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Abstract

This study delves into the scholarly conversation on migration and citizenship. The investigation is focused on the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, in the North West province of South Africa. This involves, therefore, the understanding of the perceptions, interpretations and the practices that Zimbabwean migrants engage in whilst in Potchefstroom/SA, and how these constitute a transnational citizenship. The lack of scholarly research related to, firstly Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, and secondly, the dynamics of transnational citizenship among them resulted in the need to attempt to close this gap.

Thus, an empirical investigation, adopting the instrumental exploratory single case study research design, was conducted, and included 20 interviews as well as 4 focus groups. Purposive sampling and snowball sampling were utilised in conjunction with each other to select participants. Upon obtaining the data, it was sorted into defined categories, and it was through the thematic analysis of these categories that a Zimbabwean narrative of ‘being Zimbabwean’ and ‘living in Potchefstroom’ was weaved out from their empirical findings. From this narrative, the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom were, therefore, determined, as well as the way in which they constitute a transnational citizenship.

The narrative was analysed through the use of Bourdieu's theory of practice as a theoretical anchor, and it revealed that position-taking in the field required, while observing field doxa, navigating and negotiating the vertical and horizontal relationships and power distributions that characterise a field. Zimbabwean migrants encounter these vertical and horizontal relationships and power distributions with both Potchefstroom/SA and Zimbabwe (as migrants and citizens), as well as the actors within each of these realms. The findings, therefore, essentially revealed that: 1) Zimbabwean migrants never clinically cut ties with their home nations; and 2) the vertical and horizontal relationships structure the grand field and fields that Zimbabwean migrants enter in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe; and 3) the dynamics of their transnational citizenship are the practices in which they engage in whilst in Potchefstroom fields. Their practices are an interplay of their habitus and capital, whilst they perceive and interpret the doxa of the fields they enter. This results in the dynamics of transnational citizenship. Lastly, the study contributes to the development of the body of scholarly research on Zimbabwean migrants in small towns such as, in this case, Potchefstroom.
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Chapter 1: Introduction, research problem, question and objective

1.1. Introduction

This study investigates the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, in the North West province of South Africa (SA). In continuation of the academic conversation of citizenship and migration, the study focusses on the dynamics of transnational citizenship and how they play out in the social realm, particularly the transnational social realm and the (transnational) fields that are present and active in that realm. Zimbabwean migrants can be understood as social actors in possession of embodied dispositions, taste, group culture and history, which they share with their social groups and compatriots (habitus), as well as varying degrees of capital. This study, therefore, delves into an investigation of their perceptions, interpretations and practices towards their citizenship, as they actively negotiate, struggle and compete for capital and positions in the fields available in the transnational social realm. That is, their perceptions, interpretations and practices related to how all of this plays out in the transnational social realm, and how it constitutes a transnational citizenship.

The dynamics that are argued to be essential for understanding the dynamical nature of transnational citizenship in this study include: 1) the legal, political, and social dynamics of citizenship; 2) the economic dynamic emphasised by Aiwa Ong in her flexible citizenship conception, and 3) the dynamic induced by the flow and exchange of cultures emphasised by transnationalism. Therefore, this research study focuses on these factors as the dynamics of transnational citizenship and seeks to investigate the way in which they play out in the case of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, as they navigate, negotiate and compete for capital and positions in the fields available in both the Potchefstroom (host nation) and the Zimbabwean (home nation) contexts (grand field).

Therefore, this investigation focuses specifically on the nature of the relationship Zimbabwean migrants have with Zimbabwe and Potchefstroom simultaneously, as well as other actors within this social realm. This further includes the kind of resources and capital they are able to access and mobilise, their rights, ‘freedom’ and limits as a citizen of Zimbabwe and an immigrant of SA, and the overall impact this has on them as they navigate and compete in the available fields. Their interpretations of their citizenship involves their understanding of: 1) themselves as both citizens of Zimbabwe and migrants
in SA, and what the implications of such relationships with the two nations are; 2) the legislature, laws and unofficial rules that regulate their field of action, as well as the rights and resources they have access to whilst physically located in Potchefstroom, and non-physically located in Zimbabwe; and 3) the other actors in the field, their habitus, positions and power. Their perceptions of their citizenship in this regard would refer to, not their understanding of the above mentioned, but their judgment of it. That is, the way in which they perceive themselves as citizens of Zimbabwe and migrants in SA, including the related dynamics of those relations. Their actions (or practices) of their citizenship refers to the manner in which they behave, perform and act as they navigate the field, in pursuit of resources, capital and better positions.

Prior to being fully immersed in the transnational citizenship conversation, as well as the dynamics thereof, it is paramount that a generally accepted definition of citizenship, which is suitable to this case study, be given. Thus, on a general spectrum, the classical conception of citizenship refers to a status an individual holds which entitles them with the ‘enjoyment’ of the privileges of legal, social, and political rights granted by a nation-state; as well as the participation and activeness of individuals in the legal, political and social fields available within the nation of which they claim citizenship (Ellison, 1997:699; John & Gaventa, 2002:3; Marshall, 2009:148). This can be simplified by stating that, ultimately, citizenship refers to the relationship between an individual and a nation-state. What could further be highlighted here is that this relationship is commonly understood to be with only a single nation-state, and thus implying that individuals possess a ‘single’ citizenship status.

Relationships between individuals and more than just one nation-state also exist, however, and are often referred to as dual or multiple citizenship. Fox (2005:172) contends that dual citizenship refers to the possessing of citizenship status of two countries, whereas multiple citizenship refers to possessing citizenship status in more than two countries. He adds that both dual and multiple citizenship contain, to a degree, elements of transnational (forms of) citizenship (Fox, 2005:171), as they refer to cross-border movement, as well as the resentment of the constraints of a nationally-defined citizenship which limits people to the possession of a single citizenship. However, this can be challenged, as single, dual and multiple citizenship all heavily depend on the existence of national borders; they all require that citizens be in possession of passports of the nations which they claim the citizenship of, and citizens can only be active in one nation’s boundaries at a given time – in the legal, political, social and economic fields – regardless of whether they possess multiple
citizenship. Therefore, single, dual, and multiple citizenship are all essentially classical conceptions of citizenship, defined and understood within the politically-defined national terrain, and actually essentially fall under the umbrella of nationalism, more than that of transnationalism.

Contemporary conceptions of citizenship include *flexible citizenship*, and *transnational citizenship*. According to Aiwa Ong (1998:137-139), the concept of ‘flexible citizenship’ suggests that globalisation (and the emergence of cosmopolitan society and global culture) has resulted in economic reasons being amongst the primary ‘shapers’ of people’s deciding on citizenship – political rights and allegiance to a nation are not the foundation of that decision any longer. From Ong’s theoretical standpoint, it could thus be contended that participation in the economic field is paramount to any citizen of any nation, since this brings about stability and betterment in terms of living life, general wellness, and access to the opportunities available in the life-worlds. Therefore, as the *economic* field emphasised by Ong places its focus on the ‘flexibility’ of migrants’ citizenship, it highlights and supports this study’s judgement to include the economic field as a contributor to the dynamical nature and understanding of transnational citizenship.

The conception of citizenship directly relevant and, it can be asserted, most suitable for this case study is transnational citizenship, which places emphasis on presence, activity, exchanges and connectedness with the home and host country *simultaneously*. Fox (2005:171) refers to transnational citizens as people who “extend their rights and principles of political and social equality beyond nation-state boundaries”. For Kastoryano (1999:3), transnational citizenship includes simultaneous ‘belonging’ and allegiance to more than one nation-state. Smith’s (2007:1101) emphasis in this regard highlights the ability of migrants to be politically engaged in their home nation whilst located in a foreign (host) nation. So then, going ‘beyond-national-borders’ results in a social realm referred to as the *transnational social realm*, which consists of a realm which is independent of both host and home nation, and described as being ‘external’ of national borders. The transnational social realm can be said to be a semi-physical or non-physical social realm. It can be argued, however, that the transnational social realm also has to consist of both migrants’ home and host countries, as the exclusion of these may cause analytical difficulties since migrants are physically located within national borders of host countries, whilst non-physically being located in the home countries. Therefore, in this case study, the transnational social realm refers to a semi-physical realm consisting of Potchefstroom/SA (host nation)-and-Zimbabwe (home nation) synchronously, as these are *physical-and-non-*
physical social realms which migrants are located and active in. This also emphasises the somewhat impossibility to be fully free and detached from a nation-state, as well as the fields and the dynamics thereof, even though globalisation and cosmopolitanism emphasise the weakening of national boundaries.

With regards to this case study, and as emphasised by transnationalism and transmigration scholars (see Fouron & Glick-Schiller, 2001:60; Fox, 2005:175; Glick-Schiller & Fouron 1999:341, Hanyane, 2015:49), transnational citizenship refers to: the ever-existing relationship and ‘bond’ migrants have with their home country, whilst being present, active, connected, and in-pursuit of citizenship rights and roles in both their home and host country (more than one nation) simultaneously. This ‘bond’ and ‘connectedness’ refers to socio-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural ties migrants have with their home and host nations simultaneously. Additionally, transnational citizenship in this study refers to people being simultaneously present and active in the legal, political, social, economic and cultural fields of more than one nation-state. This does not overlook the fact that they are physically located in the host nation whilst non-physically located in the home nation. Thus, implying that, although they are active within the fields primarily available (accessible) from the host nation, their activities extend beyond the host nation to encompass the fields in the home nation.

Thus, to a degree, it could be stated that the dynamics of transnational citizenship contain elements of flexible citizenship, the elements highlighted by the classical types of citizenship – such as legal, political, social elements, as well as the relationship the citizens/migrants have with the nations and social actors in the transnational social realm (the home and host nation). Therefore, what would constitute the dynamics of transnational citizenship would have to be inclusive of the legal, political, social, economic fields available within the social sphere in which migrants find themselves in. Also, the way these are perceived and interpreted by the migrants, and the behaviour and practices their perceptions and interpretations induce. As Fouron and Glick-Schiller (2001:60) contend, migrants exist in the transnational social space, maintaining kinship bonds whilst also exchanging resources, capital, information, skills and cultures, between more than one nation-state. This points to the essential inclusion of the dimension of cultural exchanges which migrating induces and results in. Thus, not only are there fields made available by the legal, political, social, economic dimensions in the transnational social realm, the cultural dimension is also included, as it makes available the cultural field which presents its own array of dynamics.
Therefore, this would entail that a study which places focus on the dynamics of transnational citizenship should firstly consider the social realm which migrants are simultaneously present and active in – that is, the transnational social realm (Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe). Secondly, to consider the semi-physical nature of the transnational social realm (as migrants are physically in Potchefstroom and non-physically in Zimbabwe). Thirdly, to consider the fields available in this realm (legal, political, social, economic, and cultural), as well as the other players (actors) active in those fields (the institutions, the local SA citizens, fellow Zimbabwean compatriots, as well as other migrants present and active in those fields). Fourthly, to consider the nature of this realm as a field in itself, that is, a field of fields. This can be justified through understanding society as a complex social system comprising of interdependent systems which provide a basis for the complex social system (society) to function (see Ball, 1978; Borch, 2011; Luhmann, 2012; 2013; Mesjasz, 2010:713). Since a field is, according to Bourdieu (1993) and Lahire (2015:66) a system, and a nation-state is a ‘meta-field’ or ‘grand field’ (see Adler-Nissen, 2011; Bourdieu, 2012) Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe can be perceived as a field in its own right. It is a grand field consisting of (sub)fields which, through their occupiable positions and available capital, create a complex field – which is the transnational social realm itself. This grand field can be said to be the result of the conjunction of two grand fields as one – that is, Potchefstroom/SA and Zimbabwe realms, as the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe (transnational) realm. Therefore, it could be argued that field positions and capital in the grand field consist of the collective positions and capital accumulated in the interdependent fields within the grand field.

The core focus of such a study would then be the interplay, negotiations, competition and struggles for capital, social positions and power between the actors within the fields in the transnational social realm, and how this contributes to Zimbabwean migrants’ perceptions, interpretations and practices towards their citizenship. Whilst this all occurs in the transnational social realm, it is specifically the fields which migrants enter whilst located in host nation (Potchefstroom) that allow them to access and be active in fields available to them throughout the entire transnational social realm. This all hinges on the extent to which the migrants have, if at all, a transnational citizenship.

The focus is placed specifically on the migrants’ transnational citizenship, as the transnationalism lens embraces “processes and practices” related to the cross-border movement and activity of goods, resources, businesses, money and people (Hanyane, 2015:49). This, therefore, implicitly implies that any cross-border movement of people can
essentially be referred to as migration, of a sort, whether this involves refugees, voluntary migration and even expatriation. Therefore, a pure study of the dynamics of transnational citizenship only truly makes sense when the population of focus is a migrant population. This lays the foundation to investigate the dynamics of transnational citizenship among a migrant population in the South African context, specifically Zimbabwean migrants based in Potchefstroom. This case study provides the necessary opportunity for an in-depth investigation into a particular group, in a particular location in this regard, as this is a case whereby migrants, who could also qualify as transnational citizens, can provide a richer, understanding of migrants living in SA, especially with regards to their citizenship. The sections that follow will, amongst other endeavours, discuss the dynamics of migration in SA, and also justify the selection of Zimbabwean migrants based in Potchefstroom as the population of focus for this case study.

In SA (and internationally) migration, and migrants are often in the centre of debates regarding nationality and citizenship (Adjai & Lazaridis, 2013:194). Although common sense would qualify the idea that migrants only move from poorer to richer societies, Bailey (2015) as well as the World Bank (2015) suggest that migration flows in the contemporary era are not that simple. There are also high migration flows from developing countries to other developing countries, with approximately 250 million of the world’s population being migrants (Bailey, 2015; World Bank, 2015). This of course affords attention to Africa, as it is said by Kirk (2016) and Lamy (2013) that Africa is a developing continent. This suggests that it is not farfetched or difficult to accept that there are high migration flows and a large migrant population in Africa, particularly in SA. Stats SA (2015:123) reports that SA’s annual net immigration, between the years 2000 and 2010, amounts to 247 000. This places SA within the same statistical region as countries such as Canada (228 000), the UK (181 000) and Australia (181 000) (Stats SA, 2015:123). Other studies and publications also emphasise that SA is one of the highly favoured migrant destinations on the continent, especially for migrants from the SADC region (Dzimwasha, 2014; Meny-Gibert & Chiumia, 2016; Wilhelm-Solomon, 2016; World Bank, 2015). This is due to the widespread economic crises, political upheavals as well as environmental degradation recently, and in some cases, currently occurring in many African regions, including SADC (Stats SA, 2015:123).

In the late 1990s, former SA Minister of Home Affairs, Mangosuthu Buthelezi (1997) publicly proclaimed that the majority of migrants in SA are from the SADC region, particularly from Zimbabwe. This is further emphasised and reflected in more recent
studies, illustrating that 5% to 10% of SA’s current population comprises of both documented and undocumented migrants from various nations across the world, with the majority being Zimbabweans in search of ‘greener pastures’ (African News Agency, 2015; Park & Chen, 2009:25; Wilhelm-Solomon, 2016). Meny-Gibert and Chiumia (2016) further emphasise that approximately 75% of migrants in SA are from SADC with Zimbabwe being the top migrant ‘sending’ country. Africa Check (2013) had previously reported an approximate of 2 to 3 million Zimbabwean migrants currently live in SA, this however has been disputed by Meny-Gibert and Chiumia (2016), in that the issue with undocumented migrants makes it impossible to truly gain knowledge of the number of migrants, and therefore this has led to situations “where anecdote rather than factual data” tend to determine the number of Zimbabwean migrants in SA. However, although there may be uncertainties regarding factual statistics, in essence it can be accepted that Zimbabwe has the largest population of migrants living in SA.

Ngomane (2010:11), as well as Stats SA (2015:120), asserts that there has been a generational migration of SADC migrants to SA since, at least, the discovery of gold and diamonds in the Witwatersrand and Orange Free-state respectively. The reasons for this may vary, however; essentially, people migrate for economic betterment, not of themselves, but usually of family and kins that remained behind in the home country (Ngomane, 2010:12). Khan (2007:9) contends that an estimate 3000 Zimbabweans cross the border into SA on a daily basis", and she cites the need for “food, money and jobs” as the core push factor for this migration to SA. Idemudia et al., (2013:19), adding onto this, cite challenges such as “poverty, drought, famine, the lack of housing and other basic resources” as being at the core of what Zimbabweans are confronted with, thus leading to their decisions to migrate. These authors further state that because Zimbabwean migrants lack some, if not all of these “human, institutional, and structural resources”, they can be deemed as a ‘type’ of refugee or forced migrant, as opposed to purely being economic migrants in search of economic betterment (Idemudia et al., 2013:19).

The push (or force) to migrate, therefore, does exist, and SA is the desired and most convenient destination as it allows easier travel between SA and Zimbabwe. Supporting this contention regarding the close proximity and ease of travel, Ngomane (2010:13-14) further highlights that SA as a destination is also convenient as it also allows for the sending of goods, money, and the likes, as well as the seasonal or circular travel (migration) between the two countries, which are further made easier by the technological
advancements in areas such as communication, transportation and banking (sending and receiving of money).

This ‘ease’ and convenience is, however, met by an influx of undocumented (illegal) Zimbabwean migrants in SA, and as mentioned, undocumented migrants create difficulties and complications with regards to obtaining accurate statistical data regarding Zimbabwean migration to SA. Focusing on documented migrants, therefore, Stats SA (2015) reported that, although the influx of migrants to SA is concentrated in the larger and more economically developed provinces such as Gauteng (52%), Western Cape (12%) and KwaZulu-Natal (8%), the North West, as well as Limpopo and Mpumalanga provinces each provide residence to 7% of SA’s migration population. Stats SA (2015) also reported that the provinces of Eastern Cape (3%), Free-State (3%), and Northern Cape (1%) are residence to the lowest number of migrants.

Furthermore, it was reported that most black African migrants reside in Gauteng (55%), while the remaining black migrant population resides in Limpopo (9.1%), North West (8.2%), Mpumalanga (7.9%) and the Western Cape (7.3%) (Stats SA, 2015). The preference for provinces such as the North West, by black African migrants is reported to be similarities in cultural background, proximity to home countries, as well as language (Stats SA, 2015). Therefore, what can be deduced from this statistical report is that SA as a destination does attract Zimbabwean migrants, and outside of Gauteng, the North West province is among the preferred regions in SA by African migrants.

Thus, it can be argued that Potchefstroom has a high influx of Zimbabwean migrants based in the region. This is due to the stated facts that: 1) Zimbabwean migrants make up most African migrants in SA; 2) Potchefstroom is amongst the more economically well-off cities located in one of the entry corridors; and 3) Potchefstroom also provides a ‘gateway’ within and via the North West corridor through into Johannesburg and other areas in Gauteng. As Cross (2009) contends, not all migrants passing through the corridors in SA make it, or choose to go at all, to the larger regions as their destinations, some settle in the cities and towns along the corridors. Thus, with Zimbabwean migrants making the largest percentage of the migrant population in SA (Stats SA, 2015:120; Wilhelm-Solomon, 2016), it can be argued that many Zimbabwean migrants do in fact settle in Potchefstroom.

To qualify this speculation of the presence of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, an informal observation was conducted. From this observation, it was found that Zimbabwean migrants are present and active in Potchefstroom and its various fields, as street vendors
and small-scale business owners, as professionals and semi-professionals in institutions such as the university, and also as students. Most of the population group being in located in the town central area, the Bult (university area), and also Ikageng, a local black township located in Potchefstroom.

Therefore, what can be stated is that since SA is a desired destination by SADC and other African migrants, in-depth knowledge of migrants’ perceptions, interpretations and practices towards their citizenship, as well as the sort of relationships and networks they maintain whilst based in SA, could prove to be useful. With the above stated, it becomes more brazen as to why such a case study would provoke research interests. The dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants is an area of study that is yet to capture wide scholarly attention, and the reasons for such may vary. Additionally, since assumptions regarding all Zimbabwean migrants having a strong transnational citizenship cannot be made, such an investigation, therefore, also sought to uncover what holds a strong transnational citizenship, and also why it may be weak or non-existent among some members of the same migrant population. Therefore, as an example of a small city in which Zimbabwean migrants are located and are active, Potchefstroom provides an interesting opportunity as a social realm from which to investigate the dynamics of transnational citizenship among a particular population of social actors, in this case, Zimbabwean migrants.

1.2. The research problem

Delving into the investigation of the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom sets up an interesting research study, as it combines the somewhat primeval scholarly conversation on citizenship and the more recent transnationalism project towards understanding a particular migrant population. Vast amount of scholarly work on citizenship has been produced since the era of Aristotle, however, Jones and Gaventa (2002:v) still emphasise that “very little is known about the realities of how different people understand themselves as citizens, and the way in which this (understanding) impacts on the different dimensions of their lives”. This is particularly true regarding the citizenship of Zimbabwean migrants in SA and therefore in Potchefstroom. Although there have been publications on Zimbabwean migration to SA in general, and to the North West province in particular, focusing on an array of topics such
as xenophobia, socio-economic impact of migration in SA, and illegal migration (see Chigeza, 2012; Dzingai, 2016; Matshoane, 2015), scholarly focus in terms of publications and reporting on Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom does not exist. This implies that there are no reports or publications on the topic of citizenship and Zimbabwean migration, specifically in Potchefstroom.

If a gaze through the neoclassical migration lens, for instance, was to be adopted, it could be stated that Zimbabwean migrants are either Zimbabwean citizens based in SA, or ‘new’ SA citizens who have cut ties with their country of origin. The transmigration lens, however, contends that migrants never truly ‘leave’ Zimbabwe for SA, in fact they are present both in Zimbabwe and SA simultaneously, they remain connected with and ‘bonded’ to Zimbabwe and fellow compatriots through transnational relationships, activities, networks, and social exchanges, whilst in SA (Glick-Schiller & Fouron, 1999:341). Zimbabwean migrants, in this case, can no longer be simply defined or understood as purely Zimbabwean citizens in Zimbabwe, but as transnational citizens who are simultaneously present in both Zimbabwe and SA. However, such a contention cannot be assumed to hold true for all Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.

Conversely, whilst Zimbabwean migrants may define, as well as, perceive, interpret and act out their citizenship in a transnational manner, there are still structural dynamics which may prove to be a constant nuisance, in that their human and political rights and participation would still be limited and tied to their Zimbabwean nationality. As a result, they are excluded and ill-provided for within the borders of SA, since they cannot be perceived as anything but Zimbabwean nationals who have migrated to SA – they are migrants. This of course also impedes on their ability and liberty to participate in the economic market in SA. Socially, Zimbabwean migrants still face an array of xenophobic sentiments and attacks, regardless of whether they make strong contributions to the economy and job sector of SA (Adjai & Lazardis, 2013:199; Wilkinson, 2015), and regardless of their perceptions, interpretations and practices towards their citizenship.

Thus, as mentioned above, the theoretical standpoint which assumes that all migrants possess a transnational citizenship may not hold true for all migrants. Furthermore, understanding migrants as simply ‘foreign citizens’ may prove to be insufficient to understanding the migrants’ actual perceptions, interpretations and practices towards their citizenship, and what such dynamics would imply for them, as well as the host nation, especially if the migrants themselves have different and possibly diverse perceptions towards their own citizenship. The very same could be stated about Zimbabwean
migrants, in this regard. An investigative study focused on transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants can thus be valuable, as it provides insight to the above mentioned. The research problem, therefore, is that there is a lack of in-depth scholarly knowledge with regards to the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.

1.3. Research questions

Following the orientation and narrowed problematising of the research topic, using the sources and consulted literature, this study intended to answer the overarching research question that is as follows: what are the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom?

To efficiently answer this question, the following research questions were presented as support to the overarching question. These read as follows:

1.3.1. What does the applicable literature contribute to the understanding and interpretation of migration?

1.3.2. What does the applicable literature contribute to the understanding and interpretation of citizenship and transnational citizenship?

1.3.3. What is the applicable theoretical lens for understanding the dynamics of transnational citizenship?

1.3.4. What is an applicable research methodology to use for a study of the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom?

1.3.5. What are the perceptions, interpretations, and practices of citizenship amongst Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom and how do they constitute a transnational citizenship orientation?

1.3.6. What conclusions and recommendations can be made regarding the dynamics of transnational citizenship of Zimbabwean migrants?
1.4. Research objectives

Building on the overarching research question mentioned above (see section 3), the main objective of this research study is therefore: to investigate the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. From the reviewed literature it is evident that there is a knowledge gap with regards to how transnational citizenship dynamics play out in the case of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. Therefore, the objectives that essentially directed this research study read as follows:

1.4.1. To determine the contribution of applicable literature to the understanding and interpretation of migration.

1.4.2. To determine the contribution of applicable literature to the understanding interpretation citizenship and transnational citizenship.

1.4.3. To determine the applicable theoretical lens for understanding the dynamics of transnational citizenship.

1.4.4. To describe the applicable research methodology used for a study of the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.

1.4.5. To determine the perceptions, interpretations, and practices of citizenship amongst Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom and explain how they constitutes a transnational citizenship orientation.

1.4.6. To provide conclusions and suggest recommendations that can be made regarding the dynamics of transnational citizenship of Zimbabwean migrants.

1.5. Central theoretical framework

The following section provides a discussion of the core theoretical framework in which the research study is anchored in. Various theories, such as the social network theory, and the social exchange theory would also be useful in investigating the dynamics of transnational citizenship, as these theories aim to study the relationships, networks, connections, and exchanges that social actors engage in within the social realm. However, for this study, the theoretical framework is developed from Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of practice, with focus on the interplay of habitus, capital and social positions in the fields in Potchefstroom and how they extend beyond Potchefstroom, if at all, to the transnational social realm.
The theory of practice specifically provides for a relevant and interesting theoretical anchor in this research study. This theory allows for the investigation of how actors (Zimbabwean migrants), carrying with them their *habitus* and capital into the transnational social realm (whilst located in Potchefstroom and Zimbabwe simultaneously), perceive, interpret, and act, particularly towards their citizenship, within the fields they enter, and how this constitutes a transnational citizenship. A field is an ‘arena of action’ within a social realm which encompasses the social agents, their capital (economic, social, symbolic and cultural), doxa (a set of field rules) and the positions (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:98; Web *et al*., 2002:23; Calhoun *et al*., 2007:261). The field also comprises of power relations and struggles in which social agents negotiate, compete and struggle for the acquisition of social positions and capital (Web *et al*., 2002:22). It is the dynamic nature of the transnational social realm as a complex field that is of particularly interest to this study, particularly the struggles and negotiations occurring in the interdependent fields in which migrants enter in this complex realm.

This theory is shaped by the agency-structure dichotomy, as well as the transnational lens. The agency-structure dichotomy is a classical sociological notion that highlights the ever-occurring relation between human agents and the social structures and institutions, or in other words, the individual/s and the (social) forces spawning from the social structures and institutions (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998:962; Giddens, 1979:53,62; McAnulla, 2002:271; Raskoff, 2009). Raskoff (2009), for instance, maintains that although structures and societies can be argued to exist beyond the control of individuals, it is individuals who, through their actions (practices) create and maintain them. She contends, therefore, that agency and structure cannot be separated from each other. Therefore, this lens is most useful in explaining the vertical relationships and dynamics between the migrant and the home and host nations, the citizen and the society, the individual and the group.

Through this lens, the vertical distribution of power but also the ways in which migrants negotiate their position and degree of power in various fields is investigated. Placing particular focus on the social agents provides for an overview of the horizontal relationship, which are of equal, if not more, importance as the vertical relationships. The horizontal relationships are of importance since they relate to how Zimbabweans can collectively mobilise capital as they enter fields that are alien, and possibly unfriendly. Horizontal relationships may also include Zimbabwean migrants’ interactions with local South African citizens, thus even bridging potential resistance migrants may face from locals, allowing
them to commence towards accessing and functioning positively in the fields available in the Potchefstroom realm.

With regards to the citizen-and-nation-state, it could be contended that the citizen is in fact an individual/agent and the nation-state is a structured entity with degrees of impact on the citizen. Although nation-states exist independently of, and beyond the control of citizens, it is the citizens who create the nation-state, and thus, the components of the citizen-and-nation-state dichotomy are better understood in conjunction, perhaps in a similar manner to those of agency-structure. It is from this theoretical point of departure that the dynamics of transmigration must be understood, as the theoretical stance of transmigration blurs the seemingly tangible relationship between citizen and nation-state.

The transnationalism lens takes the theory of practice to ‘beyond-national-borders’, into the transnational social realm, and essentially speaks on the ‘ever-connectedness’ of migrants to their home countries, as well as their simultaneous existence, presence, and practices in both host and home country (Hanyane, 2015:49; Upegui-Hernandez, 2012:2005). National borders are essentially weakened here, but are still present – thus, they are semi-physical. In this sense, transmigration emphasises that migrants, or rather transnational migrants (transmigrants), are migrants who are in multiple and simultaneous social relations and connections, networks and social exchanges with people in more than one country (beyond just ‘within-nation-borders’) (Fouron & Glick-Schiller, 2001:60; Glick-Schiller et al., 1995:48; Upegui-Hernandez, 2012:2005). Therefore, this lens emphasises also the horizontal relationships between social actors, which extend beyond the weakened national borders. The text that follows, therefore, provides a synoptic discussion of the theory of practice, as infused and shaped by both the agency-structure dichotomy, as well as the transnational lens.

