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1 PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Transformation Africa, coordinator of the annual Day of Prayer throughout the African Continent, formed a partnership with the Unit for Religion and Development Research (Faculty of Theology at the University of Stellenbosch) to facilitate a Transformation Research Project in the greater Cape Town area. The scope of the project is the Cape Peninsula, from Atlantis to Gordon’s Bay to the west.

The first phase of the research project was the pilot project and was done in the Helderberg Basin. The second phase encompasses the duplication of the pilot research process in the rest of the Cape Peninsula. The Peninsula was divided into 20 units of approximately 150,000 people each. Mitchell’s Plain comprises two of these units of 150,000 people.

The report consists of three parts. First, the process of research and the different instruments for the data collection are described. This is followed by an overview of the results of both the primary and secondary research. Lastly, the concluding remarks deal especially with the role of churches in Mitchell’s Plain.

Firstly, we would like to thank everybody who contributed to the successful completion of this project. Specifically we would like to thank the following people:

- The steering committee of the different fraternals: Pastors Hankee MacMaster, Henry Busch (chairman), Victor Scoble, Danny Brown and Nazeem Khan;
- Everybody in whatever capacity who helped and prayed;
- The coordinator of the research in Mitchell’s Plain, Pastor Danny Brown;
- The 20+ fieldworkers who diligently mapped their communities;
- The sponsors: individuals and Transformation Africa who made this possible financially.

Secondly, we would like to acknowledge the databases received from the following institutions:

- StatsSA for the demographic data;
- City Health Directorate, City of Cape Town for the database on the causes of death;
- Strategic Information Department, City of Cape Town for the GIS data;
- South African Police Service (SAPS) for the data on the occurrence of crime and violence.

Dr Johannes Erasmus
Mr Gerbrand Mans

urdr@sun.ac.za
(021) 808-3577 (office)
(021) 808-3251 (fax)
2 MOTIVATION AND PURPOSE

Established within the Faculty of Theology at the University of Stellenbosch in 2001, the Unit for Religion and Development Research (URDR) has embarked on a major initiative to research the social development needs of local communities and to empower the faith-based organisations (FBOs) in those communities to enable them to play an active and effective role in alleviating poverty and meeting the needs of the people. Hence, at the end of 2003 the Unit was contracted by Transformation Africa to facilitate a research process in the Cape Peninsula.

The work of the Unit is based on the following assumptions and facts:

Firstly, the Unit proceeds from the understanding that the solution to the majority of problems related to poverty in South Africa lies in carrying out two steps. The first is that one needs to gather data on the problem, and the problem must have a human face. The second step is networking, empowering and motivating all parties concerned in a society to address the problem. This problem can be solved only with strong input from grassroots level, where local communities are part and parcel of a process of participatory action research.

In this process the Unit wants to assist and participate by making faith-based organisations (FBOs) aware of events in their constituencies and giving them access to reliable, user-friendly information necessary for the evaluation and/or planning of their ministries in their communities.

Secondly, whilst the Unit recognises the need for stronger community networks, it maintains that the potential of the religious sector in South Africa, through its various FBOs, can play a major role in this regard. In South Africa the Christian churches can rightly claim to be the country’s strongest and most widespread non-governmental organisation (NGO), reaching on average 63% of the Christian population weekly (World Values Survey 2000; Hendriks & Erasmus 2003). Neither the government nor any other NGO can reach and influence the public more regularly and consistently than FBOs can. Moreover, over three-quarters of the population have indicated that they are affiliated with the Christian religion (79.8% - Census 2001). There are approximately 43 000 Christian faith communities (Froise 1999:37) in South Africa and the infrastructure of the church reaches every corner of our country. Its leadership, human and organisational resources are far-reaching. Congregations and other faith-based organisations (FBOs) are value-based institutions with an effective infrastructure, in touch with realities on the ground and able to reach out to every household in their community.

Thirdly, the Unit is strongly motivated by the government’s increasing acknowledgement that it cannot on its own achieve its goal of creating a self-reliant society, and that it requires partners to serve as “delivery agents”. The government’s interest in the religious sector as a non-governmental development organisation (NGDO) is based on this sector’s organisational infrastructure, its human resources and its credibility amongst people. A number of recent statements and developments support this positive stance:

- Preliminary research conducted by the EFSA Institute for Theological and Interdisciplinary Research found that the total financial contribution by the religious sector towards welfare, relief and development programmes is approximately R1 billion per annum. According to the case studies that were selected, the combined budgets for social and welfare-related religious programmes amounted to almost R330 million. More than R170 million came from the sector’s own resources and approximately R160 million was from government subsidies in South Africa. These figures did not include the substantial amount of approximately R30 million of international donor funding channelled through church-based networks, neither did they include the numerous informal and volunteer services that are rendered in local congregations, mosques, synagogues, etc. (Koegelenberg 2001: 103).
The EFSA case studies showed that the significance of the religious sector not only lies in the number of its efforts, but also in the quality. In South Africa, religious welfare and development networks probably have not only the largest and best developed networks, but they offer more than mere administrative support: “They are essential in the formation of values and value systems in our broader society. In many cases social programmes deal with the victims of family disintegration, family violence, lack of support for the vulnerable in our society, which are symptoms of the moral crisis in our country” (Koegelenberg 2001:97-98).

During a men’s march against violence on women and children on 1 November 2001, Minister Skweyiya (2001:1) reiterated the government’s position. He made special mention of the religious sector’s role when he emphasised the government’s willingness to form partnerships with business, labour, civil society, the FBOs, NGOs and community-based organisations (CBOs).

A strategic role for the religious sector in social development is clearly implied in the government’s new prioritisation of an ethical and relational dimension in development. In its strategic “Ten Point Plan” the Department of Social Development states as the first point: “We will restore the ethics of care and human development in all welfare programmes. This requires an urgent rebuilding of family, community and social relations in order to promote social integration” (Department of Social Development 2002).

In rating South African social institutions the HSRC (2000) found that the public’s view of the church received the highest percentage of trust (74% in 2000). Second to the church was the Electoral Commission at 50%! This signifies that churches enjoy significant credibility.

The well-being of communities depends largely on the harnessing of their citizens’ contributions. In many of these communities the majority of the residents are people of faith. It is inevitable that most of these contributions, be they physical, emotional or other resources, come from people of faith. Anyone who wants to mobilise these contributions towards the development of society cannot ignore the pervasiveness of these faith communities.

Against this background, the following aims were set for the research in Mitchell’s Plain:

- To establish the major challenges facing society (e.g. the seven SACLA II “giants”: HIV/Aids, Crime, Violence, Poverty & Unemployment, Racism, Sexism and Family Crisis);
- To quantify these factors (how big and where);
- To establish the potential impact of the Church on the community.

