories highlight the considerations of the individual migrant as a decisive factor in the migration process. In Sjaastad’s human capital approach, migration is regarded as an individual investment decision with the aim of enhancing the productivity of human capital, e.g. knowledge and competencies. The migrant’s decision to move is based on a rational cost-benefit calculation of the expected future benefits of migration whereby the moving costs are subtracted from the urban wage difference (Lucas, 1994). This emphasis on the individual migrant’s rational decision-making process is in accordance with Lee’s push and pull-framework. In this framework, the positive ‘pull’-factors at the potential destination and negative ‘push’-factors at the original location are decisive in the individual migrant’s resolution to move.

In critical response to both neo-classical migration theory and push and pull-theory, De Haas et al. (2010: 5, 6) successfully evince how the functional roots of these theories evoke the notion of migration as ‘a predominantly linear and inversely proportional function of wage differentials’, in which ‘migrants are effectively reduced to passive pawns (...) propelled around by macro-level push and pull forces and making perfectly rational and predictable decisions based on individual utility maximisation’. Consequently, they express the need for migration theory that incorporates meaningful notions of agency and structure.

In the 1980s, the New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) theory was developed by an academic movement that criticised earlier migration theories for ‘overly emphasizing the structural and historical factors involved in migration, and producing an individualistic view’ (Ito, 2010: 46). The NELM theory distinguishes itself from the theories discussed so far by taking the household as the prime unit of analysis, thereby functioning on the meso-level. The decision to migrate is made by household members together and for the sake of the household’s well-being. By sending off one or more members to urban centres, the members of the rural household cooperate to achieve income diversification and household coinsurance (Hagen-Zanker, 2008). After the move, social and economic relations between the migrant and the household are actively maintained. The migrant may send home remittances and, in turn, is supported by the household in times of need. Although studies based on NELM regard migration as a household strategy in a more holistic framework, Lee’s push and pull-perspective dominated by urban-rural income differences is still prevalent (Ito, 2010). This neoclassical accentuation is shifted to a focus on livelihood diversification in the livelihood approach to migration.

2.1.2.2 The livelihood approach to migration

Placed within the framework of the livelihood approach (Ellis, 1998), the topic of livelihood diversification in Africa’s rural areas has inspired a number of studies since the 1990s. Following Ito (2010: 47), livelihood diversification is defined as ‘the process by which rural families construct a diverse portfolio of activities and social support capabilities in their struggle for survival and to improve their standards of living’. Livelihood diversification is aimed at increasing
the household’s social security, ‘indicating the arrangements people make to secure their livelihood over time’ (Kaag et al., 2004: 55), by the mitigation of risks. Migration can thus be perceived as a strategy to enhance the socioeconomic position and the social security of the rural household by diversifying its sources of income. However, in contrast to NELM studies, income differences between urban and rural areas are not the main drivers of migration. The prime focus of the livelihood approach to migration is the diversification of livelihood activities to ensure the household’s wellbeing. While the real rural wage may surpass the real urban wage, household members can still be placed in urban centres to ensure the household’s survival in case of external and internal shocks in the rural area, such as a fall in agricultural prices, drought, flooding or pests (Lucas, 1994).

2.1.2.3 Social network theory
While the previous theories of migration are predominantly focused on the economic motives of migration, social network theory aims to explain the importance of migrant networks in the migration process. Following Massey & España (1987:733), a migrant network can be defined as ‘a web of social ties that links potential migrants in sending communities to people and institutions in receiving areas’. Migrant networks are utilised to obtain information and employment. The availability of a migrant network has the potential to reduce the costs of moving as food and housing might be offered by relatives or friends while the newcomer attempts to find employment (Ito, 2010). Besides their economic employability, family members and relatives play a major role in the social adaptation process of migrants in the destination town. These observations are summarized in social network theory, which states that ‘ties to relatives or friends with migration experience decrease the financial, social, and economic costs of relocation and increase the returns to migration’ (McConnell, 2008: 773). A dense migrant network reduces risks and makes migration more likely.

2.1.2.4 The three-tier theoretical approach to migration
So far this sub-section has elaborated on a number of migration theories that varied between the macro-, micro- and meso-level. Finally, the three-tier theoretical approach to migration will be set forth. This approach, developed by Massey et al. (1993) in response to the lack of a coherent theory of migration, unites the macro, meso and micro-levels of migration in a theoretical framework. The resulting three-tier approach offers a starting point to explain the full range of factors that impact on internal and international population movements (Simatele & Simatele, 2009). In this framework, the micro-level analysis of migration flows targets the individual, who is a rational decision-maker aimed at improving his or her livelihood. The meso-level consists of a set of social and symbolic ties among movers and groups and the resources available to them (Massey et al., 1993). In accordance with the livelihood approach to migration and social network theory, the decision to migrate is influenced by social networks including stayers and migrants, and facilitated by the resources and needs of the household. The third and final level of the three-tier approach is the macro-level. This level analyses migration opportunities from an economic, political and cultural setting, while taking macroeconomic, demographic and ecological changes into account (Ibid.).
2.2 The economy of affection

2.2.1 Defining the economy of affection

Following the three-tier theoretical approach to migration (Massey et al., 1993), possible friction and conflict can already be sensed between the migrant and the household he or she leaves behind. While the migrant is considered a rational decision-maker who aims to improve his or her own livelihood through the process of migration, the household that is left behind aims for the enhancement of its socioeconomic position and social security by supporting this particular member to move to an urban area. As chapter 4 will show, the influence and support of relatives in the decision-making process that leads to individual migration is not to be underestimated. However, the reduced influence of the kin members after the migrant’s departure may lead to a scenario of non-support that was originally not intended by at least one out of two parties. How, then, does the rural kin succeed to continually engage the migrant with the rural home community? In this theoretical framework, I will discuss two social mechanisms that balance the seemingly unequal dependency relationship between urban migrants and rural relatives that emanates from a successful migration path. The first mechanism is the economy of affection, the second the arena of enforceable trust (section 2.3).

The economy of affection, developed by Hydén (1980, 2006) is an informal political economy in which both the rural kin and the urban migrant are players, and through which resources are allocated. Based on the assumptions of social exchange theory, the logic of the economy of affection is based on ‘direct, face-to-face reciprocities to get things done’, starting from the core principles that ‘(a) whom you know is more important than what you know, (b) sharing personal wealth is more rewarding than investing in economic growth, and (c) a helping hand today generates returns tomorrow’ (Hydén, 2006: 72). As participation in the economy of affection centres on risk mitigation and the deployment of social support capabilities, it can be perceived as a strategy of livelihood diversification. Contexts of uncertainty in rural communities within a state that is far from the Western welfare model leads people to engage in ‘affective behaviour’: through personal investments in reciprocal relations with other individuals they aim to achieve goals that are seen as otherwise impossible to attain (Ibid.: 73). The scarcity goods at stake can be classified as material goods or symbolic goods, such as prestige and status.

Hydén (Ibid.) identifies four motives for engaging in affective behaviour, namely to: (a) gain status, (b) seek favour, (c) share a benefit, and (d) provide a common good. As the economy of affection assumes dynamics of personal interdependence and shared expectations, people can turn to affective behaviour when faced with either opportunity or constraint. For instance, in relation to rural-urban migration an affective deal could be closed as follows: rural relative X aims to use urban migrant Y to obtain a material good from the city. If Y accepts X’s request, Y loses resources on the short term but gains influence over X that Y can utilise in future encounters with rural relatives. The transaction might as well lead to the enhancement of Y’s status in his or her rural home community. Therefore, if Y has the means to accommodate X, it is perceived a rational decision for Y to close this informal deal with X.
However, opportunistic behaviour within the economy of affection is not uncommon (Ibid.: 87). As its terms are always ambiguous, urban migrant Y may be faced with numerous requests from rural relatives while it is unsure how and when these favours will be repaid. On the other hand, the refusal of requests may lead to feelings of jealousy, anger and frustration, and potential social sanctions in the rural community. On an individual level, therefore, the economy of affection may have positive or negative consequences depending on one’s position and willingness to participate in the affective network.

2.2.2 The legitimacy of seeking favours

Right from the early stages of the individual rural-urban migration process in Africa, the economy of affection plays a major role. Not only is the potential migrant regularly supported with resources of the rural home community, more often than not the affective network outside the village is employed to house, feed and assist the migrant to find employment in his or her first urban destination. Kinship networks in particular are effective tools in facilitating rural-urban migration (Hydén, 1980). After the move, the integration process of urban migrants is closely followed by rural relatives who gain their information from the migrant or through extensive social networks. Once the new urban dweller has settled down and found work in the city, the time has come to start repaying his or her debt that has been accumulating within the economy of affection. The rural kin now expects the migrant’s material and financial support and starts seeking favours.

Sharing one’s resources is crucial to upholding the economy of affection (Hydén, 1980). Within this informal political economy, it is perceived as legitimate for the less well-endowed to seek favours from someone with resources. In general the approach to problem-solving is seeking out another individual for help, ‘rather than finding a solution on one’s own’ (Hydén, 2006: 75). Not only does this sociocultural pattern lead to practices of clientelism, it might also put a heavy burden on urban migrants to support their relatives in rural areas, an argument that will be set forth in the next subsection.

However, this affective behavioural pattern of seeking favours from urban kin members does not only emanate from the expectations and duties that abide within the economy of affection; it also results from the perceived socioeconomic stratification of the urban and the rural. As African urbanization has tended to merge with industrialization, Westernization and capitalism, urbanization is considered a ‘journey from one ‘world’ to another’ (Ferguson, 1997: 137). The deterritorialization of labour brings selected individuals into relatively well-to-do urban societies, where capital, technology and commercialization have resulted in the availability of previously unattainable goods and services (Appadurai, 2011). While the new migrant attempts to cope with urban life, its opportunities and hardships, the affective requests of rural relatives are now incorporated in the belief that the migrant is a gateway to a ‘modern lifestyle’ with an abundance of resources. In Zambia, remittances mainly consist of food, cash, clothes, or ‘town goods’ (Cliggett, 2005). For rural relatives, urban remittances do not just render economic assistance and access to ‘town goods’. The ‘symbolic experience of personal recognition given by the migrant’ (Cligett,
2005: 44) is also highly valued, leading to the conclusion that remitting is both an economic and social exchange.

Under the influence of decades of urbanization, many Zambian traditional exchanges and local rituals such as funerals, marriages and ancestral cults, have already been monetized (Geschiere, 2001: 78). Following Appadurai (2011: 597), the process of migration induces the negotiation of new commodity patterns, debts and obligations, while ‘rumours and fantasies about the new setting are manoeuvred into existing repertoires of knowledge and practice’. Inevitably, rural-urban migration in Africa seems to lead to the commoditization of the social relations between the urban migrant and the rural kin within the sphere of the economy of affection. When the urban migrant's adaptation to ‘new kinds of earning and new dispositions of capital and technology’ (Appadurai, 2011: 598) merges with the economy of affection, the desires of rural relatives may soar to new heights. Are the benefits of the economy of affection high enough to prevent the migrant from dismissing his or her obligations?

2.2.3 The economy of affection: safety-net or drain on resources?

So far, the point has been made that engagement in the economy of affection has the potential to become a drain on the resources of urban migrants, as the expectations and requests of rural relatives tend to increase strongly once the migrant has settled in and found work in the city. Following Portes & Sensenbrenner (1993: 1338), it is important ‘not to lose sight of the fact that the same social mechanisms that give rise to appropriable resources for individual use can also constrain action or even derail it from its original goals’. Socially expected practices of remitting and supporting can severely impede the urban migrant’s capacity to build a viable livelihood, as the majority of urban migrants are not well employed and often do not have surplus income (Cliggett, 2005: 35).

At the same time, it is important to realise that urban migrants can greatly benefit from a positive participation in the economy of affection that connects them with their rural community. Sending remittances, receiving rural relatives in one’s home, and visiting the village can effectuate mutually beneficial social relations for urban migrants and their rural relatives, while facilitating options to return to the home community (Cliggett, 2005; Moore & Vaughan, 1994). In general, by investing in the economy of affection, the urban migrant is able to keep rural lines of assistance open:

'A maternal uncle who receives a shirt from a migrant nephew knows he was remembered, and may be more likely to help the young man with bride wealth, than to help a migrant who never communicated and then appears with expectations of assistance from his kin.' (Cliggett, 2005: 44).

It is often the migrant himself or herself who informs the rural kin of his or her newly established socioeconomic position when the transition period in town has resulted in favourable circumstances:

'Single men might send a gift, via a visitor, of a bag of sugar, a bar of soap, or a chitenge [wrap] to their mother, as a sign that they are settling and earning a living in town, but also as a sign that they want to maintain contact with the village.' (Ibid.: 41).
Besides strengthening the migrant’s position and status in the economy of affection, the practice of remitting has the potential to increase the self-confidence of urban migrants as their accepted gifts are improving the livelihood of rural relatives. However, a number of case-studies show that the absence of remitting and the neglect of rural relatives are not uncommon among rural-urban Zambian migrants (Cliggett, 2000, 2005; Ferguson, 1999; Hansen, 1996). The actions that initiate this pattern can be categorised as keeping physical, social, cultural, and economic distance from the rural kin. Firstly, while ‘the apparent anonymity is the city is deceptive, where local alliances are strong and social networks very large’ (Ferguson, 1999: 11), the fact remains that ‘the most direct and effective form of pressure for support, a face-to-face request, is a difficult option’ (Cliggett, 2005: 43). Secondly, unwillingness to support rural kin may emanate from negative feelings or conflicts between relatives, especially when conflict has played a role in the migrant’s decision to relocate (Cliggett, 2000). The social distance that is created in such situations could successfully prevent the migrant from responding to the calls of the economy of affection. Thirdly, as the next section will show, cultural distance can be created by adopting a cosmopolitan urban cultural style that distances the urban migrant from the rural kin and its norms and values.