Bourdieu’s theory of practice proves most relevant and useful for understanding the dynamics which occur upon social actors’ entering a social environment, which is essentially what migrants do as they migrate into different nations and societies. Society is in essence, a multi-lateral, multi-dimensional, multi-dynamic space, and it is (as explained) the grand field, consisting of and divided into various interdependent (sub)fields, which could be social groups, institutions, work places, political spaces, and so forth (Walther, 2014:7). Each field is defined by and embedded with its unique doxa which are essential for the functioning of the field, as well as the behaviour and practices of the actors. According to those doxa, social groups and individual actors within positions of power in
that field assess the ‘newly joining’ actors and assign to them a position in the field (Walther, 2014:9).

The positions of power within a particular field are acquired through actor’s habitus, as well as the amount of capital available to them (Buchholz, 2016:39). Actors obtain their habitus from their social groups and social context – family, neighbourhood, country – and this becomes their internalised structures, tastes, perceptions, and interpretations of their life-worlds (Navarro, 2006:16; Walther (2014:13). It essentially refers to the resources an actor is in possession of and equipped with from the onset as they enter a field (Bourdieu, 1984:170; Wacquant; 2005:316). It is through their habitus that they obtain their capital and social identity, which is their initial field position (Web et al., 2002:25).

The power itself is both vertically and horizontally distributed in the field, and as contended by Weininger (2005:89), the amount of power available to actors allows for the up-down (vertical) navigation between the positions in the field, whilst their position affords to them the movement into and across (horizontal) the field, potentially into other fields. That is, power distributed throughout and across all the actors in the field, and power that is distributed hierarchically, from the upper-class elite, bourgeoisie social groups in the field down to the so-called lower class, proletariat group (Weininger, 2005:89). Therefore, as contended above, a field is essentially an arena of power struggles and relations in which social actors compete and struggle for social positions and capital.

With focus on the Zimbabwean migrants, it could be contended that as Zimbabwean citizens, the grand field in which these citizens find themselves is their national space – Zimbabwe – narrowing down to the various social groups and institutions they belong to and are active in – the fields. Their social positions are assigned by the political institution, the work/job market, their next of kin, communities, family and friendship groups, and it is within these fields that they seek, struggle and compete for more capital, as well as positions of power, which further positions them in the grand field. However, upon migrating, these citizens then enter the transnational social realm, and thus the (transnational) fields that may be available in this social realm. The dynamics change as the grand field is no longer Zimbabwe – their home country, nor is it purely SA – their host country. The migrants, whilst physically located in Potchefstroom, enter the transnational social realm which removes them from the constraints of the physical borders of SA and Zimbabwe, into a semi-physical realm whereby they are actively connected to both nations simultaneously. Therefore, the fields encountered here – transnational fields – are not only those in a particular nation, but those in both nations (for instance, actors enter and seek
positions in the economic or legal fields of both Potchefstroom/SA and Zimbabwe simultaneously).

With regards to their habitus, it could be argued that Zimbabwean migrants carry with them a Zimbabwean habitus which they acquire from their home country, and ‘use’ it as a point of departure when entering and competing in fields both in Zimbabwe, and particularly Potchefstroom, as Potchefstroom is their physical location. The nature and characteristics of the habitus, as well as the dynamical nature of the migrants’ habitus are further elaborated in chapter 4 (section 4.4).

Furthermore, there are four core types of capital that are essential in Bourdieu’s theory of practice; these are: economic, social, cultural, as well as symbolic capital. Essentially, it can be argued that the first three listed capitals all coincide to create symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1990a:137; Buchholz, 2016:7). It is through their capital that actors are able to act and practice in the field, towards acquiring positions. It is through their practices in the field that actors are able to acquire better field positions. It is through the acquisition of field position that an actor may possess any degree of power within a field, and thus more capital, more social resources, a developed habitus, social identity and status in the field, and grand field (Kelly & Lusis, 2006:833; Walther, 2014:9). Zimbabwean migrants enter Potchefstroom in possession of varying degrees of capital which sits them in certain positions in the available fields which they partake in whilst in Potchefstroom. It is their capital that opens for them the opportunity not only to ‘play’ in the Potchefstroom fields, but to expand that ‘play’ into the transnational social realm, ‘playing’ in both Potchefstroom and Zimbabwe simultaneously. The conception of capital and its dynamics in relation to the Zimbabwean migrants living in Potchefstroom will be further discussed in chapter 4 (section 4.6).

In conclusion, it can be contended that the field is a sphere in which there is a power struggling and competing between individuals for positions and capital in that field. This power struggle and competition is guided by the doxa within that field. It is vital for actors (migrants) then to learn the doxa of that field in order to ‘play’ or act in a manner which is acceptable to that field, as this may result in a lack of elevation to higher positions and may ultimately lead to rejection from the field. While migrants’ habitus and capital become their resources and means of acting within the fields, various structural dynamics in the field may affect the initial positions afforded to them. The migrants, however, in their negotiations, struggles and competing in the field, can acquire more or ‘new’ capital and field ‘skills’ necessary to negotiate for capital and positions in the fields available in the
transnational social realm. However, to partake in the grand field of transnational social realm, the migrants have to be physically active in the Potchefstroom realm (which is too a grand field) to begin with. This then brings to question the extent to which all Zimbabwean migrants can be said to possess a transnational citizenship, and the implication of not having one. This therefore highlights Potchefstroom as the true arena of analysis for this research study, through which the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants can be investigated and understood. It is in this grand field that actors may have access to any fields. The fields which are available to them, and the extent to which they can access them remains at the heart of this investigation. It is their habitus, capital and practices in Potchefstroom that may avail transnational field access for them in the transnational social realm, beyond just the fields they encounter in Potchefstroom.

The theory of practice offers a gaze into the terrain in which the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants can be investigated – that is, their perceptions, interpretations and practices towards their citizenship as they negotiate and compete for capital and positions in the available fields in the transnational social realm. This investigation, therefore, focuses on how the aforementioned may constitute a transnational citizenship. The agency-structure dichotomy, as a supporting lens, provides for an overview of the dynamic nature of vertical power relations and struggles within this realm, whilst a focus on the social agents provides for an overview of the horizontal power relations. The transmigration lens directs this research study towards a beyond-national-borders (transnational) analysis of the social realm in which Zimbabwean migrants are located. Its usefulness as a supporting lens for field theory is the manner in which it allows for the taking of the physical social realm as a grand field with its fields, within a national border, beyond the border, into the transnational social realm with its (transnational) fields. It is through this theoretical framework that the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, especially how they play out in the legal, political, social, economic, and cultural fields, are investigated in this study.

1.6. Methodology and research design

This research project, in essence, is a case study on the dynamics of transnational citizenship of Zimbabwean migrants based in Potchefstroom. The research itself was conducted by means of a literature review and empirical research. Chapter five provides a
more elaborate overview of the research design for this study, whereas the following section provides a synoptic overview.

1.6.1. The literature review
The importance of a thorough, well researched and presented literature review cannot be stressed enough. As Fouche and Deport (2005:123) state, the literature aids in grounding the focus of the research study, as well as provides for a clear understanding of the research topic and the broader field. As this process essentially provides researchers with knowledge of previous scholarly work, it also aids in identifying knowledge gaps in the ‘areas of concern’, whilst informing the researcher of key concepts, authors, methodologies, related to, in this case study, migration and the dynamics of transnational citizenship (Bhattacherjee, 2012:20-21; De Wet et al., 1981:80).

Therefore, applicable literature was consulted throughout the duration of this study. The sources consulted include books, textbooks, scholarly articles (both online and print), news articles (both online and print), statutory documents, and such other literature and documents that may prove to be useful towards addressing and ultimately answering the posed overarching research question for this study – what are the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom? These cover themes, theories, topics and concepts related to transnationalism, citizenship, transnational citizenship, and migration, particularly related to SA (Potchefstroom) and Zimbabwe. Thus, the literature review can be deemed the first phase of data collection.

1.6.2. The research design
The research title implies that the study delves into an investigation of a particular population group – Zimbabwean migrants, and particular phenomenon – the dynamics of transnational citizenship, within a particular location – Potchefstroom. For this research, the design is qualitative as this allows for the in-depth studying and analysing of a phenomenon, through in-depth interviews with participants, usually a small sample size (Babbie & Mouton, 2004:279; Creswell, 2003:18; Monette et al., 2005:5). The data cannot be generalised in this regard. Therefore, for such an investigation, the instrumental exploratory single case study research design was adopted as the most appropriate design for this study. A case study, as scholars assert, is particularly useful for an in-depth understanding of unique occurrences in their unique and specific contexts (Rule & John, 2011:3; Yin, 2009:18).
1.6.3. Population and sampling strategy

As suggested by the title, the relevant population in this study is Zimbabwean migrants located in Potchefstroom. The study focuses particularly on documented Zimbabwean migrants, all above the consenting age of 18 years old. These, in fact, were the only criteria qualifying participants for the partaking in this study: 1) they had to be Zimbabwean migrants; 2) living in Potchefstroom; 3) over the consenting age of 18 years; and 4) in possession of official documentation (not illegal migrants).

Patton (2002), Surbhi (2016) and even Yin (2011) all highlight the usefulness of purposive and snowball sampling for investigative or exploratory research. Purposive (or judgment) sampling and snowball sampling were employed. Essentially it could be said that all participants were purposefully selected based on their ability to provide relevant and rich in-depth responses on the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. Upon identifying and interviewing selected participants, snowball sampling was used as participants were requested to advise and refer the researcher to other potential participants. The participants identified through the snowball sampling process were also purposefully selected. This sampling procedure continued throughout the duration of the data collection phase of the research. Chapter 5 delves deeper into a discussion of the research methodology adopted in this study.

1.6.4. Empirical data collection

The empirical data collection was obtained through two approaches: semi-structured interviews, as well as focus groups. Interviews were conducted in order to provide for the participants an opportunity to fully express themselves with regards to the topic at hand. This provides for the researcher an opportunity, as Yin (2011:135) proclaims, to “learn” from the participants, as they are somewhat experts on this particular subject matter. As Yin (1994:82) highlights, a focus group represents a collective group of participants as one unit. Each group counts as one individual interview and provided for the participants an opportunity to tell ‘our story’. Four focus groups of 2-4 participants were held. They were vital in providing an account of their shared experiences of living in Potchefstroom, living in Zimbabwe, and also their Zimbabweanness – being Zimbabwean.

Therefore, the researcher’s task was to initiate a free-flowing conversation aligned with the title and overarching question of the study – what are the dynamics of transnational
citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom? – towards addressing particularly objective 3.5 – to determine the perceptions, interpretations and practices on citizenship amongst Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom and explain how it constitutes a transnational citizenship orientation. The conversations were dominated by the participants, as the researcher played the role of an active listener, as well as an active moderator in both the individual interview and small focus groups.

1.6.5. Data analysis
The extensive qualitative data obtained from the focus groups and interviews was transcribed from the recordings, with the assistance of two transcribers. Thereafter, the data was coded and categorised into themes through the creation of thematic categories for analysis (Creswell, 2009:195). The data was manually coded using Microsoft Word and sorting it into categories using Microsoft Excel. This technique is elaborated on in chapter 5 (section 5.8). Three themes were formulated during the analysis and were thematically analysed. Chapter 6 provides an interpretation and discussion of these themes in conjunction with the scholarly literature consulted in this study.

1.6.6. Ethical considerations
While conducting the study, it is of paramount importance that scientific research and researchers adhere to the code of ethics of research to avoid unlawfulness and unprofessionalism (Babbie, 2004:63; Smith, 1981:14). Bless et al. (2013:25) and Ruane (2005:17) both highlight that social scientific research is unlikely to cause any extreme physical harm, as could natural scientific research, however regardless of this, certain ethical considerations will be acknowledged by social science researchers. Therefore, the following ethics were considered throughout this research study:

Consent was sought from all participants at the beginning of each focus group and interview to ensure their wilful participation in the study. Upon giving their consent, they were also informed that their participation is voluntary and that they may request to leave the focus group or cease the interview at any point. No physical, psychological or social harm was experienced by the participants. The privacy of participants was respected, and their personal information is kept confidential in a password-protected encrypted folder stored on the researcher’s external hard drive. The anonymity of all participants was not overlooked, and as such, their personal names are not revealed in the reporting of the empirical findings of this study.
The participants as well as the scientific community were not deceived. All data and findings will be presented accurately, honestly and truthfully in a professional manner. Lastly, all data, private information and personal details such as the names of the participants remain safe and secure in the said encrypted folder, which only the researcher has knowledge of, as well as access to. Therefore, in reporting, participants are referred to by pseudonyms – their identities are not revealed. For an elaborate discussion on the ethical considerations, see chapter 5 (section 5.7).

1.7. Limitations of study

In embarking on any research project, researchers should expect limitations that the study may not be able to address. These limitations should however be expected and acknowledged when they emerge. In this research study, three limitations were identified. The first limitation relates to the methodology chosen for this study. Qualitative data is subjective and specific to the individual participant, and as such, cannot be generalised to represent, in the case of this research, the entire Zimbabwean migrant population in SA, and even Potchefstroom holistically. This is probably the qualitative approach’s disadvantageous characteristic, and thus its main limitation. Furthermore, the focus on investigation indirectly points to exploratory research, which essentially is not focused on describing or explaining phenomena – a feat achievable through experiments and survey research. Lastly, a single case study is too specific, exclusive and constrained. It limits the general scope of any researcher or research project, focusing only, and exclusively on the case— that is, in this regard, the Zimbabwean migrants based in Potchefstroom.

A second limitation is the directed focus on solely the Zimbabwean migrant population and their perceptions, interpretation and practices towards their citizenship. This therefore excludes other SADC, African and intercontinental migrant populations based in Potchefstroom. More than that, the local South African citizens who are also residents to Potchefstroom are excluded. The exclusion of these groups limits the scope, as well as the pure appreciation of the multi-dimensional, multi-lateral and multi-dynamical nature of the transnational social space and fields, which are accessible through the Potchefstroom terrain, in which all the aforementioned population groups are active in. Therefore, excluding the others to afford focus solely on the Zimbabwean migrant population is an ‘injustice’ which this research cannot envisage to address, but must, at the very least,
acknowledge. This further shows the need for further research in this regard, which is inclusive of the other aforementioned population groups.

The third limitation of the study is its sole focus on Potchefstroom as the region of choice, and thus excluding other regions within the JB Marks Local Municipality, the North West province, and SA as a whole. The experiences of Zimbabwean (as well as other) migrants in regions outside of Potchefstroom could yield different results, conclusions and recommendations which may either contradict or support those of this particular case study. This, again, results in a limited scope and understanding of the dynamics of transitional citizenship, and particularly among Zimbabwean (and/or other) migrants who migrate to SA. This also limits the appreciation of the dynamics of the transnational social space and how each region, containing multi-plex and diverse fields, contributes further to the complexity of the transnational social realm.

1.8. Significance of study

The research project contributes to the ever-complex and dynamic conversation of citizenship, as well as that of migration, which prove to remain a complexity to this day. Moreover, this research project gives insight into an area of study that has previously not gained much attention. That is, the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants based in Potchefstroom. Jones and Gaventa (2002:v) state that little is known regarding people’s self-understanding as citizens, and furthermore, not much is known regarding how the state, as a structured entity, impacts on the various facets of human lives and life-worlds. In the case of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, it could be contended that this is probably a topic that hardly attracts attention, especially considering that dominant social, political and scholarly migration debates in SA generally revolve around topics such as xenophobia, ‘job-taking’ and unemployment issues (see Abdi, 2011; Adjai & Lazaridis, 2013; De Jager, 2011; Hick, 1999; Kalitanyi & Visser, 2010), illegal/undocumented migration (see Gqirana, 2017; Machecka et al., 2015; Solomon, 2003), human trafficking (see Morreira, 2010; Muanamoha et al., 2010).

Theoretically, the study engages the conception of transmigration as a lens through which the dynamics of citizenship among migrants in Potchefstroom could be investigated and understood. In a ‘Bourdieuian’ sense, it is said that Zimbabwean migrants are in constant power struggles, negotiations and competition with each other, other migrants, and the
local SA citizens for social positions and more capital than their primary habitus had afforded them. Therefore, this case study relooks at Bourdieu’s theory of practice in the transnational social space, and thus delving into the investigation into the transnational social fields. This study, thus, makes a theoretical contribution in this regard.

The correlation between migration and citizenship is one of importance in the contemporary era, as migration has grown to become one of the highly debated topics in international politics. Essentially, all that may be related to, and/or associated with citizenship will ultimately have an impact on the nation-state, leading to complications particularly for the receiving, host nations – in this regard, SA. Transnational citizenship is ultimately a ‘beyond-national-borders’ conception of citizenship, which blurs and complicates the significance of national borders. Migration, as discussed, is also a topic of great concern in SA. Thus, with a high influx of migrants entering the country, the dynamics of transnational citizenship, especially in the contemporary era – characterised by transnational relations in general – are a factor that is significant in contemporary SA, socially and culturally, as well as politically. As this provides for officials, scholars, as well as the public, a phenomenological understanding of the activities and social actions, practices and behaviour of, in this case, particularly Zimbabwean migrants. This study therefore sheds light in this area of interest.

1.9. Preliminary chapter layout

**Chapter 1: Introduction**
This chapter offers an introduction and orientation to the study, and the research problem of interest. Thus, essentially, the chapter includes an orientation to the study, the research problem, research questions, research objectives, research design, as well as the significance of the study.

**Chapter 2: Towards an understanding of migration**
This chapter presents a literature review on migration, focusing on the contribution of applicable literature to the interpretation of migration and transnational migration.
Chapter 3: Citizenship: understanding the concept and its types
Similar to chapter 2, this chapter presents a literature review on citizenship, focusing on the contribution of applicable literature to the interpretation of citizenship and transnational citizenship.

Chapter 4: The Theory of Practice as a framework for dynamics of transnational citizenship
Chapter four then provides a theoretical approach to transnational citizenship. More particularly, the chapter provides the applicable theoretical lens that is used for understanding the dynamics of transnational citizenship.

Chapter 5: Research methodology
This chapter provides a detailed description of the applicable research methodology used for a study of the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.

Chapter 6: Analysis, interpretation and discussion of findings
Chapter six provides an analysis, interpretation and discussion of the empirical research findings.

Chapter 7: Conclusions and recommendations
This chapter intends to provide conclusions and suggest recommendations that can be made regarding the dynamics of transnational citizenship of Zimbabwean migrants.
Chapter 2: Towards an understanding of migration

2.1. Introduction

Prior to delving into the complexity of migration in SA, it is paramount to attempt to answer, in detail and in simplicity, the questions: what is migration? Who migrates? What types of migration exist? This offers grounds for the contemporary understanding of migration, and thus will position the research within this understanding.

This chapter, therefore, provides a definition of migration. This is followed by a discussion of the foundational scholarly lenses of perceiving and analysing migration. These are the classical and the neoclassical lenses, also collectively referred to as the traditional lens. In the said section, the varying types, categories and limitations of the traditional migration lens are discussed. To overcome the shortcomings of the traditional lens, the transnational migration lens is introduced, and argued to be the most suitable lens to understand and analyse contemporary migration, especially in the case of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.

Delving into the latter sections of the chapter, a brief overview of the contribution of SADC migrants to SA is provided. This is followed, in conclusion, by a discussion of the general migration trends which are specific to Zimbabwe. This discussion includes the reasons, patterns, processes, as well as some of the transnational activities prevalent to Zimbabweans migrants located in SA. With all this stated, this chapter, therefore, commences with a discussion of the conceptualisation of migration according to scholarship. The following section provides this discussion.

2.2. What is migration?

Dingle and Drake (2007:113) broadly state that migration can be envisioned as some “heroic” move of large or “whole populations over long distance”. These, and other scholars, also highlight that there are various types of species migration, such as fish migration, bird migration, cattle migration, reptile migration, and the likes – these, amongst others, form what is referred to as animal migration (Cheke & Tratalos, 2007:145; Dingle & Drake, 2007:113-114). The concern of this research study, however, affords special attention to the dynamics and patterns of what is referred to as human migration (henceforth migration).
Hubschmann (2015:1), as well as Greiner (2010:137) assert that human migration is a phenomenon that dates back centuries if not millennia and occurs both within the borders of one nation or across those of various nations. Classical definitions of migration, particularly the foundational scholarly works of Ernst Georg Ravenstein (1885, 1889) and Evert Lee (1966), insists that migration is “a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence”. Developing this definition further, McNeill (1984:1), the National Geographic Society (2005), as well as Kardulias and Hall (2006:1), proclaim that migration is a semi-permanent or permanent relocation as the result of human reactions to push and pull factors such as political, social, environmental, and economic changes.

Hagen-Zanker’s (2008:4) definition proclaims that migration should be acknowledged as a “temporary or permanent move of individuals or groups of people from one geographical location to another for various reasons ranging from persecution to better employment possibilities”. The 2016 Green paper on international migration published by the SA Department of Home Affairs (SADHA, 2016:5) defines migration as the movement of people across national borders, “regardless of (1) the person’s legal status; (2) whether the movement is voluntary or involuntary; (3) what the causes for the movement are; or (4) what the length of the stay is”. Both definitions, although contemporary, tend to hinge on the traditional definitions of migration.

Traditional definitions such as that of Lee (1966:46) tend to simply highlight the migration from point A to B; the reasons for migrating; statistics such as the number of people migrating; as well as the duration of their migration – temporary, semi-permanent, permanent. For further examples of such work, see Eisenstadt (1953:167-180), Trewartha (1969:136), Ross (1982:448-449) and Chandna (1998:86). This ‘old’ definition is maintained in contemporary definitions such as that of Hagen-Zanker (2008) which recognises these same characteristics – that there are various types of movement, reasons for moving, ways of reaching and entering countries or living there and degrees of permanency – and that migration can take place in any combination. This conception of migration is rooted in what scholars refer to as the neoclassical migration lens (Anitha & Pearson, 2013; Luthi, 2009), which essentially still hinges on the classical push-pull factors, reasons for migration and statistics.

Furthermore, two central concepts in the field of migration are emigration and immigration. ‘Emigration’ is defined as migrants who leave their country of origin and are thus said to
‘emigrate’ from their home countries (Asch, 1994:3; Wellman, 2015). ‘Immigration’, on the contrary, refers to migrants who enter a host country, and are, thus, said to ‘immigrate’ to the host country (Asch, 1994:2; Wellman, 2015). Migration, moreover, is broadly and simply defined by scholars as a permanent or semi-permanent move by humans from one place of residence (home country) to another (host country) (Asch, 1994:2; Chandna, 1998:89; Sinha, 2005:408-409; Wellman, 2015). This definition of migration captures and encompasses both immigration and emigration. Therefore, for this reason, the term migration (migrants) is utilised as the key term and will include both immigration (immigrants) and emigration (emigrants).

Since the foundational Law of Migration (1885, 1889), the scholarly works of Ernst Georg Ravenstein, traditional migrations definitions have evolved from a simplistic, binary conception to more complex multi-dimensional conceptions of migration. Amidst the complex multi-dimensional conceptions is the contemporary transnational migration definition, which acknowledges migration as a reciprocal interchange of resources, skills, cultures, and people between two or more nations (Colic-Peisker, 2002:32). It is the simultaneous presence and activeness of migrants in more than one nation (Fouron & Glick-Schiller, 2001:60; Hanyane, 2015:49).

Therefore, migration in this regard, refers to the movement of people from one nation (home) to another (host). However, it goes beyond just the move. It involves the reasons for the move, and the obstacles faced when moving, as well as upon arriving in the host nation. Most importantly, therefore, and considering more contemporary scholarship, migration is not a point A to point B move, but a point A to point B move, whilst remaining fully active and present in point A. Therefore, it is point A and B, as opposed to point A to B. Through this conceptualisation, migration also involves the cross-border relations, interaction and exchanges between people in the host and home nation. The traditional lenses of migration are discussed in the section that follows.

2.3. Classical and neoclassical migration: the two traditional lenses and their limitations

The classical and neoclassical migration lenses are the two foundational lenses developed within the scholarship of migration. These two lenses can be collectively referred to as the traditional lenses of migration. The neoclassical lens emerged as a development of the
classical, and thus became the adopted lens by migration scholars of the mid-20th century. It is paramount that a distinction between these two lenses is provided, as this also illustrates a chronological development of migration scholarship – from classical to transnational migration scholarship. The text that follows intends to provide this distinction.

Classical and neoclassical (traditional) scholars of migration, as already stated, tend to adopt a simplistic binary conception of migration, and so distinguish between two categories – forced and voluntary migration (Castles, 2003:13; Heberle, 1955:66; Pine, 2014:95; Polzer, 2010:2). In this regard, the focus of this scholarship was on the reasons for migration (forced or voluntary); who migrates (mostly men); and the number of migrants (Lee, 1966:55-57; Luthi, 2009). For instance, Ravenstein’s (1885, 1889) classical lens of migration, according to Anitha and Pearson (2013), as well as Luthi (2009), referred specifically to push and pull factors. These are factors which push migrants out of their country or region to another; and also factors which pull or attract migrants to their destinations. These authors add on, saying that it is these factors which determine people’s decisions to migrate (Anitha & Pearson, 2013; Luthi, 2009).

Lee (1966:54) proclaims that what was established through the classical lens is that all migration is a result of socio-political, socio-economic, socio-cultural, environmental and personal factors that ‘act’ as push and/or pull factors. However, in developing what Anitha & Pearson (2013) refer to as the neoclassical lens, Lee (1966:54) added intervening factors to the push-pull dichotomy. His argument in this regard is that these factors are the decisive factors determining if or not the push or pull factor is strong enough to influence the decision to migrate or not. As Lee (1966:50) explains, the push-pull factors exist both at the place (country) of origin, as well as at the desired destination. They facilitate individuals’ decision to migrate or not to migrate, while they (the migrants) are also confronted by intervening obstacles (finance, distance and transport) which may result in difficulties when deciding to migrate and in selecting destinations (Lee, 1966:50).

Lee (1966:56) further emphasises that migration is likely to occur during economic boom times, arguing that regardless of voluntary or involuntary reasons, the availability of work opportunities, the need or desire for economic betterment, and the financial status will always be amongst the core determinants to, or not to migrate. What Lee included into the classical lens of migration are the intervening factors. This inclusion, therefore, became the differentiating factor between the classical and neoclassical lens. It is the neoclassical
lens that was adopted and has dominated theory, literature, and the way in which migration is modelled (Anitha & Pearson, 2013; Luthi, 2009).

Along with the traditional lenses, also emerged the traditional distinctive categories which further categorised human migration into varying sub-categories. This is further elaborated in the following section.

2.3.1. Traditional distinctive categories of migration

Primary traditional distinctions that can be made regarding human migration distinguish between two main types, that is, internal (national) migration and external (international) migration (NGS, 2005, Luthi 2009). These, in brief, refer to migration occurring within national borders, such as region-to-region; town-to-town (see Greiner, 2010), as well as migration occurring beyond national borders, from country-to-country (see Castles et al., 2013).

Further distinctions distinguish between documented (legal) and undocumented (illegal/irregular) migration. The former simply refers to migrants who possess legal documentation permitting them to be within the borders of a particular country, while the latter refers to migrants entering a nation or territory outside of the legal channels and residing there unrecognised, and thus outside of a country’s formal statistical measures (SADHA, 2016:5-6; IOM, 2018). The ‘irregular migration’ category may also include those who illegally obtain falsified documents to live and work in a country. It should be also appreciated that this generally makes it a somewhat impossible obstacle to regulate migration, to understand migration patterns, as well as to obtain accurate migration statistics (Stats SA, 2011:46a; 2011:124b). Therefore, considering this and towards a narrowed focus, ‘undocumented migration’ remains outside the scope of this study, and attention is afforded particularly on documented international human migration.

Other vital distinctions that should be mentioned are those that distinguish between short-term/temporary, semi-permanent and permanent migration; distance of the move (Chandna, 1998; 88; Johnston, 1994:380); and also, demographical categories and statistics – gender, age, as well as nationality (Lee, 1966:55-56). These, as well as the aforementioned distinctive categories are amongst the core developments and foundation laid down by neoclassical migration scholars. Furthermore, these have all been and still are the conventional categories and types of migrations. Therefore, in light of this, the
question that can be posed is: who actually migrates? This is, in fact, the question which section 3.2 intends to address.

2.3.2. Who migrates? The general demographical characteristics of migrants
The demographical characteristics of migrants can be argued to be an entity that is relative to the era and context in which they are recorded. That is to say, the demographical characteristics within the 20th century may relatively differ from those of the 21st century. Furthermore, the characteristics of a certain geographical region may differ from those of other regions. However, according to the historical scholarship, migrants are generally perceived to be predominantly working-age males, from poorer/developing regions or countries, migrating for personal (or family-related) economic reasons – and as such, women were overlooked, and not much scholarly attention was afforded to woman migrants (Anitha & Pearson, 2013; Luthi, 2009). However, this has changed, according to Koser (2007:7) due to the increase in international job opportunities that may sometimes be gender-specific in their selection. These types of jobs include healthcare, white-collar services, entertainment and the likes.