The scope of the project is Mitchell’s Plain (see table of the suburbs map below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Valley</td>
<td>26,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastridge</td>
<td>22,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentegeur</td>
<td>38,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay</td>
<td>7,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portlands</td>
<td>26,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocklands</td>
<td>26,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strandfontein</td>
<td>23,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tafelsig</td>
<td>47,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weltevreden</td>
<td>5,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weltevreden Valley</td>
<td>17,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westridge</td>
<td>18,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgat</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands</td>
<td>21,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283,187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In this section the research process as well as the different instruments for data collection will be described. The results will be discussed in the next section. It is appropriate to make two observations here. Firstly, the research has been conducted within the paradigm of participative action research. Consequently, the researchers do not keep their distance by not involving the community. People on the ground participate in the research, the locus of control moves away from the University to the local community. The purpose of the research is not only to gather objective information, but to change, to transform a community.

Secondly, during the empirical research process a multi-disciplinary approach has been adopted, thereby utilising expertise from other social sciences. Although the Unit is situated in the Faculty of Theology, other disciplines are consulted, for example, Sociology and Geography.

The challenge was to design a methodology that would provide appropriate results in the light of the aims of the research.

### 3.1 Consultation with fraternal

With reference to the graph above, the research process commenced with consultation sessions with the local fraternal on 14th May 2004. During these meetings the vision, scope and possible outcomes of the research were explained. Previous examples of similar research done by the Unit were shown to familiarise the leadership with the research. It was stressed during the consultation that the fraternals must take co-ownership of the research process.
During this initial gathering a date was set for the next meeting, where the planning of both the research and the follow-up were done. It was suggested that a steering committee representing the geographical and denominational spread of the study area be chosen to facilitate the process.

### 3.2 Day of planning

On 31st May 2004 the **day of planning** was held with the steering committee of the fraternals. The coming launch, research and feedback were planned and everyone’s responsibilities clarified.

### 3.3 Launch

On 11th June 2004 the **launch** was held at the church of Pastor Bush in Strandfontein, where church leaders, business leaders and representatives of government were invited to share our vision. The purpose of the launch was to communicate this venture as a service to the community. Approximately 50 people attended the launch.

### 3.4 Research

Three weeks of **research**, 14th – 30th June, followed the launch. During these three weeks two processes ran simultaneously. The fraternal appointed a local coordinator for the research, Pastor Danny Brown of the Assemblies of God Church. The **coordinator** was a key person with regards to organising the research. He liaised with researchers from Stellenbosch, the fraternal and the community. He received training on several occasions on what was expected of him.

#### 3.4.1 GPS phase

The **purpose** was to mark all places of worship and places which have a significant influence on the social wellbeing of people (e.g. shebeens, places where drugs are sold, etc.) in Mitchell’s Plain with GPS (**Global Positioning System**) technology. The places of worship did not include prayer meeting venues during the week – only venues for churches’ official meetings on Sundays, whether these were held in a separate building, house, classroom in a school, etc. Twenty-six fieldworkers were mobilised from different parts of Mitchell’s Plain. They were expected to have a good knowledge of the area where they live (must have lived there for longer than two years). They were grouped in 13 teams and trained in how to do the fieldwork. Each team then received a map of the area in which they had to conduct their fieldwork. The map helped them to coordinate their investigations and prevented teams from duplicating work, thus saving time. Each team was dropped off in their designated area and literally walked up one street and down the next. The data were downloaded onto a computer and ESRI’s ArcView shape files created from the data. These fieldworkers received certificates for taking part of the project.

#### 3.4.2 Needs analysis

Secondly, a **needs analysis** was conducted in two areas, Tafelsig/Vredenpark and Eastridge, with six groups each time. The composition of the groups was guided by gender and age as seen below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 men</td>
<td>16-24 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 women</td>
<td>16-24 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 men</td>
<td>24-44 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 women</td>
<td>24-44 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 men</td>
<td>45+ yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 women</td>
<td>45+ yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of the needs analysis was to prioritise the social development needs specific to these two areas by using the Priority Index (P-Index) research technique, i.e. a methodology that is strongly based on the principles of PAR and which directly involves individuals and target groups in
the community in prioritising the community’s needs. Secondly, the purpose was to draw community profiles of every selected community on the basis of the P-Index data.

This technique has the following characteristics: (a) simplicity, (b) the ability to reveal and prioritise a community’s actual needs, and (c) reliability regarding the information it elicits, regardless of whether respondents are literate or illiterate.

The P-Index distinguishes between the importance of a need and its priority by comparing the respondents’ perception of the importance of a given facility to their current level of satisfaction with that facility. “As a result of this technique, a facility which respondents regard as very important while at the same time being quite satisfied with the current state of affairs, will occupy a lower position on the P-Index than one sharing the same level of importance while being regarded as highly unsatisfactory” (Schutte 2000:10).

The second phase of the needs analysis is to draw a community profile (C-Index) using the data of the P-index. The third phase is measuring the “bonding” of a community by determining three elements, namely:

1. Social support services available for those who need help;
2. Socialisation, i.e. friendship circles existing within the community;
3. A sense of belonging or pride of belonging to the community.

The potential for community development thus depends on three issues. Firstly, the extent of bonding in the community; secondly, the extent to which the individual’s basic needs are satisfied; and thirdly, the extent to which the individual’s social needs are satisfied. Schutte identified 13 facilities that are crucial to any community (Schutte 2000:23ff.). These are considered to be the cornerstones necessary for the survival of any community. The first six refer to individual needs for survival, while the remaining seven are social needs related to the interaction of humans:

1. Shelter
2. Health care
3. Sanitation
4. Water
5. Food
6. Energy
7. Safety
8. Income
9. Education
10. Recreation
11. Religion
12. Welfare
13. Transport

### 3.5 Processing of the data

Once the preliminary research had been completed, the data collected were processed and put into a geographical information system (GIS). GIS are computer systems for capturing, storing and manipulating, analysing, displaying and integrating spatial (geographical or locational) and non-spatial (statistical or attribution) information (Maguire 1991). Other secondary sources of information, namely the Censuses of 1996 and 2001, statistics from the SAPS, statistics from the City Health Directorate regarding causes of death, were all integrated in a geo-database and coupled to the GIS for the manipulation, analysing and displaying of the different datasets.

The results from the research need to be accessible to the community in order for them to be of value. Accessibility in our context has two aspects. The first is that the data must be available to anyone who wants to use them. The second is that people in the community must be able to understand, relate and make their own interpretations of the data. This will lead to a better understanding of the problems which the local people identified; empower them to do something
about these problems; and, very important, know where to channel available resources. How is this level of user-friendly availability and accessibility of data reached?

All of this is the reason for using GIS as a vehicle in realising this goal. The use of GIS allows the production of meaningful, attention-grabbing maps that visually illustrate important issues (Jones 1997; Queralt & Witte 1998). The software also enables people to gain new insights into issues and enhance communication between them. Hence much attention was given to showing the research results visually with maps. This worked very effectively, because people interact with a map if they are familiar with the area.

3.6 Feedback

Finally, the feedback was held on 11th August at the Westridge Assembly of God Church.

3.7 Website

Lastly, information is accessible to our research partners on the website of the University of Stellenbosch, excluding information on an individual level, which will be protected. The Department of Geography bought the internet software (ARCIMS) equivalent to the software package ARCView, which enabled us to develop the website. The link to the website is: www.sun.ac.za/theology/urdr.htm.