Lastly, the occurrence of non-support and neglect of rural relatives by urban migrants may be caused by keeping economic distance. As set forth in the previous chapter, since late 1970s the Zambian economy has suffered from a severe crisis. The implementation of Structural Adjustment Programs in the 1980s and 1990s has led to the deterioration of urban living conditions and the stagnation of employment opportunities (Ito, 2010; Potts, 2005; Simatele & Simatele, 2009). In a situation where rural poverty is increasing simultaneously and off-farm sources of income are growing in significance, ‘urban migrants may try to negotiate ways of ensuring that their burden of transferring money back home to family and community does not become too heavy, but they have great difficulty escaping these expectations and social pressures without losing their status in the eyes of those at home’ (Hydén, 2006: 75). Although the Zambian economy has experienced some growth in the first years of the 21st century, it is not surprising that the economic difficulties still faced by many urban migrants seems to have led to a declining capacity and willingness to support rural relatives (Potts, 2005).

In many cases, the economy of affection can be considered as a drain on the limited resources of urban migrants instead of a social safety-net. As rural demands rise while the rural community is less and less capable of offering concrete forms of material social security to urban kin (Geschiere, 2001: 78), to what extent are the main principles of the economy of affection still functional? Its mutual benefits of reciprocity and social investments seem to be overshadowed by one-sided opportunistic behaviour as rural relatives ‘see themselves as having an entitlement to claim part of the money that their urban-based kin generates while away from the farm’ (Hydén, 2006: 75). Still, in spite of the apparent lack of benefits for urban migrants, in the majority of cases the institutions of the economy of affection will prevail. This is achieved by a second social mechanism that mutually interacts with the economy of affection in keeping the urban migrant involved with the rural home community: the arena of enforceable trust.
2.3 The arena of enforceable trust

2.3.1 The mechanism of enforceable trust

The concept of enforceable trust finds its roots in Weber’s classic notion of ‘substantive rationality’ in market transactions. As opposed to the formal rationality of economic action, ‘the extent of quantitative calculation or accounting which is technically possible and (...) actually applied’, substantive rationality is ‘the degree in which a given group of persons (...) is or could be adequately provided with goods by means of an economically oriented course of social action. This course of action will be interpreted in terms of a given set of ultimate values no matter what they may be’ (Weber, 2009:185). In short, substantive rationality explains how group goals govern economic behaviour, and how social embeddedness in networks may cause individuals to ‘subordinate their present desires to collective expectations in anticipation of what Weber designates as “utilities”, that is long-term market advantages by virtue of group membership’ (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993: 1325).

However, collective reciprocity transactions *an sich* do not touch on the core of substantive rationality. Following Portes & Sensenbrenner (Ibid.), in the end it is individual members’ disciplined compliance with group expectations that leads to the ‘anticipation of utilities associated with “good standing” in a particular collectivity’. Therefore, their notion of ‘enforceable trust’, based on the principles of Weber’s substantive rationality, is focused on the internal sanctioning capacity of the community:

> Individuals behave according to expectations not only because they must, but out of fear of punishment or in anticipation of rewards. The predictability in the behaviour of members of a group is in direct proportion to its sanctioning capacity’ (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993: 1332).

Trust can be defined as ‘the confidence that others will do the “right” thing despite a clear balance of incentives to the contrary’ (Granovetter, 2005: 33). In his 2006 research paper, Hofstede adds a useful distinction between intrinsic and enforceable trust. According to him, intrinsic trust between people is simply based on ‘liking someone’ and wanting to trust the person. On the other hand, enforceable trust is centred on control, and on how to influence the actions of others. While a mutual relationship of intrinsic trust makes control redundant, enforceable trust is founded on a clear power base of reward and punishment to ensure the ‘right’ thing is done.

The effectiveness of enforceable trust as a social mechanism is proportional to 1. The available options outside the community of securing social honour and economic opportunity, and 2. The group’s ability to monitor the behaviour of its members (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993: 1335, 1337). These observations have caused Portes & Sensenbrenner to develop the following proposition:

> ‘The greater the ability of a community to confer unique rewards on its members, and the more developed its internal means of communication, then the greater the strength of enforceable trust and the higher the level of social capital stemming from it.’ (p. 1337)

Although the economy of affection as developed by Hydén (1980) is set forth as a stable social safety-net with mutual benefits, in his 2006 publication Hydén considers the possibility of
coercion in the economy of affection and general social exchange theory. He concludes that unbalanced power, and therefore unequal dependencies, may result in reciprocities that entail punishment or negative power in the economy of affection (p. 85). In this thesis, I will argue that the social mechanism of enforceable trust comes in when the principles of the economy of affection fail to make the urban migrant comply with the demands and expectations of the rural kin when faced with a lack of benefits. Because of the internal sanctioning capacity of enforceable trust, the interaction between the economy of affection and the mechanism of enforceable trust is able to ensure the support of the urban migrant to a greater extent, even when the rural community does not have much to offer in return.

In the remainder of this section, I will set forth what I consider to be ‘the arena of enforceable trust’. The next subsection will describe the variety of urban styles that have resulted from urban migration and their impact on rural-urban relations, while subsection 2.3.3 centres on different power levelling mechanisms that are used by rural relatives to retain power over urban migrants. Finally, subsection 2.3.4 illustrates the range of coping mechanisms that urban migrants apply to strengthen their stance in the arena of enforceable trust. In general, the influence of economic fluctuations on the economy of affection and the mechanism of enforceable trust is emphasized.

2.3.2 The impact of economic fluctuations on urban cultural styles

As stated in Chapter 1, following Zambian independence in 1964 the urban population grew from 18% in 1963 to 40% in 1980. It is to be expected that rural-urban migrants have developed a variety of ways to adjust to urban life and to balance urban-rural relations. In his interesting work concerning urban life on the Copperbelt, Ferguson (1999) describes how official Zambian policies in the 1960s, 70s and 80s were designed to create a focus on nuclear families. The idea of the ‘modern family’ soon became popular among some middle-class workers, while others chose to keep several rural relatives in their urban homes. But although some urban residents enjoyed the idea of the nuclear family, the wage-earning migrant would almost automatically become ‘a magnet for relatives and rural visitors’, as a result of which ‘the small “nuclear” family quickly becomes large and “extended” ’ (Ferguson, 1999: 182). This is only one example of how rural norms and values continued to penetrate the lives of those in town.

As mentioned before, urban migrants developed their personal styles and strategies to deal with the duality of rural and urban life. During his fieldwork, Ferguson encountered two main, though variable, urban cultural styles: the localist and the cosmopolitan style.

‘Localist stylistic markers seemed to distinguish those who had a strong sense of continuing allegiance to a rural “home” community -those who visited often, adhered to “custom,” and displayed a strong ethnic or regional identity. Cosmopolitan style, on the other hand, marked the distance a worker maintained from “home”; it signified a shrugging off of localist cultural traits, and often a rejection of rural ties, along with an embracing of Western-dominated transnational mass culture.’ (Ferguson, 1999: 92).

While localist urban dwellers demonstrated a close attachment to their rural home communities, cosmopolitans were less keen to allow rural kin into their newly found realities. In the context of a flourishing economy, these urban migrants could afford to isolate themselves from their rural relatives and turn their back on the expectations of the economy of affection, especially as
retirement could be planned for in the city. At the same time it must be noted that, in those days, because of favourable economic circumstances it was relatively easy for urban migrants to simultaneously support their urban family and the rural kin (Ferguson, 1997). Many urban migrants were able to invest in their rural home communities and planned for rural retirements. Some participated in relations of clientelism, in particular if the migrant was aiming for a future political career for which he or she would need the back-up of the rural community (Bratton, 2007; Geschiere, 2001).

However, with the economy’s downfall since the late 1970s, Zambian urban culture was increasingly shaped and constrained by rural-urban power relations (Ferguson: 1999: 99). As unemployment rates skyrocketed, the majority of urban workers had no choice but to overturn their initial plans and plan for rural futures. For those who had to turn or return to their rural communities, it became crucial not to appear ‘too urbanized’ in matters of dress, attitudes, habits and speech (Ibid.: 83). These signs could distinguish one from being a localist or a cosmopolitan, and a successful rural return or retirement was far more often achieved by those who displayed a localist style. As urban poverty increased from 4% in 1975 to 50% in 1994 (World Bank, 1996), more and more urban migrants were facing the inevitable choice to return to their ‘village’, which could vary from the natal village to a particular chief’s area, or any place within the home district (Moore & Vaughan, 1994: 173).

Following Hydén (2006: 86), 'the structural characteristics of the exchange relations, rather than motives of the actors, cause a power imbalance'. As previously better-off urban migrants find themselves in need of rural assistance, power dynamics between the rural and the urban actors shift to new equilibria. Rural relatives now have a unique reward for those who comply with the demands of the economy of affection: a friendly welcome 'back home'. As the sanctioning capacity of rural relatives increases, urban migrants face more pressure to make their peace with the rural kin. The migrants’ motives to participate in the economy of affection shift from ‘gaining status’ to ‘seeking favour’. According to Ferguson (1997: 151):

‘This new power in the hands of the rural dependents finds expression in new demands made on workers’ earning power, even as workers’ shrinking real income means that they are less and less able to satisfy even the old demands. Even the most loyal urban localists feel besieged with unfair and impossible demands.’

Due to the Zambian economic downfall, in the last decades of the 20th century the centre of gravity of the mechanism of enforceable trust convincingly lies with rural communities, enabling them to reinforce their position in the economy of affection. However, which sanctioning strategies does the rural community exhibit to coerce urban migrants to comply? In the next subsection, I will set forth a categorisation of three main levelling mechanisms that act as the sanctioning capacity of the rural community, and therefore determine the efficacy of the mechanism of enforceable trust.

2.3.3 The internal sanctioning capacity: three levelling mechanisms

As explained in the previous section, it may occur that participation in the economy of affection has no distinct short-term or long-term benefits for the urban migrant. While the expectations of rural relatives are often high and demands numerous, complying will limit the migrant’s
individual resources with nothing substantial offered in return. Still, the principles of enforceable trust and its levelling mechanisms enable the rural kin to coerce the migrant to comply with at least some of their demands. In the Zambian context, three main levelling mechanisms can be identified that collaborate as the internal sanctioning capacity of the rural community. These are (1) value introjection, (2) social exclusion, and (3) witchcraft practices.

In the arena of enforceable trust, the first levelling mechanism applied by the rural community is value introjection: 'general values in which individuals are socialized, and which appear as "the right thing to do"' (Torche & Valenzuela, 2011: 186). During the socialization process of children, value introjection can develop into bounded solidarity: 'principled group-oriented supportive behaviour towards the members of the same community' (Ibid.). Both are altruistic but externally induced motivations to participate in the economy of affection, even when direct benefits are absent (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993).

As in many developing nations, the principle of filial duty as part of value introjection plays a main role in Zambian society. Parents often make large sacrifices to raise a child. Filial duty evolves from the notion that the child has a duty to reciprocate these sacrifices (debt theory), or has a duty to respond with acts of gratitude (gratitude theory) once grown up (Keller, 2006). A failure to support one's parents cannot be easily undone and is often met by severe consequences in rural communities. In general, once a community member starts showing deviant behaviour, he or she is reminded of the community's norms and values and called to order. In recent times, modern communication technologies such as cell phones have greatly enhanced the community’s capacity to work through the levelling mechanism of value introjection. Not only has it become easier to reach the urban migrant him or herself, social networks are increasingly capable of reporting deviant behaviour to rural communities (Ferguson, 1999).

The second levelling mechanism applied by rural communities is the threat of social exclusion. This mechanism will be deployed by the rural community when the strategy of value introjection has come to naught, and the urban migrant is still refusing to comply with the community's demands. It must be understood that exclusion from the rural home community is a serious punishment. For many impoverished or retired urban workers there is no economic safety-net expect within the nexus of urban-rural linkages (Potts, 2009). Furthermore, in many parts of Africa the village remains important as a source of identity and belonging (Geschiere, 2001: 79). When someone is not buried in the village, this is often considered a sign of deep social shame; it means that the rural family was not willing to take care of the body. Therefore, 'the village-ancestor complex continues to exercise a hold over people’s minds from which also urbanities who seem to have lost all contact with their rural origins cannot escape' (Ibid.: 93). Through dutiful participation in the economy of affection, a place in the village can be maintained. On the other hand,

‘when a migrant does not maintain contact with his rural relatives, they feel no obligation to welcome him home, and simply offer "we don't know him" as a polite explanation, meaning "he never maintained contact with us, why should we care for him now?" (…) Stories from the old age homes tell of people in villages chasing the return migrant away, or claiming they did not recognize him.’ (Cliggett, 2005: 44)
Finally, witchcraft practices are the third levelling mechanism that acts as part of the internal sanctioning capacity of the rural community. With regard to the social relations between rural relatives and urban migrants, 'fear of witchcraft has long been an effective sanction used by rural kin to help enforce customary norms of generosity and social and economic levelling on returning migrants’ (Ferguson, 1999: 117). In general, the notion of witchcraft has come to be understood as 'the belief in the ability of some humans to use supernatural power to disable or enable other humans' that can be utilised as 'a means of social control or a manifestation of tension within a particular society' (Ngong, 2012: 155). It can be used for good or evil purposes. Throughout history, practices of witchcraft have shown to be highly flexible as they attune to larger changes in society (Sanders, 2003: 339).