Koser (2007:7) further adds that generally many countries have allowed for family migration and family-reunion migration, whereby migrants migrate with only the intension to reunite with family members and next of kin who had migrated earlier. This has resulted in the rise of children and women migrating, and thus questions the age, gender, socio-economic-status demographics, as well as reasons for migration. Migration is essentially not simply an economic decision, it is not an individualistic decision, it always involves adults and children, the young and elderly, as well as both men and women. Unlike early discourse and scholarly work, contemporary scholarly work and discourse on migration has to be inclusive of this. This particular research study however places focus particularly on adult men and women migrants located across Potchefstroom. No children or minors under the consenting age of 18, no elderly and no undocumented Zimbabwean migrants are included in the research.

2.3.3. Forced and voluntary migration: the essential types of migration
There are two essential types and categories of migration that are rooted in the traditional lens. Heberle (1955:66), Castles (2003:13), and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM, 2018) assert that these two types are referred to by migration scholars as, ‘involuntary migration’ or ‘forced migration’, as well as ‘voluntary migration’. These authors
further state that forced migration refers to the movement of people without their will and desire, forced upon them by varying socio-political, environmental, and legal entities (Castles, 2003:13; Heberle, 1955:66; IOM, 2018). This may include refugees and asylum seekers from war-torn countries, slaves, prisoners, people fleeing or in fear of persecution or other potential threats to their life (Pine, 2014:95; Polzer, 2010:2).

Voluntary migration, often referred to as economic migration is probably the simpler category to comprehend, as it simply refers to migration for the purpose of self-betterment, economic gains, improved standards of living, availability of job opportunities, and so forth (SADHA, 2016:6; IOM, 2018). Lee (1966:56) asserts that economic reasons are always responsible for decisions to migrate. Referring to Zimbabwean migration, Zanamwe and Devillard (2010:13) also cite economic betterment as among the paramount reasons for migrating to SA. Therefore, from the voluntary dimension, it can be essentially argued that migrants are rational actors, and migration is seen to be a rational act and choice determined by economic benefits (Anitha & Pearson, 2013; Luthi, 2009). This has been seen to be the dominant reason behind migration, and early scholars such as Ravenstein, and later, Lee emphasises this.

Other types of human migrations include seasonal migration, that is migrating due to conditions induced by climate change (NGS, 2018); circular migration, which refers to the “fluid movement of people between countries, including temporary or long-term movement which may be beneficial to all involved, if occurring voluntarily and linked to the labour needs of countries of origin and destination” (IOM, 2018). All of these may be regarded as forced and voluntary migration.

Expatriation, another form of human movement, should also be considered as a type of voluntary migration instead of being perceived as a unique form of human movement. Von Koppenfels (2016) distinguishes between expatriates and migrants, stating that the former is a ‘move’ made by citizens of the richer ‘core’ nations, whereas, the latter (migration) is seemingly associated with movement of citizens of the less developed periphery nations. What this instils is a stigmatised attitude towards migrants, whereas expatriates are perceived as ‘elite’ tourists – certainly not a danger to the host nation as the migrants are. This division of human movement into two so-called distinct categories is an injustice to migration scholarship, because, all forms of human movement can be deemed migration. Kunz (2016:89) supports this, stating that the division between migration and expatriation boasts “complex configurations of racialization, gender, class and nationality, and implicitly re-enforces the dynamics of the colonial past”.
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In large degrees, expatriation leans more on the voluntary type of migration, however, there are degrees of force, which may be essentially sensational or subjective. This could involve the desire to relocate to be with family or a spouse, for instance. Ultimately, however, expatriation cannot and should not be acknowledged as a form of human movement falling outside the frameworks of (human) migration. The traditional lenses, therefore, would maintain that migration entails any form of human movement or relocation, whether forced or voluntary.

2.3.5. Limitations of the traditional lens

The reliance on the traditional lens of migration entails a retraction to, and maintenance of older conceptions of migration, shaped by Ravenstein in the late 19th century, and developed by Lee in the mid-20th century. This would essentially entail the employment of an individualistic approach to understanding migration, and the emphasis that all migration is a result of push-pull factors, as well as intervening factors. This lens can be quite simplistic and rigid in its categorising. That is to say, migrants are often solely seen as ‘forced’ or ‘economic’. Therefore, the brazen limitation, and perhaps issue, with this is that there is no ‘middle ground’, where migrants can be viewed as ‘forced-voluntary’, where ‘forced’ may extend beyond refugees and asylum seekers to emotional and sensational factors such as grief after a death or even a divorce.

‘Forced’ can also refer to economic wellbeing, in that economic migrants may be ‘forced’ to migrate due to the socio-economic and socio-political situation in their home countries. Such migrants find themselves in an assumed ‘threatening situation’, a ‘symbolic ghetto’, and due to this reason, they may feel ‘forced’ to migrate even though the ultimate choice is voluntary, and the assumed ‘symbolic threat’ is not life-threatening, violent, and could possibly, in some cases, be a false assumption.

As Modi (2003:1759) and Martin et al. (2014) state, all migration to a large degree is voluntary. Although this is not completely the case with regards to slaves, prisoners, and the likes, it does in some way speak to this dilemma of forced-voluntary migrants. Cassidy (2004:2), on the other hand, argues that there is some degree of force in all voluntary migration. The International Organisation for Migration (2018) also add to this when stating that forced migration can refer to any movement which contain elements of coercion, whether the move is voluntary or not. Therefore, the lack of this ‘forced-economic’ migration middle ground creates a dogmatic and rigid conception of migration which does
not take into full consideration the impact of, for instance, a rapidly evolving society, whereby understandings and meanings of push-and-pull, force-or-voluntary is blurred and not as clear-cut as it once seemed to be.

Another limitation of the neoclassical lens is that it narrows its scope to analyse a move between country A to country B, and as mentioned, the reasons, statistics and consequences of migration. This in essence does not speak to the dynamics induced by the relationships, the social and cultural exchanges, practices and activities, and more importantly the socio-economic, socio-cultural and socio-political connections a migrant maintains with their home country, as citizens of that country. The neoclassical migration lens affords its attention to migrants who are migrating. It does not address migrants who have already migrated and are residing in the host nation, which is in actuality the focus of this research study. This has thus become the task and focus of contemporary migration theoretical lenses such as transnational migration (transmigration), which is particularly relevant to this study.

2.4. Transnational migration (transmigration): a contemporary lens for understanding migration

The transnational migration (transmigration) lens adopts a more complex perspective towards understanding migrations. According to Drbohlav (2015:18), “migration is not merely settlement migration or circular labour migration”, and thus he voices a concept which he refers to as ‘fluid migration’, a term synonymous to ‘liquid modernity’, coined by Zygmunt Bauman (Bauman, 2000:15). Upegui-Hernandez (2012:2005) argues, in this regard, that the development of transmigration, in the early 1990s, emerged as a critique, as well as an indirect remedy to the binary and mostly individualistic perspective which is apparent in the traditional migration lenses. However, as it shall be demonstrated in the paragraphs that follow, the transmigration lens could also be regarded as an alternative to the neoclassical lens, as they have differing foci.

Transmigration stems from the broader philosophy of transnationalism. As (Hanyane, 2015:49) asserts, transnationalism “refers to the flow of people, ideas and goods between regions”, as well as the “heightened interconnectivity between people”, and “loosening of boundaries between countries”. This points to another difference between the neoclassical migration and transmigration lenses, which is, that the traditional lens places its framework
and focus on a ‘tight-national-borders’ analysis, whereas transmigration takes its analytical framework loose-national-borders. In this sense, this lens argues that transnational migrants, or rather transmigrants, are migrants who are in multiple and simultaneous social relations, social networks and social exchanges with people in more than one country simultaneously (Fouron & Glick-Schiller, 2001:60; Glick-Schiller et al., 1995:48; Upegui-Hernandez, 2012:2005). Glick-Schiller et al. (1995:48), as well as Levitt and Glick-Schiller (2004:1002-1003) also assert that transmigrants create and establish a transnational social realm, which comprises of transnational social fields that connect and join together both their home and host nations. Vertovic (2001:574) asserts that transmigrants therefore ‘live’ in, and thus are members of, the transnational communities which they create through their transnational activities. He states that migrants are effectively able to both be “here” and “there” due to the effectiveness, and affordability of contemporary forms of “communication” and “transportation” (Vertovic, 2001:575). Though they do not completely ‘disappear’, national borders and their constraints are thus blurred in this regard. It could be further said that transmigrants would find national borders to be a nuisance, as borders could be regarded as intervening obstacles to their ‘transnational activities’.

Vancluysen et al. (2009:4) proclaim that transnational practices and activities “cover all spheres of social action”. However, scholarly literature emphasises a focus on socio-political, socio-economical and socio-cultural activities (see for example Portes, 2001; Snel et al., 2006). Socio-political activities would entail any forms of political affiliation or organisation by migrants related to their home nations whilst in the host nation, participation in electoral activities, or such other activities which are as simple as reading newspapers to remain politically informed of the happenings in the home nation (Al-Ali et al., 2001:621; Snel et al., 2006:293; Vanclusyen et al., 2009:4).

Socio-economic activities include monetary remittance and exchange between migrants and their home compatriots, as well as investments by migrants in their home country. Portes (2003:887) also states that socio-economic activities assist in the economic development and financial stability for the home countries and provide financial support and welfare to family members as well. Socio-economic activities can thus be argued to not merely focus on the home nation, but include the activities in the host nation, as it is within the host nation that transmigrants are physically located and are able to compete in the economic field.
The socio-cultural activities are much more “affective and less instrumental than the socio-political and socio-economic activities” (Itzigsohn & Suacedo, 2002:768). These include visitations or maintenance of communication with friends and family in the home country, participation in cultural and religious activities of the home country whilst in the host country, eating home country food, watching and/or listening to home country media, and so forth (Al-Ali et al., 2001:623; Snel et al., 2006:263; Vanclusyen et al., 2009:5).

The focus of the transmigration lens is thus not only on the actual ‘migrating’ and the reasons leading to it, but also the simultaneous existence and activities of migrants in more than one country, as well as, the cross-border, transnational relations and practices of migrants. Therefore, as stated, this lens provides an extension and an alternative to the traditional lens, which focuses on the migrating migrant, their reasons and demographic statistics, all induced by push-pull factors and intervening obstacles (Jakubowicz, 2012:5).

Transnational activities, as alluded to above, have to be acknowledged as the result of globalisation in essence. As Lima (2010:3-5) argues, the advancements and developments of techno-science, have changed the trends of migration. These have provided for ease of travel and communication, as well as the creation of multiple channels to send goods and money across borders. This therefore implies that the social networks and relations with people in multiple countries, as well as the practices and activities that are constantly occurring have to be acknowledged. These cross-border relations, according to Upegui-Hernandez (2012:2005), further create transnational social realms and the related dynamics, which go beyond the immediate social relationships and sociality depicted and emphasised in the social network theory, particularly if contemporary technological advancements and channels of communication are considered. It becomes quite a realistic feat in the lives of people, to simultaneously ‘exist’ and ‘be present’ in more than one realm.

Therefore, the usefulness of the conception of ‘transmigration’ is that it highlights the migrants’ love and commitment to their country of origin, as well as the need to survive and sustain themselves. This is particularly relevant for this research project, which places its focus on the dynamics of transnational citizenship – transnational citizens, as it shall be demonstrated, are also essentially transmigrants. Furthermore, unlike the traditional migration lens, which focuses on reasons and processes of migration, transmigration emphasises the following: firstly, the loosened national borders and the interconnectedness of migrants to the host nation and their home nations, as well as compatriots and other social actors whilst in the host nation. Secondly, the ever-existing
transnational relations, practices, interactions and exchanges happening in the transnational communities created by migrants’ practices in the transnational social realm. It is the emphasis on the simultaneous presence and activity in both the home and host nation that forms the core analytical focus of the transmigration lens. This is precisely their effective presence and activeness in the transnational social realm and fields. The conclusive section that follows, thus, discusses the general migration trends specific to Zimbabwe, including a distinction between a traditional and transnational perspective towards understanding Zimbabwean migration.

2.5. Conclusion: general migration trends specific to Zimbabwe

Zimbabwean migration to SA is a rather old phenomenon, occurring since the 19th century following the emergence of the diamond and gold mining sectors (Ngomane, 2010:11; Stats SA, 2015:120; Zanamwe & Devillard, 2010:35). According to Tishkoff and William (2002:611), and more recently, Shriner et al. (2016), SADC, mostly Zimbabwean, migrants increased in terms of their entry flow into SA since the first democratic elections in 1994. Adjai and Lazaridis (2013:193), also referring to this 1994 transitional period from apartheid to post-apartheid SA, assert that the socio-political ‘shift’ from apartheid SA towards the ‘new’ democratic republic of SA brought with it ‘new’ hope, excitement and opportunities for economic participation for black SA citizens, who had previously been marginalised from such and deemed second class citizens. However, this ‘new’ hope, excitement and economic opportunity was not experienced and desired only by SA citizens, but by all black Africans, particularly in the SADC community (Adjai & Lazaridis, 2013:13; Stats SA, 2015:124).

The growing influx and spread of Zimbabwean migrants across SA has seen, as Stats SA (2015:120) report, just over 8% of Zimbabwean migrants reside in the North West province. This could be a result of varying factors. One, for example, is the fact that North West is the fourth smallest out of the 9 provinces in SA, and it also has one of the highest unemployment rates in SA, reported by Stolley (2015) to be approximately 43%. Alexander (2017) further reports that 80% of the economic activity in the province occurs between Potchefstroom, Klerksdorp and Rustenburg - that is, the southern and eastern regions of the province, it would not be farfetched to assume that a substantial number would be
located in Potchefstroom. This lack of scholarly work focused on Potchefstroom implies a potential rejection of such an assumption. Scholarly work on Zimbabweans in the North West province has been conducted in regions such as Mafikeng, on focal topics such as migrants' socio-economic contribution in SA (Matshoane, 2015) and violence against foreign nationals (Tshabanu et al., 2007). Not much else has been published or reported on Zimbabwean migrants in the North West province, let alone Potchefstroom. As indicated in chapter 1, scholarly work related to Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom is yet to be published. Interestingly, Potchefstroom is deemed one of the economic hubs and major towns of the North West province (Alexander, 2017; Motlogelwa, 2017). Therefore, with regards to the growing economic opportunities in SA since 1994, Potchefstroom represents one of the regions rich in opportunities, particularly in the North West.

However, whilst the opportunities arose in SA, attracting SADC migrants, the home nations left behind by the migrants were negatively affected. Zanamwe and Devillard (2010:13), for instance, emphasise that migrating from Zimbabwe has also led to an extreme “brain drain”, which has been constantly occurring since the collapse of the national economy in 2000. A brain drain refers to the loss of skilled citizens to other nations (host countries) (IOM, 2018), and in the case of Zimbabwe, most of the brain drain refer to loss of skilled citizens to neighbouring countries, especially SA (Zanamwe & Devillard, 2010:35).

Kiwanuka (2009:6), in her study of “Zimbabwean migration into Southern Africa”, highlights four findings which she deems as the key trends in Zimbabwean migration in Southern African countries; all of which are particularly relevant to this study. These findings state that: firstly, Zimbabwean migrants choose SA as their prime destination, followed by Botswana, prior to opting for other African or Western nations. Secondly, Zimbabweans who migrate include informal traders, shoppers, long-term skilled and unskilled migrants. Thirdly, Zimbabwean migrants are constantly moving back and forth to visit, “deliver remittance”, work shop and exchange resources – thus the migration is circular and temporary or semi-permanent. Then, lastly, male citizens still dominate Zimbabwean migration in terms of the number of migrants and length of stay, however, “women are increasingly on the move as cross-border traders, shoppers and visitors” (Kiwanuka, 2009:7).

What should also be considered, however, as this author also states in her work, is that the majority of Zimbabwean migration occurs “against the background of political instability and economic collapse in Zimbabwe”, and should therefore be considered more as forced,
rather than economic migration (Kiwanuka, 2009:6). Furthermore, it can therefore be said that to understand Zimbabwean migration would entail the appreciation of the existence of both force and voluntary (economic) reasons at the centre of the decision to migrate, thus further alluding to the probable necessity to blur the lines between these two entities.

Economic reasons, followed by political and/civil upheaval, are regarded as the prime reason for leaving Zimbabwe (see Amit, 2009; Khan, 2007; Kiwanuka, 2009; Zanamwe & Devillard, 2010). Kiwanuka (2009:25), for instance, cites “unemployment, hyper-inflation and devaluation of the currency, poverty, acute shortages of foodstuffs, and the collapse of major economic and public service sectors such as health care and education” as the core economic reasons for migrating. Other scholars also site the depletion and/or lack of basic resources, lack of employment and hyper-inflation as the paramount to the decision to leave Zimbabwe (Idemudia et al., 2013:19; Zanamwe & Devillard, 2010:13). For instance, Zanamwe and Devillard (2010:13) note the growth in the number of day-trippers, which refers particularly to shoppers who cross the border into SA just for the day and return to Zimbabwe. However, Idemudia et al. (2013:20) also site in addition to economic reasons, lack of healthcare and mediation as well as political and civil unrest and violence. Therefore, the migration to, as well as living in SA is expected to serve as an immediate and direct remedy to the aforementioned.

When in SA, a country which promises hope and ‘greener pastures’, Zimbabweans are met by disappointment according to Idemudia et al. (2013:21), finding it difficult to obtain basic resources such as adequate housing, employment, and in some cases, food sources. These authors also state that many unskilled Zimbabwean migrants enter exploitative and sometimes, coercive work environments where they are poorly compensated, if at all, for their usually blue-collar labour (Idemudia et al., 2013:21). Socially, Zimbabwean migrants also still face an array of xenophobic sentiments and attacks, regardless of whether they make strong contributions to the economy and job sector of SA (Abdi, 2011; Adjai & Lazardis, 2013:199; Dzimwasha, 2014; Wilkinson, 2015). They are perceived as ‘job-takers’ by local South African citizens who see them as a ‘threat’ to scare employment opportunities and resources (Adjai & Lazardis, 2013:197). This social hostility, according to Pasura (2013:199), acts as indirect re-enforcement of transnational ties and relationships which Zimbabwean migrants maintain with family and friends in Zimbabwe. He refers to religious and cultural activities, and practices which migrants collectively partake in with fellow migrant compatriots in the host nation (see
section 2.6 above for examples of these activities) (Pasura, 2013:199). Through such practices, the migrants maintain their connection with Zimbabwe as citizens.

Therefore, in summary, what Kiwanuka (2006:23) asserts, when stating that “Zimbabweans are mainly circular migrants who migrate as a means of sustaining livelihoods to support families and networks at home”, should be considered. Circular migration speaks of a “fluid”, back and forth movement between countries by the migrants, however, it still adopts a neoclassical stance, in that a migrant is either in country A or country B. A transnational stance in this regard would advocate for the simultaneous presence of the migrant in both countries A and B, regardless of whether there is a circular migration between the two countries or not. The primary reason behind Zimbabweans migrating into SA is economic, though this is not acknowledged as the sole reason. With healthcare, as well as political and civil unrest being admits the reasons for migrating, it can be argued that Zimbabwean migrants could be perceived more as forced, rather than economic migrants. In fact, they could even be deemed forced-economic migrants, appreciated the blurring of the boundaries between the two categories.

Upon arrival in SA, many Zimbabweans find it difficult to establish themselves in the employment field, to find adequate housing and other basic resources. Furthermore, they encounter xenophobic sentiments, rejection and such other hostility from SA citizens in the social realm, deemed as ‘job takers’, amongst other things. They maintain transnational ties and bonds with compatriots in Zimbabwe, through partaking in transnational activities and practices in the transnational social realm which connect both Zimbabwe and SA. Therefore, the transmigration lens and stance, in this research project, allows for investigation into the dynamics of migrants currently residing in Potchefstroom.

Apart from the migration trends discussed above, other trending discussions specific to Zimbabwean migration in SA include and address phenomena such as xenophobia, ‘job-taking’ and unemployment issues (see Abdi, 2011; Adjai & Lazaridis, 2013; De Jager, 2011; Hicks, 1999; Kalitanyi & Visser, 2010), illegal/undocumented migration (see Gqirana, 2017; Machecka et al., 2015; Solomon, 2003), as well as human trafficking (see Morreira, 2010; Muanamoha et al., 2010). What is seemingly brazen is the lack of knowledge regarding Zimbabwean migration and citizenship. Therefore, this research project, in fulfilling its objectives, may contribute to the development of scholarly knowledge to fill this gap.
In conclusion therefore, it could be argued that adopting the traditional migration lens for analysing and understanding the general migration trends specific to Zimbabwe would result in the initial distinction between forced and voluntary migration. On one hand, their migrating is forced by the socio-political and socio-economic upheavals in Zimbabwe. Whereas on the other hand, they volunteer to migrate in search of economic betterment – they are not directly forced or confronted by physically harmful and life-threatening factors. However, what the traditional lens would emphasise is that the migrants leave Zimbabwe for Potchefstroom/SA – a direct shift from point A to point B. Adopting the transmigration lens, on the contrary, would insist that Zimbabwean migrants are members of a transnational community located in the transnational social realm comprising of both host and home nation. This transnational social realm is therefore the Potchefstroom-and-Zimbabwe social realm. It is created by the Zimbabwean migrants’ transnational activities and relations whilst there are located in Potchefstroom. Therefore, the transmigration lens pays particular focus to the post-migration practices, exchanges and relations of Zimbabwean migrants occurring transnationally, as opposed to why Zimbabweans are migrating to Potchefstroom.

This chapter, therefore, provided a discussion of migration, its varying types, as well as some of its distinctive categories. This serves to provide an understanding of migration for this study, particularly towards the justification of the transmigration lens as the most useful lens for understanding Zimbabweans living in Potchefstroom/SA. Chapter 3, which follows next, adopts an approach similar to that of this chapter (2) and provides a discussion of the conception of citizenship. In closing chapter 3, a conclusion infusing both (trans)migration and (trans)citizenship as significantly intertwined is provided, as migrants in the host nation are citizens of their home nation.
Chapter 3: Citizenship: understanding the concept and its varying types

3.1. Introduction

The following chapter, building on from the previous chapter, ventures into a discussion on the classical conception of citizenship. This includes the concept, the types and the dilemmas related to citizenship. Furthermore, this chapter intends to lay a foundation for the conceptualisation of transnational citizenship as a suitable analytical lens for this research study. This foundation sets up a conclusion on Zimbabwean migration and citizenship, essentially conclusively fusing both the migration (chapter 2) and the citizenship discussions, as this aligns the discussion towards chapter 4, which intends to offer a tentative conceptual frame towards investigating the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. Prior delving into this chapter, it should also be noted that some element may appear as repetitions from the discussion offered in chapter 1. These minimal repetitions are acknowledged, however, as the chapter progresses, they become necessary in assisting the discussion. As a point of departure, therefore, this chapter commences with a broad understanding of citizenship.

3.2. Understanding citizenship

Preceding the discussion of the nature of transnational citizenship as a suitable lens for understanding and addressing citizenship and the related concerns, it would prove beneficial to establish a broad understanding of the concept of citizenship, as well as the types thereof.

In offering this broad point of departure, Baubock (2008:3) asserts that citizenship refers to the “formal legal status” connecting individuals to a nation, for example, or such other established political body. He further states that this formal status is associated with the “legal rights and duties”, as well as a “set of responsibilities, virtues, and practices […and also] a collective identity that can be shared across distinctions of class, race, gender, religion, ethnic origin, or way of life” (Baubock, 2008:3). Adding to this, Schwenken and Russ-Sattar (2014:2) assert that citizenship, therefore cannot be understood independently from modern political concepts such as democracy, state and nation. These authors further emphasise that, in the macro sense, citizenship entails a correlation
between persons and a political community such as a nation, and essentially, hinging on a Rousseauean “republican understanding” of the concept, they state that citizenship refers to the “active political participation” by individuals within a political community (Schwenken & Russ-Sattar, 2014:2). This participation involves the rights of the citizens, as well as the duties and obligations citizens have towards the nation.

Haas (2001:2), as well as Jahanbegloo (2018) state, therefore, that being a citizen essentially entails a sense of belonging and membership into a political space and/or socio-cultural space, as well as participating and fulfilling legal, civil and political duties brought about by this space. Furthermore, for Haas (2001:4) being a citizen also entails the possession and production of a social identity shared by other members of that political society. Citizens of the same country share a national identity, between them exists a shared feeling of belonging to the country, and thus a sense of loyalty to the country and to each other (Hass, 2001:4; 2008: 60; Miller, 1995:150). In a multicultural society such as SA, for instance, whereby there exists extreme diversity in cultures and communities, citizenship can stand as the only sense and means of bonding and unifying social actors under the umbrella of nationalism – creating shared social/national identity (Haas, 2008:60).

Citizenship is essentially a social status which actors can acquire in society. It can be acquired through birth – being born in a particular country, through registration or marrying a citizen of a particular nation – as marriage entails registration, and also by naturalisation – residing in a country for a period of time which eventually earns migrants the citizenship rights in their host nation (Pohlmann, et al., 2013:2; Sember, 2018). The legislative and political dynamics surrounding the processes of acquiring citizenship status varies from country to country, it is mainly through these three ways that citizenship can be acquired.

The aforementioned conception of citizenship can be referred to as the traditional or the classical understanding of citizenship, which emphasises a relationship with a single nation. This, therefore, can be deemed the first type of citizenship. Furthermore, the aforementioned conception of citizenship is also the point of departure towards a sociological understanding of citizenship.

According to Pohlmann et al. (2013:2), a sociological conception of citizenship goes beyond the formal aspects of political and civil attachment, recognition and participation, as well as the legal rights and duties. To this formal political conception, the sociological conception should add an informal dimension towards understanding citizenship. What
Pohlmann et al., (2013:2) imply by this is that a “conventional” and “empathetic understanding of citizenship should acknowledge the citizens’ “shared sets of values” as well as their “substantial rights and duties”. They argue that this “empathetic notion of citizenship builds the characteristic of the polis and how it empowers its citizens” (Pohlmann et al., 2013:2). Turner’s (1994:158) older assentation in this regard, highlighted a cultural aspect to citizenship which would acknowledge the “social practices” – such as speaking the official language(s) of a nation – that would enable individuals to fully partake in the “national culture”. Therefore, in conclusion, it can be said that a sociological conceptualisation of citizenship should recognise both the formal political and civil dynamic, as well as the cultural dynamic of citizenship, with the social practices and activities associated with.

3.2.1. Dual and multiple citizenship

Dual citizenship refers to the possession of citizenship status of two countries simultaneously (Fox, 2005:172; Sember, 2018), whilst multiple citizenship acknowledges the possession of citizenship status of more than two countries. Bloemraad (2004:389) found, in her research, that those who possess high levels of human capital are more likely to seek dual and multiple citizenships, as opposed to those who are “economically marginalised”. She further asserts that multiple citizenship, to a degree, overlooks and undermines a nation’s sovereignty of citizens, as they are not quite politically and legally attached and ‘tied’ to a country (Bloemraad, 2004:390). Whereas dual citizenship, to a degree, still promotes such attachments to a nation. Both dual and multiple citizenship, however, maintain connections of citizens to just one nation regardless of the number of passports in possession. This therefore shows how the two types of citizenship are still connected to traditional citizenship.

Although the classical conception of citizenship is persistent in holding its traditional understanding – that a citizen should be politically attached to a nation, the rapid globalisation brings with it the change in the nature of the concept of the modern nation, which implies that there is also a change in the nature of citizenship. Both dual and multiple citizenships implicitly relate to cross-border movement of humans, as they refer to the possession of citizenship in country A, as well as country B (country C, and so forth for multiple citizenship) (Bloemraad, 2004:360). Therefore, these conceptions of citizenships can be said to be slightly detached from the classical understanding of citizenship, although they still hinge on and are more adequately defined within the framework of
traditional citizenship. That being, political, legal and social attachment and participation within a nation – although it is more than one nation in this case.

3.2.2. Flexible Citizenship

The conception of flexible citizenship, it could be argued, maintains the traditional understanding of citizenship as a connection to one state at a single time. Aiwa Ong (2006:599), for instance, contends that the idea of citizenship and its dependence on membership to a nation-state has been replaced by claims to “new entitlement” to political rights which are “being realized through (...) globalized contingencies”. For instance, she refers to ‘flexible citizenship’ as a ‘new’ citizenship conception which suggests that globalisation (and the emergence of cosmopolitan society and global culture) has resulted in economic reasons being amongst the primary ‘shapers’ of humans’ deciding on citizenship – political rights and allegiance to a nation are not the foundation of that decision any longer (Ong, 1998:137-139). This highlights the necessity and need to participate in the economic field in a particular nation. It is due to their ability and the extent to which they can partake in this field that social actors claim or seek citizenship status in a nation.