4 RESULTS

Annexure 1 contains all the variants available from the research.

4.1 Demographics of Mitchell’s Plain

An extensive demographic report on Mitchell’s Plain is attached in Annexure 2. The data have been provided by StatsSA and are taken from Census 1996 and 2001. There are 19 variants which reflect individual, economic and household realities in Mitchell’s Plain. Each variable is given in four columns: 1996, 2001, change from 1996 to 2001, and provincial (CA – comparative area).

The report in Annexure 2 immediately makes a few things evident:

- The population in Mitchell’s Plain increased by 32,064 (10,547 households) people from 1996 to 2001. The Black population in this area grew by approximately 17,000 people and the Coloured people by approximately 14,600 people. Consequently, the Black population group as a percentage of the total population in Mitchell’s Plain grew from 3.9% to 9.5% (5.6% growth).
- Mitchell’s Plain mainly consists of Coloured people speaking Afrikaans (52.92%) and English (39.5%).
- Pentecostal/charismatic churches have the biggest Christian market share (13.7%). The percentage of people who are affiliated with the Christian religion in Mitchell’s Plain is 69.9%, compared to the provincial percentage of 81.9%.
- The high percentage of people older than 20 years with only Grade 8-11 school qualifications (50.35%) compared to the provincial figure (36.1%). One can conclude from this that a large number of children do not finish school.
- The percentage of unemployed people in Mitchell’s Plain has grown from 11.6% in 1996 to 17% in 2001.
- The average income of households per year of R60,017 is lower than the provincial average of R76,000. The average per household in 1996 was R39,581. If inflation is taken into account, income has increased from R39,581 in 1996 to R44,130 in 2001. Hence an increase of only 11.5% from 1996 to 2001!
Most people are employed in the manufacturing (32%), community/social services (21%) and wholesale/ retail trade (17.8%).

Basic demographic indicators taken from Census 2001 are as follows:

- **Population**: 283,185
- **Population groups**:
  - Black – 9.5%
  - Coloured – 89.6%
- **Age**
  - 0-19 years – 41.9%
  - 20-34 years – 25.7%
  - 35-49 year – 20.71%
  - 50 and older – 11.7%
- **Average income per household**: R 60,017 per year
- **Language**
  - IsiXhosa – 7%
  - Afrikaans – 52.8%
  - English – 39.5%
- **Religious affiliation**
  - Christian – 69.9%
  - Islam – 24.5%
  - No religion – 4.3%

A few maps are given to paint a demographic picture of Mitchell’s Plain.
4.1.1 Average age of residents

The map shows the average age of the residents in each of the smaller areas in Mitchell’s Plain. The average age of the whole area is 27.4 years. Compare this average, for instance, with the average of the Western Cape Province, which is 28.7 years. The average age for the area of research rose from 25.7 years to 27.4 years from 1996 to 2001.

If one studies the map in conjunction with the legend, it is evident that there are two areas that fall into the category of 31-39 years, namely Westridge and Portlands.
4.1.2 Average income per household

The areas in red indicate the lowest average income (in rand) per household per year. The average income of the entire area of research is, as already indicated, lower than the provincial average.

Tafelsig and Wolfgat fall into the lowest income category, according to the legend. Only Strandfontein and Mandalay fall into the highest category of income.
The purpose of this map is to show the percentage of adults (20 years and older) who did not have the opportunity to complete any schooling. The percentage for Mitchell’s Plain is 2.6%. This is below the provincial percentage of 5.8%. The highest percentages were recorded in Weltevreden Valley (8%), Lentegeur (4.5%) and Weltevreden (4.3%).
4.1.4 Housing: Informal dwellings

The map shows the percentages of households, in each of the smaller areas of Mitchell’s Plain, where the house can be classified in accordance with the Census as an informal dwelling. The total percentage of informal dwellings in Mitchell’s Plain is approximately 3.9%. There are, however, areas with 15.4% (Weltevreden), 15.2% (Weltevreden Valley) informal dwellings.

1 The official definition of Census 2001 for an informal dwelling is a combination of two dwelling types: “Informal dwelling/shack in backyard” and “Informal dwelling/shack, NOT in backyard, e.g. in an informal/squatter settlement” (www.statssa.gov.za).
4.1.5 Unemployment

An unemployed person, according to Census 2001, is a person between the ages of 15 and 65 who did not have work, could not find work, has taken active steps to find employment and could start within one week, if offered work.

Mitchell’s Plain has an unemployment percentage (according to StatsSA’s definition explained above) of 17%. It has risen since Census 1996 from 11.6% to 17%. The area with the highest percentage was Weltevreden (36.4%) followed by Wolfgat (25.4%) and Tafelsig (24.2%).
The purpose of this map is to depict the possible influence of, for example, HIV/Aids on households by indicating the areas where children younger than 20 years are the heads of households. According to the legend, there are no areas with percentages higher than 3.71%. However, there is one area (Weltevreden) with percentages ranging from 0.8% to 1.7%.
The purpose of this map is to depict the affiliation to Christian denominations in Mitchell’s Plain. All the answers of respondents in Census 2001 were indexed into 67 groups, 62 religious groups and five other categories (e.g. “not stated”). This map shows all people who indicated that they are affiliated with a Christian church or denomination.

As was indicated above, 69.9% of the people in Mitchell’s Plain indicated that they are affiliated with the Christian religion. There are areas with higher percentages, e.g. Mandalay with 89.1%, followed by Strandfontein with 77.6% and Westridge with 76.2%. On the other hand, Lentegeur has the lowest percentage with 60.8%.

There are areas in Mitchell’s Plain with significant percentages of people affiliated with Islam, e.g. Wolfgat with 35.6% and Lentegeur with 33.2%.
4.2 GPS phase

4.2.1 Places of worship

A summary of all the places of worship is given below. There are a total of 432 places where people worship. Congregants utilise different venues for this purpose, e.g. houses, formal buildings, schools or other places. 86.8% of all places of worship are Christian, followed by Muslim with 9.5%. Most Christian groups gather in school buildings (39.7%).