As in many African countries, in Zambia witchcraft is an important societal issue that penetrates several domains of life. Generally, people suspect it is practiced quite often. It is important to realise that the Zambian terms for witchcraft do not identify actions according to their supernatural ability, but to their 'sneakiness and illegitimacy', and the danger that someone might kill you’ (Ferguson, 1999: 120, 119). For instance, cases of poisoning or burning down a house were repeatedly ascribed to witchcraft practices. Considering the consequences of Zambia's economic fluctuations in the 1980s and 1990s, it is not surprising that, according to Ferguson's fieldwork, witchcraft became most feared by those urban migrants who exhibited a cosmopolitan style, those who 'had ignored and snubbed their rural kin all their lives, those whose very manner stood as an affront and an offense to rural proprieties' (Ibid.: 158). If an urban migrant has no choice but to return to the village, showing remorse and starting to comply with the demands of the economy of affection, however high and impossible, tends to be a better choice than the alternative offered in the following quote:

'Some, they do fear to be bewitched. They haven't been visiting their relatives, so once they get there they will think that they came with plenty of wealth. So they try to bewitch them so they get the wealth those people came with.' (Ferguson, 1999: 118)

In conclusion, in the Zambian case practices and threats of value introjection, exclusion and witchcraft function as the main sanctioning strategies of the rural community to coerce urban migrants to comply with the demands of the economy of affection, together building the mechanism of enforceable trust. The next subsection will consider the range of coping strategies that urban migrants may exert when dealing with the rural community's practices of enforceable trust.

2.3.4 Coping strategies of urban migrants

Faced with the sanctioning mechanisms of enforceable trust, urban migrants are forced to develop coping strategies that range from full compliance to non-compliance with the demands of the economy of affection. As social structures are impacted by the larger political economy over time, as we have seen these coping strategies are compelled to change in the context of wider economic fluctuations.
The urban migrant's first option is to comply with the demands of the economy of affection, either because of 'internalized' altruistic motives (value introjection, bounded solidarity) or self-interested motives (aim or reciprocity exchanges, avoiding sanctions) (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993; Torche & Valenzuela, 2011). A complying attitude can be manifested on the economic, social, and cultural level. Complying behaviour on the economic level is exhibited by supporting rural relatives financially, e.g. by sending remittances to the village and paying for funerals. Examples of social compliance are receiving rural relatives in one's urban home and visiting the village on a regular basis. Lastly, cultural compliance is signified by performing a localist urban style that incorporates the norms and values of the rural home community (Ferguson, 1999). However, as a result of compliance with the economy of affection the migrant may face a gigantic free-riding problem, whereby 'less diligent group members can enforce on successful members all types of demands backed by the same normative structure' (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993: 1339). As a result of this power imbalance, the migrant's individual action is constrained.

When faced with the dilemma between individualism and collectivism, it is likely that many urban migrants are tempted to employ a coping mechanism of limited or non-compliance with affective demands. Especially when there are available options of securing economic opportunity and social honour outside the rural community, urban migrants will often choose to lower their level of compliance with the demands of the economy of affection (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993: 1335). A successful economic and social life in town eliminates the direct need to accommodate one's rural kin. In the booming 1950s and 1960s, a coping strategy of non-compliance was made possible by the urban workers' capability to build a livelihood independent of rural relations (Ferguson, 1999). As a result, the levelling mechanisms of enforceable trust largely lost their power and urban migrants were 'freed' from the demands of rural relatives, although a majority of urban dwellers would occasionally support them because of altruistic motivations or to reduce the risk of full exclusion from the rural community.

However, as outlined before, starting from the late 1970s Zambian economic circumstances forced the majority of non-complying urban migrants to change their coping strategies with regard to the economy of affection. Their stance in the arena of enforceable trust became increasingly precarious and vulnerable as the power equilibrium shifted to the benefit of rural relatives. In particular urban dwellers who had exhibited non-compliance to the economy of affection were facing difficulties, as 'moving to a rural area entailed a kind of day of reckoning, a tallying of social debts and credits that had built up over the years' (Ferguson, 1999: 112). Building on Ferguson's argument that trends in urban styles respond to changes in the wider political economy (1999), in the remainder of this thesis I aim to set forth how contemporary socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to small towns in Zambia's Western Province are resulting in a renegotiation of the economy of affection.
3. Research design

3.1 Methodology

This chapter will discuss the methodology and methods of the research. In this section the philosophy behind the study is outlined. Subsequently section 3.2 provides an illustration of the research setting, the specific research methods that were used to collect and analyse the data, and the limitations, ethical issues and reflexive observations that arose in relation to the fieldwork.

As mentioned in the previous chapters, this study aims to answer the following main question:

**In what ways are contemporary socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to small towns in Zambia’s Western Province resulting in changes in patterns of enforceable trust, and in a renegotiation of the economy of affection that includes urban-urban migrants and their rural relatives?**

To answer the main question, during the fieldwork answers had to be found to four sub questions:

1. What are the contemporary socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to small towns in Zambia’s Western Province?
2. Which levelling mechanisms are used by rural relatives to balance their position in the economy of affection vis-à-vis their urban kin?
3. Which coping strategies do urban-urban migrants apply to balance their position in the economy of affection vis-à-vis their rural kin?
4. How are these dynamics changing the economy of affection that involves rural relatives and urban-urban migrants?

In order to find answers to these questions, qualitative research was conducted in two towns of Zambia’s Western Province. In this research, the definitions of the Central Statistical Office of Zambia will be used to clarify the differences between urban and rural areas. According to CSO (2012a: 13), an urban area is defined by a minimum population size of 5,000 people, whose main economic activity is non-agricultural. Furthermore, the area must dispose of ‘basic modern facilities, such as piped water, tarred roads, a post office and police post/station, and a health centre’. Two of such scarce urban centres in Western Province are the towns of Mongu and Seshake. Western Province’s urban areas display a variety in developmental routes and socioeconomic characteristics. Therefore, in order to facilitate a comparative analysis and to increase the reliability of the data, I have chosen two small towns as my research areas.

This study is aimed at capturing the dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to small towns and consequential changes in urban-rural social relations and support patterns. However, as it focuses on the economy of affection that links rural communities and urban migrants, one criterion for selecting participants was that they were urban-urban labour migrants who had originally left their villages to find employment. In conclusion, when this study speaks of urban-urban migrants or urban migrants, it can be seen as a shorthand for rural-urban-urban labour migrants.
As the research was both qualitative and explorative in nature, some of the original research questions have changed in the process of doing field research. In general I have aimed to be flexible and adaptive to local circumstances and social patterns and practices, and to apply an interpretative approach to understand the social reality of my research participants in their context (Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, 2006). This means that the fieldwork period has produced an overview of social perceptions that may or may not coincide with the factual truth and reality. In my position as researcher I have strived to appear neutral in order to prevent conflicts of interest and socially desirable answers to interview questions. By using participant observation, informal interviews, and semi-structured interviews as research methods, I have attempted to achieve methodological data triangulation (Guion et al., 2011).

3.2 Methods

3.2.1 Research setting

The fieldwork of this study was conducted between March 3 and May 23, 2014. Two towns in Western Province have acted as main research areas: Mongu, the province’s capital, and Sesheke, a border town in the South (Figure 3.1). To enhance my understanding of the relationship rural kin-urban migrant, I have also joined urban migrants on their visits to the villages of Sifula (April 16, Mongu District) and Mutemwa (May 11, Sesheke District).

There is a simple reason why I decided to conduct my MSc thesis research in Zambia’s Western Province. During my MSc internship with WWF Zambia in 2013, I had already been stationed in Sesheke for four months. When I decided to return to Zambia for this study, based on the
supposition that sociocultural familiarity would increase the depth of the research, I thought it wise to return to a place I was already familiar with. More importantly, it was in Sesheke that I noticed the interesting socioeconomic dynamics of labour migration and urban-rural support patterns. I aimed to conduct a comparative study of migration in two small towns in Western Province. Because of Sesheke’s recent economic revival, it has become a popular migrant destination. Another town that attracts many Zambian labour migrants is Mongu, the capital and largest urban area of Western Province.

Mongu and Sesheke qualify as the two of the most urbanized areas in Western Province with estimated population sizes of roughly 50,000 and 20,000. The main languages spoken are Silozi, the tribal language of the Lozi people, and English. Both Mongu and Sesheke are capitals of their own districts within Western Province. Apart from these common features, the histories and current situations of the towns are quite divergent. Mongu, the capital town of Western Province, has a long and rich history of functioning as the capital of Barotseland before this historic state was incorporated by the state of Zambia in 1964. Traditionally, Mongu is the home town of the Lozi people and their ruler, the Litunga. In recent decades Mongu has known stable population growth rates and moderate economic growth.

In contrast, the younger town of Sesheke has been experiencing a population boom since 2004. In this year the Katima Mulilo Bridge was built, replacing the ferry that used to connect Sesheke with Katima Mulilo, a Namibian town. The modernisation of the Sesheke-Livingstone road in the same year contributed to a sharp rise in the intensity of road traffic passing through Sesheke. Many Zambians use Sesheke as a transit point on their way to the more modern, inexpensive and diverse shops in Namibia, while foreign trucks move through Sesheke to reach Zambia’s major cities. On the one hand, the enhanced importance of Sesheke in Western Province’s infrastructural landscape has resulted in employment and business opportunities. On the other hand, rapid population growth is followed simultaneously by the rise of squatter camps, housing shortages, and inadequate public facilities. Thereby the proximity of Namibia has resulted in extensive cross-border smuggling practices.

Broadly spoken, I resided in Sesheke in March and May 2014, while I spent the month of April in Mongu. During the fieldwork period I stayed in self-contained lodges located close to the town centres.

3.2.2 Data collection and analysis

3.2.2.1 Methods of data collection

The main data source of this study are face-to-face semi-structured interviews conducted with rural-urban-urban migrants residing in Mongu and Sesheke. The personal interview was chosen over the questionnaire because interviews are more suited to explore attitudes, values, beliefs and motives with regard to a topic (Barriball & White, 1994). The rich and detailed variety of data that results from interviews makes this data collection method favourable in the case of explorative research. However, to facilitate comparability of the data the interviews were developed in a semi-structured fashion. Each interview was conducted with the help of an interview guide (Appendix...)
A total of 33 labour migrants was interviewed; 20 residing in Sesheke and 13 residing in Mongu. The interviews were conducted in the participants’ homes, or at a neutral, public place in Mongu or Sesheke. No financial or material compensation was offered for participation in the research. After conducting 10 interviewees in Sesheke, extra questions were added to the interview guide. To guarantee the comparability of the data, I have arranged second meetings with those first 10 research participants. The other participants were interviewed individually on one occasion. On average the semi-structured interviews lasted between 40 and 45 minutes. Intensive probing was applied to increase the richness of the data and to reduce the risk of socially desirable answers. All interviews were recorded with a smartpen and transcribed afterwards.

The semi-structured interviews incorporated the following sections:

A. Background information migrant
B. Departure from village and settling in first urban destination
C. Departure from previous urban centre and settling in Mongu/Sesheke
D. Experiences in Mongu/Sesheke
E. General migration patterns and social support in Zambia

Besides the semi-structured interviews, other methods of data collection that were applied are participant observation and informal interviews. After participation in meetings, happenings and conservations in Mongu and Sesheke, I recorded new knowledge, experiences and questions in my field notes to enlarge my knowledge base and insights in relation to the research topics. During my visits to the villages of Sifula and Mutemwa, I briefly interviewed some villagers on the relationship between rural communities and urban migrants. Lastly, more extensive though unstructured interviews were conducted with government officials, such as the director of the Social Welfare Department in Mongu and the District Planning Officer in Sesheke.

Originally I intended to organise focus groups as an additional method of data collection. While in the field, I cancelled this plan. When I was interning with WWF Zambia, I had already noticed that Zambian patterns of cultural hierarchy can impede the participation of the young, the poor, the low-educated, and the female members in a focus group. Therefore, if a focus group is composed of members with diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, the results are inclined to be unsophisticated and unsatisfactory. As my research sample displayed quite a large variety, I have made the decision to invest in a larger number of individual interviewees during which every participant can have his or her say, regardless of socioeconomic background.

3.2.2.2 Selection of participants for the semi-structured interviews

Considering the facts that 1. I did not know any Zambian rural-urban-urban migrants at the start of the fieldwork, and 2. This research population is not easily detected physically or geographically and therefore hard to reach (Handcock & Gile, 2011), I have applied snowball sampling to find participants for the semi-structured interviews. Following Thompson (2002: 183), snowball sampling is defined as the procedure by which ‘a few identified members of a rare
population are asked to identify other members of the population, those so identified are asked to identify others, and so on, for the purpose of obtaining a nonprobability sample.'

To increase local awareness of my research, I handed out little pieces of paper on which I stated my request and requirements for research participants, my name and my Zambian phone number. In Sesheke I was able to use my contacts and the social network of my interpreter to enlarge my research sample. In Mongu I had to rely completely on the systematics of snowball sampling. Thanks to my acquaintance with a local radio maker, my request for research participants was also recited in English and Silozi on Mongu’s local news radio.

My criteria for selecting research participants were as follows:

- The participant is at least 18 years old.
- The participant has first moved from a rural area to an urban destination for reasons of employment.
- Subsequently, the participant has moved to Mongu or Sesheke for reasons of employment.
- The participant is currently still residing in Mongu or Sesheke.

Apart from these four requisites, no preference was given regarding age, sex, place of birth, educational level, or household size of the migrant, although the selection procedure of interviewees was aimed at ensuring the diversity of the sample. In general, my interviewees in Mongu were younger and had attained a better level of English than the Sesheke interviewees. In Mongu, I was able to conduct all 13 interviewees without interpreter. Meanwhile, an informed Silozi-English interpreter was asked to apply his skills during 9 out of 20 interviews in Sesheke.

3.2.2.3 Methods of data analysis

After the semi-structured interviews had taken place, the recordings were transcribed into sorted computer files. As the interviewees were assured anonymity, I have taken care to protect their identity. When this thesis is finalised, the original interview recordings will be destroyed.