Ong (2006:499) further states that some of the dynamics and changes in citizenship and how it was traditionally known are a result of globalisation, “global flows and their configuration of new social spaces of entangled possibilities”. One of these possibilities, and thus, paramount in the dynamics of citizenship is the ability to partake in the economic market. According to her, therefore, migrants can be said to claim some degree of citizenship affiliation to their host countries. Flexible citizenship can thus be deemed as a ‘type’ of contemporary conception of citizenship, which is heavily intertwined with and within the transnationalism philosophy. Thus, to a degree, it could be stated that transnational citizenship contains elements of flexible citizenship.

Therefore, unlike single, dual and multiple citizenship, which focus on the legal, political and social rudiments as the grounds to which social actors can claim or acquire citizenship, flexible citizenship emphasises another rudiment. That is, the economic rudiment, particularly social actors’ entry into the economic field of a given nation. The citizenship is flexible in that actors can switch nations based on their ability to, and the extent to which they can ‘play’ in the economic field. All of these types of citizenship,
however, do fall into the traditional conception of citizenship, which is an actor’s relationship with a single nation at a time.

3.2.3. Post-national citizenship
Another conception of citizenship worth noting is post-national citizenship, which essentially refers to citizenship that, according to Soysal (1994:137), is based on “personhood” as opposed to “nationhood”. This conception hinges on universal movements of personhood, human rights and social welfare, and thus, puts forth these rights as far more essential than ascribed political rights (Soysal, 1994:137). In this regard, migrants can, for instance, make welfare “claims regardless of citizenship status” (Bloemraad, 396). As such, post-national citizenship does away with the national citizen and foreigner dichotomy. Bloemraad (2004:396) for instance states that post-national citizenship rejects the notion that citizenship is related to state membership to any degree. She states that “advantages of citizenship, such as civil rights and social welfare, are increasingly vested in individuals – or ‘personhood’ – rather than through membership in a nation-state” (Bloemraad, 2004:396). Therefore, as Tambini (2001:195) proclaims, post-national citizenship as a new form of “participation, rights and belonging [is] displacing national citizenship”, not only this, but particularly state-related citizenship. It is therefore, for this reason that post-national citizenship does not form part of the conceptualisation of citizenship in this research study. This study places its focus on transnational citizenship, which does acknowledge the existence and significance of national borders when understanding, as well as analysing citizenship.

3.3. Citizenship dilemmas related to migration
Migration and citizenship are two opposing concepts. They each respectively refer to groups of people who are usually located in the same country. However, a migrant is regarded as a foreigner in that country, whereas a citizen is one who belongs there. Migrants essentially have foreign citizenships, which is that of their home country. Some scholars proclaim that the brazen impact migration has on citizenship is that migration leads to the emergence of other conceptions of citizenship, such as dual or multiple citizenship, or in fact, even a transnational citizenship status for the migrant population
(see Anderson, 2014; Baubock, 2006; Fox, 2005; Gilbertson, 2006; Kastoryano, 1999; Leggewie, 2013; Thelen, 2000).

As Lyon (2009:131) postulates, “citizenship is a precious thing even though it may not fully be appreciated until it is threatened”. It is a result of the changing nature of society that directs scholarship to revisit the concept of citizen, as to situate it in the realm of a globalised world. Ong (2006:499) is of agreement to this when stating that some of the dynamics and changes in (classical) citizenship, and how it was traditionally known, are a result of globalisation, “global flows and their configuration of new social spaces of entangled possibilities”. One of these possibilities is the ability to partake in the global economic market and job sector.

Scholars also emphasises the existence of two core school of thoughts towards understanding citizenship, namely, the civic-republican conception, as well as the liberal-individual conception of citizenship (Heater, 2004:157; Pocock, 1995:29). The civic-republican conception, according to Williamson (2010:94) and Callaway (2017), contends that citizens should be ‘active’ civil and political actors in the country in which they are politically and socially recognised as citizens. Their democratic participation and civil engagement in the country, as well as their concern regarding common nationality is of key importance here, as their participation as citizens occurs in the legal, political and social/public realms of their country (Callaway, 2017; Heater, 2004:157; Williamson, 2010:94). In this regard it can be said that, for instance, since Zimbabwean migrants are not civil-republic citizens of SA, they are excluded from partaking in civil and political activities or enjoying citizenship rights and privileges whilst in SA. However, the emergence of dual and multiple citizenship allows Zimbabwean migrants to ‘find ways’ in which to gain political recognition and acceptance as a citizen of SA without having to denounce their Zimbabwean citizenship. In this way, they maintain citizenship participation and activity in both SA and Zimbabwe, though this would occur per nation at a given time, not simultaneously. Nonetheless, citizenship, through this lens is essentially determined by the structure and social entities.

The liberal-individual conception perceives a citizen as an autonomous, self-centred actors, directing their own lives, and who have obligations to obey the law, engage in economic activities and pay taxes in their country of residence (Callaway, 2017; Williamson, 2010:92-93). Unlike the civil-republic conception in this regard, citizens are ‘passive’ in terms of their political and civil involvement in the country, with their prime focus being economic gains and betterment (Callaway, 2017; Heater, 2004:157;
Therefore, political and civil attachment and/or involvement is not a decisive factor through this lens, citizenship is determined by a somewhat rational choice. Humans may choose to migrate to other countries in pursuit of economic betterment, their core obligation and duty to their country of residence is paying taxes.

This is synonymous with the conception of flexible citizenship, which emphasises that it is not the individual’s ability to participate civicly and politically in a country that determines their loyalty and commitment to that county and other individuals, but rather their ability to participate economically in a given country. In this regard, citizens migrate to and pledge allegiance to a country of their choice, where they find economic betterment. If Zimbabweans are used as an example again, skilled citizens migrated to surrounding countries, particularly SA, following the national economic collapse. The pursuit of economic betterment has been cited by many to be the core reason as to Zimbabwean citizens migrate to SA (Idemudia et al., 2013:21; Kiwanuka, 2006:23; Zanamwe & Devillard, 2010:13).

Therefore, this ability to partake in the economic realm is also a paramount factor for migration, as migrants, regardless of where or why they migrate, would need to find economic stability and betterment. In this regard, migrants can be said to claim some degree of citizen affiliation to their host countries. Flexible citizenship, as highlighted, places its focus specifically on the economic field and the related dynamics thereof, which become the primary reasons as to why people migrate and afford their allegiance to particular nations. What this implicitly implies, and what can be contended here is that Ong’s flexible citizenship tends to favour focus on migration from the poorer (developing) nations to the richer (developed) ones, a typical situation of so-called third world nations and citizens, moving to the developed West, particularly for monetary gains. However, there are other fields and dynamics outside and, to some degree, beyond the economic field, which may lead to the flexible nature of citizenship. These include the legal, political, social and cultural fields. Even with the consideration of these however, it could be argued that Ong’s conception of flexible citizenship only addresses the dynamics occurring within the economic field available in a single nation at a time. This overlooks other types and levels of flexibility a migrant/citizen may possess. That is, the option, ability, means, distance, duration one may move. Therefore, this flexibility does not include or acknowledge simultaneous activity and participation in the economic fields of two or more nations simultaneously, as does the conception of transnational citizenship. Flexible
citizenship is a somewhat circular type of migration, with shifts in economic opportunities as the primary driver for the circulation.

Pohlmann et al. (2013:1) also make mention that the rapid increase in migration brings with it a “fear” and “concern” amongst host nations. The perceptions held by local citizens regarding migrants create a hostile realm for migrants who settle and attempt to act in the social realm of the host country. This is the case for Zimbabwean migrants who, upon coming into SA, are met by xenophobic sentiments and attacks. According to Adjai and Lazaridis (2013:198), SA citizens regard Zimbabwean migrants as ‘job-takers’, convinced that Zimbabwean migrants are the cause of the high levels of unemployment of SA local citizens, as they ‘steal’ all the jobs, and take all the housing, education and healthcare.

Thus, migration challenges the conceptions of citizenship, especially that of a single citizenship. Migration opens the borders of nations, and directly coerced nations to reconsider integral sections of their legislation in order to encompass the various foreign nationals entering or within a nation. Dual citizenship and multiple citizenship are both a result of migration. However, these conceptions of citizenship maintain the traditional rudiments of citizenship. Flexible citizenship, on the contrary, is the epitome of how globalisation and migration removes all traditional citizenship rudiments, replacing them with only the economic rudiment as the factor through which actors determine their citizenship and nation of allegiance. Therefore, migration, as well as the rapidly changing globalised world, have resulted in serious reconceptualisation, and rethinking towards what the true implications of citizenship and nationality could entail.

3.4. Transnational citizenship as a lens

Since globalisation, cosmopolitanism and transnationalism create multicultural societies, transnational social space, and transnational communities, there emerges what is known as a transnational citizen. This refers to actors who “extend their rights and principals of political and social equality beyond nation-state boundaries” (Fox, 2005:171). Transnational citizens and transmigrants share the conception of a transnational social realm. What truly distinguish the two concepts is that the transmigrant is physically located in a host country, and partakes in transnational activities that connects and ‘binds’ them to two countries simultaneously. This grants them a transnational citizenship – that is, the
citizenship status acquired when humans partake in activities and practices in the fields available to them in the transnational social realm.

A rich conceptualisation of transnational citizenship has already been defined in chapter 1 (see section 1.1). Speaking on the necessary definition of a transnational citizenship lens, Fox (2005:175) contends that a narrow definition would simply speak of “migrants who manage to sustain or create dual or multiple national identities”. Whereas a broader, and more thorough definition would acknowledge the “multi-level processes through which social, civic and political actors claim rights in the transnational public sphere”. Therefore, the transnational citizen cannot simply be associated with or understood according to the frameworks of nationalism, because, in this regard, they cease to be present in a single politically-defined national space. They are present, as members of “transnational communities”, in a “multi-layered, multi-sited” transnational social realm, which includes those who have migrated, those who have remained at home, government and non-government institutions and organisations (Glick-Schiller, 2004:1003; Portes, 1997:812). Therefore, since Vertovic (2001:574), Bohland (2012:165) and Hanyane (2015:49) all postulate that transnationalism also blurs or “loosens” national borders, as well as, to an extent, their relevance and meaning, it could thus be contended that, to some degree, transnationalism also blurs all that is defined within the parameters of a nation-state. This blurring, it should be proclaimed, does not imply the total removal of national borders, but a weakening of them. As Fox (2005:171) states, transnationalism births transnational citizenship, which, it could be argued, essentially blurs the concept and meaning of citizenship.

This blurring of citizenship, as well as cross-border movements and relations cause instability for the citizen-and-nation-state relationship, which is essentially a vertically structured relationship between the individual (at the bottom) and the nation-state (at the top). Citizenship is often understood within the frameworks of this relationship, however, Levitt and Glick-Schiller (2004:1003) refer to a citizen-and-society relationship instead, emphasising that transnationalism does away with the conceptions of nation and society as constituting the same thing. A nation (or country) is a physical and visible realm, with physical and visible borders. Transnationalism places its focus and operation in a realm outside of nation borders, a rather non-physical realm which connects two or more nations, as well as the migrants within them with their home nation.

Contrary to this, however, is Fox’s (2005:175) cautionary stipulation, in which he asserts that the disregarding of the nation-state by the transnational lens causes an analytical
complication when studying citizenship. This is because the citizen-and-nation-state relationship cannot and does not exist in the transnational social realm, and thus since citizenship has to be (re)defined and (re)conceptualised in the transnational social realm. As such, it may be prevalent and necessary for the citizen-and-nation-state relationship to be redefined in that context as well. What this would suggest is that the transnational social realm be perceived, not as a non-physical realm operating outside of the national borders, but as a semi-physical realm occurring both within and beyond national borders. This perspective would appreciate two crucial entities that cannot be ignored: 1) migrants still physically exist in the material world, and thus within a physical politically-defined national realm, regardless of their transnational characteristics, participation, practices; 2) national borders may loosen or blur, but they do not disappear, and they do maintain degrees of legal and political power over individuals and activities occurring with their borders. Thus, transnational citizens need to be physically located in a social realm, whether home or host country. It is only in this way they can partake and act in the transnational social realm, which is arguably non-physical by nature.

In reference and continuation of an on-going debate regarding whether transnational citizenship is a “defensible extension” of national citizenship, or a “meaningful complement”, Stokes (2004:119) proclaims that the likeliness of the emergence of possibly varying dimensions and understandings highlight the probability of there being “kinds of transnational citizenship”. It can be stated that one form of such citizenship requires the complete rejection of national attachments and complete allegiance to transnational democracy, all which occurs in the realm outside of the national borders, that is, the transnational social realm. On the contrary, it can also be argued that another “kind” of transnational citizenship does not require a clinical rejection of national attachments and borders, but still persists to operate outside the direct constraints induced by physical national borders. A “kind” of transnational citizenship that considers its (transnational) social realm as semi-physical in nature.

Therefore, considering what Fox (2005:175) highlights, conceptualising transnational citizenship as completely outside of the national social realm, several analytical complications emerge. This can therefore be remedied through the appreciation of the transnational social realm as a semi-physical as opposed to a non-physical realm. Furthermore, the transnational citizenship as a lens proves useful in analysing the practices and relations actors engage in, both in their host and host nations. That is 1) their interpretation and understanding of themselves as citizens, as well as their
relationship with other actors in the transnational social realm; 2) their thoughts and perceptions of these relationships and understandings; and also 3) the actions and practices induced by their interpretations and perceptions, as they navigate and seek to mobilise resources in the transnational social realm.

3.5. Conclusion on migration and citizenship

In conclusion, it should be highlighted that, although the adopted conception of migration for this study is the transmigration lens, this does not entail that transmigration is a better alternative lens, and it also does not entail that the classical and neoclassical lenses are outdated, as many scholars tend to argue. The differentiating factor between the transmigration and the traditional lenses is, that traditional lens focuses on individuals who are migrating, their reasons for doing so, they demographical characteristics, as well as the consequences their migrating may have on the host (receiving) country. This is essentially how migrants have been commonly categorised, and also how the phenomenon of migration has been understood and addressed by scholars adopting this lens.

Transmigration offers an alternative, which to an extent is also an expansion of migration scholarship, in essence, to analyse those who have already migrated and based in the host nation. This speaks directly to the focus of the research study, that is, migrants who are already in Potchefstroom.

However, whilst in the host nation and partaking in transnational activities, the migrant is also faced with the constraints of single national citizenship, since they are essentially citizens of their home countries – in the political sense. However, as social beings, they are still physically located in a particular country. Through the classical citizenship conception, the migrants remain excluded as citizens of their host nations, unless they opt to acquire citizenship status of their host nation – should they qualify for this. This is a dynamic which cannot be overlooked, because regardless of their subjective perspective and interpretations of their citizenship, and regardless of their practices towards or away from their citizenship, they will still be officially, legally and socially regarded as, for instance, Zimbabwean citizens in Potchefstroom.

From this, therefore, it can be said that, unlike the classical conceptions of citizenship, contemporary conceptions do not necessarily rely on a political and other such official
attachments or allegiances to a nation, whether a single or multiple nations. The conception of a country or nation is dissolved in this regard, and what exists is just the social realm, particularly transnational social realm. This realm is not constrained by national borders, and thus allows for the fluid transnational practice and exchange. However, the space is not completely non-physical, as it comprises of two or more countries joined by the transitional activities of transnational migrants and transnational citizens. The boundaries of the country loosen, but do not disappear. They loosen only to ‘allow’ for the country to contribute’ and ‘play’ its part in the creation of a transnational social realm. Therefore, this realm could be deemed semi-physical.

As Fox (2005:171) states, for transnational citizenship to stand as an analytically valuable and useful tool from which to analyse citizenship, instead of being a “you know it when you see it” concept, it has to encompass the core rudiments of traditional citizenship, which could perhaps also be referred to as national citizenship, in this context. What could be added to this is that the acceptance of the rudiments of national citizenship, should be accompanied by the acknowledgment of some physical territory, as this is the physical location of transnational actors (the population group relevant to the research study). This will strengthen the analytical shortcomings of transnational citizenship alluded to by some scholars.

Towards concluding this chapter, the following section therefore attempts to infuse the migration discussion provided in chapter 2, as well as that of citizenship provided in this chapter. This is done with the purpose of illustrating the degree to which these two discussed concepts are heavily intertwined. Thus, these concepts should both be regarded as paramount in this study, as the Zimbabwean population of focus is both a citizen and a migrant group of Zimbabwe and Potchefstroom/SA respectively.

3.5.1. Conclusion on Zimbabwean migrants and citizenship

A Zimbabwean who holds a SA passport as well as a Zimbabwean passport can be referred to as a dual citizen, as they can be fully immersed in a single nation as a citizen, enjoying all privileges which may come with that. They would gain multiple citizenship status should they acquire a third passport. On the contrary, Zimbabweans who migrate and pledge allegiance to a nation for the sole reason that they are active in the economic field of that nation. If they work, gain economic betterment and stability from that nation, and as a result claim the citizenship of that nation, they can be referred to as flexible
citizens. This suggest that these migrants would migrate from SA to another nation, should they feel it offers more towards their economic ambitions.

More central to the focus of the study, transnational citizens would, therefore, be Zimbabwean migrants who upon leaving Zimbabwe maintain bonds with those at home and those in SA. In working and living in SA, they enter legal, political, social, economic and cultural fields, in which they are faced with an array of dynamics such as capital, social positions and power relations and struggles, not only with SA local citizens, but other migrants from Zimbabwe and elsewhere, as well as transnational government and non-government institutions and organisations. More so, since they are in SA and Zimbabwe simultaneously, they are also faced with dynamics of the Zimbabwean context. They have to negotiate and engage in the fields in Zimbabwe with fellow Zimbabweans and all who are currently located in fields available in Zimbabwe. Analysis of the contribution of local SA citizens, and Zimbabwean citizens currently in Zimbabwe would require a multilateral analysis with complex and dynamical in-depth elaboration. This falls outside the scope of this research study.

Therefore, the migrants, as mentioned, are active and present in both their home and host countries simultaneously, and they maintain a ‘bond’ with their home country which transcends the national social space into the transnational social space, and thus – according to a transmigration lens – transmigrants would regard national borders a nuisance of a sort. Zimbabwean migrants, for example, may have physically crossed the national borders of their home countries into the borders of SA, however, they are still able and persist to maintain bonds and connections with Zimbabwe through transnational activities and practices, relationships, networks and exchanges (of resources such as goods and information) with fellow compatriots who have migrated to SA, particularly Potchefstroom, and those who have remained in Zimbabwe.

As expressed, Zimbabwean migration to SA is usually long-term and circular, and with the primary reason behind the decision to migrate being economic for the majority, as well as the alleged high number of irregular/undocumented migrants, the question/s can then be asked, how possible is the acquisition of a transnational citizenship and participation in transnational activities for the majority of the migrant group? Is it possible that Zimbabwean citizens migrating who face exploitation, find no employment of adequate accommodation also partake in transnational activities and practices in the fields-of-action available in transnational social realm?
Whether these questions stand to be answered or not, they do however allude to the possibility that some Zimbabwean migrants desire and seek to maintain their current citizenship status, which may be national (single and still purely Zimbabwean), or transnational (dual or multiple, not just Zimbabwean citizens). It cannot, however, be assumed that all Zimbabwean migrants possess a strong transnational citizenship. Some may possess a weaker transnational citizenship and can only partially partake and act in the transnational social realm, or perhaps some may have no transnational citizenship at all. Therefore, they may have changed or have ever-changing perceptions, interpretations and practices towards their citizenship. This change may affect, or be affected by, the Zimbabwean migrants' practices in the fields available to them in both Potchefstroom/SA and Zimbabwe (the transnational social realm). Furthermore, this change could also influence, or be influenced by the dynamics occurring in the fields which they are able to be active in, in the transnational social realm – more so, their positions and degrees of power within those fields.

This opens the field for investigating transnational citizenship dynamics among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, as this provides a particular case whereby transnational citizenship dynamics can be investigated and may give a richer, understanding of migrants living in SA, especially with regards to their citizenship. The investigation could also uncover, 1) the extents to which Zimbabwean migrant develop a transnational citizenship, 2) if the concept of transnational citizenship is useful in the Potchefstroom (SA) social context, or, 3) if perhaps it should be reconceptualised to capture the 'essence' of African, particularly Zimbabwean migration. The chapter that follows therefore, presents the ‘theory of practice’ as suitable theoretical framework from which to investigate and analyse the dynamics of transnational citizenship.
Chapter 4: The Theory of Practice as the applicable theoretical framework for understanding the dynamics of transnational citizenship

4.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter, the contribution of scholarly literature to the debate on migration, citizenship and transnational citizenship, as well as dynamics and trends specific to Zimbabwean migration were discussed. What follows in this chapter, is a discussion towards an applicable theoretical lens to understand the dynamics of transnational citizenship. There are a variety of theoretical approaches that can be employed in a migration-focused research project, especially since the phenomenon can occur both within and beyond national borders, whilst at the same time gaining multidisciplinary academic attention. However, for the purpose to investigate the research problem at hand, the theory of practice seems to be amidst the most useful, if not the only useful theory. This discussion of the theory of practice as the applicable theoretical framework for understanding the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom is, therefore, the paramount focus of this chapter. However, prior to the application of a theoretical framework, what should be primarily addressed and conceptualised are ‘the dynamics of transnational citizenship’. In other words, what constitutes the dynamics of transnational citizenship. This therefore is the first section of focus in this chapter.

Following this is a discussion on the agency-structure dichotomy as a lens for understanding citizenship. Citizenship in relation to structure and agency is discussed respectively, alluding to the necessity to place analytical focus both on agency and structure and thus the vertical and horizontal relationship within the field. Building from the agency-structure dichotomy, the formation of habitus is discussed. The discussion delves into the connection of habitus to agency-structure. The field as an arena of power, as well as capital as the currency are discussed, building onto a justification of the usefulness of the theory of practice as a theoretical anchor for this case study. Bringing this chapter to a close therefore, is a discussion of the theory of practice as a theoretical framework for studying the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. The first question, therefore, may be: what constitutes the dynamics of
transnational citizenship, and how can this be conceptualised? The following section discusses this in particular.

4.2. What constitutes the dynamics of transnational citizenship? Towards the conceptualisation of a concept

Retracting back to the foundation set in chapter 1 and 3, the conception of citizenship can be divided to include classical conceptions of citizenship (single, dual, multiple citizenship), flexible citizenship, transnational citizenship, and even post-national citizenship. When referring specifically to transnational citizenship, the conception of post-national citizenship can be rejected. Post-national citizenship completely disregards national borders, and thus a relationship between state-and-citizen is rejected through this lens (Bloemraad, 2004:396; Hafner-Fink, 2013:867; Sassen, 2003:278; Soysal, 1994:137). However, both the dynamics of classical citizenship and flexible citizenship can be included. This is due to the fact that, as Bloemraad (2004:396) also asserts, these types of citizenship still take into account the existence of the state, as well as the relationship individuals share with nation-states and compatriots. The dynamics of transnational citizenship can only be investigated if transnational citizenship itself is understood, not as a rejection of classical and flexible citizenship, but as an extension of these. Elements from previous chapters (1 and 3) can be found in this section, as they bring clarity to concerns of this section, building towards the discussion related to the agency-structure dichotomy (section 4.3).

Classical citizenship essentially involves the relationship between the state and the individual, specifically the individual’s activeness, presences and ties with the state on the legal, political, and social rudiments highlighted by traditional citizenship (Iija, 2011; Jones & Gaventa, 2002:3; Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006:654; Marshall, 2009:148). This also includes the individuals’ self-understanding as a citizen of a nation, and a compatriot to fellow citizens in light of and in relation to these rudiments. Therefore, in this regard it can be said that the dynamics of traditional citizenship are legal, political and social.

Flexible citizenship maintains this connection between state and citizen, however, what is strongly emphasised here is the economic rudiment (Ong, 1998:137; 2006:499). More precisely, their relationship with the state, as well as their understanding of themselves as citizens of a nation is shaped and determined by the actor’s ability to partake in the
economic field of a nation. That is, their patriotism is determined by their economic attainment, and the extent thereof, within a nation. It could thus be proclaimed that the dynamics of flexible citizenship are essentially economic.

Transnational citizenship should therefore, firstly, introduce to the said rudiments, the cultural fluidity and diversity, as well as socio-cultural impact highlighted by transnationalism (Briggs et al., 2008:625-626; Fouron & Glick-Schiller, 2001:60; Hanyane, 2015:49) as an extension to the rudiments of citizenship. Secondly, transnational citizenship should carry, in its constitution and conceptualisation, these rudiments of classical and flexible citizenship. Thirdly, the concept should serve to not reject, but extend and expand this state-and-citizen relationship and self-understanding of the individual as a citizen. This carrying and extension would imply that the self-understanding and relationship is not within, nor is it with, one nation and the actors within that nation, but with two or more nations simultaneously. This goes beyond the implications of dual and multiple citizenship (both types of classical citizenship).

As Bloemraad (2004:393) and Fox (2005:172) affirm, dual and multiple citizenship still operate within the terrains of one nation-state at a single time, regardless of the number of passports an actor may possess. Transnational citizenship, however, emphasises simultaneous existence, presence and action in two or more nations (Fox, 2005:171; Kastoryano, 1999:3; Vertovic, 2001:574). Therefore, the relationship extends to include two states (or more) and the citizen, not in the physical national realm, but in the transnational social realm, in which the citizens, as well as the states, institutions, organisation involved form and join the transnational 'community' (Portes, 1997:812; Vertovic, 2001:574). The transnational citizen is therefore active, present, in relation with, and connected to, in this case study, both Potchefstroom in South Africa and Zimbabwe simultaneously. This is the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe transnational social realm.

The concept of ‘dynamics of transnational citizenship’ should not only include the discussed rudiments. It should not merely delve into the discussed relationship between the individual and the state, as well as the individuals’ understanding of themselves as members of the transnational community in the transnational social realm. It should seek to focus on the actions and practices that, in this case, Zimbabwean migrants engage in, or are able to engage in whilst in Potchefstroom. Furthermore, the focus should also be on how these actions and practices are extended to the Zimbabwe, and therefore keeping the Zimbabwean simultaneously active and present in both Potchefstroom and Zimbabwe. These would be actions necessary to sustain themselves and survive in the Potchefstroom
context and the fields available. Social actions are essentially the practices and behaviour, or rather the ‘things’ actors do and the way actors do ‘things’. These are subjective to the actor to an extent, whilst also objectively influenced by the social context and structure (Bourdieu, 1990b:25, Kassin et al., 2011:114). Thus, in this regard, the dynamics of the social context would first have to be interpreted by the actors.

An actor’s interpretation refers to the way in which they explain and understand their social context, as well as other actors (Weiten, 2014:642; Yin, 2010:195). In fact, Fricker (2006:96) refers to social interpretation as actors’ “social understanding” of their experiences, their identity and the dynamics of power relations in society. In the case of Zimbabwean migrants, their social interpretation could refer to their understanding of the Potchefstroom doxa, which is the official and unofficial social/civic rules and norms. It could also include their interpretation of the amount of available resources and field participation opportunities, as well as their positions as actors/players in the field. Furthermore, this may also entail the interpretation of their self-understanding and relationship with other actors, as citizens. Therefore, acknowledging Zimbabwean migrants’ interpretations is paramount, as it is where their social perceptions spawn from and hinge on.

Kassin et al. (2011:138) state that social perception is essentially an actor’s judgement of their social context and fellow actors. That is particularly what they ‘think’ of their social context and fellow actors. All actors’ perceptions stem from what they interpret and understand. It is also perception, according to Wurim (2003:103) that “enables us to interpret and understand our surroundings”. Grezes and De Gelder (2008:67) assert that actors’ daily life is spent interpreting the occurrences in the social context and they judge and perceive these in order to interpret them better. Therefore, as their interpretations induce their perceptions, their perceptions further lead to bettered interpretations.

Lierberman and Pfeifer (2005:195) proclaim that perception is in fact a subjective process of interpretation and understanding. This reutters Frederik Nietzsche’s statement, when he once asserted that: “whoever thought that he had understood something of me had merely constructed something out of me, after his own image” (Nietzsche, 1969:261). This would mean that actors possess some general means or ‘guideline’ of interpreting, perceiving and determining actions in society. This they get through their primary socialisations; their cultural dispositions and trajectories – their habitus. Therefore, in Bourdieuan terms, the actors’ habitus influences their interpretations and perceptions; they interpret and perceive their society and other actors through the structure and constitution of their own habitus.
(Bourdieu, 1984:101; 1990b:25). This would regard perceptions, as well as interpretation and practices, not as completely subjective as Nietzsche proclaims, but as also in part objectively determined by their habitus.

Therefore, Zimbabwean migrants’ understanding, and judgment of Potchefstroom’s dynamics is through their own Zimbabwean understanding and judgment of the world. That is, through their unique primary and secondary habitus acquired from their socio-cultural history and social experience, as well as the Zimbabwean national habitus shared with fellow Zimbabwean citizens (see section 4.4.1 below). Therefore, although they are all Zimbabweans with a shared national habitus, citizens have their unique culturally-inherited habitus which influence their understanding and judgment. This essentially will have an influence on their social actions. Furthermore, this means their practices and behaviour will not only be influenced, but directed and to an extent determined/structured by how they come to interpret and perceive the context of Potchefstroom and all it has to offer them. Their social action, particularly the types of practices possible for them, and the extent to which these practices could go, are determined by their habitus and thus the interpretations and perceptions of the fields in which they enter. Social realms and their fields are created by the practices of social actors (Fligstein, 2001:108; Giddens, 1979:53,62, Raskoff, 2009), consequently the transnational social realm as a social field, it is argued, to be formed and structured by the practices of transmigrants. Thus, without an understanding or judgement of the field of action, their ability to act is affected and their transnational activity limited.