Table 2: Summary of places of worship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Formal church building</th>
<th>School building</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional African Belief</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other religions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>432</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A map showing the 375 places of Christian worship is provided below. If one looks at the distribution more closely one can draw a few conclusions (see also Table 4):

- For Mitchell’s Plain as a whole there is one church for every 528 people. Compare this figure with, for example, Helderberg Basin, where there is on average one church for every 660 people, Khayelitsha with 1,201 and Southern Suburbs with 1,356;
- There is only one area with no churches, namely Wolfgat;
- The areas with the most churches are Tafelsig (66), Portlands (63) and Eastridge (50). This, however, does not tell the whole story;
- If the ratio of people per church in specific areas is calculated, a different perspective develops. The areas where the ratio of people per church is the lowest are Portlands (299), Eastridge (310) and Woodlands (386);
- On the other hand, there are areas with only one church for every 6,256 people in Weltevreden Valley, one for every 3,767 people in Weltevreden and one for every 2,095 in Mandalay.
4.2.2 Liquor outlets

The number of liquor outlets (227) is less than the Christian places of worship. A few observations can be made:

- There is only one area with no liquor outlet namely Wolfgat;
- The areas with the most liquor outlets are Tafelsig (74), Rocklands (40) and Eastridge (29);
- If one looks more closely at the number of liquor outlets, it seems as if there is an average of one outlet for every 1,248 people in Mitchell’s Plain;
- If the ratio of people per liquor outlet is calculated for the different areas a different perspective develops. The number of liquor outlets per population is the lowest in Tafelsig (one for every 642 people), Rocklands (one for every 671 people) and Mandalay (one for every 705 people).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Summary of liquor outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liquor stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shebeens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pubs/taverns, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below summarises the discussion regarding churches and liquor outlets in an effort to establish possible connections. The columns contain the area, the population of that area, the population in that area that are affiliated with the Christian religion, the percentage of Christians of the population, number of liquor outlets, number of churches, ratio of people in that area per liquor outlet and lastly ratio of people in that area per church.

Table 4: Summary of places of worship and liquor outlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>% Christians</th>
<th>Liquor outlets</th>
<th>Churches</th>
<th>Persons/Liquor</th>
<th>Persons/Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Valley</td>
<td>26,357</td>
<td>18,212</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastridge</td>
<td>22,124</td>
<td>15,506</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentegeur</td>
<td>38,870</td>
<td>23,621</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay</td>
<td>7,054</td>
<td>6,286</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>2,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portlands</td>
<td>26,954</td>
<td>18,849</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2.3 Places of sexual misconduct

A total of 1 place was mapped.
4.2.4 Selling of illegal drugs

132 places were mapped where drugs are sold illegally. These places are mainly focused in Tafelsig (52), Lentegeur (24) and Eastridge (16).
4.3 Needs analysis

A full report of each needs analysis held in the two areas is available at our office. However, a summary of the P-Index, C-Index, and Bonding will be given for each area below.

4.3.1 Eastridge

P-Index

A graph summarising the top 11 priorities is given below. The scale varies between 0 and 11, with 11 the highest priority.

It is evident that the community is struggling with major issues. A summary of respondents’ feedback on four clusters of these issues will be given below.

The issue of crime, security and gangs seem to be very important.

“If there was more work, it would help to prevent gangsterism.”

“We need something to keep the children busy and to help stop crime.”

“The gangsters also use the field – they smoke dagga.”

“There must be sports that we can get involved with to help eliminate gangsterism.”

“The shebeens foster gangsterism.”

“There must be more neighbourhood watch groups. The police take too long to come.”
“There are no police in the area.”
“We are too scared to go to the shops because you get robbed by the skollies who don’t have work.”
“Police arrest innocent people who are standing around in the street.”
“The police must keep the youngsters out of trouble.”
“The police take the vans to go and visit family and friends, and then when we need the police they aren’t there.”
“The police won’t come out if it is gangsters.”
“The police are poorly trained and are illiterate.”
“There are also corrupt policemen. They are involved with crime – smuggling. They are paid by gangs.”

The next important issue is related to crime, especially **drugs**. Also linked to the issue of drugs is the need for a **recreation centre and sports fields**.

“The sports fields are abused. People go there to do drugs and smoke dagga.”
“Children are involved with drugs. Men take drugs and then they do anything to get money.”
“Girls are abused after taking drugs because they don’t know what they are doing. The drugs make them mad.”
“The people are using the new ‘tik’ drugs. They steal globes from the houses.”
“We need indoor sports fields.”
“There must also be something for older people to do – women who don’t work.”
“The sports fields are abused. People go there to do drugs and smoke dagga.”
“There is a tennis court but it is too far. We need something to keep the children busy and to help stop crime.”
“A soccer field will keep the children off the streets. But we also need equipment.”
“There are no lights at the field, so you can’t play at night.”
“The gangsters also use the field – they smoke dagga.”
“There must be sports that we can get involved with to help eliminate gangsterism.”
“We have to pay to use the facilities that are available, it should be for free.”
“Children have nowhere to play. They play on the pavements and this is dangerous. The cars drive very fast and it is dangerous playing in the street.”
“The parks are very small.”

The third cluster has to do with the need for a **day hospital**.

“You have to buy your medicine. Not all the medicine is available at the hospital.”
“There is bribery – people pay the staff so that they can get medicine first. The staff smuggle drugs out of the clinic.”
“You have to wait very long at the hospital – you get sicker when you sit there. We need another hospital so that we don’t have to wait all day.”
“You first have to see the sister, then the doctor, then the dentist. You see a different doctor every time – we need to be able to see the same doctor each time.”
“The nurses don’t care about the patients. They talk to each other.”
“People should be given food – they wait so long at the hospital and have nothing to eat.”

The fourth cluster has to do with the need for **income and food**.

“We don’t have money to buy food.”

“We don’t get work. The black people get work much easier than what we do. We have been promised work but haven’t heard anything again. Coloureds are discriminated against – black people are favoured.”

“You have to know English, Afrikaans and Xhosa to get work.”

“We need money to feed the children and for the rent. We don’t even have enough money for groceries. We also have to pay school fees. We have to support a family and put food on the table.”

“It is difficult to get pension and because there is no work, there is no money.”

“Some jobs require that you have a drivers licence, but we don’t have money to get a licence.”

“We don’t have any experience in looking for a job.”

“The people are very specific about how old you have to be to get a job.”

“If there was more work it would help to prevent gangsterism.”

**C-Index**

A graph of the C-index is given below. The scale varies between 0 and 11, where 11 indicates high satisfaction. The five facilities and services rated the highest were religion, water, energy, food supply and housing. Religion is the sector which is viewed most positively. This provides for an opportunity to enter the community via the religious sector.

**Bonding**

Again the scale varies between 0 and 11, where 11 is the highest in a positive sense. Three questions were asked to establish the level of bonding in the community. The average response is given below:

1. To what extent do you consider the community to be your home? 8.6
2. How close do you feel to your friends in the community? 8.6
3. To what extent can you rely on the community to come to your aid? 3.3

The average figure for bonding in Eastridge is 6.6.

4.3.2 Tafelsig/Vredenpark

P-Index

A graph summarising the top 13 priorities is given below. The scale varies between 0 and 11, with 11 the highest priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-Index: Tafelsig/Vredenpark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident that the community is struggling with major issues. A summary of respondents’ feedback on five clusters of these issues will be given below.

The issue of **crime, security, gangs and drugs** seem to be very important.

“There are many gangsters who shoot in the streets. There aren’t that many in Freedom Park, but they come into our area and make trouble.”

“Even at the schools – the children are exposed to gangsterism. Some children are bad – they stab other children. Walk around with knives.”

“The gangsters shoot in the streets and innocent people are hurt.” They use children to steal from you because the children can get through a window into the house.” They sell the stuff to people.”

“People must stop buying stolen goods.”