The analysis of the semi-structured interviews largely coincided with the five stages of the Framework Approach, a method of qualitative contact analysis that is suitable for research with a limited time frame (Pope et al., 2000; Srivastava & Thomson, 2009). After familiarisation with the raw data (1), through coding and constant comparison a thematic framework with key issues, concepts and themes was identified (2) by looking the aims of the study and issues that were repeatedly brought up by the interviewees. Subsequently all the data were indexed (3) into this thematic framework, followed by the process of charting (4): after rearranging the data, charts, tables or verbal descriptions were developed for each key subject or theme. A selection of these can be found in the next chapter. In the framework’s final stage of mapping and interpretation (5), explanations are provided for the findings. This process is based on both the original research aims and the themes that have been inducted from the data.

The Framework Approach is a method of data analysis which has inductive as well as deductive aspects. Grounded Theory, an inductive method of data analysis, can be recognised in the fact that the Framework Approach reflects the original accounts of the research sample. However, the
method works deductively from predefined research objectives. This combination of deductive and inductive elements results in a more structured process of data collection and analysis than is common in most qualitative research (Pope et al., 2000).

3.2.3 Limitations, ethical issues and reflective observations

3.2.3.1 Limitations of the study
The first limitation of this study is the effect that snowball sampling has had on the age difference between the Mongu and the Sesheke sample. In Sesheke, my dedicated 60-year-old interpreter attempted to find me as many interviewees as possible. Because of his age, many of his acquaintances were already retired. In the end he found me about 8 participants for the semi-structured interviews. I tried to find some younger migrants myself, but with an average of 47 years old, the age of the sample turned out to be quite high. 400 kilometres northwest of Sesheke, my struggle to find participants for the Mongu sample started with a number of young urban-urban migrants whom I found in the town centre. Using snowball sampling, they continued to lead me to other relatively young persons. In the end the average age of the Mongu sample was 30 years old. As a consequence of the age difference, with regard to some research topics it made more sense to use the two samples to show generational differences rather than to compare the socioeconomic dynamics of Mongu and Sesheke.

Secondly, in qualitative research, the researcher has to take the statements of participants at face value since self-reported data are difficult to verify. While participants may speak the truth, they can also have incentives to be dishonest, such as strategic interests or the aim of socially desirable interaction with the researcher. With regard to my research, I think a bias was created by the fact that some interviewees attempted to exaggerate their dour position in life. As I will set forth in the next subsection, a selection of research participants wished to establish some sort of patron-client relationship with me. When comparing the signs of their socioeconomic status – e.g. size and equipment of the house, clothing – and their statements about life during the interview, it seemed they were trying to generate pity and support. In particular, these practices may have influenced their statements about rural-urban and urban-rural support systems. In future research, this bias could be reduced by interviewing the migrants’ rural kin as well to verify the statements made by the migrants.

Finally, at times the language difference created a barrier. The Silozi language has a completely different composition than Germanic languages such as English and Dutch. Therefore a statement or the outcome of a translation may appear strange and unsatisfactory, even when translated by someone who speaks both English and Silozi fluently. When making appointments for interviews, I would try to assess the participant’s capacity of speaking English. However, sometimes his or her level of English would be sufficient for casual talk, but during the interview some questions were not understood. In those cases I have tried to rephrase the question or to ask follow-up questions to ensure we were discussing the same phenomenon.

3.2.3.2 Ethical issues and reflexive observations
My internship period had already taught me to think carefully about my position and behaviour in Zambian society. Although the prevalence of gender inequality is high, in my case the fact that
I am female was more than offset by my skin colour. In the rural region of Sesheke, white people are still seen as rare guests of honour on almost every occasion. I was favoured in shops, at the border, on the streets, simply because I am white. In Mongu, where more whites can be found, the attitude towards me was less humble and shy. However, in both towns people obviously were very interested in this white girl walking around town by herself. I felt like I was being watched all the time. A general observation was that Zambians are not used to individual whites interacting with the general public. I was asked many times why I was walking around by myself, since 'whites always walk around in groups'.

As Zambia is a relatively stable country with low crime rates, it was safe for me to live and work in this context. However, my situation in Mongu was a bit more precarious because I was not familiar with the town and the people. Consequently, some people tried to take advantage of me by following me around or waiting for me at my lodge. Although I do not believe anyone really meant to harm me, sometimes these practices made me feel unsafe. In Sesheke I was under the protection of the WWF Sesheke office workers and several friends and acquaintances I had met the year before. I was able to enjoy those fieldwork periods more.

During my field research I have encountered practices of corruption and patronage on several occasions. As a white person strolling around Zambia, many locals suspected me to have incessant flows of money. Explaining that I am a student did not change much. Sometimes I was clearly expected to bribe someone. At the same time, there were quite some people who tried to invoke some sort of patron-client relationship with me; I was asked to support them in their children’s education, daily needs, business endeavours, etc. For instance, at the start of one interview in Mongu, a young man stated that he needed someone to take him back to school, and subsequently succeeded to return to this request during his answers to the majority of interview questions. Even after I had returned to the Netherlands, through social media requests kept coming in from Zambian acquaintances, and acquaintances of acquaintances. Many attempts were and are being made to involve me in their economies of affection.
4. Research findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will give an overview of the research findings. Preference was given to findings that build up the study's main argument, without dismissing those findings that contradict the argument. At times graphic data representations and quotations are used to present the findings more effectively.

The following section introduces a range of relevant descriptive statistical findings that comprise the socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to Mongu/Sesheke, focusing in particular on urban-rural and rural-urban support patterns. After presenting the research sample, the section will discuss the dynamics of the individual migration paths in chronological order, starting from the migrant's departure from the village up to his or her settlement in Mongu or Sesheke. This section is finalised by evaluating the interviewees' statements on general urban-rural and rural-urban support patterns in Zambia.

The subsequent and final section of the chapter analyses the affective behavioural patterns of the people in the research sample. Firstly, several expressions of affective behaviour are set forth. Next, in accordance with the theoretical classifications of Chapter 2, an overview will be given of the levelling mechanisms used by rural relatives, and the related coping strategies that were applied by members of the research sample.

4.2 Socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to Mongu/Sesheke

4.2.1 Characteristics of the sample

Between March 17 and May 14, 2014, 33 residents of Sesheke and Mongu were interviewed for the sake of this research. All research participants originally came from village areas and can be qualified as rural-urban-urban migrants. In the case of the Mongu sample, 85% of the home villages are in Western Province, while 4 out of 13 villages are part of Mongu District (Table 4.1). In the case of the Sesheke sample, 80% of the home villages are in Western Province, with 11 out of 20 villages being part of Sesheke District (Table 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home village in</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>% (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Province</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongu District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home village in</th>
<th>Sesheke</th>
<th>% (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Province</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesheke District</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All research participants had at first migrated from the home village to a larger Zambian city. Most
of these cities are located outside Western Province, such as Livingstone (10) or Lusaka (9). A majority of 22 out of 33 interviewees subsequently made one or several stops in other cities and towns before settling in Sesheke or Mongu, their current residences.

The research sample counted 28 men (Mongu: 10, Sesheke: 18) and 5 women (Mongu: 3, Sesheke: 2). All research participants were between 21 and 69 years old, whereas the average age of the sample was 40.1 years old (Mongu: 30.2; Sesheke: 46.5). The average number of children of the research participants was 3.1 (Mongu: 1.4; Sesheke: 4.2). The average household size of the sample was 5.0 (Mongu: 3.8; Sesheke: 5.9).

With regard to level of education (Table 4.3), the majority of the sample had at least completed secondary education (Mongu: 93%; Sesheke: 60%). While the Mongu sample scored higher on finishing high school, the Sesheke sample contained just as many persons who have finished a certificate, diploma, or degree after high school.

Table 4.3 Education levels of the research sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education levels of the research sample</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesheke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted primary education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted secondary education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed secondary education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced diploma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the division between formal and informal employment status was about equal. In the Sesheke sample, 6 participants were retired. In general, the Sesheke sample displayed a higher socioeconomic status than the Mongu sample. Although some members of the Mongu sample worked in middle-income jobs as teachers or other government workers, the majority of the sample consisted of low-paid workers such as security guards, cleaners, and shop personnel. On the other hand, the Sesheke sample included a diversity of shop owners, business men, government workers, technicians, and farmers. The enhanced importance of Sesheke in Western Province’s infrastructural landscape seems to have resulted in a variety of business opportunities that have not been extended to Mongu District. However, considering the higher average age of the members of the Sesheke sample, it is plausible that increased financial stability has contributed to their ability to seize emerging business opportunities.

4.2.2 Moving to first urban destination (FUD)

4.2.2.1 Leaving the village

In the research sample, the average age to leave the village for the first migration move was 19 years old. The migrants were between 14 and 28 years old when they left the home village. Almost all migrants discussed this decision with one or several relatives. All interviewees who had
discussed the decision with family members felt supported by their relatives in their final decision to leave the village. Encouragement and support by the family could therefore be regarded as an important factor in the migrant’s decision-making process to migrate. When asked why he or she had made the decision to leave the village, the lack of employment opportunities in the village (53%) and the search for a better life (21%) were mentioned as main motives to leave the village (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4 Reasons for leaving the village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for leaving the village</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesheke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment purposes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek better life</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of money</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational purposes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike for village life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of the sample was able to pay for the journey to their first urban destination themselves. In other cases, parents, siblings and other relatives stepped in. The research participants made their first move to leave the village between 1960 and 2011.

4.2.2.2 Move to first urban destination (FUD)

A large majority of the 33 migrants subsequently migrated to an urban area outside Western province, predominantly to neighbouring Southern Province with its popular capital Livingstone (10), or to Lusaka Province (9). Migrants chose their FUD based on the perceived employment opportunities and the presence of relatives. A majority of 62% knew relatives in the first urban area they moved to. Only 15% knew no one in their FUD. Third- and second-degree relatives offered most help in the settling-down process of the new migrants. In particular, aunts, uncles and siblings were involved in helping and housing them:

‘Before I went to Lusaka he came to village to visit us, that was a brother to my mom. She told him: “please, one of these days my son will come”. He said: “ok, ok”. So when my mom found some money, I just started off. My uncle was the only one I knew in Lusaka. When I came to Lusaka, fortunately enough I located where my uncle was living and when I came there, he said: “my nephew, welcome, welcome. Please do the best you can, life is like this and this”. So I started now and lived with him.’ [Interview M7; April 5, 2014]

While 20% of the sample never found a job in their FUD (42% of the Mongu sample), most interviewees found a job after applying (30%), or with the assistance of relatives (23%).

4.2.2.3 Contact and support urban migrant - rural kin in FUD

While residing in their FUD, 90% of the interviewees was in contact with their rural relatives in the home village. Depending on the time period this contact was facilitated either by letters or phone. Thereby two-third of the sample visited the home village while residing in the FUD, often during annual holidays or work leaves. The village was also visited by urban migrants in case of a funeral, illness or another problem. The 10 interviewees who did not visit the village while
residing in their FUD gave the following reasons: only in FUD for a short time (3), avoiding challenges in the village (3), no money to travel (2), too far to travel (2).

About 75% of the interviewees claimed to have sent money and/or goods to their rural kin while residing in their FUD (Table 4.5).

Table 4.5 Sent money/goods to rural kin from FUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent money/goods to rural kin from FUD</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesseke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: money</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: goods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: money and goods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 8 participants who did not sent anything gave the following reasons: lack of money (4), unemployment (3), no contact with the rural kin (1). A majority of 22 interviewees sent money to their home villages while residing in their FUD. According to the interviewees, this money was predominantly utilised to buy food or to pay for the school fees of siblings. Clothes/blankets, food, and other groceries were the goods most often sent to the villages from FUD. 73% of the interviewees felt that the family in home village was expecting their support. The other interviewees claimed their families had no expectations because they had informed them about unemployment or a lack of money:

“When you are unemployed, they know that. They will appreciate that and they will inform everyone: “no, now he is not working”. The demands will go down. Even if someone comes to visit you, you can say: “no, not now. We are having problems”. [Interview S2; March 17, 2014]

When asked why rural relatives were expecting the migrants’ support, the sample gave the following main reasons: filial duty, status of employment, socioeconomic stratification village-town, and being the first-born (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6 Reasons expectations rural kin in FUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons expectations rural kin in FUD</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesseke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filial duty migrant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status migrant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratification village-town</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant is first-born</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other supporter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting aim of leaving village</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education migrant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2.4 Contact and support rural kin - urban migrant in FUD

More than 60% of the migrants were visited by relatives from the home village in their FUD. Thereby half of the migrants received goods from the home village, and a small minority received both money and goods (Table 4.7).
In all cases the goods sent were village foods. The interviews classified the following products as village foods: pumpkins, groundnuts, cassava, honey, rice, maize, watermelons, fish, beans, love fruit, and sour milk. Among the Mongu sample, village support levels in the FUD were higher. Thereby a quarter of the total sample felt morally supported by the family in the home village, and a few migrants were supported by rural relatives in case of illness. A majority of 70% of the total sample did not expect the rural kin’s support, predominantly because of a lack of resources and poverty in the village. The 30% that did expect the rural kin’s support, based their expectations on familial and tribal values of supporting each other (Table 4.8).

### Table 4.8 Expectations migrant on support rural kin in FUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations migrant on support rural kin in FUD</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesseke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources in the village</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant is first-born</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long distance to village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.3 Moving to Mongu/Sesheke

#### 4.2.3.1 Leaving previous urban destination (PUD)

After leaving their FUD, 22 out of 33 interviewees made one or several stops in other cities or towns before settling in Mongu or Sesheke. Finally, 13 interviewees migrated from Lusaka and 7 interviewees migrated from Livingstone to settle in Mongu or Sesheke. The interviewees moved to Mongu or Sesheke between 1991 and 2014. Their main motives to leave their PUD were employment purposes, a transfer, and to come back home (Table 4.9).
Almost every migrant discussed the decision to leave their PUD and come to Mongu/Sesheke with rural relatives, such as mother, father, spouse, and siblings. A majority of 65% of the migrants paid for the journey to Mongu or Sesheke themselves. Others were supported by their employers, parents or siblings.