Therefore, in conclusion, it could be said that the dynamics of transnational citizenship are constituted by the social actions and practises of Zimbabwean migrants in the fields available in Potchefstroom which they may (re)produce and expand into the transnational social realm. It is the way in which they interpret and perceive Potchefstroom that may result in practices that create a transnational social realm, connecting Potchefstroom and Zimbabwe, in which they can access the fields that emerge within this realm. Upon entering the Potchefstroom fields, they are confronted by the legal, political, social, economic and cultural rudiments, as well as the dynamics these produce. These also extend into the transnational social realm which they create. It is in light of these rudiments and dynamics within the fields that determine and (de)motivate actors’ practices of a transnational citizenship. That is, their wanting it and seeking to acquire it, or not. This therefore points to the interplay between social actors’ agency and the objective structural forces. The following section delves into this interplay and relationship.
4.3. Agency-structure dichotomy as a lens for understanding citizenship

The agency-structure dichotomy is a classical sociological notion that highlights the ever-occurring relation between human agents and the social structures and institutions, or in other words, the individual/s and the (social) forces spawning from the social structures and institutions (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998:962; Giddens, 1979:53,62; McAnulla, 2002:271; Raskoff, 2009). Raskoff (2009), for instance, maintains that although structures and societies can be argued to exist objectively and beyond the control of actors, it is actors who create and maintain them. She contended, therefore, that agency and structure cannot be separated from each other. Bourdieu’s theoretical work (Bourdieu, 1990b:25; 1993:3; Jenkins, 1992:25) emphasises this same argument, stating that although social action is intrinsically subjective to the actors, it is determined by objective social forces and entities. Bourdieu (1990b:25), in this regard, particularly advocates for a scientific gaze that does not separate objectivism and subjectivism. That is, the relationship and interplay between agency and structure implies that these two concepts have to be understood, analysed and studied in relation to, and in consideration of each other. Where agency (subjective) is in discussion, structure (objective) too is prevalent. This is also particularly the point of departure towards a Bourdieuan theoretical framework for this study.

With regards to the citizen-and-nation-state relationship, it could be contended that the citizen is in fact an individual/agent and the nation-state is a structured entity with degrees of impact on the citizen. Although nation-states exist beyond the control of citizens, it is the citizens who create the nation-state – predominantly their practices. Contrary, it is also the nation-state that determines, constrains and shapes the practices of the citizens, particularly within the border and terrain of the nation-state. Thus, the components of the citizen-and-nation-state dichotomy cannot be separated or understood independently of each other, just like that of agency-structure. The following section, therefore, seeks to elaborate further on this.

4.3.1. Citizenship and structure

Unlike chapter 3, which provides a discussion of the various type of citizenships, this section provides a discussion of the relationship between citizenship and structure. This essentially refers to the vertical relationship citizens have with the nation-states, as well as with civil society.
Srebrink (2017) differentiates between two core factors determining nationalism; ethnic nationalism – which involves the shared culture and heritage of citizens, as well as civic nationalism – which then involves the “association of people with equal and shared political rights, and an allegiance to similar political procedures”. He asserts that, to fully grasp the concept of citizenship, toggling with the civic and ethnic dimension is paramount. In conjunction with this outset, furthermore, Marshall’s (2009:149-150) contention is that classical citizenship theory holds the conception that the political rights of a citizen depend on membership to a nation-state, and it is a status individuals obtain when they are full members of a political community.

Building onto the above, Turner (1997:5) in his theorising proclaims that citizenship can be deemed a “major foundation of social solidarity”. He goes on to state that citizenship can be understood through the examination of social identity, civic virtue and community. Gofman (2014:46) highlights that social solidarity ensures that social actors remain within the constraints of a structure. In this regard then, possessing a citizenship status of any form implies that actors collectively comply to the forces and constraints of a structure. This structure, or structuring entity, it could be argued, is the nation-state.

Additionally, Iija (2011:1) contends that the general concept of citizenship “includes the protection of a person’s rights both at home and abroad”. Thus, Iija (2011:1) emphasises that citizenship includes actors’ rights within a national territory. Furthermore, it is not limited to just those within nation-state borders, it expands to include other actors who may be located in another nation-state. That is, even citizens who migrate from their home countries are included under the umbrella of citizenship, unless of course they clinically cut all ties and renounce their connection to their home countries. In essence, Iija’s (2011) thesis discusses the legal, political and social dimensions of citizenship, and argues that the concept of citizenship contains all three of these dimensions, and in varying degrees, these dimensions all carry paramount contributions and determinants to the understanding of citizenship, thus should always be included in the political philosophy of citizenship.

To emphasise these three dimensions, she highlights and states that an individual’s “legal status as full member of society, the recognition of that status by fellow citizens”, as well as the “character of an individual acting as a member of society” is at the core of what constitutes and determines their citizenship (Iija, 2011:1). Essentially, what Iija highlights here is that the legal and political dimension as full membership status in a particular society, as well as other social beings recognising this status, accompanied by the practices as a member of society, are at the core of understanding the concept of
citizenship. This concept involves the actions of individuals, as well as how these individuals are perceived by the nation-state (legally and politically) and by other individuals in that society (socially). Thus, in agreement with Fox (2005:174), it can be contended that citizenship can be defined as both state-based and society-based. Thus, essentially, it lies within the parameters of a structure, and structuring entities such as a nation-state, or civil society.

This further emphasises the structural dynamics, and thus the vertical relationship with regards to citizenship. It could be argued that it is in fact the nation-state (structure) that initially imposes the dynamics of citizenship upon individuals (agents/actors), who are then later deemed citizens of that particular nation-state(s). This is particularly the case should a structuralist argument be posed.

By virtue of possessing official documentation such as passports or identity cards, actors fall into the ‘entrapment’ of nationalism. They proceed to (re)form their personal selves, with regards to identity (and citizenship, in this case) according to nation-state determinants. Stets and Burke (2000:225), for example, argue that social identity births personal identity. That is, through their self-classification with social groups and societies, actors gain social roles which they play as members of social groups and societies. From this they gain their social identities, characterised by their social roles. These determine the actors’ social status and position. From this complexity, then, the personal or self-identity is born (Hogg, 2001:186; Snow, 2001:367; Stets & Burke, 2000:224). Among the essential identity markers for actors is nationality, thus, having a national identity, as Smith (1991:8), Kelman (1997:171), as well as Frahm (2012:21) contend. This therefore alludes to the conception that indeed, citizenship and identity are intertwined, and thus as citizens, individuals have a sense of self-identity, which is informed by their roles, activeness and participation in a nation as citizens. In essence, it is through social identity, position and connectedness to a nation as a citizen, that plays a pivotal role in the formation of a personal, or self, identity.

Pine (2014:95) and Polzer (2010:2), however, argue that globalisation has also lead to large waves of international migration, with economic migration increasing as people whirlwind to various global regions in pursuit of economic wellbeing. The impacts migration has on the conception of citizenship are immense (Fox, 2005:172; Leggewie, 2013), to say the least, as nation-states and the conception of citizenship are often deemed somewhat of a nuisance through the globalisation, cosmopolitan and transnational lenses (Glick-Schiller & Fouron, 1999:341; Stokes, 2004:119). This would thus allude to agency and
choice, alongside structural force, also being associated with citizenship. The following section looks into this.

4.3.2. Citizenship and Agency
Citizenship, according to Urban (2008:311), is a choice associated to the freewill and agency of individuals. This is especially true in debates within the frameworks of transnational citizenship, even dual, multiple and flexible citizenship to large degrees show the rational choice actors have in their deciding on a nation to belong and pledge allegiance to. Connecting it to the rational choice theory, as well as the social exchange theory, ‘agency’ can be seen as a shaper of social choices and actions. What could be argued here is that, regardless of socio-structural forces, humans make rational choices as they go about their social relations, exchanges and practices in their life-worlds (Cook et al., 2013:53-54; Emirbayer & Mische, 1998:962; Ritzer, 2003:411). Therefore, the assumption that a citizen is essentially defined by their belonging and political connectedness to a nation-state, implicitly suggests that the nation-state to which a citizen chooses to belong is not a choice solely determined by themselves as actors. Similarly, the assumption that the nation-state initially imposes the dynamics of citizenship on actors, implies that nation-states exist prior and completely objective of citizens. This overlooks the argument that it is the practices of actors that produce and reproduce society, social structures and institutions. A nation-state is, too, (re)produced by actors’ practices.

As already stated in the conclusive paragraph of section 4.2 (above), the transnational social realm and structures are constantly (re)produced by the activities of actors, just as those of any structure and social realm. The transnational social realm is the grand field in which migrants can be said to exist, and thus they (re)create the fields, structures, their own self-understandings, transnational identities, and so forth. Levitt and Glick-Schiller (2004:1003) further contend that the transmigration lens rejects the classical idea that the “nation-state and society is one and the same thing”. Though they are seemingly the same, the one characteristic shared by these two realms and structures is that they are both (re)produced by actors. If this is the case, then everything defined within the parameters of a nation-state will be affected when a shift into the transnational social realm occurs – citizenship is also amongst the affected. Within the transnational social realm, the actors (migrants) choose and act to define their sense of belonging through the multi-diverse cultures and fields available. They also negotiate and maintain close networks as they engage in transnational exchanges of resources, skills, capital and social
positions. Therefore, the notion of agency, under the frameworks of rational choice, as well as actor-network lenses, also has to be considered as it highlights the citizens’ agency as a major characteristic of the theoretical framework of this research study.

4.3.3. Conclusion of the agency-structure dichotomy

In concluding this discussion on agency and structure in relation to citizenship, certain factors already discussed must be reemphasised. Iija (2011) contends that citizenship contains legal, political and social dynamics, and that all three are crucial for the understanding of citizenship as they each essentially contain macro-structural implication, from the nation-state and society, down to the agent level. However, it can be argued that these dynamics also have a micro level impact on the perceptions, actions and practices of actors in their life-worlds, as it is because of, and in the constraints of, socio-structural forces, within structures that agents act, whilst it is the actors’ (inter)acting and practices that determines and creates the structures (Giddens, 1979:53; 62, Raskoff, 2009). Although nation-states exist independently of, and beyond the control of citizens, it is the citizens who create the nation-state. Even if a nation-state can be deemed as existing independently of citizens, the components of the citizen-and-nation-state dichotomy cannot be separated or understood independently of each other, just like that of agency-structure. A nation is essentially only a nation when it has citizens claiming allegiance and citizenship of that nation. Without this, a nation is merely just another social realm amongst other social realms. Similarly, a citizen can only essentially be a citizen should they pledge allegiance and claim the citizenship of a particular nation. Otherwise, they exist merely as social actors, not necessarily citizens.

Adding to this dynamical nature of citizenship, Fox (2005:175) states that in a liberal democracy, the relationship between nation-state and individual (citizen) is both vertical and horizontal in nature. It is vertical, in the sense that the political “rule of law” and power have a top-down dynamic, with the state occupying the top and the citizens occupying the bottom, and it is horizontal in that the power relations are horizontally spread across the social field, amongst agents (citizens) themselves, not only between structure and agents (Fox, 2005:175). Reverting to the previous paragraph towards an extension of Fox’s proclamation, it should also be highlighted that the vertical relationship is in fact reciprocal. That is to say that although citizens occupy the bottom of the said top-down dynamic, it is still the practices of citizens that influence and create the structure. Thus, it could be asserted that this vertical and horizontal feature, as well as the legal, political and social
aspects essentially make-up the dynamics of citizenship. Figure 4.1 below provides an illustration of the vertical and horizontal relationships.
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*Figure 4.1: Vertical and horizontal relationships in a nation-state*

What can be seen in figure 4.1 is the reciprocal vertical relationship between the nation-state and the citizens, as well as the horizontal relationship between the citizens themselves. What is also included in this figure is the placement of migrants amidst the citizens, all occupying the position of agents in relation to the structure (nation-state). This is justified by the fact that, upon migrating, migrants enter a vertical relationship with their host nation, as well as a horizontal relationship with the citizens of that nation. Furthermore, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.7), migration is deemed to have a political, economic and social impact and effect, which are similar areas that appear to be impacted and affected by citizenship.

Therefore, in this regard, it could be argued that migration can lead to the (re)conceptualisation, or at least, (re)thinking of citizenship. This (re)conceptualisation can occur on two levels: firstly, at a structural (macro) level – where, for instance, the host/receiving nation is ‘forced’ to acknowledge migrants and their actions within their national borders. They are ‘forced’ in affording them some form and level of political status
and rights, and in some instances naturalisation processes have to be drafted and constantly amended. Secondly, at the actor (micro) level – whereby the individuals within the migrant population can experience a shift/change regarding the perceptions, interpretations, and practices towards their citizenship as they now find themselves in a relationship with a state to which they are not citizens, and fellow actors to whom they are foreigners.

Transnationalism in this regard launches the agency-structure dichotomy into a realm whereby agency is practiced in two physical objective realms simultaneously. These objective realms are, in this case, Potchefstroom (agency practiced as Zimbabwean migrants) and Zimbabwe (agency practiced as Zimbabwean citizens). Furthermore, the agency is practiced in the semi-physical Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. Actors in this regard have to navigate and seek positions both in the physical realm they are located in, as well as the transnational social realm which they create to connect their home and host country. This is what Giddens (1979:66) also refers to as structuration – that is, how the practices of actors’, though constrained, determined and shaped by structure, (re)produce social structures and systems. The practices of actors as citizens go beyond the already existing physical national realm into the semi-physical transnational social realm, which, although it is also a structure, affords them agency that permits them to act outside and beyond the explicit constraints of the physical nation-state. Actors come to possess, determine and understand their agency through their habitus, which is formed and acquired from their primary socialisation – that is their family group, their family culture and history. Their habitus is also reshaped and further developed by the structures they encounter as they act within social fields. The following section further elaborates on the formation of habitus and its impact of social action and practices in the transnational social realm.

4.4. Formation of habitus

Habitus, as Wacquant (2005:316) asserts, refers to the way in which “society becomes deposited in persons in the form of lasting dispositions, or trained capacities and structured propensities to think, feel, and act in determinant ways, which then guide them [the people]”. This is the primary habitus, and according to Walther (2014:13), it is a stable habitus which is acquired from the family group through primary socialisation. The primary habitus is also referred to as the class habitus, as it shapes and determines an actor’s
position in society, as well as their lifestyle, tastes, perspectives, actions and interests (Walther, 2014:13). Navarro (2006:16) asserts that the nature of habitus characterises it as being gradually fluid and flexible, rather than permanent and tangible. He further elaborates, stating that it is socially created, rather than individual, it can morph and change due to specific contexts, and “can be changed under unexpected situations or, over a long historical period” (Navarro, 2006:16). In essence, habitus therefore is created by an interplay between structure and agency, as opposed to being exclusively related to either of the two.

Walther (2014:13) refers to the secondary habitus, which is activated upon entering the social realm, and thus the various fields. The secondary habitus relies on the primary habitus as its foundation, as this internalised history is never forgotten, though constantly reproduced through the generations. For Walther (2014:13), the is habitus like a psychosomatic mind which is durable, whilst flexible enough to accept readjustments to it induced by different contexts, episteme, as well as life experiences.

As Bourdieu (1984:170) states, the conception of habitus deals with aspects that are shaped by past events and structures, and also the current events, practices and related structures, and ultimately the conditions that determine humans’ perception of these. Therefore, in this regard, he maintains that habitus is unconsciously created and, in some instances, reproduced “without any deliberate pursuit of coherence … without any conscious concentration” (Bourdieu, 1984:170). Habitus ensures that there is, in each individual, a presence of history and tradition, which structures, shapes and forms schemata of thought, perception, and practice/action. In this regard, it guarantees, more than any official law or norm, the practices and perceptions of individuals and groups (Bourdieu, 2007:279).

Some scholars have argued intensely against the rigidness of the conception of habitus (Adams, 2006; King, 2000; Reay, 2004). King (2000:425) in particular insists that since habitus is a transferred or inherited cultural history, trajectories and dispositions, it implies that “any choices individual can make are always already given by the habitus which is itself determined by their objective, prior, and therefore, unchangeable [social] position”. He refers here to actors' choices in terms of their tastes, activities and practices. However, as Jo (2013:2-3) also highlights, the argument made by these scholars is not entire false, though it is a misunderstanding of the essence of Bourdieu’s work. Jo (2013:6) states that Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992:43) refer to a “feel for the game”, which implies that actors adapt themselves, and also transform and develop their habitus whenever they enter new
fields and begin to understand those fields' doxa and functionality. This, according to Jo (2013; 6, 8), implies that choices made by actors are not necessarily predetermined by their habitus, but by the actors socialised subjectivity which assists them to understand and have a “feel for the game” of the field in which they have entered.

Ultimately, it could be argued that habitus refers to the perspectives, interpretations, practices, tastes and interests that social actors have, and it provides the combination of, as well as the amount of capital available for social actors. Therefore, it refers to the social 'resources’ an actor has, and these resources come in the form of dispositions, trajectories, values and social ‘rules’ that an individual, to an extent, absorbs and takes in unconsciously. These, although transformable, forever stay with individuals across the fields they enter in their life-worlds (Web et al., 2002:36). Individuals rely on their habitus when entering fields, as it is through the guidance of their habitus that they can respond to the dynamics of the fields they enter. In other words, their habitus allows for their subjective flexibility as actors within a structured arena (Jo, 2013:8; Web et al., 2002:36), and affords the actor their modus operandi (their modes of practices), which in turn produce their opus operatum (the results of their practices) (Walther, 2014:14). Developed with reference to Walther (2014:15), figure 4.2 below graphically illustrates the interplay between the field of practice (objective/structure) and the habitus (agent), as well as the recurring circular motion from the modus operandi produce by habitus, to the opus operatum attained by actors, and ultimately contributing to the habitus – perceptions, actions, tastes.
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Therefore, in summing up the core aspects that connote and constitute the habitus, Bourdieu (1984:170; 1990a:87) and Web et al. (2002:37) proclaim that it provides for actors their intrinsic knowledge – their beliefs, values, and understanding of the world; as well as their social identity – the position/s and status they hold in society. The habitus also instils certain attitudes, norms, values and ways of behaving; what individuals present and understand to ‘themselves’ and ‘their likes’ and ‘tastes’ are all predominantly created, constructed, shaped, and influenced by their habitus (Jenkins 1992:75). Furthermore, Web et al. (2002:36) emphasise that the habitus operates at a “partly unconscious” level” for the actor and Jenkins (1992:82) states that the habitus “is the source of objective practices but is itself a set of subjective generative principles produced by the objective patterns of social life”. Finally, the habitus is established and constituted in “moments of practices” (Bourdieu, 1990b:80-81; Web et al., 2002:37). This implies that it is only when an actor is confronted with the necessity to act in a field that a habitus is ‘activated’. This is a point where actors’ semi-conscious “habitual” or “ritual” practices and actions are called upon (Bourdieu, 1990b:87; Jenkins, 1992:74). It is through, and also because of the activities and practices of actors that a habitus is ‘alive’. Jenkins (1992:75) says it is not merely their practices, but also the actors’ interactions and relations with each other and their environment that the habitus is birthed and sustained. Up until that point, it is somewhat, frozen or temporarily inactive. Therefore, it is argued that the interpretations, perceptions and actions/practices of actors are fundamentally products of their habitus.

4.4.1. Migrants’ habitus and field(s)
In the mid-1990s, Arjun Appadurai (1996:6) argued that in a globalised world whereby people are constantly on the move, there also prevails an unregulated flow of a variety of texts from differing social settings. This places immediate challenges to the habitus as actors are confronted with multiple cultural texts which are not of their own habitus, and in many cases these multiple texts are from social (national) contexts not familiar to them. Social change results in actors needing to be flexible and make do with what is before them. Appadurai (1996:6) further proclaimed that rigid identities and habitus are challenged and struggle to prevail in a contemporary society. Since the core focus of transmigration scholars is the simultaneous presence and practices in two or more nations (Briggs et al., 2008:625; Faist, 2014:207-208; Glick-Schiller et al., 1995:48; Upegui-Hernandez, 2012:2005; Vertovic, 2001:575). This would suggest – in light of Appadurai’s
argument – that actors’ habitus will be affected, shaped and flexible not only in relation to fields in their home or host nations, but in the transitional social realm which encompasses both nations. Therefore, transnational citizenship, as well as pursuing it, would pose a challenge on the habitus of migrants too in this regard.

As the above literature asserts, habitus generally speaks on how social group culture and history (personal) shape the actors’ tastes, perceptions, as well as their social behaviour and actions. Migration would, thus, ultimately affect the habitus. Being simultaneously part of two or more countries, a transmigrant’s habitus is bound to face an array of influential, challenging and impactful factors, for better or for worse. The factors are of the home nation, the host nation and the combination of both of these nations.

Habitus can be said to be the definer of social groups, as the habitus of a particular group represents their unitary, socialised subjectivity and similar lifestyle in terms of their tastes, choices, perceptions and practices/actions (Bourdieu, 1984:173; Bourdieu & Wacquant; 1992:124; Jenkins, 1992:75). If it could be thus stated that a group’s habitus provides for the group implicit, and to some degree, explicit guidelines which orient and determine actors’ perceptions, behaviours and practices (Bourdieu, 1984:173-174; 1990a:11; Calhoun et al., 2007:261; Kelly & Lusis, 2005:835). The exact, therefore, could be said of migrant groups and their habitus; they enter a host nation (a foreign or unfamiliar grand field), and are confronted by foreign (unfamiliar) fields with foreign (unfamiliar) doxa. It is whilst they navigate and compete in these fields that they manage varying degrees of simultaneous partaking in similar fields available in their home nations (familiar grand field). It is their ability to be simultaneously present and active in fields in both their home and host nation simultaneously. It is their practices and activities that produce fields that are simultaneously available and operative in the transnational social realm.

Migrants, as a group, intrinsically carry with them a habitus instilled in them, and ascribed from socialisation in their home country (Jo, 2013:10; Kelly & Lusis, 2005:835). Therefore, in this case, their ascribed group habitus is Zimbabwean. The Zimbabwean habitus can be referred to as a national habitus. A national habitus is essentially characterised by being of, as well as being from a particular nation, in this case, Zimbabwe (see for example Kuipers, 2012; Toubourg, 2016). It also characterises and shapes ‘ways of being and feeling’ part of this particular nation (see for example Le Hir, 2014). Although a Zimbabwean (national) habitus is particularly shared by all citizens of Zimbabwe, this does not necessarily imply that all Zimbabwean citizens share the same primary or secondary habitus. The Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom come from different social contexts
in Zimbabwe, with varying status quos, socio-economic status, as well as socio-political and socio-cultural perspectives, impacts and so forth. This implies that within the group of migrants based in Potchefstroom, there are diverse ascribed habitus which they carried across with them from Zimbabwe, and therefore affording to different migrants, varying degrees of power, positions (favourable and also not so favourable).

Although this social division may be the case, Zimbabwean migrants will essentially all have a primary, a secondary, as well as a national (Zimbabwean) habitus. The ascribed (primary) habitus of different Zimbabwean groups differs and goes to the extent of dividing the migrants themselves into classes – those from rural/poorer regions, and those from urban/wealthier regions of Zimbabwe. This implies, as Bourdieu (1984:101), as well as Jo (2013:1) state, that the trajectories and dispositions afforded by a group’s habitus perpetuates inequality and instils the acceptance of inequality, as well as one’s social status, identity and position. Therefore, within their own national context, Zimbabweans, like citizens of most nations in the contemporary era, carry differing habitus to their fellow compatriots. Regardless of this division, however, as a collective, they carry the social identity of being Zimbabwean migrants, and thus, whilst located within the Potchefstroom/SA context, their social identity and status would be that of a migrant, and thus less than that of citizen. This excludes those possessing a South African citizenship status.

Zimbabwean migrants living in Potchefstroom’s, sense of being, self-understanding, as well as actions and behaviour, as Zimbabwean citizens, can be heavily tied to their habitus. Thus, all they do, think, feel, eat, and the kind of ‘things’ that may appeal to or attract them are determined by their habitus. The transmigration lens would assert that, following their migration to SA, Zimbabweans constantly maintain, (re)produce and (re)shape their habitus through the transnational relations, bonds, exchanges, and practices.

Furthermore, the transmigration lens would also contend that the Zimbabwean migrants, as transnational citizens, should probably have a transnational habitus. This would entail that what would influence, impact, and at some point, intertangle with their ‘traditional’ habitus are the dynamics of the transnational social realm – not merely those of the physical national space. In this regard, by virtue of being in SA, the habitus of Zimbabwean migrants is bound to be impacted and potentially transformed, beyond just a secondary habitus. Therefore, should the notion of a ‘transnational habitus’ be appreciated, it would raise the idea of transnational capital – the amount of, as well as the availability of capital
beyond national borders, and in more than one country simultaneously – that which allows for them to navigate and compete in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm, mobilising better positions in the transnational social realm. This, however, does not form part of the focus of this particular investigation.

For Bourdieu (1993:8), human action is directed towards the maximisation of material and symbolic capital, which in turn leads to acquired dispositions useful for the ‘upgrading’ and betterment of the primary habitus and social status, the social identity and the positions occupied by the actor. The triad relationship between habitus, capital and social practice comprise the core dynamical interplay in the field. In his book Distinctions, Bourdieu (1984:101) expresses this relation through the following equation:

$$[(\text{Habitus}) + \text{(Capital)} + \text{Field}] = \text{Practice}$$

It is through this interplay that actors make positions available and occupy the positions that are available. Social action then, the practices and performance of actors in society, occurs in the field. Thus, it is in the field that the dynamics of transitional citizenship can even exist, let alone be investigated. Furthermore, it is the correlation of habitus and capital with the field dynamics that produce the practices of actors. The next section, therefore, expands particularly on the field and its dynamics, with particular intentions of asserting Bourdieu’s theory of practice in the field as the theoretical anchor for this case study.

4.5. The field as an arena of power

In its essence, the field can be perceived, firstly, as an arena of ‘action’. Thus, implying that what should be of investigative focus in the field is ‘what people are actually doing’. This involves their behaviour, their position-taking in the field, as well as their pursuit and usage of capital (Calhoun et al., 2007:261; Jenkins, 1992:68-69). This is essentially the interplay between the actors’ habitus, their actions and practices within the field, the amount of available capital that they possess, and the positions which they navigate through and within, as well as occupy. Actors’ practice and use of capital in their seeking of better field-positions results in an on-going struggle and competition with other actors in the respective field for the available field-positions, (Bourdieu, 1990b:16; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:98) and its accompanying benefits (increased capital, and as a result
further ‘enrichment’ of habitus). Therefore, those actors in possession of high amounts of capital – also referred to as *incumbents* (Fligstein, 2001:108; 2008:231) – are at an advantage over those with less capital, and can navigate, compete and occupy better positions in the field (Web et al., 2002:22).

Similarly, those occupying higher positions can mobilise and accumulate more capital efficiently than other actors within the same field. Actors occupying high field positions with access to high amounts of capital are also referred to as *incumbents*, whereas their counterparts in lower field positions are referred to as *insurgents* or *challengers*, who challenge them for field positions and capital (Fligstein, 2001:108; 2008:231). The incumbents as the dominant field actors; it is particularly their practices as actors that initially determine the field dynamics such as: what positions are available, which actors occupy which positions, the doxa of the field – essentially, they define the position of the challengers. However, all these determinants of the incumbents are challenged by the practices of challengers, and thus (re)defined, (re)determined accordingly.

Capital is the valued resource in each field and is limited whilst highly demanded by actors (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:98; Walther, 2014:9). In pursuit of more capital, actors therefore engage in competition, struggles over the mobilisation of the most capital, as capital affords actors power to navigate, act, acquire positions, (re)produce, (re)develop, and even (re)establish the habitus, social status and social identity of an actor. This, therefore, results in the field qualifying as an arena of power, more than simply an arena of social action and practice. It is through the power – capital and positions – an actor possesses that a certain action/practice can even be possible.

Power, in this regard, can be argued to refer to an ability. That is, the ability for actors to navigate and acquire better (higher) field-positions, through their actions and mobilisation/acquisition of increased capital (Web et al., 2002:23). Power is particularly determined by the possession and using of capital (Kelly & Lusis, 2006:833). It can be seen as the ability of actors to occupy the limited higher positions (through position-taking) in the field, surpassing the struggles and competition posed upon them by their challengers, as well as structural constraints. Therefore, some challengers may struggle in their attempt to occupy higher positions, they may be in possession of little capital, whilst another possibility may be their inexperence of the field.