“We need floodlights in the area. Sometimes the lights don’t work.”
“We need a mobile police station.”
The police take long to respond when we phone for help. The service we get is very bad.”
“If there are policeman in the streets and a crime is committed, they won’t help unless they get a call.”
“They don’t respond to people asking for help. They stand and talk and never help you. And they don’t have a van available.”
“If you phone to report drugs you have to phone 3 or 4 times before they will come out.”
“The community needs to help the police. They must look after their children and take responsibility. Some people hide stuff from the police.”
“The police don’t give community service.”
There are a lot of break-ins because people are unemployed.”
“There is no neighbourhood watch. We are attacked in our houses. The other day people were gassed!”
“Children use drugs. They are easily available.”
The second cluster has to do with welfare.
“Fathers don’t support their children.”
“If children are given into foster care no one checks up on the children. Families take children in foster care because you get money for fostering. They don’t care about the children.”
“The child grant is only R170 per month; it is not enough to look after the children.”
The third cluster has to do with a recreation centre of place for activities.
“We need a place where children can go after school. They must be able to participate in cultural activities like ballroom dancing and ballet.”
“The parents don’t have money to pay for lessons, but the children do want to take part.”
There must also be sports facilities. This will help to keep them off the streets. The white schools have activities at school in the afternoon. We need this at our schools.”
“This will keep the people active.”
“The children are naughty. They drink and do drugs because there is nothing else to do.”
“Parks would help to keep the children off the streets, because they would have a place to play.”
“It is important that there is a fence around the park, so that it is an enclosed area.”
“The naughty children (who drink and smoke and do drugs) must be kept out.”
“We need a safety park.”
The fourth cluster has to do with sanitation.
“4-6 houses have to share toilets. These are only emptied twice a week.”
“The children are getting sick because of dirty toilets.”
The fifth cluster is income/job related.
“We have no work. There are supposed to be a lot of jobs.”
“A few years ago there was a job for everyone, now young and old have to sit at home.”
“We don’t have money, because we have no work. We can’t pay the rates. Many people owe a lot of money because the rates have gone up!”

“Some people are even begging for food. We will do anything to feed our children!”

“Privatisation is creating unemployment.”

“Some people do something to get a small income – the one man’s wife is selling chickens and baking cookies. But this doesn’t bring in enough money. It is not enough for the rent.”

“And the people need money for food. It is also important to give the children some stuff – all the things that they need.”

“We don’t have enough money to pay school fees” You have to send the child to school, but what must you do if you can’t afford the fees.”

“Some people have done a course that they have paid for, and they can’t get jobs.”

“People from other areas got the jobs.”

“We need courses that we can attend for free so that we can get a qualification.”

“You need to have experience to get work. A lot of people do good work e.g. needlework, but don’t have qualifications or experience, they just work privately.”

**C-Index**

A graph of the C-index is given below. The scale varies between 0 and 11, where 11 indicates high satisfaction. The five facilities and services rated the highest were religion, transport, water, housing and health care. Religion and transport are the sectors which are viewed most positively. This provides for an opportunity to enter the community via the religious sector.

---

**C-index: Tafelsig/Vredenpark**

---

**Bonding**
Again the scale varies between 0 and 11, where 11 is the highest in a positive sense. Three questions were asked to establish the level of bonding in the community. The average response is given below:

4. To what extent do you consider the community to be your home? 8
5. How close do you feel to your friends in the community? 8
6. To what extent can you rely on the community to come to your aid? 8.5

The average figure for bonding in Tafelsig/Vredenpark is 8.2

The people living in this area are poor. Their biggest problems stem from lack of income. They do not have many facilities readily available, and social welfare in the area is poor. Drugs are a big problem – readily available to children of any age.

Religion is very strong in this area and can definitely be used to the advantage. The people expect the church to help with food. This seems to be their most immediate concern – they need food to feed their children. If they don’t have money, they can’t give the family food. But they also speak about corruption which takes place when people have dealt out food parcels in the past. Richer people take the parcels.

The bonding in the area is also strong. This is good, because the people can rely on each other, and it gives a basis upon which to work.

4.4 Secondary data

Three secondary sources of data were added as layers of information into the GIS, namely census data, a database from the City of Cape Town Health directorate and crime statistics from SAPS.

4.4.1 Census data

Examples of the demographics of Mitchell’s Plain taken from census data were given above.

4.4.2 Health data

The results of the analysis of the database showing the causes of death of the CMA population will be given.
4.4.2.1 People who died as a result of assault

The map shows the percentage of people in Mitchell’s Plain who died in 2001 as a result of physical assault. The percentages are shown for each of the smaller areas of Mitchell’s Plain. If one studies the map in conjunction with the legend, a disturbing picture unfolds. A vast area falls into the category of 15.85% to 28.73% (Wolfsgat, Tafelsig and Mandalay).
4.4.2.2 The number of HIV/Aids-related deaths

The percentage of people in Mitchell’s Plain who died in 2001 as a result of some or other disease together with HIV/Aids is shown on this map. Mandalay is the only area that falls in the legend category of 17.55% to 31.48%. This is a disturbing figure.
4.4.3 Crime data: SAPS

a. Sexual crimes (rape, attempted rape).

b. Assault (indecent assault, common assault, assault with grievous bodily harm).

The next two maps show the boundaries of the police stations in the city of Cape Town. The graduated colours on the maps indicate the intensity to which a certain kind of crime occurs within the service area of a specific police station in relation to the overall occurrence of the same kind of crime in the rest of the City of Cape Town. In other words the darker the colour for a specific area, the higher the incidence of the crime for that area in relation to the rest of the City. The percentages which each colour represents can be seen in the legend of the map.

The police stations which service areas that are partially or completely included in the study area (Mitchell’s Plain) are Strandfontein and Mitchell’s Plain (and a small segment in Nyanga). The boundaries of the study area are indicated in red on the map.

4.4.3.1 Violent crimes/assault

It is evident from the graduated colours that the study area in total has a high rate of occurrences of violent crimes compared to the rest of the City of Cape Town. Strandfontein is an exception, with considerable fewer occurrences of violent crimes than the rest of the study area.
4.4.3.2 Sexual crimes/rape

4.4.3.2 Sexual crimes/rape

On this map we see the same phenomenon as on the previous map, which depicts the occurrences of violent crimes. The graduated colours indicate that in total the study area has a fairly high rate of rape incidents. Again Mitchell’s Plain shows many incidents of rape. Strandfontein is again an exception.

5 DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

The feedback of the results was held at the Westridge Assembly God Church on 11th August 2004. The Unit also developed a website where the research partners can view the results of the research (www.sun.ac.za/theology/urdr.htm).

6 CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion we want, firstly, to summarise the results and, secondly, direct concluding remarks to the church leaders.