4.2.3.2 Move to Mongu/Sesheke

The migrants’ main motives to move to Mongu/Sesheke were to be close to relatives, because of a transfer, and to explore business opportunities and employment opportunities (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10  Motives to move to Mongu/Sesheke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives to move to Mongu/Sesheke</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesheke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close to relatives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to village</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower costs of living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish to invest in home community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plurality of the total sample (84%) subsequently moved back to Western Province, where almost half of them (Mongu: 31%; Sesheke: 55%) even moved back to their districts of origin.

Almost all interviewees already knew people in Mongu/Sesheke and had visited Mongu/Sesheke before moving there. A large majority of 70% got assistance from relatives to settle down in Mongu/Sesheke. Currently, half of the total sample is renting a house, while others own a house, are staying with relatives, or are being housed by their employer (Table 4.11). It is plausible that the generational difference between the Mongu and the Sesheke sample is causing the greater residential independence of the Sesheke sample.

Table 4.11  Current housing situation sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current housing situation sample</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesheke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with relatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged by employer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment was found after applying for a vacancy, because of a transfer, or through contacts. Thereby 6 interviewees were retired at the time of the research and 4 interviewees had started their own businesses. Lastly, 2 interviewees were still searching for employment.

4.2.3.3 Experiences in Mongu/Sesheke

On average, the Mongu sample had been living in Mongu for 5 years, while the Sesheke sample had an average length of stay of 13 years. According to the interviewees, in comparison to the PUD, the positive aspects of staying in Mongu are lower costs of living, people's friendliness, many familiar faces, and the feeling that 'it's home'. Also the proximity to the home village and tribal similarities were valued. In the case of Sesheke, the interviewees predominantly mentioned Sesheke's business potential, the feeling that 'it's home', the proximity to the home village, and Sesheke's peacefulness.

In comparison with the PUD, negative aspects of staying in Mongu were considered to be: low levels of development, high levels of alcohol abuse, low moral standards, the lack of entertainment/sport facilities, and the fact that Mongu is just too hot. With regard to Sesheke, interviewees mentioned the equally high costs of living, low levels of development, the high level of alcohol abuse, low moral standards, the lack of educational facilities, and the lack of opportunities for youths. A diverse range of comments on the negative aspects of living in Mongu or Sesheke were summarized by a member of the Sesheke sample:

‘What I dislike about staying here is that the place is small. When these school leavers leave school there is nothing they can do. There is no college. The only work they do is just to be a taxi driver or to be a money changer you know. And there is a lot of prostitution here. There are very few chances for the young. When I came here, with work and qualifications, this place was good for me. I knew exactly what I wanted to do. Then this is a good place. It is not good for someone who is starting life, it is not a good place. I have seen a lot of children that have loomed their life in Sesheke here. They started prostitution, they started beer drinking.’

[Interview S1; March 17, 2014]

However, 91% of the total sample found living in Mongu/Sesheke to be a positive experience. The age differential is clearly exhibited in the interviewees' expected length of stay in Mongu/Sesheke. Whereas 77% of the Mongu sample plans to leave Mongu within the next 5 years, only 10% of the Sesheke sample plans to leave within the same time frame. Thereby more than half of the Sesheke sample aims to stay in their current residences until death, against 15% of the Mongu sample.

4.2.3.4 Contact and support urban migrant - rural kin in Mongu/Sesheke

All but one member of the research sample stated to be in contact with relatives in the home village at the time of the research. Almost 80% claimed to have more contact with rural relatives since they have moved to Mongu/Sesheke. This contact is largely facilitated by phone. Modern communication technologies and reduced distance to the village have attributed to increased contact between the village and the migrant. Moreover, 69% of the total sample claimed to visit their home village at least once a year, with 35% visiting the village more than 6 times a year. A minority of 10% has never visited the home village since their move to Mongu/Sesheke.
Of the total sample, 87% is supporting rural relatives with money and/or goods. For the Mongu sample, this percentage is 100%. The reasons for part of the Sesheke sample not to support the village are: focusing on the nuclear family, parents have passed away, or having no contact with the village. More than half of the total sample is helping the rural kin with both money and goods (Table 4.12).

### Table 4.12 Sending money/goods to rural kin from Mongu/Sesheke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sending money/goods to rural kin</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesheke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: money</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: goods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: money and goods</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food, clothes/blankets, other groceries, farm inputs, and building materials make up the range of goods that are send or brought to the village, while the money sent to rural relatives is predominantly used for the education of siblings, nieces and nephews, and to buy food.

A majority of the total sample felt that their relatives in the home village were currently expecting their material and/or financial support. This number was substantially larger among the Mongu sample, with 92% against 59% among the Sesheke sample. Some members of the Sesheke sample claimed that their relatives in the village were not expecting their support because they were aware that the migrant had retired:

‘After assisting my side, we would assist my wife’s village. When I was working, they [the village kin] expected it very, very much. Now that I’m retired, I can’t help as much as I did. They appreciate that.’ [Interview S18; May 8, 2014]

Thereby a quarter of the Sesheke sample believed their village relatives knew they did not have the resources to support. In case the migrants felt that the village was expecting support, the following reasons were given for Mongu: the filial duty of the migrant, the lack of another supporter, and the fact that the migrant is successful in life. In the case of Sesheke, the expectations of the rural kin were explained by the fact that the migrant is successful in life, the migrant’s leading role in the village, and the lack of another supporter (Table 4.13).

### Table 4.13 Reasons expectations rural kin in Mongu/Sesheke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons expectations rural kin</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesheke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filial duty migrant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant is successful in life</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other supporter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratification town-village</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading role in village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant is first-born</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village is used to being supported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village also supports migrant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3.5 Contact and support rural kin - urban migrant in Mongu/Sesheke

During their stay in Mongu/Sesheke, 83% of the sample was visited by relatives from the village. Furthermore, a majority was supported with money and/or goods by the village (Table 4.14). While some members of the Mongu sample received money from the village, the Sesheke sample only received goods. In all cases, the goods received were village foods.

Table 4.14 Migrant obtained money/goods from village in Mongu/Sesheke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant obtained m/g from village in M/S</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesheke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: goods</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: money and goods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thereby 30% of the total sample (Mongu: 42; Sesheke: 22%) felt morally supported by their village relatives. A few members of the Sesheke sample also mentioned they were supported by the village in case of illness in the nuclear family.

When asked whether they expected the rural kin’s support (Table 4.15), 61% of the total sample gave a negative answer. The main reasons given for not having expectations were the lack of resources and poverty in the village, and the distance to the village. The 11 interviewees that stated to expect the rural kin’s support, gave the following reasons: familial values, reciprocity, and the fact that supporting back and forward had become a pattern. These findings are largely in agreement with Table 4.8, signalling that the interviewees' expectations with regard to rural support have not changed much after moving to Mongu or Sesheke.

Table 4.15 Expectations migrant on support rural kin in Mongu/Sesheke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations migrant support rural kin M/S</th>
<th>Mongu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sesheke</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources in the village</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long distance to village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant is first-born</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has become a pattern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequently, the interviewees were asked about their designated place to spend their retirement. A majority of 60% (Mongu: 50%; Sesheke: 67%) planned to retire in their current place of residence, while 30% had plans to retire in another urban area (Mongu: 42%; Sesheke: 22%). Only 2 interviewees aimed to spend their retirement in the home village.
4.2.4 General urban-rural and rural-urban support patterns in Zambia

4.2.4.1 General support patterns urban migrants - village in Zambia

At the end of the interview, the interviewees were asked some general questions about mutual support patterns between urban migrants and their rural relatives in Zambia. In response to the question whether it is common for a labour migrant in town to support his/her relatives in the village, 47% of the total sample claimed this was common. Thereby 34% stated that some migrants do, some migrants don’t. In contrast, 19% of the total sample did not think it was common for migrants to support their rural kin. When asked why migrants support rural relatives, the following main motives were given: because of filial duty, to improve the livelihood of the village, and because of the dependency of the village (Table 4.16).

Table 4.16  General motives for urban migrants to support rural kin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General motives to support rural kin</th>
<th>Mongu %</th>
<th>Seseke %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filial duty</td>
<td>9 32.1</td>
<td>12 35.3</td>
<td>21 33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve livelihood village</td>
<td>6 21.4</td>
<td>11 32.4</td>
<td>17 27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency village</td>
<td>5 17.9</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>7 11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final aim of reciprocity</td>
<td>2 7.1</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>4 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives request support</td>
<td>2 7.1</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>4 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting was migration aim</td>
<td>2 7.1</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>4 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce modernity</td>
<td>1 3.6</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>3 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid witchcraft practices</td>
<td>1 3.6</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>2 3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked why migrants do not support rural kin, the following reasons were offered: migrants forget the village (30%), focus on own household (28%), or have a lack of capacity to support (27%). Other reasons mentioned were: long distance to the village, negative relationship with rural kin, unsupportive spouse, and fear of witchcraft practices in the village.

4.2.4.2 General support patterns rural kin - urban migrants in Zambia

A large majority of 75% of the total sample did not think it is common for rural kin to support a migrant in town, while 16% believes some village relatives support and some don’t, and 9% thinks it is common for rural kin to support. Sharing the village resources, reciprocity, helping the migrant to solve a problem, and having enough wealth in the village were the leading motives that were given for rural kin to support a migrant in town (Table 4.17).

Table 4.17  General motives for rural kin to support urban migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General motives to support migrant</th>
<th>Mongu %</th>
<th>Seseke %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share village resources</td>
<td>4 36.4</td>
<td>6 30.0</td>
<td>10 32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>1 9.1</td>
<td>4 20.0</td>
<td>5 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant has a problem</td>
<td>3 27.3</td>
<td>2 10.0</td>
<td>5 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough wealth in village</td>
<td>1 9.1</td>
<td>4 20.0</td>
<td>5 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for migrant’s support</td>
<td>1 9.1</td>
<td>3 15.0</td>
<td>4 12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental care</td>
<td>1 9.1</td>
<td>1 5.0</td>
<td>2 6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expressions of village support mentioned were sending food, sending money, visiting in case of illness, moral support, inviting an unsuccessful migrant to return to the village, and supplying herbal medicines.

When asked why the rural relatives would not support a migrant in town, the main reason given was their lack of capacity (33%):

‘No, actually, we don’t expect that because we know how village life is. How difficult their life is. At the village they are always struggling to find food. Every time you are in the fields; busy ploughing, busy cutting fire wood in the bushes. You know, they struggle there. So we don’t expect much from them. Even when they bring something to us, we would say: “don’t every time think we need food from you. If you see that food is not enough, then you can just stay back”.’ [Interview M10; April 12, 2014]

Thereby the socioeconomic stratification village-town (28%), and the idea that support is supposed to go the other way (20%) were prevalent. Also mentioned were: the villagers’ preference to be dependent, jealousy, large distance, and the fact that cows are needed for prestige.

4.3 Analysing affective behavioural patterns of the research sample

4.3.1 Expressions of affective behaviour

4.3.1.1 Support of the affective network in the individual migration process

Right from the early start of the individual rural-urban migration process, the affective network is involved. Most members of the research sample had discussed their decision to move with relatives in the village, after which extended kin in town was asked to receive the migrant in their homes. As the migrant’s settling-down process can easily take up to a year, the burden on urban relatives may become quite high:

‘When people migrate to cities, they have to identify where to stay. There is no shelter for the homeless or anything. They have to identify a person, a friend or a relative, that they are going to stay with. And then during that stay, everything is provided for them: meals, everything they want. Then that constraints the person that is keeping them.’ [Interview District Planning Officer Sesheke; May 14, 2014]

It will not come as a surprise that a large number of rural-urban migrants choose their first urban destination based on the presence of relatives, and that the urban kin tends to assist the migrant in finding employment. Again, while most of them had been financially independent for years, the majority of the sample consulted members of the affective network before deciding to move to Mongu or Sesheke, and were assisted by kin members after arrival.

4.3.1.2 Visiting patterns

In comparison to their activities in their FUD, the migrants’ visits to their villages have increased from 68% to 90% since they have moved to Mongu or Sesheke. Several factors could contribute to this finding, namely: 1. reduced distance as most migrants have moved closer to their home villages, 2. the emergence of modern communication technologies which keep the migrants...
involved with village life, and 3. having reached a more financially stable phase in one’s life and therefore being able to support the family in the village to a greater extent, as the following quote illustrates:

“Well, I used to come to Mongu but just ended up here. I didn’t proceed to the village. I came to Mongu during vacations, when we closed. I think somehow I found it easier for me to be around here. Because the village, you know, also has its own challenges. So when you find yourself moving out you’d want to build yourself until things become better for you. Yes, that’s when you begin to get back to the village and wherever possible render some assistance. Otherwise they will just ask you for things you can’t give.” [Interview M13; April 21, 2014]

In comparison to the situation in the FUD, the frequency of visits from the home village has increased for both the Mongu and the Sesheke sample. For the Mongu sample, 92% has been visited by family from the home village while residing in Mongu. This percentage was 67% in the FUD. In the Sesheke sample, the number has grown from 63% to 77%. It is plausible that the reduced distance between the village and the migrants is the main reason for the increased visits, as many of the latter have moved back to their own districts or provinces. Furthermore, it is likely that the migrant currently has more resources to accommodate the needs of his or her rural relatives. In the words of another member of the Mongu sample: ‘they always come now that I’m more comfortable and settled’.