For Web et al. (2002:23), challengers therefore often accept their limitations and constrains in the field. They accept that their lower capital only affords them so much
against actors with more capital and in better positions. They adjust their expectations according to their probable achievements in the field. Therefore, such challengers are less ambitious and are content and satisfied with their position (Web et al., 2002:23). This, in turn, implies that, in their actions and practices, the incumbents are mainly in competition with one another. They are capable of acquiring higher positions and navigating through the various positions in the field without much competition from the less ambitious, less powerful challengers. The powerful possess larger amounts of capital, which they keep accumulating as they struggle and compete with other powerful actors for the available field position, which unlock for their occupants more capital, and thus more power. It is this possession of a field position and capital which affords actors their ‘power’ and means to act – competing for positions and capital, and thus, more power.

Further, it is this power dynamic that, for Bourdieu (2000:216), (re)produces symbolic dominance and subordination of less powerful actors by the more powerful. In his own words, Bourdieu (2000:216) describes and refers to this domination and subordination as:

“the realistic, even resigned or fatalistic, dispositions which lead members of the dominated classes to put up with objective conditions that would be judged intolerable or revolting by agents otherwise disposed...help reproduce the conditions of oppression”.

The dominated classes referred to above generally allude to the less powerful challengers in the field. More explicitly however, the dominated classes are those limited due to their low capital, such as limited education, lack of social networks and a habitus of a lower/dominated class that has been sustained for generations (Bourdieu, 2000:215; Web et al., 2002:24). Thus, in this regard, challengers enter a field already with the knowledge that their subjective expectations for capital are reliant on the probability of their acquisition of capital, especially in competition with the powerful incumbents of that field. Although challengers are able to navigate and occupy better capital and positions, and thus essentially bettering themselves and social identity, the position and identity they signal to other actors keeps them within their occupied position. They will be perceived by other actors as a lower, subordinate actor, and in turn are ascribed a social identity and status of that nature (Bourdieu, 2007:274). In their satisfied, content acceptance of their situation as universality and ‘the way things are’, Bourdieu (1990a:85; 2007:277-279) emphasises that they implicitly and indirectly promote and sustain their own subordination, their own lower positions and low volumes of capital.
This lays out and maintains the playing field, in which a power struggle and competition for capital and positions is prevalent. What can be further asserted here is that the dynamics of the field, as well as the distribution of capital within a field is not done in a manner which promotes equal opportunities, equal resources and distribution of capital, equal distribution of power among actors, as well as equal means and ability to act. The practices of some actors are far more limited than those of others. Bourdieu (2000:214) proclaims that all those “who talk of equality of opportunity forget that social games…are not ‘fair games’. Without being, strictly speaking, rigged, the competition resembles a handicap race that has lasted for generations”. This essentially implies that the competition as well as the distribution of resources and power in a field will always be unequal to large extents, favouring certain actors more than others.

For Bourdieu (1990a:85; 1992:167), therefore, unevenness and inequality in the field results in the production of symbolic violence, which can be defined as a type of “violence which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity”. John Galtung’s (1969; 1990) concept of ‘cultural violence’ also makes this proclamation. Cultural violence, according to Galtung (1990:291) refers to “any aspect of a culture that can be used to legitimize violence in its direct or structural form”. What these scholars imply here is that the limitations of the social navigation, ambition and aspiration, limited access to social currency, and inferior position of the challengers in the field is a form of ‘indirect’ and ‘hidden’ violence against them. This sustains their low positions, domination, powerlessness and less prestigious status in the field. However, the dominated are complicit to this violence upon them since they accept their social identity and circumstances as the nature of things – it is how things are. This of course further strengthens the power of the dominant actors in the field, as the dominated assist in their own domination due to, as Web et al. (2002:25) assert, the misrecognition of the violence upon them.

4.5.1. Transnational social realm as a field of power relations
According to Levitt and Glick-Schiller (2004:1007), the conception of field for Bourdieu essentially speaks to and refers to the manner in which “social relationships are structured by power” dynamics. Fields are created by the actors struggling for social positions within them (Fligstein, 2008:233), and thus fields are fluid, flexible and reproducible by, and through the social actions and practices of actors. Actors in this regard may consist of both individuals as well as institutions. As stated in the second paragraph of section 4.5, it is
their practices, that (re)determine the dynamics of the field. What Levitt and Glick-Schiller (2004:1008) state is that although Bourdieu does not explicitly speak on the transnational social field as his territory of analysis, he does not exempt it as a dimension worth pursuing. Therefore, these authors attempt to launch the Bourdieuian conception of ‘the field’ into the transnational debate and thus speak of the transnational social field.

Since the transnational social realm is too a (grand) field in its own right, it provides diverse positions for social actors to occupy (Glick-Schiller & Fouron, 1999:344; Levitt & Glick-Schiller, 2004:1009; Molina et al., 2014:3). Some actors may have stronger and wider transnational ties and networks than their compatriots located within the same national (physical) realm (Levitt & Glick-Schiller, 2004:1009). In this regard, they become amongst the main source of information, keeping them connected to their home nations, so that “they can act if events motivate them to do so”. The level of transnational networks and connectedness to the home nation whilst based in the host nation can, to some degree, be a source of power for those who are able to efficiently partake in transnational activities and practices. They also are key informants to those migrants who are unable to fully partake, if at all, in the transnational social realm. Therefore, what this does is it re-emphasises the horizontal power distribution. As in the case where only a few are able to engage in transnational practices, their partaking also benefits the less, or non-active actors – essentially resulting in a collective mobilisation of power, as Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.

In conclusion therefore, it can be said that the field consists of two core and diverse distributions of power – that is, the vertical and horizontal distributions. They encounter both vertical (bureaucratic and structural), as well as horizontal (social) power relations and dynamics as they compete and negotiate for more capital and better social positions. They are in competition with Zimbabwean migrants (their compatriots), with other migrants, as well as South African citizens in Potchefstroom, and those from other regions of SA, migrated from other regions – this is the horizontal distribution. The vertical distribution involves, for example, civic society as well as the state/government (political/legal relationship). It is in this regard a top-down relationship. Figure 3.1 above can be referred to for a graphic illustration of these vertical and horizontal relationships.

The competition, position-taking and power dynamics in the field are a result of the available resources in the field – that is, the capital. In the grand field of Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe, it is through practice in the interdependent (sub)fields that capital is garnered. It is also in pursuit of capital that actors act and behave in certain ways in the
field. It is also the acquisition and accumulation of capital that affords actors varying
degrees of power, as well as the ability to act in the fields and grand field.

Throughout this study, the term capital has been used on several accounts without truly
delving into the essence of this concept, as well as its true implications. Bourdieu provides
and defines four types of capital, namely, economic, social, cultural, and symbolic capital.
The following section intends to delve deeper into the dynamics of these concepts,
particularly with regards to Zimbabwean migrants.

4.6. Capital: the ‘currency’ in the arena of power

The following section will provide a discussion of capital as an investable currency which
can yield more and increased capital (dividends) in the field. Pierre Bourdieu’s four capitals
(economic, social, cultural, symbolic) will also be discussed in relation to Zimbabweans in
the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. This sets the foundation for the conclusive
subsection which discusses the vertical and horizontal distribution of capital in this realm.

According to Calhoun et al. (2007:263) and Walther (2014:9) the field is organised and
structured by the actors, according to the capital available in that field. The habitus, as well
as the practices and competition that occur in the field are a result of the relationship
between the actors and the capital in that given field. Calhoun et al. (2007:263) go on to
state that it is the four types of capital that determine and structure the competition, the
differences and similarities between actors (class), the social inequalities and the general
organisation of the field (Calhoun et al., 2007:263). What they assert here, firstly, reutters
the stratification and power dynamics resulting from actors’ pursuit of capital. Secondly,
this sheds light onto the ascribed capital, which an individual obtains through their habitus,
as well as the acquired or accumulated capital, which is essentially the main motive,
according to Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1990a:87), that actors act in the field – to acquire more
capital and better positions, and thus more power.

Providing a Bourdieuan understanding of the notion of capital, Harker et al. (1990:1)
highlight that, for Bourdieu:

“the definition of capital is very wide […] and includes material things (which can have
symbolic value), as well as ‘untouchable’ but culturally significant attributes such as
prestige, status, and authority (referred to as symbolic capital), along with cultural
capital (defined as culturally calculated taste and consumption patterns)”. […] capital
acts as a social relation within a system of exchange, and the term is extended ‘to all
the goods, material and symbolic, without distinction, that present themselves as rare
and worthy of being sought after in a particular social formation’.

Capital here goes beyond economic and money-related factors. It particularly refers to a
social system of exchange, what can be called social currency, or perhaps even better,
field currency. Thus, capital in its essence, refers to the valuable resources available in the
field (Walther, 2014:9). It is, as proclaimed, a form of currency, wealth or stakes which an
individual obtains, initially, through the primary social group – therefore, through their
habitus (Bourdieu, 1990a:87-93; Calhoun et al., 2007:263; Jenkins, 1992:86). Actors
invest this currency in the fields they enter, and the desired dividends of their investments
return in the form of more capital, better field positions, a developed habitus, as well as
social status and identity. Through, as well as because of capital, actors are able to act
and practice in the field, towards the acquisition of available positions and more capital –
thus, acquire and mobilise more power (Kelly & Lusis, 2006:833).

Bourdieu (1990a:87) uses the ‘market’ metaphor to refer to capital as the sought-after and
fought-over valued resources that is limited in supply, with a high demand. Thus, as
Jenkins (1992:87) further proclaims in this regard, what is created is a “supply and
demand” relationship between the available capital within a given field, and the actors
within that field. The value, power, types and amounts of capital available, as well as the
principles that constitute it in each field are determined by the actors themselves (Bourdieu
& Wacquant, 1992:98; Web et al., 2002:22). It is also the actors who determine the extent
to which capital is distributed across the field as well as the accessibility of the capital to
other actors. What this implies, as Web et al. (2002:22) assert, is that the field is
hierarchically, or rather, vertically stratified. Therefore, the constitution, possession and
distribution of valuable resources, and thus power, is also vertically distributed. With the
incumbents possessing more power in terms of the capital they can mobilise, as well as
the positions they can occupy in that field. However, the horizontal distribution of capital
and power is also quite possible. In this regard, challengers acting at the same social
levels and positions can either compete against each other for the very limited capital
available in the lower field positions, or collectively mobilise capital, and collectively
compete with the more elite actors in the field. These include not only other humans, but
also institutions and organisations that are actively present in the field.

As mentioned above, capital goes beyond the economic element. Bourdieu extends this
notion to holistically encompass four types of currency possessed and acquirable to the
actors in the field. These, as well as their significance in light of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, are particularised below.

4.6.1. Economic capital of migrants in the field(s)

Economic capital specifically refers to monetary availability for social actors, that is the amount of and access to money in the field (Bourdieu, 1986:54; Walther, 2014:9). Bourdieu’s (1986:54) contention is that economic capital provides direct and immediate access to certain goods and services. Walther (2014:9) further adds that this capital can be “transformed into other types of capital than vice-versa”. Therefore, it can be said that economic capital certainly may have an influence on the Zimbabwean migrants’ initial decision, ability and affording to migrate, as well as the means thereof, with regards to transportation. Though economic capital is pivotal for a foundational start upon entering SA, and settling in Potchefstroom, Zimbabwean migrants enter, as challengers, an economic field contested by SA local citizens in Potchefstroom, their Zimbabwean compatriots, as well as other migrants from Africa and beyond. Their negotiated positions in this field are shaped and influenced by the other capitals. Furthermore, their negotiated positions in this field would determine their standards of living in Potchefstroom, and too their activeness in the transnational relations, connections and exchanges in and between Potchefstroom and Zimbabwe. Certain services such as healthcare and education are easily accessed with the availability of economic capital. As scholars have proclaimed, economic reasons are amongst the core reasons as to why Zimbabweans migrate to SA (Idemudia et al., 2013:19; Kiwanuka, 2009:7; Zanamwe & Devillard, 2010:13). Therefore, entering and negotiating the economic field in Potchefstroom can be regarded as the main aspirations of Zimbabwean migrants.

The quest for jobs in Potchefstroom, whether formal or informal, is one instance of economic field activity in Potchefstroom. Zimbabweans in this regard compete with all other actors in Potchefstroom. All these actors are in competition with each other for economic capital. The mobilisation of such capital can become a pivotal dynamic in the ability to partake in the economic field in both Potchefstroom and Zimbabwe simultaneously. This involves the possession and receiving of economic capital from Zimbabwe, the earning and usage of money in Potchefstroom, the sending of money to family and compatriots at home, as well as the investing of money in Zimbabwe. Though migration results in degrees of deskilling and loss of workers for the home nation, transnational activities have been deemed a vital means of economic development for
both the host and home nation (Breen & Nel, 2011:35; Crush & Ramachandran, 2014:13; Kalitanyi & Visser, 2010:376). Furthermore, entry and access to positions in other available fields may be enhanced by the amount of economic capital available to actors, as well as the position they occupy in the economic field. Thus, economic capital is a resource of power that may be a determinant of migrants’ ability to participate in the transnational social realm, it determines the ability and access an actor may have to transnational activities and the extent to which they can navigate the transnational social realm. As these fields require access to certain forms of tele- and online communication, access to resources such as computers and modern cell-phones, and even banking (specifically send and receiving money) electronically is determined by the possession of economic capital.

Therefore, Zimbabwean migrants can be said to be competing for, and mobilising economic capital in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe social realm. As Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom, they compete against South African locals, and other foreign nationals to mobilise economic capital. When it comes to, for instance, acquiring employment, it could be argued that their migrant status should afford them less of an advantage as that of the local South African citizens or other foreign nationals (including their own compatriots) who may possess a South Africa citizenship. As Zimbabwean citizens who are not living in Zimbabwe, they can utilise their collective agency to mobile economic capital to their benefit. They also have means of entering and acting in the economic field of Zimbabwe through their transnational practice. This involves the sending and receiving of money from Zimbabwe.

### 4.6.2. Social capital of migrants in the field(s)

Social capital refers to social networks and relationships. It is the social network of availability of “actual or potential resources that can be legitimised by family, group or class membership” (Walther, 2014:10). These relationships afford to the actor the socially and “collectively-owned” resources which ultimately ‘accredit’ the actors as they enter into the social arena (Bourdieu, 1986:51). Therefore, access to information and knowledge, membership to a certain family (the family name), tribe, class, school, and also a neighbourhood or community, can be said to be examples of some determinants of social capital. For instance, having family members, friends, and members of home communities or such other persons who have already migrated to SA makes for an added ‘pull’ for Zimbabwean citizens to migrate to SA. The connections and networks that they maintain
whilst in Potchefstroom, in this case, will depend on the social class, tribe, school, and such other fields the migrants belong to in their home country. This may also determine where exactly to SA they migrate, for what reasons, and where they desire or choose to be geographically located in Potchefstroom. However, and most importantly, the other capital and positions they are able to access in the available fields depend on their social capital, and to a large degree, their current position (social identity) in the social field.

It may also affect their activity, and the degree to which they are active in the transnational social realm, as well as their perspectives, interpretations and practices towards their citizenship whilst in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. Zimbabweans may have strong social networks with their compatriots, other migrants, South African citizens in Potchefstroom, and other players such as government and non-government officials and organisations. At the same time, the migrants may have strong social networks in Zimbabwe, and thus having social clout in both realms. This affords for the migrant a higher amounts of transnational social capital. That is, they establish and maintain social network bonds within the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm; resulting in their partaking in transnational activities and practices less hurdles than those with lower amounts of social capital. Acquiring a job, and a place to stay, for example, can be the result of having high amounts of social capital, as well as access to a whole variety of available fields and capital in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. The ability and access to means of transporting goods back to Zimbabwe, may also be a result of high social capital – simply, knowing and being known by the ‘right’ people.

In conclusion, therefore, social capital strongly determines the ability for actors to gain stability and comfort in a field. Some Zimbabweans have more, some less due to a combination of their ascribed habitus, social identity and status (their migrant status and its containing factors). This alludes to the stratification caused by the pursuit of capital in the field, as well as the capacity of power enabled by the possession of capital. Social capital is therefore a resource of power for Zimbabwean migrants in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. It may determine whether or not jobs and access to income is even a possibility; where to find suitable accommodation; and how to negotiate the social dynamics in a foreign nation with and within other actors who are not Zimbabwean. Those with less or none cannot fully embrace extreme transnational experiences of citizenship. They will negotiate within the borders of a particular nation with the intention of bettering their networks and connections, leading to more social capital and thus more capital holistically.
4.6.3. Cultural capital of migrants in the field(s)

Thirdly, there is also cultural capital, which is quite essential in Bourdieu’s theorising, as it essentially is the “primary cause for status and relative positions within a social field” (Walther, 2014:10). It is dividable into three forms, and can thus be obtained: 1) through the family and ethnic/cultural group (habitus) – this is the incorporated/embodied form; 2) through prolonged assimilation and inculcation, being objectified by material objects such as books, monuments, musical instruments – this is the objectivised form; and 3) through, for instance, education and the acquisition of formal qualifications such as academic diplomas and degrees- this is the institutionalised form (Bourdieu, 1986:47,54; Walther, 2014:10). Essentially, it could be argued that action towards the accumulation of cultural capital necessitates the (re)production of the habitus. It is all the forms, attributes and characteristics of cultural capital that come to form the cultural history, values, and dispositions that formulate the habitus. It is, after all, in the field, through and because of actors’ practices that the habitus is produced.

Cultural capital, with regards to Zimbabwean migrants refers to their family, ethnic/cultural and national history and background, as well as their level of education and qualifications. Also, their tastes, interests, sense of self, perceptions, behaviours and attitudes. This may determine the fields and positions they are exposed to and can ultimately access whilst in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. Furthermore, whilst in Potchefstroom, cultural capital can determine, to a large extent, the other types and amounts of capital as well as the level/ranking of positions available and attainable by a migrant in various fields. Without, for instance, the ‘right’ education and qualifications, and also the ‘right’ family and ethnic/cultural background, only certain positions may be available and achievable for some. This could further create stratifications between the migrants – those entering fields possessing high amounts of cultural capital gain an advantageous start in pursuit of the desired, valued and ‘better’ field positions. Deducing from the aforementioned, it makes sense to emphasise that cultural capital certainly would affect perceptions, interpretations and practices towards citizenship, as well the migrants’ field negotiations, struggles and competition – placing certain migrants in advantageous positions. More so, cultural capital also determines the kind of fields, practices and positions available to the migrants in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm in its entirety.

Migration also has a socio-cultural impact on the host (receiving) nation which may lead to cultural plurality, as migrants enter the host nation in possession of their own habitus. As Fouron & Glick-Schiller (2001:60) contend, migrants exist in the transnational social space,
maintaining kinship bonds whilst also exchanging resources, capital, information, skills and cultures, between more than one nation-state. This points to the essential inclusion of the dimension of cultural exchanges which migrating induces and results in. This also implies that the host nation’s culture as a nation may be affected, as well as the diverse cultures of the social groups within the nation. This may generate negative reception from the national citizens of the host nation. Schrova (2004), for instance, postulates that the fearing, or the “fear of migrants rests upon the fear of change and especially changes to culture”. Referring to the fluid and ever-flexible nature of culture and ever-debated definition of culture, he also says that “cultures change continuously over time. The cultures as we know them today are the result of centuries of migration” (Schrova, 2004).

McDonald (2000:814), as well as Kalitanyi and Visser (2010:376) also emphasise that migrants do not solely contribute to the SA’s economy, they are also at the core of some of the cultural and resource exchange, at least at a community level. This further reemphasises Appadurai’s (1996:6) argument, that stagnation towards change in the contemporary global world is more detrimental for the host nation, than it is good. The culture and habitus of all actors will be affected by migration and the presence of foreign nationals in any host nation. Therefore, although there may be fear of migrants, stagnation and refusal to adapt to the changes migrants bring with them could result in negative results. As this implies that the host nation will not benefit from the skills and knowledge migrants bring with them.

Cultural capital is paramount for position-taking, and initially, actors acquire it through their habitus. However, to accumulate more of it, actors require access to spaces such as education institutes and resources such as books. This implies furthering their knowledge and skills. Although Potchefstroom may have institutions for education and therefore making acquiring cultural capital in this way a probability, the amounts possessed of other capitals such as social and economic brings to question the probability of acquiring increased cultural capital. In other words, access to education, books and such resources does costs money. Possessing the ‘right’ amount of social capital may provide other means towards acquiring economic and cultural capital. However, social capital is determined, for example, by family ties, connections, networks and habitus. All these capitals come to form what is referred to as symbolic capital.
4.6.4. Symbolic capital of migrants in the field(s)

Symbolic capital is a conglomeration of the other three capitals and refers to the way in which an actor is perceived and acknowledged by other actors in the field. This is precisely an actor’s status, “honour and recognition” (Walther, 2014:11). It is automatically ‘active’ when an actor enters a field, and it essentially renders to the individual either a degree, or lack of power, with which they struggle and challenge for positions and more capital within the various fields they enter (Bourdieu, 1990b:119; Walther, 2014:10). Buchholz (2016:7) asserts that this status or “prestige” that symbolic capital affords spawn from the possessions of the other forms of capital, such as economic (being wealthy), social (having strong network ties and relations), and cultural capital (possessing scholarly qualifications). These capitals all transform into symbolic capital. What this suggests is that Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom could have varying amounts of symbolic capital as a result of the economic, social and cultural capital that they have in Zimbabwe and are able to mobilise whilst in Potchefstroom, as well as that which they have in South Africa and are able to mobilise whilst in Potchefstroom. Bourdieu (1990b:119) emphasises that particularly economic capital as strongly connected with symbolic capital. In his own words, Bourdieu (1990b:119) states that:

“economic and symbolic capital are so inextricably intertwined that the display of material and symbolic strength represented by prestigious affines is in itself likely to bring in material profits, in good-faith economy in which good repute constitute the best, if not the only, economic guarantee”.

Therefore, this implies that Zimbabwean migrants with high amounts of symbolic capital have a much higher possibility to realise their economic ambitions than those with less symbolic capital. It is essentially symbolic capital that affords actors power – that is, symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1990a:137). Thus, this implicitly creates a class stratification of some sort among members of the same migrant population.

In conclusion, thus, it can be asserted that the symbolic capital Zimbabwean migrants possess, as Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom, is that of a migrant, and thus, it does not afford them with national citizenship rights and access to resources in that regard. However, within the same migrant group, varying actors with varying degrees of symbolic capital, are able to mobilise and access varying degrees of other capital, whilst acquiring varying positions available for migrants in Potchefstroom. The mobilisation of capital,
through the transnational lens, goes beyond the borders. Thus, the symbolic capital they possess in Zimbabwe as citizens not living in Zimbabwe, as well as that which they possess in Potchefstroom/SA as migrants from Zimbabwe, should be taken into consideration. This is because it is not solely within the boundaries of one particular national realm that migrants aspire to access and accumulate capital, it is in both nations, precisely the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. While some may be able to acquire truly beneficial positions and amounts of capital in the transnational social realm, it can be argued that it is highly likely that some may not be able to engage, navigate and acquire any positions in this realm. Thus, they are painstakingly limited to act in the fields available in Potchefstroom or Zimbabwe, for the limited capital distributed. Symbolic capital, and thus symbolic power, allows or denies them entry to higher positions in the fields available in the transnational social realm, and thus access (or lack thereof) to more capital in the field. This could affect the migrants’ perceptions, interpretations and practices towards their citizenship, particularly their presence and ‘activeness’ (or not) as transnational citizens.

This therefore brings to the forth the question regarding the dynamics of the vertical and horizontal distribution of capital in the field. Although inviting diverse contestation, it can be argued that chronologically actors, upon entering their social life-world at birth, first acquire (incorporated) cultural capital through their habitus which is from their family group. Then their economic capital follows this, as this relates to the amount of money the family, they are born into has. These together give rise to the social networks that the actor will be exposed to due to their cultural and economic capital. These all come to determine how, starting at the stage of infancy, actors are perceived in the field (in this case, the life-world). This is their symbolic capital. The following section delves into, and further elaborates on this discussion.

4.7. The vertical and horizontal distribution of capital in the field(s)

The following section further builds on the dynamics of capital, particularly its distribution in the field. What is of particular focus in this section is the way in which capital is both vertically and horizontally distributed amongst field actors. This also involves the way in which these distributions constitute the arena for the dynamics of transnational citizenship.
Figure 4.3 below illustrates the vertical relationship between the Zimbabwean state and its fields, with the Zimbabwean citizens, as well as its parallelism to the vertical relationship between the SA (Potchefstroom) state and its fields, with the Zimbabwean migrants. Thus, it is a relationship between home nation-and-citizen, as well as host nation-and-migrant.

![Diagram of vertical and horizontal relationships between Zimbabwe and South Africa](image)

**Figure 4.3: Transnational vertical and horizontal relationships**

Furthermore, figure 4.3 also illustrates the horizontal relationship between Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom with other Zimbabweans and foreign nationals located in Zimbabwe, as well as the relationship between Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom with the local South African citizens, other foreign nationals living in Potchefstroom. It is these relationships that make possible the modes of capital distribution in the field; providing both a vertical and horizontal channel in both fields. Therefore, this figure graphically illustrates not only vertical and horizontal relationship, but also the way in which capital can be distributed both in the Potchefstroom and Zimbabwe realms. What is not illustrated and explained by this figure is the manner in which capital is distributed among the actors in the fields – that is, how the vertical and horizontal distribution operate. As expressed in section 4.3.1, the vertical relationship is not solely between state and citizen, but also society and actors.
Figure 4.4 below intends to illustrate this distribution, and thus will be utilised in explaining the distribution.

![Diagram of cultural and economic capital distribution](image)

*Figure 4.4: Distribution of capital in the field*

Figure 4.4 highlights a field in which actors (A - D) have occupied positions (1 - 4) according to their cultural and economic capital. Cultural capital is initially obtained through the primary social group. It is incorporated into the actors through the habitus (see section 4.6.3). Economic capital determines the extent to which actors can access goods, services and other capitals (see section 4.6.1). Therefore, depending on their primary habitus, actors either possess high or low volumes of cultural and economic capital, and this goes towards establishing their initial position in a field. Field positions are ranked hierarchical, with the area indicated by 1 in figure 4.4 being the highest, the areas indicated by 2 and 3 as the middle positions, and the area indicated by 4 as the lowest rank.

Therefore, if further comprehend figure 4.4 it is translated into the Zimbabwe realm, it can be said that actor A has a high amount of cultural and economic capital, and thus occupies the high-ranked field position. B has a high amount of economic capital and low cultural capital, whereas C has a low amount of economic capital and high cultural capital. Therefore, both of these actors are in somewhat equal positions, but are however still below actors A. It is actor D who occupies the lowest ranked position, as they have a low amount of cultural as well as economic capital. There may be other actors in this position possessing a bit more cultural and/or economic capital than D. Though these slight
differences can be beneficial in relative situations, the actors competing in area 4 with D are the lowest ranked challengers in the ranking of the field, as area 4 has the lowest occupiable field positions. Thus, it can be said that A has more power than B and C, who have potentially the same power although from differing sources, and they both have more power than D. Therefore, the strongest challenger for A is B and C, who face more challenge from each other as well as D, who poses the least challenge for A.

Actors in each of the hierarchical rankings are more likely to interact and network with other actors they encounter in that same position. So, actor D is more likely to network and compete with actor D₁ for capital and positions, than they are to challenge actor A. Through their networking and competition for economic capital, for instance, D and D₁ may either challenge each other or collectively mobilise the available resource in order to connect, network and even challenge B, eventually gaining access to field position 2. In this field position, D becomes B and can pose stronger challenge for the high-ranked position 1 occupied by A. Thus, a position an actor finds themselves in is not stagnant and can constantly be improved through practice.

These distributions of capital and occupation of positions has a significance when migrating, entering and staying in the Potchefstroom/SA realm and its fields. Firstly, Zimbabweans enter these as foreign players. The doxa and value of capital is not determined by them, but the actors they encounter. These predominantly consist of local South African citizens, secondary are other foreign nationals living in Potchefstroom. Therefore, their competition in the field is with these two groups as well as their fellow Zimbabwean compatriots. So, actor B, coming from positions in area 2 in the Zimbabwe realm may either find themselves occupying, for instance, positions in area 4 in Potchefstroom, depending on the value of the capital they possess. However, they may also still retain their position, and perhaps even gaining access to better areas and position than other actors including South Africans, who by virtue of being citizens of SA, are expected to be more advantaged. This is quite likely for actor A occupying positions in area 1 in Zimbabwe, and still having stronger symbolic capital than South Africans occupying positions in area 2, 3 and 4 in Potchefstroom. This would allow A to compete for the highest available field position in a foreign (host) nation, even if upon their migrating they enter areas 2 or 3. Therefore, Zimbabwean actor A in Potchefstroom may have stronger symbolic capital than South African actor D, and thus higher prestige and status.

Other Zimbabwean migrants, such as D who occupies positions in area 4 in Zimbabwe, are likely to find themselves even lower down the hierarchal order of the low positions in
area 4 in Potchefstroom. Here, they will encounter an array of disadvantaged challengers all seeking stability in the field. All of these actors will have low economic and cultural capital, thus predominantly constituting of unskilled, blue-collar labourers, with limited access to other resources. However, even in this area, there may be Zimbabweans with more skills, knowledge and connections than South Africans and other migrants. Therefore, playing the field from this position, especially for a migrant player, who occupies a similar position in their home nation may prove to be quite a challenge with hostile obstacles.