Summarising the demographics of Mitchell’s Plain, it seems that the following can be said:

- The community is, socio-economically speaking, Coloured, Afrikaans/English speaking, growing and poor.
- Half (50.4%) of the adult population only completed Grades 8-11 in high school.
- The average income is well below the provincial average and only grew by R4500 per household per year from 1996 to 2001, when inflation is taken into account. Unemployment also grew from 11.6% in 1996 to 17% in 2001. This is a big concern.
• The Black population group as a percentage of the total population in Mitchell’s Plain grew from 3.9% to 9.5% (5.6% growth).
• Affiliation with the Christian religion in Mitchell’s Plain is only 69.9%, compared to the provincial percentage of 81.9%.

Examination of the GPS phase produces very interesting results. There are a total of 375 Christian places of worship. Most of these churches worship in schools. How do we interpret this - positively or negatively? The answer is: probably a little of both. It can be viewed as a sign of disunity in the Christian community. Some churches certainly do have a history of disruption. The 375 churches are witness to this reality. However, this is most unfortunate.

But one can also view the distribution of churches positively in the sense of their potential impact in Mitchell’s Plain. Churches are probably the only organisations in Mitchell’s Plain that have contact with virtually every household in the community. The distribution definitely adds to the churches’ potential to influence the community.

We would also like to argue that more churches can be planted. The ratio is one church for every 528 people. Generally speaking, the ratio is smaller in poorer communities. There are possible reasons for this. More affluent people are able to travel to churches further away from them. Concomitantly churches in richer areas possibly have the infrastructure (full-time pastors, telephones, fax lines, e-mail and buildings to serve more people. On the other hand, people in poorer areas mostly have to walk to the church of their preference.

Ideally, in a community such as Mitchell’s Plain there should be one church for every 400 people. This would mean a total of 708 churches for Mitchell’s Plain. In other words, a total of 333 more churches are needed to minister effectively to the community. These churches can be planted in areas where the ratio of population per church is low, e.g. Weltevreden Valley (1 church for 6,256 people) and Weltevreden (1 church for 3,767 people).

However, all the liquor outlets have a heavy impact on the community. There are a total of 227 liquor outlets. What is just as distressing is that there is one outlet for every 1,248 people. Alcohol also facilitates other crimes which impact on the community, e.g. violent crimes, especially domestic violence, etc.

The number of places where drugs are sold is exceptionally high (132 places). For instance, there are 52 places in Tafelsig alone. We have not come across such a phenomenon in any of the other areas of research. When one reads this statistic together with the needs analysis reports of how the community feels the burden of drugs, gangsterism and crime, a bleak picture emerges.

The needs analysis reports from Tafelsig and Eastridge tell a story of poverty, of persons being caught up in the cycle of gangs, crime and drugs. The cluster of crime, security, gangs and drugs recur as the main problems that need to be addressed. Parents also want recreation facilities where their children don’t have to be confronted by the threat of these activities. At the root of these problems lies poverty, sometimes abject poverty.

Unfortunately we were not able to access in time the crime statistics for the smaller units within each police station’s jurisdiction to identify specific areas of need. The SAPS recently (since the pilot project in Helderberg Basin) changed their policy in terms of which these data can be accessed. We recently received permission to access and process the data. As soon as we receive the data, they will be processed and made available.

However, it seems from the maps that, compared to the rest of the city, the research area is definitely an area where assault and rape are major problems. Strandfontein is an exception, with considerable fewer occurrences of violent crimes and rape than the rest of the study area.
The data from City Health confirms the violent nature of the Mitchell’s Plain community. Assault is a major reason why people died in Mitchell’s Plain during 2001. There were areas where the cause of death was assault in 15.85% to 28.73% of the cases (Wolfgat, Tafelsig and Mandalay).

Summarising the above discussion, one can conclude that the areas below can be called “hot spots”. The reason is that they consistently reappear as areas of need.

- Socio-economically speaking, the whole Mitchell’s Plain is a hot spot.
- The areas that seem to reappear with particularly high statistics are Weltevreden, Weltevreden Valley, Tafelsig and Wolfgat.

Concluding remarks on the church as a role-player in development

Lastly, since the mid-1980s South Africa has gone through far-reaching transformations. The two most prominent ones were getting rid of the yoke of apartheid and the entering into a new democratic dispensation with the first democratic elections held in 1994. The South African population is currently celebrating the 10th anniversary of these elections. Since 1994 the country has also developed and accepted one of the most liberal constitutions in the world. South Africa is now governed according to a constitution in which human rights are spelled out. The country as whole and local communities are still grappling with the realities of living in a post-apartheid democracy.

It is evident, however, that daunting challenges still face South Africa after the miracle of its peaceful transition. Overwhelming poverty and poverty-related problems, such as the HIV/AIDS pandemic, face Africa. South Africa is comprised of both a rich and a poor world. Previously, the apartheid laws marked boundaries between these two worlds. Now, new boundaries are developing along, inter alia, political power and class-related lines. Social transformation, implying the way society and culture change in response to such factors as economic growth, war or political upheavals, is particularly relevant to the continuing transformation of communities in post-apartheid South Africa.

Firstly, the paradigm of church leaders must be challenged. Many pastors only live, think and plan within the paradigm of their own local organization. Sometimes, they are guilty of ambitiously building their own kingdoms in their churches. Leaders must focus more on the kingdom of God and the community. Instead of keeping believers inside the church, members should be empowered and mobilised to live “out there.” Thus, when reflecting on community transformation, they should consider strategies that operate at several levels. Churches need to form partnerships with the community, other churches and other role-players. Transformation will not happen at only one level.

Secondly, let’s examine the church from a development perspective. Since 1994 South Africans have been living in a secular, pluralist, democratic society. Such a society has various public institutions, organizations and initiatives that fill the public space. Free from government intervention, individuals can organize themselves into autonomous organizations. The church is an example of such an organization, competing with government and business for room in the public space.

The church is also a volunteer organization and thus forms part of the dynamics of volunteer organizations, over against the government sector, which has the ability to demand resources by means of threat, power and coercion. The business sector operates with economic power by selling products and services, while volunteer organizations specialise in the power of consensus. People commit to a volunteer organization to the extent that they identify with its vision and values. They remain committed to the point that they are able to realise themselves through the organization. The power of these organizations resides in their values, vision, independence and services that they render to improve the community’s quality of life. On the other hand, such organizations are very sensitive as regards their membership. Therefore, the more vital their vision and values, the greater the number of members!
Thus, as a volunteer organization, the church competes for public space by communicating and living a **vision and values** for the community.

A second developmental perspective on the church is its role as agent for development. Traditionally, the church has always been involved in ministries of charity. These services focus on people’s immediate needs, for example, food, housing and medical services, especially during and after wars and natural disasters. In fact, the church probably has the best organized networks locally and internationally for delivering these services.

However, if churches accept the challenge to play a role in developing sustainable communities, they should also implement strategies other than merely providing relief. Churches must develop strategies to increase people’s capacities to promote meeting their own needs through self-reliant action (community development). Churches should also adopt strategies that attempt to develop sustainable systems: churches that work with major national role-players to reorient policies and working modes in a sustained process of using and raising resources in such a way that the challenges can be dealt with effectively. Lastly, churches should develop people’s movements: decentralized action to involve people in a movement at grassroots level, where there is less focus on money and resources, and more on motivating social energy in movements.