4.3.1.3 Exchanges of financial and material resources

Although less than half of the interviewees considered it common for urban migrants to support their rural kin, the sample’s own support patterns contradict this perception. In the case of Mongu, the percentage of urban migrants supporting their home village by sending money and/or goods has increased from 67% in the FUD to 100% while residing in Mongu. This can be interpreted as another result of the elements mentioned before: reduced physical distance, modern communication technologies, and increased capacity to support. In the case of Sesheke, the percentage of migrants supporting their home village by sending money and/or goods has slightly dropped from 79% to 76%. Considering the age differential, the discrepancy between the samples is not surprising. In general the expectations of rural relatives are lower with regard to retired migrants, of which the Sesheke sample contains six. Moreover, while many migrants residing in Mongu are supporting their parents in accordance with the principles of filial duty, a number of parents of the Sesheke sample has already passed away. This may reduce the migrant’s motivation to support the home village, although for some the expectations of the rural relatives remain high:

‘It is more intense because in the social system I am now almost the head of the village. So they seek help, they seek financial support and all that stuff. Basically you cannot completely withdraw support, even when your parents are dead. There are always young ones. They look at you and say: “this man is better than us, he should help us.” That is a lot of social pressure. You find that in the village almost everybody is related to you. You cannot run away from that. There must at least be some support.’ [Interview S2; March 17, 2014]

While a large number of interviewees claimed that it is not common for rural relatives to support migrants in town, the majority of interviewees was and is being supported by the home village while residing in their FUD and current residences. The low general expectations of village

2 Interview M2; April 2, 2014
support can be clarified by taking into account the possible meanings of ‘support’. For some interviewees this concept denotes all types of assistance, while others apply a categorisation that only considers direct or indirect financial assistance as support:

‘But that’s not really support. Like, if they send me a watermelon. They didn’t buy it, they grew it.’ [Interview S13; March 26, 2014]

Regardless of the diverse definitions of support, the percentage of home villages sending money and/or goods to their urban kin has increased, respectively from 67% to 75% in the case of Mongu, and from 53% to 59% in the case of Sesheke. Goods, and especially village foods, are still most common to be send. By keeping the support relations intact, rural relatives aim to continuously connect urban migrants to the rural kin, hence secure future support. It is likely that this trend is stimulated by reduced distance to the village which decreases shipping costs. The increase in support may be connected to the enhanced support of urban migrants as well, as reciprocity is generally referred to as a main motive to support:

‘Here in town, there are no places where you can say: “I’m going to the fields”. The whole place is filled with buildings, unlike in the villages. That side, they do their farming each and every time. So you find that us people in town, we always need something like pumpkins, watermelon, maize... So that’s why they do that. They know in town we don’t grow foods. It’s also a sign of appreciation because we help them. If we wouldn’t be sending them, I don’t think they would send something to us.’ [Interview M10; April 12, 2014]

Even though the affective principle of reciprocity seems to prevail, many interviews do not feel that their support to the village is offset by the village’s support. During the interviews, a large majority of the sample complained that the expectations of their home villages tend to be too high, especially when one is working and earning an income in town. The prime reason given for these high expectations is the fact that there is no other form of support available for the villagers. Most villagers are dependent on one or few persons who work in an urban area. However, the interviewees feel that the villagers want to depend on someone who is staying in town, while the costs of living in an urban area are much higher than in the village, where food, feed and fuel come from the land.

While many migrants experience supporting the village as a social responsibility, conflicts arise when the needs and demands of the village endanger the migrant’s individual needs. The interviewees repeatedly stated that their rural relatives lack understanding when it comes to the living circumstances in urban areas, as they believe that someone who is working or has worked in town has infinite supplies of money. The general feeling is that villagers do not appreciate the hardships a migrant can endure in town:

‘I started receiving quite some complaints after I came here. People expected me to offer support, financial support. Adopting my nephews and nieces and cater for their education, things like that. But then of course as an individual you also have your road map, with your own plans. So my plans were somehow conflicting with the plans of some people in the village. I wasn’t settled yet and already people had their own expectations. That really became difficult for me.’ [Interview M13; April 21, 2014]

It cannot be denied that many members of the sample expressed a genuine concern to improve the livelihoods of their rural relatives as they understand the challenges and hardships of village
life. At the same time, a certain feeling of resignation could be detected among several interviewees. As the following quote illustrates, the long-established Zambian sociocultural patterns of migration and urban support seem to be internalized by many of them:

“This migration, what is has done: it has put the city up here and the village down there. So the goods and money are supposed to be dropping by gravity, and cannot go up.” [Interview S10; March 24, 2014]

4.3.1.4 The female members of the research sample

So far, this section has dealt with general expressions of affective behaviour that were found during the fieldwork period. A final paragraph will focus on the supportive behaviour of the female members of the research sample. As mentioned in the previous section, the research sample included five women, of which three are currently living in Mongu, while two are residing in Sesheke. At the time of the research, their average age was 35 years old. Among them were a cleaner, two shop workers, and two teachers. The five women migrated to their first urban destinations by themselves, at the average age of 19 years old. In their first urban destinations, they all failed to find a paying job and were not able to support themselves, let alone their rural relatives. Subsequently, two women received assistance from their families to start teacher training, while the others continued to move around, staying with a range of relatives. After settling in Mongu or Sesheke, they all managed to find a paying job and have been supporting their rural relatives by sending money and/or goods several times a year.

During the interviews, the female members of the research sample indirectly discussed the role of women in supportive patterns, emphasizing that relatives often have higher expectations of female kin:

‘Sure they were expecting that. I’m the firstborn daughter so as a woman, you know... A woman is someone who has to help other people.’ [Interview M6; April 4, 2014]

‘My mom really needs me, because I’m the only one she has now. My sisters died and my brothers are not reliable. They don’t even mind to help mom. One time I told her: “I want to go away to a big city and start something there.” Then I looked at her and I could see the tears in her eyes. I said: “mom, what’s the problem?” She said: “when you go, I’m doomed!” So I said: “it’s ok, I was just joking with you.”’ [Interview M3; April 3, 2014]

Although the female members of the research sample had struggled more than their male counterparts to build an independent urban livelihood, prevalent gender patterns seem to pressurise Zambian women, even more than men, to support their relatives and sacrifice their own dreams; values that are generally internalized by the women themselves.

The next subsection will discuss the range of levelling mechanisms that rural relatives use to coerce urban migrants to comply with their demands, even when participation in the economy of affection seems to have no distinct short-term or long-term benefits for the migrant. To what extent are the previously discussed levelling mechanisms of value introjection, social exclusion, and witchcraft practices applied by the sample’s rural kin? The final subsection reviews the accompanying coping strategies of the interviewees. What strategies of compliance or non-compliance do they apply to handle the demands of the economy of affection?
4.3.2 Levelling mechanisms of rural relatives

4.3.2.1 Value introjection

As discussed in Chapter 2, in this study value introjection is identified as one of the three main levelling mechanisms that collaborate as the internal sanctioning capacity of the Zambian rural community. Torche and Valenzuela (2011: 86) have defined value introjection as ‘general values in which individuals are socialized, and which appear as “the right thing to do”’. Although value introjection may lead to seemingly altruistic motivations to participate in the economy of affection, the fact remains that these motivations are externally induced during the human socialization process. The internalization of community values starting at an early age has favourable effects on the efficacy of the mechanism of enforceable trust, which is aimed at controlling the behaviour of group members.

Unquestionably, the fieldwork of this study has confirmed that the principle of filial duty as part of value introjection plays a leading role in the dynamics between urban migrants and the rural communities they have left behind. Almost every interviewee talked about his or her personal duty and the general duty of urban migrants to support their rural relatives, and especially their parents. In this context, most interviewees referred to the sacrifices made by parents while they are raising their children, and the consequential social obligation of the child to reciprocate these sacrifices:

‘Most of the parents are not working [in formal employment]. So they would sell their animals, get the money and pay for their children. So when the child goes, the little money that you send back, they will buy animals so that they bring back what they sold during your school. So their expectations are very high. And that’s why you hear other parents complaining to say: “no, I kept giving soil to seed that is rotten!” It’s even a curse in the African communities: when your parents have supported you and then you neglect them, you turn your back, you won’t even come to see them, everyone will consider you to be cursed.’ [Interview M12; April 15, 2014]

This quote is interesting for two main reasons. First, the interviewee’s statement displays a clear link to debt theory: it is the obligation of the child to repay the money that was spent by the parents during his or her education. While adult children residing in the village repay their debt by assisting the parents in practical, in-kind ways, urban migrants are expected to assist the parents by sending money. Secondly, according to the interviewee the sanctioning mechanism that prevails when urban migrants neglect their parents is related to both value introjection and witchcraft, as ‘everyone will consider you to be cursed’. The question why the migrant is considered to be cursed for not complying with the demands of the economy of affection is partly answered by the following quotes:

‘As a parent you never know. When your child moves away, he may help you and maybe he won’t. It’s a risk. So some people try to keep their children in the village. There are some people here in the village that are starving, starving! But they have children in town. These children can never be successful, because their parents are unhappy. If you make your parents happy, you will be successful in everything you do.’ [Interview Sifula Village 2; April 16, 2014]

‘If you forget that you’ve got parents when you’re in town, it’s unfortunate because they complain. A lot of parents, they complain, and it’s bad luck for those who are in town. I tell you that some people who leave home, to go and get a better job, they just die instantly. Because the family complained, the mother complained. She’s very old, she can’t plough, she can’t do anything. Now for you to be in town, eat this, drink… There’s breakfast,'
In these quotes, two sociocultural discourses are exhibited: 1. If you make your parents happy by supporting them in their needs, you will be successful yourself. 2. If your parents complain about you because you do not support them, you can never be successful and might even die a mysterious death in town, cut off from your own family. In the latter quote, it is possible that ‘complaining’ was used as a euphemism for cursing. Considering the large number of interviewees who have made a similar point, the ultimate power base of value introjection seems to lie with the perceived positive or negative prospects that are connected to certain types of individual behaviour. While the internalization of communal values has the potential to result in ostensibly altruistic practices of support, in the end the vague threats of exclusion and witchcraft appear to be the most effective stimulants to coerce urban migrants to comply with the demands of the rural community, and in particular their parents. This study’s findings with regard to the more direct threats of social exclusion and witchcraft practices will be discussed in the next subsections.

4.3.2.2 Social exclusion
The second levelling mechanism applied by rural communities is (the threat of) social exclusion. When vague threats in the context of value introjection have not resulted in the urban migrant’s compliance, rural relatives can deploy more targeted threats and practices of social exclusion. As emphasized by the following quote, the efficacy of this component of the rural community’s sanctioning capacity is closely related to the migrant’s options to secure socioeconomic prosperity outside the home community:

‘One time maybe the job can be finished. Then you can be forced again to go back to the village. Then the ones who are not supporting the village, when you come there, they don’t welcome you. It’s important to stay on good terms. Otherwise the village can say: “no, this one never helped us. Let him just be with himself”.’ [Interview M4; April 4, 2014]

During the fieldwork, only a small minority of interviewees discussed the possibility of becoming fully excluded from the rural community. The high numbers of urban-rural support found among the sample could account for the interviewees’ general reliance on the benevolence of the rural kin. Yet, social exclusion from the rural home community can work on a variety of levels and may also be practiced as a sanction after a ‘renegade’ migrant restarts to comply with affective demands. The subsequent comment was made by a 30-year-old migrant, who had only started to support his rural kin after he arrived in his second urban destination:

‘You know, that period that I was away, not helping them, there was that gap that was created. Of course, the people in the village, there was that level on which we would interact and so on. And then when that gap was created, now I noticed that even the way we would interact, it’s no longer the same as it used to be. Because somehow, I think, some of them have developed ideas that I’m quite distant, away from them. Which is not really the case.’ [Interview M13; April 21, 2014]

Immediately when the migrant had left the village to find employment in the city, the expectations of the rural relatives were altered. Because he had not responded to their requests and demands, even though he did have a job in his first urban destination, he was socially excluded to a certain extent after he starting supporting again. Possibly, the rural kin seized the opportunity to set an
example for other potential rural-urban migrants, thereby stimulating the process of value introjection. As mentioned in Chapter 2, in Africa the village remains an important source of identity and belonging (Geschiere, 2001). Social exclusion from the home village, ranging from the creation of a subtle distance to full exclusion, can therefore be considered a serious sanction for those urban migrants who prefer to stay on good terms with the rural community.

4.3.2.3 Witchcraft practices
Many interviewees were keen to discuss the influence of witchcraft on the rural-urban migration process and related practices of support. Jealousy plays a main role in practices of witchcraft. In accordance with Ferguson’s findings (1999), during the interviews jealousy was often used as a synonym of witchcraft or described as a direct inducement to attack someone by using witchcraft practices. An elderly resident of Seshake explained the role of witchcraft practices in rural-urban migration as follows:

‘The African traditional mentality is that anybody who is old is supposed to have medicines. That when you reach a certain age, you are assumed that you have taken some medicines to protect yourself, or maybe even to harm other people. So then people who go to work in towns, they fear to go back. Thinking that if they go back, people in the village have these medicines and they’ll be jealous because these people come with property, with money and so forth. So they [people in the village] start to envy, and in the process they can harm them [migrants]. So that’s why many of them don’t come back here. (…) Even if you are assisting them [people in the village], the jealousy still remains.’ [Interview S2; March 17, 2014]

The interviewee's statement that jealousy remains, even when migrants assist the village kin, might offer a main reason why the vast majority of the generally loyal research sample does not plan for a village retirement. After asking what the interviewee meant with ‘medicines’ and how they are used to harm people, I received a long, botanical lecture in which he distinguished between 1. medicinal plants and parts of trees that are processed in traditional medicines, and 2. poisonous plants whose infusion can be used for witchcraft practices and, bluntly, ‘killing someone’. While this interviewee offered a very concrete and down-to-earth definition of witchcraft, for many others the concept still seems to be surrounded by mystical notions of spirits and good or bad luck that can even reach you in town:

‘When the elders back in the village wish you good, you’ll do well. You shouldn’t forget them. You should go back to them, make them happy. Then they’ll wish you well. Those are praises and good spirits that keep you comfortable.’ [Interview M2; April 2, 2014]

‘Some people are jealous. Some people think if I bewitch this one, I’ll be able to get what they have. Witchcraft is everywhere. Even in town there is witchcraft. There is witchcraft in the village, yes. But when it is your village, what do you do? Some people have migrated, they have left their villages fearing to be bewitched by their relatives. But somebody who is in that business can get you anywhere.’ [Interview S17; May 5, 2014]

The interaction between value introjection and witchcraft practices turns out to persuade many urban migrants to comply with the demands of their rural relatives.