Therefore, the positions Zimbabwean migrants are able to occupy in Potchefstroom are related to the positions they occupy in Zimbabwe, as well as what they generate in Potchefstroom. The positions represent the access and power actors have. That is, their ‘ability’ to accumulate more capital and positions through their practices in the field. As migrants are constantly bonded to their home nations through transnational practices and networks, they never truly leave the fields of Zimbabwe, they merely expand their playing field to include the terrain of Potchefstroom. Thus, implying their playing in the economic field in Potchefstroom, for example, they have expanded their playing field by not limiting it only to Zimbabwe. Therefore, acknowledging the distribution of capital and positions that Zimbabwean migrants are constantly and simultaneously experiencing in Zimbabwe and Potchefstroom gives a gaze into the dynamics they encounter as transnational citizens. As citizens of Zimbabwe, they compete for positions against other Zimbabweans and migrants located in Zimbabwe. Therefore, in Zimbabwe, they have citizenship privileges which essentially provides them advantages over migrants. As migrants in Potchefstroom, they compete against other Zimbabwean and non-Zimbabwean migrants, and most importantly, South African citizens who have citizenship privileges to their advantages. This discussion is continued in the section that follows.

4.8. A theoretical framework for studying the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom

Up until this point, this chapter has succeeded in providing a discussion towards the applicability of the theory of practice as the core theoretical anchor for this study. Through the agency-structure dichotomy, the vertical and horizontal relationships between state/society-and-citizen, and citizens-and-citizen/migrant are highlighted and elaborated.
Following this, the core aspects of the theory of practice were discussed, these included the formation of habitus, the field as an arena of power, as well as capital as the currency of the field. The previous section (4.7) elaborately discussed the vertical and horizontal distribution of capital, and how positions are taken in the field. Therefore, the intention of the section that follows is to conclude how the vertical and horizontal relationships are characterised by a dynamic interplay of habitus, capital and practice. In other words, how the theory of practice can be utilised as a framework for studying the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. Firstly, therefore, a synopsis of the theory of practice as an anchor is provided.

The theory of practice essentially refers to actors’ activities and practices within structured fields. Bourdieu utilises an approach referred to as relational analysis in understanding the dynamic and complex nature of the relationship between structure and agency, and the “three central concepts” – positions, position-taking (practices), and dispositions (habitus) – that orient this relationship (Calhoun et al., 2007:261). Since a field is an arena of power, actors occupy positions in a field relative to each other (Bourdieu, 1990b:16; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:94-96), and these include, for example, occupation (section 4.7 and figure 4.4 above elaborate on field positions). Calhoun et al. (2007:261) highlight that it is through their occupied field positions that actors may claim or are ascribed social status and identity – that is, their symbolic capital. Thus, implying that it is through their field positions that individuals may (re)define and understand themselves.

Actors maintain their social position, and signal it to other actors in the field, through a process Bourdieu refers to as “prises de positions” (position-taking) (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:99; Calhoun et al. 2007:261). Position-taking can also be referred to as ‘practices’ or ‘actions’. These refer to, as Calhoun et al. (2007:261) state, the specific “choices actors make that signal their position to one another in symbolic terms”. This includes their modus operandi – that is the kind of practices they are able to engage in and the way in which they engage in these practices towards the acquisition of increased capital, developed habitus and the occupation of dominant field positions. These choices go beyond just practices and can also include the tastes in food, art and literature related to one’s social position, as well as their style of dress, their choice in leisure activities, and so forth – inspired by their incorporated (habitus) and objectivised cultural capital. Essentially, what can be said thus far is that each field makes available to actors, acquirable volumes of capital, as well as an array of diverse positions which they can compete or negotiate for.
Accumulating capital and occupying any position in the field is associated with a set of practices or actions (position-taking). Position-taking is guided and influenced by the habitus, as the habitus provides actors their initial volume of cultural and economic capital (see section 4.4). The habitus therefore provides a flexible guideline rather than strict rules dictating practices. Thus, for the practicing actor, it allows for the reflexive improvisation and application into new social settings – that is, fields (Bourdieu, 1984:173-174; 1990a:11; Calhoun et al., 2007:262). Therefore, the relational analysis of a field would require acknowledgment of the available positions in that field; the actors’ habitus (primary and secondary); their ascribed and acquired capital; as well as the set of practices which their habitus provides and affords for them.

Therefore, if the equation [(habitus) (capital) + field = practice] is considered once again, it can be proclaimed that in the field, practice is inspired by the dynamic interplay of habitus and capital. Practice is also shaped and influenced by the vertical and horizontal relationships which connect the players of the field. It is an investigation into the practices that actors engage in as they vertically and horizontally negotiate and challenge for capital, positions and thus power in the fields available in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe transnational realm that this research study intends pursue. To do this, figure 4.4 below is utilised.

Figure 4.3, similarly to figure 4.1, graphically illustrates the vertical relationships actors have with the nation-state, as well as the horizontal relationship they have with other actors. More precisely, figure 4.3 shows the vertical relationships Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom have with Zimbabwe, as well as with Potchefstroom/SA simultaneously. Furthermore, this figure shows the horizontal relationships between Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom and their compatriots in Zimbabwe and in Potchefstroom. What is also illustrated is the horizontal connection Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom also have with South African local citizens and other migrants in Potchefstroom. These are simultaneously existing horizontal relationships.

In both Zimbabwe and Potchefstroom, Zimbabweans have field positions which they occupy in relation to other actors in the fields. These positions are initially determined by their habitus and symbolic capital, but can be improved by through the position-taking/practices actors engage in. The practice and position-taking by actors occurs within a given time and a given space, thus it cannot be understood independently of the space (place/environment), as well as the actual time (tempo) it occurs (Bourdieu, 1990b:81; Jenkins,1992:69). This is due to both time and space being social constructs which can be
(re)shaped and (re)moulded in various ways, as influenced by the actors within a given context. Therefore, all social phenomena, including the social practices and position-taking of actors can only be understood within a specific time and a specific space. That is to say, the transnational practices and activities of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom can only be understood in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe (transnational) realm. Their constitution of capital, doxa and acquirable positions is only context-relative, it can only be understood within the particular fields of relevance.

Therefore, the transnational social realm mentioned in this research study would not be possible without the presence and practices of the Zimbabwean migrants, as well as other actors who ‘create’ this realm. In other words, this realm, its fields, capital, positions, and even its main players only come to life when there are Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom attempting to negotiate and challenge for field positions in Potchefstroom, whilst having and maintaining transnational bonds and relationships with/in Zimbabwe. These Zimbabwean migrants also establish a connection between the two grand fields (Potchefstroom/SA and Zimbabwe), whilst simultaneously connecting the social actors active in both these nations (see figure 4.3). Therefore, an analysis of the simultaneously co-existing vertical relationships would have to be acknowledged. That involves the influence understanding the unique habitus of Zimbabwean actors and the position it affords them in a particular realm (Potchefstroom or Zimbabwe, with other actors present), and a particular time. Not only will their habitus just afford them a position in Potchefstroom and Zimbabwe, but it will afford them a position in relation to other actors in both the realms. This positional relation is determined by the habitus of actors, in relation to that of competitors in the field.

Beyond just acting within time and spaces, actors also act according to the practical logic of the field, defined as doxa (Bourdieu, 1990:26; Jenkins, 1992:70). The doxa, or the doxic experience, which is also the intrinsic ‘feel of the game’, involves the practical mastery of the logic, the official and unofficial/formal and informal ‘rules’ of the field, may be learned particularly through experience in the field (Bourdieu, 1990a:61; 1990b:26 1994:276; Jenkins, 1992:70). In other words, it is taken for granted that ‘newer’ actors, such as Zimbabwean migrants, in a given field, such as Potchefstroom, are less likely to have knowledge and understanding of all the doxa in that field. This, they learn as they navigate the field, struggling and competing for positions and capital. Their social capital becomes an essential possession in this regard, as social bonds and connections with other actors and fellow Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom allows them to quickly embody the official and
unofficial/informal doxa and gain a ‘feel for the game’. They are likely to have a stronger ‘feel of the game’ in Zimbabwe than they do in Potchefstroom, thus allowing for probable stronger practice in the Zimbabwean fields. It is therefore virtually impossible for an actor to ‘play’ in any field prior to learning, and eventually internalising the doxa.

The doxa become internalised to such an extent that, as stated by Bourdieu (1990a:61; 1990b:66-68), they operate outside conscious control of the actor – in a similar manner as the various parts of the human anatomy do. The internalised structures and dispositions (habitus), as well as the doxa, provide for the actor what Bourdieu refers to as the doxic experience – “the illusion of immediate understanding” that actors get as they enter a new field. In this regard, Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, for example, understand that there are parameters between what they can and cannot do, and understand that there are doxa to absorb, positions to take, capital to be earned and other actors to compete against in Zimbabwe and in Potchefstroom.

In this regard, Jenkins (1992:71) affirms that the doxic experience refers to the actors’ “subjective expectations of objective probability”. What this implies is that actors may enter a field expecting to gain benefits from their occupation of positions and acquisition of capital in that given field. However, rather than realising their subjective expectations, they realise what actually is available for them to compete for and acquire in the given field. That is, what their habitus, their social identity (the field position they initially occupy upon entering a field), as well as their capital actually affords and makes available for them to gain. For instance, how much capital is acquirable? What field positions are attainable? The experience and ‘skills’ of the field other actors possess? These could therefore be said to form some of the core questions which actors are confronted by and may have to answer for themselves when playing/practicing in a particular field. Thus, embodying the doxa is paramount to efficient field participation.

This then shows the power play actors are involved in as they act in a given field. Learning the rules of the field is the key to participation, and social capital allows for learning even the essential unwritten/unofficial rules. As migrants in the host nation, Zimbabweans may have less advantageous positions than they do in Zimbabwe. This influences the diverse practices they are able to engage in whilst playing in two fields simultaneously, and possibly occupying different positions in each field. The field becomes an arena of action, and that of power, in which the more powerful actors obtain and maintain higher positions, and thus subordinate or dominate the less powerful actors in their field competition. This implies that although Zimbabweans may be strong field players and challengers in their
home nation, the dynamics of their vertical and horizontal relationships in Potchefstroom afford them a migrant status to the Potchefstroom/SA nation, and a ‘foreigner’ status to the citizens of SA.

The activity of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom therefore give rise to the opportunity to investigate the transnational practices of this population, especially the way in which they affect the interpretations, perceptions and actions of the migrant actors towards their citizenship. That is, the way in which they understand themselves as citizens who are migrants to a foreign nation. Their interpretations and perceptions would therefore induce their practices whilst in Potchefstroom/SA (the foreign host nation). These practices will keep them connected and bonded with Zimbabwe, as well as with Zimbabweans.

In conclusion, therefore, it should be emphasised that a theoretical framework for studying and investigating the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom should focus specifically on the activities and practices of Zimbabweans in the Potchefstroom realm and the fields in which they enter in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. This entails studying their vertical and horizontal relationships with and within both Potchefstroom and Zimbabwe, as well as the extent to which they make provision for means to remain connected to Zimbabwe through transnational activity. Therefore, the theory of practice, as conceptualised in this chapter, is presented as the theoretical framework for investigating the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. In light of this, the chapter that follows will then provide a discussion on the relevant and applicable methodology for pursuing a study of this nature, as well as a discussion of the manner in which the empirical data is analysed.
Chapter 5: Research methodology

5.1. Introduction

The previous chapters have collectively provided an in-depth synopsis of the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. What these chapters have particularly discussed is what exactly ‘the dynamics of transnational citizenship’ imply, as well as the applicable theoretical framework for effectively analysing these dynamics. Yin (2003:27) contends that developing a theoretical framework prior delving into any data collection process is one of the key distinguishing factors between case study and ethnography research. He further states that, for case study research, “theory development as part of the design [phase] is essential, whether the ensuing case study’s purpose is to develop or to test theory”. Thus far, this has been conducted since the onset of this research study, particularly in chapter 3.

This chapter therefore intends to provide an elaborate discussion on the methodological approach that was employed for the empirical investigation. To do this, firstly, a focused discussion on the dynamics of researching transmigration and transnational citizenship is presented. This is followed by a description of the location and area in which the empirical research of this particular study was executed, this being Potchefstroom. Then the selected research design is discussed, providing justification for its relevance and usefulness for this research study. Once settling on the research design, the population of focus, as well as the sampling approach is discussed. What is particularly provided here is the sum of participants deemed to be sufficient for the acquisition of the necessary empirical data. The empirical data collection process, the general research ethical considerations, the data analysis process, as well as the challenges encountered during the field research are respectively discussed in the latter stages of this chapter. This is therefore the conclusive stage of this chapter.

In essence therefore, the chapter attempts to substantiate and justify the selected methodology and empirical procedure for this research study. This is done by particular answering research question 1.3.4: “what is an applicable research methodology to use for a study of the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom?” (see chapter 1, section 1.3). However, as indicated above, this chapter will commence with a discussion on the dynamics of researching transmigration and transnational citizenship. The following section will therefore initiate this discussion.
5.2. Researching transmigration and transnational citizenship

Research on transmigration, and particularly transnational citizenship is still at its infant stages, only commencing around the mid-1990s into the 21st century (see Glick-Schiller et al., 1995; Levitt, 2001; Vertovec, 2009). Transnationalism, and thus, transnational citizenship generally causes analytical issues if applied, as it is difficult to “distinguish [it] from other civic and political relationships” and it blurs the concept and meaning of citizenship (Fox, 2005:172; Stokes, 2005:119). Transnational citizenship further complicates empirical analysis, as it emphasises that transnational citizens’ “rights and principals of political and social equality”, as well as their loyalties extend into the transnational social space (Fox, 2005:172; Mouw et al., 2014:334; Sonn et al., 2017:43; Straiton et al., 2017:1), beyond the blurred national borders and involving two nations at the same time (Hanyane, 2015:47).

Thus, it can be said that for this study, the transnational social realm cannot be perceived as a non-physical or borderless national realm. This dynamic makes analysing citizenship somewhat obscure, as actors cannot be placed in any actual or physical fields in which to partake in as citizens. Therefore, as discussed in the first chapter, the transnational social realm is a semi-physical national realm, with citizens maintaining their activity and practices in the home nation, whilst away, physically and maintaining activity and practice located in the host nation as well. It is through the host nation that the dynamics occurring in the transnational social realm should be investigated.

One of the challenges that should be highlighted is that when studying transnational citizenship many migrants who do not participate in transnational activities are excluded from the study (see Portes et al., 2002; Landolt, 2001; Smith, 2003). This creates two distinct classes of the same migrant population, and those are able to, or choose to “establish, develop and promote economic, political and/or sociocultural networks with other countries” (Ozkul, 2012:4), and those who cannot or choose not. In other words, and in the case of this study, those who are able to maintain connection with Zimbabwe through transnational activities, and those who cannot or choose not to. This dynamic emphasises a divisive factor that may divide the migrant population being investigated into two groups.
Generally, contemporary migration research tends to adopt a qualitative design. Anitha and Pearson (2013) for instance highlight that contemporary approaches to migration, such as transmigration, tend to have a micro-level focus in their methodology. These approaches tend to be an “in-depth studies of particular communities, migrants and their stories - how migrants interact with their environments, how they confront restrictive state policies and, on the differences and similarities between migrants and non-migrants from similar contexts” (Anitha & Pearson, 2013). What these authors highlight here is particularly the endeavour of this study – to gain in-depth knowledge of migrants’ stories, as well as their experiences as they interact with the Potchefstroom environment.

Other scholars who have embarked in research on transnational citizenship also tend to follow qualitative case studies and ethnographic research methods (see Basch et al., 1994; Glick-Schiller, 2003; Glick-Schiller et al., 1995; King & Lulle, 2016; Levitt, 2001). For instance, King and Lulle (2016:63), in their book titled *Research on Migration*, states that a qualitative research design “gives deeper insights into several critical issues concerning the working experience of immigrants in Europe”. Thus, considering this, a qualitative design is regarded as more efficient. A quantitative design could have been utilised had the focus of the study been to measure, for instance, the extent to which Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom have a transnational citizenship. However, this study focusses on the dynamics of transnational citizenship, and thus, an in-depth investigation would be the best approach to analyse and interpret it. The following section, therefore, describes and elaborates on the Potchefstroom realm – the location and area in which the investigation takes places. This section is followed by a discussion of the research design.

### 5.3. Potchefstroom: the location and study area

The city of Potchefstroom, located in the newly established Ventersdorp/Tlokwe local municipality which is known as the JB Marks Local Municipality (Municipalities of South Africa, 2018; O'Donovan, 2016), is the location of focus in this study. This municipality is located in the southern region of North West province, within the Dr Kenneth Kaunda District Municipality which includes Matlosana Local Municipality, as well as Maquassi Hill Local Municipality (Municipalities of South Africa, 2018; NWDESD, 2018). Potchefstroom is therefore located near the mining regions of Matlosana/Klerksdorp; Rustenburg and Brits in the Bojanala Platinum District; as well as Carltonville in the Merafong municipality (*en-route* to Johannesburg). On the macro SA scale, the North West province shares a
border with the Northern Cape, Gauteng, and Limpopo province, as well as Botswana. This situates the province as one of the major corridors for the entry of migrants into SA. Figure 5.1 below is a sketch map of SA which maps the location of the North West province, as well as the nation-states bordering SA. This include Zimbabwe although it does not border the North West province.

![Sketch map of SA](source: own illustration)

Prior to the establishment of the JB Marks Municipality, Ventersdorp local municipality and Tlokwe city council were separate entities. Tlokwe had been divided into and consists of Ikageng, Potchefstroom (from hereon, the central town and the Bult area), Promosa, Mohadin, and this whole former municipality is referred to as the city of Potchefstroom (Alexander, 2017). Therefore, throughout this research study, ‘Potchefstroom’ will refer to the entire Tlokwe, excluding the former Ventersdorp local municipality. Figure 5.2 maps JB Marks Municipality within the Dr Kenneth Kaunda District Municipality in the North West province.
Potchefstroom (see figure 5.1 and 5.2), also referred to as the City of Expertise, is one of the biggest cities in the province, and is known to be an academic city with several education institutions and the main campus of the North West University (Motlogelwa, 2017). Drawing from the 2011 national census of SA, Brinkhoff (2016) reports that the population of the city is estimated to be 148 799 residents. The racial divide of this population is as follows: 70% are Black African; 20% are White; 7% are Coloured, approximately 1% are Asian; with the rest making up the total sum. There are no publications that report the sum of Zimbabwean migrants living in Potchefstroom. The categorisation and population divide of Potchefstroom is illustrated in figure 5.3 below.
Alexander (2017) reports that 80% of the economic activity in the province occurs between Potchefstroom, Klerksdorp and Rustenburg, that is, the southern and eastern regions of the province. Unlike mining towns such as Rustenburg and Brits in the eastern region and Klerksdorp, Potchefstroom has a thriving manufacturing and agricultural industry, with steel, chemical processes, and poultry being among the core industries, and an approximate 600 businesses and enterprises such as King Korn, Kynoch, Naschem and the Soya Protein Process (SPP) company (Municipalities of South Africa, 2018). These are amongst the brazen pull factors that may make Potchefstroom seem a lucrative host region for African migrants entering SA through this corridor.

The ‘vision and mission’ of JB Marks Municipality (2018), as described on the official municipal website, is to be “a transformed and integrated African world class city”, as well as “to provide affordable and sustainable services to [the] community through affordable and responsive administration”. Thus it may be interesting to investigate and understand the dynamics of transnational citizenship among an African (Zimbabwean) migrant population living in Potchefstroom, which is in this region, as the municipality is a self-proclaimed “integrated African world class city”. For instance, the dynamics of transnational citizenship includes the practices that, in this case study, Zimbabwean migrants living in Potchefstroom partake in as actors in the Potchefstroom realm. Their
integration into the Potchefstroom realm has an influence on their field positions and practices. Thus, a case study into particularly Potchefstroom provides a region for empirically investigating the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants. The following section discusses the research methodology employed for the empirical phase of this study.

5.4. Research design and methodology

For undertaking this investigation, the instrumental exploratory single case study research approach is deemed suitable, and thus, utilised. As stated by Rule and John (2011:3), a case can be referred to as a “circumstance or problem that requires investigation”, and Yin (2009:19) points to a case being a “contemporary phenomenon” occurring “within its real-life context”. The nature of this “contemporary phenomenon” being a “particular instance” (or occurrence) which is “singular and distinct”, according to Rule and John (2011:3), is what makes it a unique case to investigate. In this research study, focus is thus afforded to an “in-depth” investigation of the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabweans who have migrated (the contemporary phenomenon) into Potchefstroom, and thus, into the transnational social realm (the “real-life context”), as the “boundaries between [this] phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2009:18). This suggests that it is useful in bringing clarity and understanding to unique ‘occurrences’, within their specific context.

The nature of the case study is, firstly, more instrumental than it is intrinsic, in that it goes beyond simply just being an interesting case to investigate. An instrumental case, therefore, refers to a case that is selected for the investigation of a broader problem (Rule & John, 2011:8). Secondly, the case study is exploratory, in that it aims to investigate a particular phenomenon that is yet to be investigated, and this could also therefore serve as a basis and departure point for further studies of this phenomenon (Rule & John, 2011:8; Yin, 2009:8). Thirdly, the case study focuses on a single, rather than multiple cases. This suggests that focus is solely on the aforementioned case, as well as the dynamics of transnational citizenship amongst this particular group. If the endeavour was towards a multiple case study, then this would present an opportunity to compare separate cases such as, for example, Zimbabwean migrants based in other cities, towns, and provinces in SA, or perhaps even the inclusion of the case of local SA citizens and government...
officials. However, such endeavours lie outside the scope of this research, and thus the appropriate approach towards the posed question/s, is a single case study.

It could further be argued that the case in this research study is, in its own right, an interesting case to investigate. It presents an opportunity to learn how Zimbabwean migrants perceive, interpret, and practice their citizenship, as they negotiate and challenge for positions and capital in the available fields in the Potchefstroom realm, as it is through this realm that they can gain access into the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. It is from this mentioned opportunity that data regarding the dynamics of transnational citizenship are obtained. More than simply being interesting, the case study investigates the broader problem of Zimbabwean migrants who have established themselves in Potchefstroom/SA, and how they have developed a transnational citizenship. This is an area of study, as emphasised in previous sections (see section 5.2 above), that has not previously been investigated, and thus such a research study makes provision for a foundation towards further investigations in this regard.

Furthermore, this case study follows a qualitative research design, which is anchored in a phenomenological framework, as the research project essentially aims to get a qualitative understanding of the phenomenon of transnational citizenship and Zimbabwean migration in Potchefstroom. Phenomenology deals with the way humans experience ‘things’ (Smith, 2013), and emphasises that reality can only be understood from the subjective experience of those actors who live that reality (Bhattacherjee, 2012:109; Lauer, 1958:7). This suggests that to arrive at the essence of transnational citizenship, its dynamics, and how they play out among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, it would be of vital importance to investigate this through the subjective conscious experience of Zimbabwean migrants themselves. This enhances the opportunity to investigate and learn, directly from the ‘experiencers’ of this reality, what can be argued to constitute the dynamics of transnational citizenship.

Qualitative research, unlike experiment or survey research refrains from focusing on explaining and describing phenomena and does not “require control of behavioural events” (Yin, 2009:8). This research design, according to Babbie and Mouton (2004:279), as well as Creswell (2003:18), focuses on investigating, exploring, and understanding human behaviour, through an in-depth and detailed engagement with research participants. Monette et al. (2005:5) state that there is a necessity to investigate and describe ‘real life’,
producing rich and dense quality data, as this offers subjective and particularly in-depth knowledge of the experiences of humans in their societies.

Other scholars (Patton, 2002:55; Ragin, 1994:92) assert that regardless of the flexibility of the features of qualitative research designs, they can only contain a small sample size. This could be perceived as a limit and disadvantage of this research design, for a qualitative sample cannot be generalised. However, this disadvantage does not completely derail the study, as the purpose of this study is to gain, through an investigation, knowledge and an understanding of the dynamics of transnational citizenship focusing on a particular case, thus the intention is not to generalise the empirical findings. Therefore, a qualitative case study research design allows for the in-depth focus on the aforementioned case, and since this is an investigation into this particular population, as expressed, an instrumental exploratory single case study shaped by a qualitative design is the most suitable for this research project.

This investigation, therefore, was conducted by means of semi-formal in-depth interviews of relevant individuals who were selected through use of the snowball sample method, as well as focus groups. This is explained in the following section.

5.5. Population of focus and the sampling approach

The relevant population from which the most valuable and crucial empirical data is obtained are, as suggested by the title, the Zimbabwean migrants living in Potchefstroom. It is this particular group that, upon migrating to Potchefstroom/SA, have created the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe transnational realm, which involves their connections and practices with, and against, South African local citizens in Potchefstroom; other foreign nationals in Potchefstroom; other Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom/SA, as well as those in Zimbabwe. This investigation, therefore, focuses primarily on the dynamics of transnational citizenship among this population. It should also be noted that only documented migrants due to analytical and ethical issue were included. Illegal/undocumented migrants were not included.
### 5.5.1 Sample size and sampling approach

Surbhi (2016) asserts that for investigative or exploratory research, non-probability sampling is ideal, because for qualitative research “no probability [is] attached to the unit of the population and [in this case] the selection relies on the subjective judgment of the researcher”. Therefore, unlike probability sampling, the empirical data obtained through non-probability sampling cannot be generalised or argued to be a representation of the whole of the population, as it implicitly represents the researcher's purposive selection of participants, and as a result, not all the “individuals of the universe are given an equal opportunity of becoming part of the sample” (Surbhi (2016). Therefore, the snowball, as well as purposive (or judgement) sampling are employed as sampling techniques.

These techniques are employed in conjunction with each other throughout the empirical data collection phase. The initial step was ‘purposefully’ making a connection with a member of the Zimbabwean migrant group (a 'lead' participant) through word-of-mouth and informal conversations with members of the general public in Potchefstroom. Upon making the connection, snowball sampling was utilised as it allows, according to Patton (2002:237) and Yin (2011:89), for participants to suggest prospective participants who may make a quality contribution to the research study. Furthermore, snowball sampling was employed in the selection of social realms and fields in which Zimbabweans are present and active in, in Potchefstroom. These were suggested by the participant whom with the first connection was made and were further suggested by other participants who partook in the study. These social realms and fields include: residential (living) regions; places of employment such as restaurants, salons, hawker stalls and places of study. This lead participant was useful in orientating and ‘painting a picture’ of Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom for the researcher.

Purposeful selection, in conjunction with the snowball approach explained above, is done particularly in light of what Palys (2008:697) refers to as criterion purposive case sampling, and what Crossman (2017) calls homogenous purposive sampling. These two approaches collectively imply that only participants who fit the ‘Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom’ criterion, can be purposefully selected as a homogenous sample, since the participants share a similar “set of characteristics”. Purposive sampling also allows for the use of judgement to purposefully select participants who may possess the most crucial knowledge and information necessary and relevant to the “central phenomenon or the key concept[s] being explored in the study” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011:173; Yin, 2011:88). However, since actors are located in fields, not only were the participants, but also the
selection of social realms and fields in which the most relevant prospective participants may be present and active were purposefully selected. Therefore, it is in this light that the two sampling techniques were utilised in conjunction.

Therefore, snowball sampling in this study was employed in a *purposive* manner, in that even the lead participant was purposefully selected prior to being invited to participate in the interview process. During the interview, the participant positioned himself as an established and connected key member of the Zimbabwean population living in Potchefstroom and had agreed to direct the research to another prospective participant, as well as to some locations whereby other participants could be identified. However, the delays to assist in this regard seemed to halt the progression of the research process. Thus, the most conducive ‘leads’ from which to snowball were the participants from Cynthia’s Hair Salon (Focus group 1), a Zimbabwean-owned hair salon, which was identified and recommended by the co-supervisor of this study.

From here on, snowball sampling was used to identify more participants and social realms with intentions of reaching the proposed sample size of approximately 20 face-to-face interviews. As Mason (2010) asserts, the qualitative sample is intended to provide meaning as opposed to generalisable findings. The key determinant for sample size is saturation (Mason, 2010), as this concept relates to the quality and completeness of the collected data towards addressing the proposed research problem. Matlerud *et al.* (2015:1) suggest that saturation is particularly realised when the collected empirical data has what they refer to as ‘information power’. This simply implies that: the quality of the collected data – determined by, among other factors, the quality of the dialogue between the researcher and participant – carries information that is rich in quality which is adequate and sufficient for analysis and publication, and thus further data collection is not necessary (see Malterud *et al.*, 2015:1, 2-5). Saturation in this study was achieved quite soon, but upon deliberating with the supervisors, it was decided that a few more interviews be included in order to diversify the respondents by including more ‘voices of opinion’. Therefore, the achieved sum of interviews for saturation of the data is indeed the proposed 20 face-to-face interviews. These were deemed sufficient for the purpose of addressing the research problem, as well as the overarching research question.