The **values** underlying these activities are threefold. Firstly, development should be **people-centred**, that is people must be able to participate in their own development, which must meet basic felt needs. It often happens that churches start ministries in response to perceived needs, not the people’s real needs. Their felt needs are a need to belong, to be significant and important, and a need for a reasonable amount of security. Secondly, development must be **sustainable** and, thirdly, there should be **empowerment** of both the helpers and those who are being helped.

In conclusion, the Christian religion has the potential to influence the community. The sets of information presented on the Christian religion definitely indicate that the Christian religion does have the potential to promote change. The success of initiatives will depend on:

1. The values/ideas which they employ; the symbols and images they use. Religious ideas about poverty, women and family, the environment, the local community, safety and security, peace, reconciliation, social justice, equity, etc. will have an influence.

2. Leadership - leadership that expresses the desired change and lives it, leadership that walks the talk. These leaders must be **prophets** who declare the path, affirm the values and act as symbol senders. Alternatively, leadership can be a networking organization.

3. Their capacity to be inclusive and effect unification will create the space for change.

4. The initiative must integrate deep spiritual transformation with social transformation.

5. The potential of the Christian religious group. The internal dynamics of religious communities in Mitchell’s Plain might also influence this potential.

6. The dialectic relationship of the Christian grouping with the larger society. In other words how is the church influencing society and how is society influencing the church? Are the churches very negative towards society, withdrawing their influence and remaining aloof or do they assertively seek ways to influence society, based on their values, for the better?
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8 ANNEXURES

8.1 Annexure 1: Variants available from research project

1. GPS
1.1 Places of worship (House, formal church building, school building, other)
   - Christian
   - Muslim
   - Hindu
   - Jewish
   - Traditional African Belief
1.2 Liquor outlets
   - Liquor stores
   - Night clubs
   - Shebeens
   - Hotels
   - Pub/Tavern
   - Other
1.3 Sexual misconduct
1.4 Selling of illegal drugs

2. Needs analysis
   Reports from two areas:
   - Sir Lowry’s Pass
   - Lwandle

3. South African Police Service Data
   - Rape
   - Attempted rape
   - Common assault
   - Assault with grievous bodily harm
   - Indecent assault
   - Sexual and/or violent crimes in general

4. Causes of death data – City of Cape Town Health Department
   - TB
   - Aids & TB
   - Aids
   - Drug overdose
   - Maternal deaths (mothers who died during pregnancy or during labour)
   - Transport related deaths
Assault

[Each variant is separately available for women and men. The average age of death in an area is also available]

5. Censuses of 1996 and 2001 (StatsSA)

Personal:
- Gender
- Populations groups
- Age groups (0-9; 10-19; 20-34; 35-49; 50+)
- First language
- Marital status (20+ years)
- Religious groups
- Education (20+ years)

Economic:
- Employment status (15-65 years)
- Occupation (employed)
- Industry (employed)
- Income per household

Household:
- Number of rooms per dwelling
- Type of dwelling
- Access to water supply
- Access to fuel for lighting
- Gender of head of household
- Age of head of household
- Relationship to head of household
- Year moved to this address (migration)
8.2 Annexure 2: Demographic Profile of Mitchell’s Plain using Census 1996 and 2001
This report is compiled by:

UNIT FOR RELIGION AND DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH

Contact details:

Dr. Johannes Erasmus
Tel. (021) 808-2614
Sel. 082 7711 542
E-mail: egdn@sun.ac.za

Gerbrand Mans
Tel. (021) 808-2614
Sel. 083 2567 067
E-mail: gmans@sun.ac.za
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What is the report about?

The main content of the report is to provide you with comparative information about your area in relation to a comparative area (CA) or town / city or province for more insight into it's demographic profile.

What information are being looked at?

A. Personal variables:  
  Gender  
  Population groups  
  Age groups  
  First language  
  Marital status (20 years and older)  
  Religious groups  
  Educational qualifications  

B. Economic variables:  
  Employment status (20 years and older)  
  Occupation (employed people)  
  Industry (employed people)  
  Income per household  

C. Household variables:  
  Number of rooms per dwelling  
  Type of dwelling  
  Access to water supply  
  Access to fuel for lighting  
  Gender of head of household  
  Age of head of household  
  Relationship to head of household  

What are being compared?

The comparisons are between:

- the way your area changed from 1996 to 2001 according to the 1996 and 2001 census data;
- the way your area differs from your CA or town/city according to the 2001 census data
2. DESCRIPTION OF INDEX-DIAGRAMS:

What is an index-diagram?
An index-diagram is a graphic representation of the comparison of one group to another, the groups being your area compared to the CA.

How do I interpret an index-diagram? (refer to figure 1)
- A diagram consists of axes:
  * each axis represents a different characteristic
    (in figure 1, each axis represents the marital status of people)

- Two values are plotted on each axis, these are index values:
  * the blue line is what the index value of your area would be if there is no difference between it and the CA
  * the red line is the actual index value of your area

- The comparative indices are calculated in the following way:
  * an index value of 100 of your area (red line) indicates that it does not differ from the CA. An index value of 150 indicates that your area is 1.5 times the CA average. A value of 50 indicates that your area is estimated to be only one-half of the CA average

  * the actual index value of your area (red line) is calculated by taking for example the percentage of people who are married in your area and dividing it by the percentage of people who are married in the whole of the CA and multiplying it by 100, (25% / 10%) * 100 = 250. Therefore 2.5 times the national average

  * as has been sad earlier; if there is no difference between the your area’s average and that of the CA, (25% / 25%) * 100 = 100, the index value will always be 100. Therefore, the blue line always runs through the axis where the value is 100.