The next subsection sets forth the range of coping strategies that urban-urban migrants apply to deal with the demands and levelling mechanisms of rural relatives. Strategies range from full compliance to full non-compliance with the demands of the economy of affection.
4.3.3 Coping strategies of urban-urban migrants

4.3.3.1 Strategies of compliance

This subsection present an analysis of the coping strategies that the research sample applies to balance their position in the economy of affection, focusing on strategies and motives of compliance, non-compliance, and the importance of urban migrants’ perceived capacity to support.

In general, strategies of compliance originate from the economy of affection’s core principles that sharing personal wealth is more rewarding than investing in economic growth, and that a helping hand today generates returns tomorrow (Hydén, 2006: 72). During the interviews, the interviewees put forward several motives to comply with affective demands of village kin. The strategies behind these motives varied from pursuing self-interest to satisfying internalized altruistic tendencies. Avoiding communal sanctions such as social exclusion or witchcraft practices, and effectuating reciprocity exchanges were the most frequently mentioned self-interested motives to support rural relatives:

‘Some people rush from urban areas to the village to sell some cattle, and then they take the money back to the city. Those who do that, they are those who think about their relatives. They think of them; they send them something. Someone can’t reap what he didn’t sow. So if you don’t support them, they also cannot support you.’ [Interview S8; March 21, 2014]

The situation displayed by this quote is in conformity with the affective principle that a helping hand today generates returns tomorrow. Several other interviewees discussed the need to invest in the village to improve one’s own situation during visits or retirement periods in the village. If one is considering to retire in the village, acting in accordance with the principle that sharing personal wealth is more rewarding than investing in economic growth could be a good strategy. In the following quote, the statements of ‘making a home’ and ‘being comfortable’ do not only refer to the aspects of owning a house and arranging some modern facilities; above all ‘being comfortable’ is associated with having a good relationship with the rural kin:

‘When you take development to your home area, you have made a home for yourself. When you go there you will be comfortable. But if you don’t support your home area, you don’t support your village, you will be miserable.’ [Interview S17; May 5, 2014]

On the other hand, compliance with the affective demands of rural relatives may result from internalized altruistic behaviour that is effectuated by the levelling mechanism of value introjection:

‘Here in town, you have to pay for everything. But they [village kin] don’t think of that. I used to be very indebted because of that. But if your sister is crying, you don’t want to break her heart. So you go somewhere to borrow money. If you say no, it’s like something is haunting you. You can see your mother in your dreams. You can’t sleep well. When you say no, it’s really difficult. I am the eldest son. If I was a younger one it could have been easier, maybe someone would have taken my place. But because where I was placed everyone looks at me.’ [Interview M7; April 5, 2014]

In this case, the urban migrant’s strong internalization of community values, especially the principle of filial duty, evoked a situation where he was obliterating himself to accommodate the
affective demands of rural relatives. Although he did not have enough resources to fulfil his and their needs, he preferred being indebted over having a bad conscience. In accordance with his statement, many interviewees discussed their desire to be acknowledged as a ‘good child’ by improving the livelihoods of rural relatives. In those situations, sharing personal wealth with rural kin rather than investing in economic growth can be perceived as a socio-emotionally rewarding experience, instead of a long-term strategy to obtain economic benefits.

4.3.3.2 Strategies of non-compliance
Although a large majority of the research sample claimed to support their rural relatives, during the interviews several participants did discuss strategies of non-compliance or reduced compliance with the affective demands of rural relatives. A repeated argument was that the demands of the rural kin initially lead to compliance among urban migrants, but as the latter support, rural expectations tend to become higher and higher. A selection of general complaints that ‘they are never satisfied’, ‘they don’t appreciate your situation’, ‘they keep asking you’, and ‘they always want more’ were enounced in almost every interview. The contemporary widespread introduction of the cell phone in Zambia stands out as a contributing factor to the increase in rural demands. Now if there is a problem in the village, the urban migrant can be contacted immediately. As a result of these and other developments, a selection of migrants has opted to employ a strategy of non-compliance or reduced compliance with the demands of the economy of affection.

The research sample’s strategies of non-compliance can be categorised as keeping physical, sociocultural and economic distance from the rural kin. These strategies are mutually supportive in that successfully exercising one of them may unlock opportunities to employ the others. For instance, if a migrant is able to avoid retirement in the village, therefore maintaining physical distance, he or she will experience less pressure to reduce economic and sociocultural distance to the rural kin:

‘If I wouldn’t have these investments, what can I do in town? Definitely I would have to go to the village. Now since I’m investing here, it means I’ll be able to stay here in town and get money here and there.’ [Interview M2; April 2, 2014]

Of course there are several levels of non-compliance with affective demands. Undeniably, for urban-urban migrants the gravest strategy of non-compliance is the complete exclusion of the rural kin out of one’s life:

‘Maybe they are not supporting because they have no relationship with those [village] people. They can be related biologically but in the actual sense there is no relationship. They choose to dote up and not even allow their relatives to come and visit them. They change their lifestyle completely.’ [Interview S17; May 5, 2014]

However, few migrants are willing to fully isolate themselves from their rural relatives, as can be derived from the large number of interviewees who have moved back to their home districts and provinces because ‘it’s home’ and because of the proximity of relatives. Only one member of the research sample had chosen to cut off all contact with his rural relatives. During the fieldwork, strategies of reduced compliance were encountered more frequently:
‘I think from the time my mother passed away that help reduced. I think I have helped long enough. The people that I have helped are now working, they have their own families. Now I feel I should concentrate on my life and my children. My mother and father have by now passed away. My brother and sister in the village can take over to look after the people. I think me I have done enough. I used to pay them some visits and also when there is a funeral I have to go back to the village. Of course, you know sometimes when your brother sees how successful you are, he might not be all that very happy. You could see some negativity, some jealousy.’ [Interview S1; March 17, 2014]

This quote illuminates a range of motives to pursue a strategy of reduced compliance. By minimizing his general contact with the village, this interviewee communicates to his rural kin that he is not willing to support them anymore. His declined willingness to support is related to several factors. Most importantly, his parents have passed away, thereby dismissing him from his filial duty. Secondly, he has been helping the village kin for quite some time already and now wants to shift his focus to the nuclear family. Thirdly, by reducing physical contact and withholding his wealth, he aims to avoid jealousy and witchcraft practices in the village. As the subsequent subsection will show, the urban migrant’s ability to avoid rural sanctions is closely related to his or her perceived capacity to support.

4.3.3.3 Urban migrants’ perceived capacity to support

From a collective point of view, the urban migrants’ perceived capacity to support rural relatives is related to general economic fluctuations. In particular the elder members of the research sample would reminisce about the early days of their migration process, when one could easily support the nuclear and the extensive family because of widespread economic welfare in urban areas. However, in the aftermath of decades of economic decline, both urban migrants and their rural relatives have had to adjust their expectations:

‘It [supporting rural kin] used to be common, but with the change of the economic situation it has become… it’s not all that prevalent the way it used to be. These days it’s each one for oneself, God for us all.’ [Interview S1; March 17, 2014]

At the same time, as overall urban-rural support has become less common, rural relatives closely watch potentially successful kin members in town. Several interviewees emphasized that the affective demands of rural relatives are heavily dependent on the individual urban migrant’s perceived capacity to support:

‘I knew one guy in Livingstone who had no means. He was just doing some piecework here and there. So the village thought: this one has money. They told him to send money. But he told them: “town life is a bit hard”. They visited him and saw that it was hard. So they stopped bothering him, asking him for money. Town life is difficult when you are not properly employed. They do understand. They even advised the person: “it is better when you just come back to the village where you can do farming and you don’t need money for rentals and electricity”. Then he moved out of Livingstone.’ [Interview S5; March 20, 2014]

In this case, the rural-urban migrant in question was unable to satisfy the demands of his rural relatives. After investigating his socioeconomic welfare during a visit, they realised this was true, ‘stopped bothering him’, and even advised him to return to the village. In general, the greater the perceived success of an urban migrant, the more is expected of him or her by rural kin. As this is common knowledge in Zambia, several rural-urban migrants attempt to lower affective demands by withholding their prosperity, especially during visits to the home village:
‘It is very important how you present yourself. If you present yourself as a big person when you are working, they also expect big support. You should present yourself modestly. They should just know that you are working, not too many details. Cause if they know, they will come knocking at your door.’ [Interview S2; March 17, 2014]

In accordance with Goffman’s theory of dramaturgical interaction (1959), according to this statement the place and the audience determine the stage performance of the urban migrant. Through his or her performance, the urban migrant hopes to convince the rural audience of a certain socioeconomic status that is generally lower than his or her actual status. If the migrant’s performance is successful, it will facilitate a less stressful participation in the economy of affection. Although the migrant is not fully exploiting his potential to support the rural kin, this coping strategy is likely to divert rural sanctions until the truth comes out.
5. Discussion and conclusion

5.1 Overview of the study's major findings

The aim of this study has been to explore how contemporary socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to two small towns in Zambia’s Western Province are resulting in a renegotiation of the economy of affection that includes urban-urban labour migrants and their rural relatives. Secondly, this study demonstrates how the interplay of the economy of affection and the mechanism of enforceable trust results in urban migrants’ enhanced compliance with the affective demands of rural relatives.

In recent decades, rural-urban-urban migrants who are relocating themselves to urban areas in the vicinity of their original villages have caused a persistent urban-urban labour migration trend in the rural Western province. By researching and analysing this trend, this study aims to increase our general knowledge of mutual support patterns between urban-urban migrants and their rural relatives. Semi-structured interviews with 33 rural-urban-urban labour migrants, informal interviews, and participant observation were used as data collection methods during a three-month explorative fieldwork period in Mongu and Sesheke, two towns in Western Province.

The first research topic centred on the contemporary socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to small towns in Zambia’s Western Province. Based on the semi-structured interviews, a comparative analysis was made of the labour migrants’ social relations with the rural kin in their first urban destination, and their social contacts with the village while residing in Mongu or Sesheke at the time of the research. In general, both rural and urban kin members were found to advise and assist the individual labour migrant, emphasizing the important role of social networks in migration processes. In comparison to the situation in the migrants’ first urban destination, general contact with rural relatives and mutual visiting and support patterns have been intensified after the labour migrants moved to Mongu or Sesheke. This dynamic is generally stimulated by reduced distance to the village, modern communication technologies, and an increased financial capacity to assist rural relatives.

Another research topic that was explored during the fieldwork were the levelling mechanisms used by rural relatives to balance their position in the economy of affection, an informal political economy through which resources are allocated based on ‘direct, face-to-face reciprocities to get things done’ (Hydén, 2006: 72). As rural demands are high and urban migrants’ material benefits of participating in the economy of affection tend to be low, the rural community employs the social mechanism of enforceable trust to make the migrant comply with affective demands and expectations. The mechanism of enforceable trust can be understood as the internal sanctioning capacity of the community that is founded on a power base of reward and punishment to ensure the 'right' thing is done (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). During the fieldwork it was found that rural relatives reinforce their position in the economy of affection by applying the levelling mechanism of value introjection in combination with (the threat of) witchcraft practices. To a lesser extent, threats of social exclusion are thrown into the arena of enforceable trust. Among the research sample, value introjection and its subordinate principle of filial duty were most effective in inducing the urban migrants’ support.
The migrants’ general motives to comply with the affective demands of rural relatives ranged from pursuing self-interest to satisfying internalized altruistic tendencies. Many members of the sample expressed a genuine concern to improve the livelihoods of their rural relatives, as they understand the challenges and hardships of village life. Yet, although mutual urban-rural support levels among the research sample are high, most interviewees feel that their financial and material support to the home village is not offset by the village’s support, which is commonly expressed in supplying the migrant with a range of village foods. The general feeling among the sample is that villagers do not appreciate the hardships migrants can endure in urban areas, and subsequently complement their expectations with ceaseless requests and demands. Therefore, even in the rare event that urban migrants have sufficient resources to fully comply with the affective demands of their rural relatives, many of them choose to employ a coping strategy of reduced compliance that is commonly associated with withholding prosperity, for instance by reducing physical contact with the village or by staged performances during encounters with rural relatives.

5.2 Renegotiating the economy of affection

This study argues that the interplay of two social mechanisms, namely the economy of affection and the mechanism of enforceable trust, is balancing the seemingly unequal dependency relationship between urban-urban labour migrants and rural relatives that emanates from a successful migration path. While participation in the economy of affection could lead to opportunistic behaviour on behalf of rural relatives and the consequential withdrawal of urban migrants, the levelling mechanisms of enforceable trust induce the migrant to comply with affective demands. From this point of view, it makes sense that contact, visits and urban-rural support have intensified after the migrants’ move to Mongu or Sesheke. Because of closer proximity, the rural community’s ability to monitor the behaviour of urban kin in Sesheke and Mongu has been enhanced, leading to a higher effectiveness of the mechanism of enforceable trust (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). At the same time, in accordance with the principles of the economy of affection, increasing urban-rural support leads to a growth in practices of reciprocity and the sharing of village resources.

This study contradicts the findings of Cliggett (2000, 2005), Ferguson (1999) and Hanson (1996), who all discussed the widespread neglect of rural kin by urban labour migrants in Zambia. In contrast to their findings, high urban-rural support levels prevail among the research sample. It is possible that the aftermath of the Zambian economic crisis of the 1980s and 1990s has caused both rural relatives and urban labour migrants to alter their behaviour in the economy of affection. For instance, in contrast with Ferguson’s findings (1997, 1999) that economic hardship in the urban Copperbelt areas was met by even harsher demands from newly empowered rural relatives, this study found that rural relatives tend to ease the burden on unprosperous urban migrants by temporarily suspending their affective demands.