When looking at the diagram and the way the red line deviates from the blue one, one gets a good idea of the differences there are between your area and the CA with the index value on each axis showing the degree of deviation.
### 3. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>1996: 251,121</th>
<th>2001: 283,185</th>
<th>DIF: 32,064</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### A. Personal Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
<td>48.17%</td>
<td>-0.43%</td>
<td>48.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.40%</td>
<td>51.83%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>51.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African/Black</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
<td>26.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>89.61%</td>
<td>-5.63%</td>
<td>53.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>-0.23%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>18.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00 - 09 yrs</td>
<td>21.92%</td>
<td>19.43%</td>
<td>-2.49%</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19 yrs</td>
<td>22.62%</td>
<td>22.42%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 34 yrs</td>
<td>26.53%</td>
<td>25.72%</td>
<td>-0.80%</td>
<td>27.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 49 yrs</td>
<td>19.89%</td>
<td>20.71%</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>20.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 yrs +</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>15.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First language</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IsiNdebele</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IsiXhosa</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IsiZulu</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siswati</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshivenda</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xitsonga</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>60.49%</td>
<td>52.82%</td>
<td>-7.67%</td>
<td>55.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>36.38%</td>
<td>39.53%</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>19.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>'96 to '01</td>
<td>CA '01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>17.77%</td>
<td>17.16%</td>
<td>-0.61%</td>
<td>21.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married civil/Religious</td>
<td>62.13%</td>
<td>52.59%</td>
<td>-9.54%</td>
<td>43.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married traditional</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living together</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>7.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widower/widow</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
<td>-2.47%</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>-0.83%</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious groups</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zion Christian churches</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Reformed churches</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>-1.77%</td>
<td>15.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic churches</td>
<td>10.27%</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
<td>-2.16%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist churches</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>6.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal/Charismatic churches</td>
<td>11.86%</td>
<td>13.71%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican churches</td>
<td>13.46%</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
<td>-2.03%</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostolic Faith Mission</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>-1.57%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran churches</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>-0.30%</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian churches</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandla Lama Nazaretha</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist churches</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>-0.10%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational churches</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>-0.03%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox churches</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Apostolic churches</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>11.35%</td>
<td>-2.37%</td>
<td>13.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Zionist churches</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian type churches</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>-0.43%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reformed churches</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other African Independent churches</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian churches</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
<td>9.59%</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
<td>10.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td>24.50%</td>
<td>-1.63%</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African traditional belief</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-christian churches</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>-0.04%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Educational qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Schooling</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
<td>-0.33%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 0 - 7</td>
<td>25.01%</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
<td>-3.27%</td>
<td>23.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 - 11</td>
<td>52.91%</td>
<td>50.35%</td>
<td>-2.56%</td>
<td>36.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric only</td>
<td>14.80%</td>
<td>21.45%</td>
<td>6.65%</td>
<td>23.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post school qualification</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td>-0.49%</td>
<td>11.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.1. Index-diagrams on personal variables

**Gender**

- **Female**
- **Male**

**Population group**

- African/Black
- Coloured
- Indian/Asian
- White
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## 2. Economic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>52.21%</td>
<td>47.38%</td>
<td>-4.83%</td>
<td>48.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>11.59%</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>17.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not economically active</td>
<td>36.20%</td>
<td>35.60%</td>
<td>-0.60%</td>
<td>34.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislators/Senior officials/Managers</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>-0.52%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>-2.86%</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians/Associate professionals</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>9.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
<td>18.69%</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
<td>12.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers/Sales workers</td>
<td>10.62%</td>
<td>11.38%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>10.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled agriculture and fishery workers</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>-0.19%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft related trades</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>17.36%</td>
<td>-1.39%</td>
<td>11.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant/Machine operators</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
<td>14.18%</td>
<td>-2.21%</td>
<td>7.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary occupation</td>
<td>19.76%</td>
<td>18.48%</td>
<td>-1.29%</td>
<td>31.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>15.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>-0.01%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>31.99%</td>
<td>26.88%</td>
<td>-5.11%</td>
<td>15.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity/Gas/Water supply</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>-0.14%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>7.48%</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>7.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole sale/Retail trade</td>
<td>17.81%</td>
<td>21.67%</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>18.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport/Storage/Communication</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
<td>-0.60%</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Insurance/Real estate/Business</td>
<td>8.94%</td>
<td>11.51%</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
<td>11.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Social services</td>
<td>22.47%</td>
<td>20.98%</td>
<td>-1.48%</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private households</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>-0.24%</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average income per household for one year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R 39,581.04</td>
<td>R 60,017.08</td>
<td>R 20,436.04</td>
<td>R 75,932.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.1. Index-diagrams on economic variables

**Employment**

- Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing
- Mining
- Manufacturing
- Electricity/Gas/Water supply
- Construction/Warehouse trade
- Transportation/Storage/Communication
- Financial/Insurance/Real estate/Business
- Community/Social services
- Occupations: Legislators/Senior officials/Managers/Professionals/Technicians/Associate professionals/Clerks/Skilled Agriculture and Fishery workers/Craft related trades/Plant Machine operators/Elementary occupation

**Industry**

- Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing
- Mining
- Manufacturing
- Electricity/Gas/Water supply
- Construction/Warehouse trade
- Transportation/Storage/Communication
- Financial/Insurance/Real estate/Business
- Community/Social services

**Occupation**

- Legislators/Senior officials/Managers/Professionals/Technicians/Associate professionals/Clerks/Skilled Agriculture and Fishery workers/Craft related trades/Plant Machine operators/Elementary occupation
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## 3. Household Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of rooms per dwelling</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- 2</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
<td>12.52%</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>27.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>84.82%</td>
<td>78.16%</td>
<td>-6.66%</td>
<td>53.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
<td>9.32%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of dwelling</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House on separate stand</td>
<td>58.06%</td>
<td>67.44%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>65.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional dwelling</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat in block of flats</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>7.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/cluster/semi-detached house</td>
<td>33.41%</td>
<td>22.37%</td>
<td>-11.04%</td>
<td>5.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House/flat/room in backyard</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal dwelling/shack in backyard</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal dwelling/shack elsewhere</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>-1.55%</td>
<td>12.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room/flatlet on shared property</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>-0.26%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan/tent</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watersupply access for household</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piped water in dwelling</td>
<td>97.65%</td>
<td>90.04%</td>
<td>-7.61%</td>
<td>68.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water on site</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>5.09%</td>
<td>18.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public tap</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borehole / rainwater tank / well</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam / river / stream / spring</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-0.01%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to fuel for lighting</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity direct from authority</td>
<td>98.41%</td>
<td>99.06%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>90.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity from other source</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>-0.02%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraffin</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>-0.85%</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candles</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of head of household</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>'96 to '01</td>
<td>CA '01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76.76%</td>
<td>68.90%</td>
<td>-7.86%</td>
<td>66.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
<td>31.27%</td>
<td>7.94%</td>
<td>34.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of head of household</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19 yrs</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29 yrs</td>
<td>12.74%</td>
<td>11.27%</td>
<td>-1.46%</td>
<td>15.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 59 yrs</td>
<td>79.02%</td>
<td>77.62%</td>
<td>-1.40%</td>
<td>65.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 + yrs</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>10.69%</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>17.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to head of household</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>'96 to '01</th>
<th>CA '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of household</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>27.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband/wife/partner</td>
<td>16.64%</td>
<td>15.46%</td>
<td>-1.17%</td>
<td>16.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son/daughter</td>
<td>48.44%</td>
<td>45.06%</td>
<td>-3.39%</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother/sister</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/mother</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>5.97%</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-relative</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year moved to town</th>
<th>Your Area</th>
<th>Neighbouring Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>earlier than '96</td>
<td>86.98%</td>
<td>82.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.1. Index-diagrams on household variables

- **Rooms per dwelling**
  - Area's Index
  - Index Value

- **Type of dwelling**
  - House on separate stand
  - Caravan/tent
  - Traditional dwelling
  - Flat in block of flats
  - Room/flatlet on shared property
  - Town/cluster/semi-detached house
  - Informal dwelling/shack elsewhere
  - Informal dwelling/shack in backyard
  - House/flat/room in backyard

- **Water supply**
  - Piped water in dwelling
  - Dam/river/stream/spring
  - Piped water on site
  - Borehole/rainwater/tank well
  - Public tap
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