This phenomenon could be interpreted in several ways. First, the increased pressure on impoverished urban workers in the 1980s and 1990s could be explained by the fact that economic decline and poverty were also heavily invading rural areas. At the time of this study, the Zambian
national economic growth rate is much higher than in the last decades of the previous century. Higher rural standards of living caused by more beneficial national agricultural policies may decrease the direct need of urban support. A second explanation for the rural relatives’ milder standards is the relatively favourable status of the rural-urban-urban migrants that participated in this study, as will be exemplified in the next section. In comparison with Ferguson’s research participants, only few members of this sample exhibited a full cosmopolitan urban style associated with the rejection of rural ties. Even in their first urban destinations, the majority of interviewees endeavoured to support the rural community. Because of the migrant’s initial or potential compliance with affective demands, his or her rural relatives may be more willing to temporarily lower their expectations. Lastly, it is possible that tribal differences result in diverse behavioural patterns. While Ferguson’s research was located on the Copperbelt, a province largely inhabited by the Bemba tribe and numerous labour migrants from all over Zambia, this study took place in Western Province, the home province of the Lozi people. Distinct and localized mutual urban-rural support patterns may originate from varying tribal values.

Besides changes in the affective behavioural patterns of rural relatives, in comparison to Ferguson’s studies, urban labour migrants seem to have adjusted their participation in the economy of affection as well. It is plausible that the economic downfall of the 1970s and 1980s has directly influenced the support patterns of contemporary urban migrants, as it has taught them to invest more heavily in the economy of affection. Urban-rural support could be perceived as a strategy of livelihood diversification of urban migrants to ensure their well-being and social security. Because of the economic crisis in previous decades, migrants might have realised that staying on good terms with the rural community could be employed as a strategy of risk mitigation in case of hardships. After all, for willing but less well-endowed participants of the economy of affection, it is legitimate to seek favours from others with resources.

At the same time, labour migrants’ increased participation in the economy of affection may be indirectly induced by the rural community’s strategy to put more emphasis on the process of value introjection, aiming to avoid the widespread practices of urban-rural non-support that took place during the booming 1960s and 1970s. As the economy of affection assumes dynamics of personal interdependence and shared expectations, inducing values to support one’s family during the socialization process of children is likely to pay off in future encounters. A final possible explanation for the high urban-rural support levels of the research sample is the increasing Zambian economic growth rate since the turn of the century, which enables more urban labour migrants to simultaneously support their nuclear and extended families.

The enhanced socioeconomic status of urban labour migrants is underlined by the sample’s designated locations to retire. Only a few interviewees aimed to spend their retirement in the home villages, while the other members of the research sample planned for retirements in their current or future urban residences. Although a friendly welcome ‘back home’ seems likely for these relatively localist-oriented and loyal urban kinsmen and women, apparently the majority of the migrants does not feel the need to return to the village. This finding is generally explained by the fear of jealousy and witchcraft practices. Because of their willing participation in the economy of affection, this selection of urban labour migrants does not have to fear social exclusion from the
village. On the other hand, the same economic success that enables them to support their rural relatives in accordance with the induced principles of value introjection might be met by feelings of jealousy and practices of witchcraft and violence. The villagers’ levelling mechanisms to strengthen their position in the economy of affection create a paradox that is overcome by locating oneself in the home district or province, while staying clear of the village and its potential dangers. This way a balance is found that mitigates a diversity of risks.

5.3 Implications, limitations and suggestions for further research

5.3.1 Implications of the study

The findings of this study offer several implications for the field of rural-urban and urban-urban migration studies. Most importantly, the identification of the mechanism of enforceable trust as source of coercion within the economy of affection successfully transforms the latter from an inconclusive ‘social safety-net with mutual benefits’ (Hydén, 1980) to an arena in which unequal dependencies are balanced by rural levelling mechanisms and urban coping strategies, thereby explaining the occurrence of ‘punishment or negative power’ in the economy of affection (Hydén, 2006: 85). The successful interplay of the mechanism of enforceable trust and the economy of affection results in enhanced urban-rural support by urban migrants, which in turn leads to reciprocal rural-urban support by rural relatives.

Secondly, adding to Massey’s three-tier approach to migration, it is plausible to argue that the meso-level of this framework, social and symbolic ties among movers and groups and the resources available to them (Massey et al., 1993), can be compared to the mechanisms of the economy of affection, thereby adding to our knowledge of the general migration process. Following this train of thought, it can be deduced that the economy of affection, working on the meso-level of migration, connects the motives and actions of the micro-level individual migrant to the macro-dynamics of the economic, political and cultural setting by adequately balancing his or her social relations with network members. For instance, this study demonstrates how urban migrants are able to employ urban-rural support as a strategy of livelihood diversification to ensure their well-being and social security when faced with financial hardship.

Finally, the study offers insights into the motives and actions of urban-urban ‘return’ migrants in Western Province, Zambia, thereby adding to Nchito’s study (2010) of migratory patterns to small towns in Zambia’s Southern Province. While Nchito focuses on the economic determinants and opportunities that stimulate the general trend of urban-urban migration to small urban centres, this study complements her findings by analysing mutual urban-rural relations and support patterns as another crucial element of Zambian urban-urban migration patterns.

5.3.2 Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research

This subsection will present an overview of the most important limitations of the study, and offers suggestions for further research. The first limitation of the study is the use of a snowball sampling technique. Not only did this sampling technique lead to a substantial age difference between the
Mongu and the Sesheke sample, the procedure by which a few identified members of a population are asked to identify new members obviously leads to varied results, depending on those members initially found by the researcher (Handcock & Gile, 2011). As a consequence, it is unsure whether or not the sample accurately represents the research population. On the other hand, because of time constraints and difficult access to the group of rural-urban-urban migrants residing in Mongu and Sesheke, snowball sampling was considered the best way to locate this population. To improve the quality of the sample, future similar studies could invest more time in identifying the members of a certain research population, thereby getting a better picture of the characteristics of an appropriate sample.

Secondly, the findings of this study are limited by the fact that self-reported qualitative data are difficult to verify. In our final conversation, my interpreter grinned and said:

‘All the people we have interviewed together have lied, but just a bit. If I wouldn't have been with you, they would have lied a bit more’. [Field notes; May 9, 2014]

As mentioned in Chapter 3, in particular some interviewees’ statements about rural-urban and urban-rural support patterns seemed to be influenced by intentions to exaggerate their dour position in life, in order to generate my pity and support. In future research, this bias could be reduced by interviewing the migrants’ rural kin as well to cross-check the statements made by the migrants. Moreover, if the sample is composed of members with similar socioeconomic backgrounds, a focus group could be used as an additional method of data collection to verify the interview data.

Thirdly, focusing on a research population of rural-urban-urban migrants who have migrated to small towns in Western Province increases the chance of selecting participants who support their rural relatives, thence creating a bias. After all, it is more likely to support village kin when one is born in the village, as well as it is more probable to return to one’s home province or district when one is in good standing in the rural community, and exhibiting a localist style. Considering the low level of socioeconomic development in Western Province and the relative difficulty of the Silozi language, even before the start of the fieldwork I expected the majority of the research sample to be original Lozi who had relocated themselves closer to their home villages. On the other hand, the selection of research participants was not at all aimed at choosing ‘return migrants’. About 20 percent of the sample was born in a different province and less than half of the sample members are currently residing in their original home districts. Despite these numbers, it is not implausible to argue that this study’s findings on urban-rural support patterns may be affected by a sample selection bias.

Finally, at times the language difference happened to create a barrier between the research participants and myself. Even when an interpreter was employed during the interview, the different composition of the Silozi and English language would sometimes result in unsatisfactory outcomes. When conducting the interviews, I have attempted to use intensive probing, follow-up questions and rephrasing to ensure the content validity of the interview data.
5.4 Conclusion

This study argues that contemporary socioeconomic dynamics of urban-urban labour migration to small towns in Zambia's Western Province are resulting in a renegotiation of the economy of affection that includes rural-urban-urban labour migrants and their rural relatives. In the aftermath of the economic crisis that hit Zambia in the 1980s and 1990s, urban migrants seem to be more inclined to comply with the affective demands of rural relatives, thereby avoiding the negative encounters with the levelling mechanisms of enforceable trust that were the inheritance of non-compliant predecessors. At the same time, contemporary urban-urban migrants were found to apply a range of coping strategies to improve their own position in the economy of affection. Consequently, it is argued that the interplay of two social mechanisms, namely the economy of affection and the arena of enforceable trust, is balancing the seemingly unequal dependency relationship between urban-urban labour migrants and rural relatives that emanates from a successful migration path.

The findings of this study offer new insights into the motives and actions of urban-urban 'return' migrants in Western Province, Zambia, by analysing mutual urban-rural social relations and support patterns as a crucial element of the urban-urban migration process. Furthermore, by identifying enforceable trust as source of coercion within the economy of affection, it becomes possible to deepen our analysis of punishment and negative power in this social mechanism. Further research is necessary to explore to what extent this customized version of the economy of affection is operating on the meso-level of Massey’s three-tier approach to migration, thence adding to our knowledge of the general migration process.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Interview guide

Interview guide

General Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to talk to me. My name is Irene van Loosen and I am a student of Wageningen University in the Netherlands. At the moment I am working on my thesis research in Sesheke and Mongu. Would you like to see the letter of introduction written by my professor? (answer)

The purpose of this interview is for you to talk about your experiences with labour migration in Zambia. During this interview I will ask you a number of questions. Please feel free to answer honestly. There are no right or wrong answers, I am interested in your personal opinion and situation.

The data that result from this interview will be used in my MSc thesis. You will remain anonymous in any documents that may result from this data collection. I would like to ask your permission to record this interview. Is that ok with you? (answer) The interview will take about 30 minutes. I cannot offer you money or in-kind compensation for participating in this research, but I am very grateful for your cooperation. Please sign this consent form. (signing)
Interview questions

A. Background information migrant
A1. What is your name?
A2. What is your age?
A3. Where were you born?
A4. Can you show me on the map in which towns and villages you have lived so far?
A5. Where do you live now?
A6. Have you gone to school? Up to which grade?
A7. What do you do for a living?
A8. Who do you live with in the same house?

B. Departure from village and settling in first urban destination
B1. In which year did you leave your village?
B2. Why did you leave your village?
B3. With which people did you discuss your decision to migrate?
B4. Has your family supported you in your decision to migrate?
B5. To which town/city did you migrate?
B6. Why did you chose this town/city?
B7. Did you already know some people there?
B8. Who helped you to arrange the journey to this town/city?
B9. Who helped you to settle down after arrival in this town/city?
B10. How did you find housing?
B11. How did you find work?
B12. Have you kept in contact with people in your village after moving to []?
B13. Did people from the village come to visit you in []?
B14. Did you go to the village to visit while living in []?
   B14b. How did they receive you?
B15. Did you sent money or goods to the village while living in []?
B16. Did you support your family in the village in another way while living in []?
B17. Did your family in the village expect you to support them while you were living in []? Why (not)?
B18. Did your family in the village ever sent you money or goods while you were living in []?
   B18b. How important was this support for your survival in town?
B19. Did you family in the village ever support you in another way while you were living in []?
B20. Did you expect them to support you? Why (not)?

C. Departure from previous urban centre and settling in Mongu/Sesheke
C1. In which year did you leave [previous urban centre]?
C2. Why did you leave [previous urban centre]?
C3. With which people did you discuss your decision to migrate?
C4. Has your family supported you in your decision to migrate?
C5. Why did you chose to come to M/S?
C6. Had you visited M/S before?
C7. Did you already know some people here?
C8. Who helped you to arrange the journey to M/S?
C9. Who helped you to settle down after arrival in M/S?
C10. How did you find housing?
C11. How did you find work?

D. Experiences in Mongu/Sesheke
D1. For how long have you been living in M/S now?
D2. What do you like about staying in M/S?
D3. What do you dislike about staying in M/S?
D4. In general, do you regard your stay in M/S as a positive experience?
D5. How long do you expect to stay in M/S?
D6. Have you kept in contact with people in your village after moving to M/S?
D7. Are you going to the village to visit?
D7b. How do they receive you when you visit?
D8. Are people coming from the village to visit you here?
D9. Are you sending money or goods to your village?
D10. Are you supporting your family in the village in another way?
D11. Does your family in the village expect you to support them? Why (not)?
D12. Did your family in the village ever send you money or goods while you were living in M/S?
D12b. How important is this support for your survival in town?
D13. Did your family in the village ever support you in another way while you were living in M/S?
D14. Do you expect them to support you? Why (not)?
D15. Do you have more or less contact with the people in your village than before you moved to M/S?
D16. After retirement, will you return to live in your village?

E. General migration patterns and social support in Zambia
E1. According to you, is it common that people who moved from the village to town are supporting their family members in the village?
E1b. Do you think that the expectations of the village are sometimes too high?
E2. Can you give examples of the kind of support that could be given in this situation?
E3. According to you, is it common that people in the village are supporting family members living in town?
E4. Can you give examples of the kind of support that could be given in this situation?

F. Finishing the interview
F1. Do you have anything else to add or comment on with regard to this interview?
Appendix B: Informed consent form for research participants

Informed consent form for research participants

I, ........................................................., agree to participate in the thesis research of Ms Irene van Loosen, MSc student of Wageningen University in the Netherlands.

The purpose and nature of the study has been explained to me.

I am participating voluntarily. I understand that I can withdraw from the study, without repercussions, at any time, whether before it starts or while I am participating.

I understand that anonymity will be ensured in the write-up by disguising my identity.

I understand that disguised extracts from my interview may be quoted in the thesis and any subsequent publications.

I give permission for my interview with Irene van Loosen to be tape-recorded.

Signed ........................................ Date .................