Furthermore, a number of 4 focus groups interviews, consisting of 2-4 individuals per group were also conducted. It was decided that 4 groups were sufficient, as saturation was obtained after engaging these focus groups. They consisted of: a) 1 family group, b) 1 student group, c) 1 close home friend-owned business group (close friends who upon
arriving in SA, jointly run a business, and lastly, d) 1 hair salon group, owned by Cynthia, Zimbabwean lady who has employed other Zimbabweans and SA locals. The Zimbabweans in the hair salon group met in Potchefstroom through social networking; they did not have a connection with each other, nor did they know each other in Zimbabwe. Thomas et al. (1992:11) highlight that a focus group is a single entity and should thus be treated as one interview, as supposed to a collection of interviews from the individual members.

Yin (2011:141) further states that the group is “focused” in that it is a collective of individuals who share similar, related or common experiences and/or perspectives with regards to the concerns of the research study’s focus. Berg (2001:111) adds that a focus group is usually a semi-guided group discussion of preferably not more than 7 participants in partaking, under the guidance of a facilitator or moderator. The author goes on to say that larger groups of participants are to be divided into smaller focus groups (Berg, 2001:111), since data also cannot be collected from only one focus group, but a diverse number as each focus group stands as a single unit of observation. Rule and John (2011:66) insist that for a case study, a focus group should consist of 6 to 12 participants. Other scholars state that a small focus group consists of 2-4 individual members, with moderate and larger focus groups ranging of 5-12 individual members (Carey & Asbury, 2012:45; Fern, 2001:115, 161; Yin, 2011:140). Large focus groups, although they may provide broader and varying field experiences, are argued to be more challenging to moderate.

Contrary to large groups, smaller focus groups were deemed more relevant for this study. Carey and Asbury (2012:45) assert that a smaller focus group can consist of 3-4 individual participants, whereas Yin (2011:140) proclaims smaller focus groups can even go as low as 2-3 participants. These authors assert that smaller groups can provide the focus of an individual interview, and thus a much deeper conversation, whereby each participant has enough comfort and “face time” (time to talk) during the interview (Carey & Asbury, 2012:45; Yin, 2011:140). The nature of the research topic has a degree of complexity, and thus fully descriptive responses from participants are more useful than short snippets and comments in larger groups. Opting for smaller groups was also feasible in reducing the difficulty of setting up focus groups. Participants have differing schedules and demands, and thus, groups consisting of fewer participants are more feasible, easier to organise, as well as to manage and moderate. Therefore, the achieved sample size was 4 groups.
consisting of 2-4 participants each. Table 5.1 below provides a concise categorical breakdown of the achieved sample.

Table 5.1: Concise breakdown of the achieved sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection segments</th>
<th>Participant category</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Gender of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face (individual) interviews</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formally employed workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal workers/street entrepreneurs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unoccupied (not working/studying)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group interview sessions</td>
<td>Family group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend-owned business group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynthia’s Hair Salon group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total sum of participants: 31 | Total sum of interviews conducted: 24 (4 focus group interviews included) |

As displayed in table 5.1, the achieved sample consists of a total sum of 31 participants, of which 16 are females and 15 are male participants. The total number of achieved interviews is therefore 24, with the 4 focus groups each qualifying as a single interview. The 20 face-to-face interviews is evenly distributed between genders; 10 participants are female and 10 are female. The individual interviews consisted of 8 students, 8 formal/skilled workers 3 informal/unskilled workers, and 1 unoccupied (not working or studying in Potchefstroom/SA) Zimbabwean. In the focus group sessions, a total sum of 13
individuals partook, with 6 of these individuals being females and 7 being males. Out of the 4 groups, 2 groups consisted of 2 participants, the third group consisted of 3 participants, whereas the fourth group consisted of 4 participants.

What is not displayed in table 4.1, but important to bear in mind is that the population sample also consists of participants from the various regions in Potchefstroom – that is, the Bult (university area), the town central area (which includes an area referred to as Potch-Industria), Ikageng, Promosa and Potch-Industria. All the interviewed participants expressed lack of knowledge of any Zimbabweans based in the Mohadin area, and for this reason, no participants from this area were found. The following section, therefore, discusses the empirical data collection procedure that was employed in retrieving, from the sample, the most relevant and integral data.

5.6. Empirical data collection

The data collection initially commenced with a review of scholarly literature with the intention of answering research questions 1.3.1 – what does the applicable literature contribute to the understanding and interpretation of migration? – as well as research question 1.3.2 – what does the applicable literature contribute to the understanding and interpretation of citizenship and transnational citizenship? (see chapter 1). As Fouche and Deport (2005:123) state, the literature aids in grounding the focus of the research study, as well as provides for a clear understanding of the research topic and the broader field. As this process essentially provides researchers with knowledge of previous scholarly work, it also aids in identifying knowledge gaps in the ‘areas of concern’, whilst informing the researcher of key concepts, authors, methodologies, related to, in this case study, migration and the dynamics of transnational citizenship (Bhattacherjee, 2012:20-21; De Wet et al., 1981:80).

Therefore, applicable literature has been consulted in this study. The sources consulted include books, textbooks, scholarly articles (both online and print), news articles (both online and print), and such other literature and documents that have proved to be useful towards addressing and ultimately answering the posed overarching research question for this study – what are the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom? Chapter 2 particularly discusses migration and citizen, whereas, chapter 3 presents the ‘theory of practice’ as the theoretical anchor for this
research study. The reviewed literature thus guided and shaped the development of the interview schedule, as well as influenced the type of information sourced in the field.

The collection of empirical data was essentially conducted in 2 segments, though this does not necessarily imply that the 2 segments were chronologically executed. *Segment 1* was the 20 face-to-face individual, semi-formal, in-depth interviews with the Zimbabwean migrants living in Potchefstroom. Gillham (2000:1) states that a qualitative interview is a ‘conversation’ between two people – the interviewer and the participant. Yin (2011:135) adds to this, saying that this is a conversation in which the researcher can “learn” from the participants instead of studying them. The interviews can be guided by a sequence and framework of questions; however, the participant should be free to sit outside the boundaries of this framework and “colour” the conversation with their own subjective perspective (Yin, 2011:136-137). Cohen *et al.* (2007:349) also highlights that the interview is flexible and useful for learning about the subjective as well as personal experiences of the participants.

Therefore, in this study, face-to-face, semi-formal, in-depth qualitative interviews were conducted with individual members of the Zimbabwean migrant. These individual interviews provided, for the participants, the opportunity to share their subjective perceptions, interpretation, and actions – this, they could perceive as an opportunity to share ‘my story’.

For the researcher, these individual interviews provided the opportunity to investigate, gain knowledge and learn of the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. Furthermore, this provided the opportunity for an in-depth ‘glance’ into the subjective life-worlds and networks of an individual migrant; a level of depth that may be potentially unachievable through the use of, for example, experiments or surveys. Moreover, this was an opportunity to acquire unique and rich empirical data, potentially not obtainable in the focus groups.

*Segment 2* was the small focus groups with Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. Yin (1994:82) contends that a focus group can be seen as a collective of participants interviewed as a collective, and “each focus group would be one of the data collection units”. It can be contended that the focus group is intended to be a democratic public sphere, and a field in its own right, in which all participants are encouraged (not directed) to fully express themselves. Therefore, this calls for the constant managing of this sphere in such a way that not only one or two participants dominate the dialogue (Yin, 2011:142).
Thus, unlike the ‘my story’ feat of the individual interviews, the focus groups provided for the participants the opportunity to share what they can refer to as: ‘our story’. Through the interview segment, as well as snowball, the various social spaces which the participants (Zimbabwean migrants) identify as their life-worlds and fields of activity provided the point of departure for the selection of potential participants for the group discussion. For instance, after learning from the first participant and from the hair salon group, it was found that most Zimbabweans live particularly in the central town area, the Bult area, as well as Ikageng, with a few in Promosa. It was also found that many are either working in or owning shops and (formal/informal) businesses in the town area, particularly in and around Church street, with some working and owning businesses in the Bult area. There are also some Zimbabweans who work and/or own shops and businesses in Ikageng as well as in Promosa. With regards to students, it was found that many attend at the North West University in particular. None of the students interviewed at the NWU had knowledge of other Zimbabwean students in other institutions in Potchefstroom.

In closure, it can therefore be said that the focus groups made provision for the opportunity to acquire more unique and rich empirical data potentially not obtainable in the interview process (segment 1). This is because the focus in the individual interviews was investigating and learning of the (‘my’) story of individual participants, and in this regard the focus group provided for the (‘our’) story of collective participants. The same interview schedule was utilised for all the individual, as well as the focus groups. This elaborated on in the next section.

4.6.1 Data collection instrumentation
To acquire the required information from the selected sample, an interview schedule was developed. Edwards and Holland (2013:54) say that an interview schedule or (topic) guide is “a list of questions or subjects that need to be covered during the interview. These questions and/or subjects (from hereon, items) assist in guiding the direction of the interview. According to Prescott (2011:30), the already-collected data, that is the literature review, provides the main source for the development of key subjects to empirically investigate and thus, the compilation of key items to ask participants in order to investigate and learn more regarding the highlighted themes. The developed interview schedule consisted of 3 main guiding items, these read as follows: 1) ‘please tell me about Zimbabwe and being a Zimbabwean citizen’; 2) how do you experiences living in
Potchefstroom as a Zimbabwean citizen?'; and 3) 'what sort of activities (practices) do you do while in Potchefstroom?'

Upon their development, items were discussed with both supervisors on separate occasions, with necessary amendments, such as the choice of words in some items, were made prior a pilot interview. The first participant that was spoken to provided, not only his vital contribution to the research study, but also the opportunity to assess whether these items would be efficient enough to obtain the necessary information to see this study through. What became quite apparent was that though the items were efficient, to insist on posing all of them to the participants, including the probing, resulted in a lengthy interview, with an influx of repeated information. Therefore, to remedy this slight predicament, the understanding of the ‘grand tour’ nature of the items was necessary. This resulted in item 2 being the item utilised to initiate the dialogue. The other items were also posed as supplementary items to further the dialogue.

The items, as mentioned, are open ‘grand tour’ types in nature. A ‘grand tour’ item is descriptive and ask the participant, as a point of departure, to “talk [the researcher] through a specific concrete example of a situation” (Edwards & Holland, 2013:55). Therefore, item 2, for instance, intended to highlight and investigate the dynamics, and thus the theme: *symbolic capital and position in Potchefstroom*. Through this question, the opportunity to probe into what Zimbabweans do in Potchefstroom, how they establish and maintain networks with other Zimbabwean and non-Zimbabwean actors, what capital and positions are available for them and how they compete and challenge for these in the fields the enter. The item also allows for the probing into the symbolic capital Zimbabwean migrants have in Zimbabwe (linking into item 1), and thus an opportunity to attempt to draw a comparison with the symbolic capital in Potchefstroom. To assist the researcher in enhancing the quality of the interview dialogues, a concise list of ‘areas to probe’ was developed for each of the 3 guiding questions/statements (see Appendix B).

The same interview schedule was utilised for both the individual interviews and the focus groups. This is due to the nature of the interviews being semi-structured. Semi-structured interviews are different from structured and unstructured interviews which, according to Prescott (2011:18), refer to survey research and in-depth ethnographic interview conversations respectively. A semi-structured interview suggests that the same questions were asked to all participants whilst the dialogue itself was informal, open-ended, and allowed for the flexible subjective response from participants (Prescott, 2011:18-19). Wallace (1998:147) says that it combined the characteristics of both structured and
unstructured interviews, and thus infuses “a certain degree of control with a certain amount to develop the interview”. In light of this, the interviews in this research were therefore semi-structured. This was due to the open ‘grand tour’ nature of the guiding items, and the kind of dialogue they induced. The semi-structured nature of the interview schedule yielded no difficulties in relating the posed questions and statement to dialogues with group and individuals.

The interviews all took place at the locations preferred by the participants. They were asked to suggest a meeting place, and most requested to meet either at their homes, their places of work or, in the case of students, at the university premises. Therefore, the informal street entrepreneurs were interviewed at their geographical location of work. Interviews with these participants were easier to obtain, as the participants are usually at the location of work every day except Sundays. All the workers employed full-time requested to meet either after work between 5pm and 7pm, or during weekends, specifically on certain Saturdays, as Sundays is reserved for church. This obviously produced enhanced challenges, as the data collection process appeared to be moving at the pace of the participants. This is further elaborated on in section 5.9.

To capture the data, two voice recording devices were utilised. One of these was a *Sony IC Recorder* which is a digital voice recording device. The other device, which was used as a supplementary device should any faults emerge with the primary one, was a digital voice recording cell-phone application. The use of voice recording devices allowed for the free-flow and social nature of the interviews. This created a more natural conversation for both the researcher and participants, with the focus afforded mainly to conversing as opposed to writing or capturing data in other means, such as writing. According to Fern (2001:19), however, the presence of recording devices can affect the atmosphere and cause the participants to withhold during the interview. This was indeed the case whereby some initially showed scepticism towards the idea of being recorded. Though they agreed to the interview being recorded, the presence of the voice-recording devise seemed to provoke slight apprehensiveness in the opening stages of the interview. However, due to the social nature of the dialogue, the recording devices were quickly forgotten, and the interviews commenced smoothly from there onwards. The section that follows is, therefore, a discussion of the ethics that were adhered to during the collection of the empirical data.
5.7. Research ethics adhered to during empirical research

It is of paramount importance that scientific research in both the natural and the social sciences adheres to certain research ethics throughout the duration of the research (Babbie, 2004:63; Smith, 1981:14). Typically, research ethics are universal though there tends to be slight differences between natural and social scientific research ethics. Positioned within the social sciences, the social sciences, sociological research is not likely to cause any drastic harm in the physical sense (Bless et al., 2013:25; Ruane, 2005:17), however, it still centres humans as subjects of study. Therefore, the treatment of participants, the treatment of the data, as well as the responsibility to the scientific community were the core areas of ethical concern adhered to in this study.

For this particular research project, it was paramount to comply and abide by the standards and ethical requirements of the North West University’s (NWU) Ethics Committee. In this regard, an application to the committee in quest of ethical clearance was submitted. The NWU Ethics Committee approved the research study, and thus allocated the ethics number: NWU-00436-18-A7. Following this, the research commenced, and the following ethics were particularly observed and abided to: informed consent of participants, voluntary participation, confidentiality and anonymity, no harm to participants, deception and truthfulness, reporting of findings, storing of data.

Prior to the commencement of an interview, the participants were presented with an informed consent which they were requested to sign to ensure their wilful participation. The form itself briefly outlines the nature of the study, and highlights the ethical rights the participant has, such as for instance, withdrawing at any point should they experience any discomfort in the course of the interview (see Appendix A). Participants were informed that their participation is voluntary and that they are not required, under any circumstances, to sit through the interview. Their identity and personal details remain anonymous and confidential respectively. The personal details of the participants are known only by the researcher and in some instances, the co-supervisor, as he had assisted in identifying of potential participants. This therefore justifies the opting for the use of pseudonyms when reporting and discussing the empirical findings in chapter 6.

The nature of this research study, the title, as well as the problem being investigated do not suggest that any harm could be incurred by the participants. Though an investigation
into migration may provoke presumptions that the research will tackle sensitive issues – such as xenophobia and illegal border-crossing – resulting in a potential degree of psychological harm, however, investigating the dynamics of transnational citizenship implies a gaze merely into the interpretations, perceptions and practices of migrants in fields. This research focuses on less sensitive issues such as migrants’ networks and social connections in the host nation, as well as the home nation.

The collected data and findings were handled with high integrity and are accurately presented and discussed. The data is not manipulated or placed out of context to favour any bias or predispositions. To ensure credibility of the findings, the study was examined and peer reviewed by both the supervisor as well as the co-supervisor, who himself is Zimbabwean. With the co-supervisor, numerous discussions related to the preliminary findings as well as the manner in which the researcher was understanding and interpreting them were held. This peer review and examining of the study, as well as the discussion with the co-supervisor adds to the credibility of this study, as the supervisors debriefed the researcher with guiding feeding towards improving the quality of the interpretation of the findings. Their contribution in this regard also resulted in the confirmability of the study, as they were able to discern if the results are factual and not a fabrication or figment of imagination by the researcher. Therefore, through this guidance, the research was able to “obtain the perception of peers in developing the conclusions of the study” (Anney, 2014:276).

Additionally, the first participant, Eric (Interview 1) was also visited on numerous occasions for conversations and discussion of the preliminary findings obtained from other participants, as well as to obtain his opinion regard the manner in which the researcher was interpreting the findings. The discussion with this participant contributed to the credibility of the study, as he was able to provide his opinion and further guide the researcher’s thought process with the regards to Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. The researcher also spent over two months in the research field engaging in a variety of conversations with Zimbabwean migrants, even those who did not partake in the study. This prolonged engagement and spending time with the Zimbabwean migrants and also prospective participants further increased the credibility, and thus trustworthiness of the study.

What Anney (2014:277) refers to as data/informant triangulation was also used to enhance the quality of the study. In this regard, the researcher (as explained) utilised two different
sources of data, those being face-to-face in-depth interviews and focus groups. This usefulness of this procedure is that provides researchers the opportunity to utilise “different informants to enhance the quality of the data from different sources” (Anney, 2014:277).

The researcher also ensured the provision of detailed and thick description of the data, and the participants were also purposefully selected (see section 5.5.1). Thick descriptions are useful in that they ensure the trans ability of the research findings. Although this is somewhat similar to the generalisability of data expected in probability sampling, in non-probability sampling transferability does not result in broad claims about the entire study’s population but provides for the reviewers and readers of the study to make connection with the study’s findings and other situations or their own experience (see Firestone, 1993).

To ensure that the researcher had garnered sufficient research in order to make relevant conclusions, the data was analysed and interpreted only after saturation was realised and the data collection phase was complete. Thus, to the scientific community as well as to the participants, the data is presented accurately, with high integrity. The data are also securely and confidentially stored in a password-protected encrypted folder in an external hard drive accessible only to the researcher. The process in which the collected data was analysed is concisely discussed in the next section.

5.8. Analysis and discussion of empirical findings

Data analysis, according to De Vos et al. (2005:333), involves the ordering and structuring of the raw empirical data, with the purpose of producing meaning from the data. The key process in the analysis of qualitative social research data is coding – classifying or categorising individual pieces of data (Babbie, 2008:422) – coupled with a retrieval system from which the categorised data can be grouped together in line with, and towards the answering of the posed research questions. This is to be sustained by scholarly literature as well as the theoretical lens of the study. Therefore, for this study, all the data obtained from the in-depth, one-on-one interviews and the focus group interviews was verbatimly transcribed from the recording devices.

For the purpose of, and respect to time constraints, two transcribers were employed to assist the researcher. One of these transcribers was a Zimbabwean migrant; he also provided assistances in translating interviews whereby some participants may have
communicated and expressed themselves in the *Shona* language of Zimbabwe. This occurred particularly in the focus group interview sessions. The transcribers received a compensation of R 2 000 each.

The dense and unsorted transcripts were manually coded using the Microsoft Word and Microsoft Excel software. In this foundational stage of data sorting and ordering, the transcripts were assigned general codes in order to produce some meaning from the data. Following the completion of the coding of the immensely dense transcripts, what was apparent were the seemingly sumptuously abstract, diverse, and to an extent, contradictory data. What was particularly clear in this regard was the need to further narrow and organise the coded data into more thematic categories in order to uncover and *make sense* of the ‘hidden’ narrative. The categorisation of the data was guided by the ideas and information that emerged as well as the codes that were initially formulated. Due to the subjective and unique dispositions of each individual participant, their responses appeared contradictory to each other in some instances; as if there were no agreements with regards to certain subjects of discussion. Thus, the formulation of categories for thematic analysis became a vital feat towards the act of ‘weaving out’ a narrative from the data.

This weaving involved, as mentioned, a further categorisation of the coded elements into more focused and definitive categories. Therefore, through analytical categorisation, the data were further organised from their initial abstract categories into defined categories from which three main themes emerged: 1) ‘Zimbabweanness (being Zimbabwean)’; 2) ‘being in Zimbabwe’; and 3) ‘living in Potchefstroom’. It is through these defined categories that the Zimbabwean narrative was weaved together. The detailed process regarding how the empirical data was analysed, as well as its reporting and interpretation is discussed in chapter 6. The section that follows, however, delves into the challenges experienced during the field research.

5.9. Challenges and other experiences encountered in the research ‘field’

The field research presented an array of dynamical challenges and experiences that have contributed to the researcher’s personal growth as a field researcher in particular. These challenges yielded priceless lessons which can be deemed as positive and constructive,
going forward with other research ventures. One of these lessons relates to the one core challenge encountered during the field research process, this was the scheduling of interviews. This difficulty had at least three layers to it, the one being ‘trust’, another being ‘time’, and the last being ‘scheduling’ interviews. This section provides, in brief, a discussion of these three factors.

5.9.1 The ‘trust’ factor

Many participants were sceptical of the reasons as to why this study is conducted; the desires and ambitions of the researcher; as well as why the interview had to be recorded. Regardless of having explained the nature of research, provided them with a concise description on the informed consent form (see Appendix A), as well as them having agreed to the interview, participants would initially meet the idea of providing a recorded interview with hostility. Once the interview commenced, it was found that many would then ease into a comfortable dialogue with the researcher (or moderator, in the case of groups). In some instances, prospective participants would, after issuing their contact details to the researcher, avoid answering calls or responding to text messages.

One participant who had initially reacted in this manner, eventually agreed to an interview, stating that their fear was that the researcher was in fact an undercover government agent representing either the SA Department of Home Affairs or Zanu-PF, the current governing political party in Zimbabwe. She stated that as migrants working in Potchefstroom, they are constantly harassed by patrolling police, requested to produce their passports and permits. Some of the participants emphasised that these police would welcome bribes and would in fact request that they are paid. In fact, this was witnessed first-hand during an interview session on Church street, whereby a number of policemen in uniform went store to store seeking passports and permits. Therefore, in fear that the researcher was too a government official, many participants were not easily convinced into agreeing to an interview. Another participant, for instance, requested to see the identification document of the researcher, or even a student ID card at least. This was to prove that the research is indeed a student project, and that the information they provided was not to be used for ulterior motives. There was a willingness to assist after the student ID card was presented, however.

Another ‘trust’ challenge encountered relates to the informed consent form. Although every participant was required to give their consent for their participation and use to their
provided information by signing the form, many refused to actually provide their signature, claiming that in signing, they were not too certain as to what exactly it is, they are agreeing to beyond merely a recorded interview. Therefore, to remedy this predicament, the supervisor suggested that recorded consent was good enough, and that it would therefore be paramount for the researcher to ensure that the participants is recorded giving their consent.

5.9.2 The 'time' factor

If trust was not the issue, time was. Many Zimbabwean migrants are in Potchefstroom either to study or to work. Outside of this, many have families and children that require attention, and other social activities such as church. This was particularly the case for female participants, and as a result, they were among the most difficult of participants to obtain. Many would cancel or reschedule interviews, citing the lack of ‘free time’ as the reason. During interviews, it was found that Zimbabweans regard themselves as ‘hardworking’ and always remaining busy, with the migrating to SA being economically motivated. This implies that most felt that voluntary participation, for no monetary incentive, was not worth their effort. For this purpose, incentives of R50 had to be introduced as a means to acquiring participants. Ironically, upon being offered the incentive, every single participant rejected the money, claiming it would be ‘un-Zimbabwean’ of them to accept payment when offering to assist someone. Therefore, although provision of incentives was made possible, the participants expressed that they are willing to volunteer their time for assisting particularly a student.

5.9.3 The 'scheduling' factor

A third challenging factor related to the managing and scheduling research interview meetings, is the ‘scheduling’ factor. As expressed in section 4.6.1, there were instances whereby the participants reduced the pace at which the data collection could have been completed in. As a result, the progress of the research was dependant on the availability of certain participants. This obviously led to seeking other prospective participants to replace those who struggled to avail themselves. This particular challenge was probably the most frustrating and demotivating. It certainly yielded lessons with regards to managing participants and working around their varying schedules. The researcher found, for instance, that individuals feel more compelled to assist should they deem their assistance as urgent. Thus, instead of attempting to schedule appointments for a later date, the
researcher requested that the interview be conducted on the same day and was prepared to do so. The participants, in this regard, also acknowledged this as convenient, and thus were willing to simply ‘get it done’. This, however, could not be done for the focus groups, and as a result, scheduling an appointment for a date convenient for all the individual participants remained the only means by which to obtain an interview.

Therefore, although these difficulties and challenges that emerged with these three challenging factors provided obstacles that hindered the study as well as the drive to see it through, they did not halt the study indefinitely. In fact, these resulted in improvisation towards ‘getting things done’, and cooperating with the participants. Efficient scheduling and following up on set meetings, as well as staying prepared to conduct interviews as they emerge can be suggested as factors that researcher should afford special attention to during the data collection phase, as these can potentially slow the progressive pace of the research down almost to complete stagnation.

5.10. Conclusion

Therefore, in conclusion it can be asserted that it was evident that the selected research methodology was in fact efficient. It afforded the researcher an opportunity to obtain rich qualitative empirical information covering a range of themes and subjects which involves the vertical and horizontal relationship Zimbabwean migrants have in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. The chapter answered research question 1.3.4 (see chapter 1): “what is an applicable research methodology to use for a study of the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom?”. What is suggested therefore is a qualitative research methodology, particularly the instrumental exploratory single case study. A discussion of the nature and characteristics of the employed research methodology, as well as the manner in which the research process and interviews were executed, are discussed in the chapter. The obtained empirical data is utilised in answering research question 1.3.5, which reads as follows: “what are the perceptions, interpretations and actions on citizenship amongst Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom, and how does it constitute a transnational citizenship orientation?” (see chapter 1). This question is addressed and answered in the next chapter, chapter 6.
Chapter 6: The perspectives, interpretations and practices of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom

6.1. Introduction

This chapter provides an analysis, interpretation and discussion of the empirical findings that were collected in Potchefstroom from 27 July 2018 until 15 October 2018. As discussed in the previous chapter, the data were collected from Zimbabwean migrants living in Potchefstroom.

In essence, this section provides an in-depth discussion of the interpretations, the perspectives and practices of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. This is done by, firstly, discussing the empirical findings, the manner in which they were analysed as well as the themes that were created. Following this, the findings are interpreted in relation to the reviewed literature and theoretical discussion provided in chapter 2 and 3 respectively.

The chapter essentially intends to answer question 1.3.5 of this research study (see chapter 1). The questions read as follows:

1.3.5. What are the perceptions, interpretations, and practices of citizenship amongst Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom and how does it constitute a transnational citizenship orientation?

As the question reads, the chapter therefore intended to determine the perception, interpretations and practices on citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. This is done particularly to determine whether or not their perceptions, interpretations and practices do establish for Zimbabwean migrants, a transnational citizenship or not, thus addressing objectives 1.4.5 of this study (see chapter 1, section 1.3).

As discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.3), a transnational citizenship is constituted by the transnational activities which, in this case, Zimbabwean migrants living in Potchefstroom engage and partake in. These activities keep the migrants connected and active in their home nation, Zimbabwe, as citizens, whilst they are active in their host nation, Potchefstroom/SA, as migrants. Their ability to, as well as the manner in which they negotiate networks, capital and positions in Potchefstroom/SA, largely determines their
ability to network, connect and remain active in Zimbabwe whilst not there. That is, their ability to acquire a transnational citizenship, which entails that the migrant is a citizen of more than one nation at the same time, that is, not a national citizen of Zimbabwe or Potchefstroom/SA, but a transnational citizen of both – of Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe.

The theory of practice, as discussed in chapter 4, is useful in analysing the fields of action which actors enter and challenge for positions and capital. Their perception and interpretation influence their practices in the field; their practices allow them access (or not) to more capital and better positions. This capital and position, or lack thereof, further allows them (or not) to connect with and remain present and active in Zimbabwe whilst located in Potchefstroom. This discussion is continued as part of the interpretation and discussion section – that is, section 5.3 below. The following section, however, provides a discursive narration of the Zimbabwean narrative.

6.2. The Zimbabwean narrative: a thematic analysis of the empirical data

Prior to heading out to the research field, especially on the backdrop of a thorough literature review and establishing a theoretical anchor, there were preliminary presumptions and expectations regarding the character of the participants who would partake in the study, as well as the quality and depth (or lack thereof) of the interview conversation. What was initially expected was the vast number and availability of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, particularly in view of statistical reports regarding the high number of Zimbabwean migrants in SA (chapter 1, section 1.1). This indeed proved to be the case, although due to their individual schedules, it was quite a task securing participants for interview conversations. Furthermore, it was presumed that the narrative of each participant, as well as each focus group would differ in various ways, and therefore, participants providing multi-dimensional and multi-lateral narratives. This was indeed the case, although the ‘grand’ narrative was quite similar. Thus, the Zimbabwean narrative had to be ‘weaved’ out of the transcribed data by conjoining together various extracts from different participants.

The narrative is essentially ‘weaved out’ from the defined categories formulated from the coded responses of the participating Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. The defined
categories were formulated on the basis of the codes assigned to the data, as well as the content of the interview conversations themselves. Thus, for this reason, the participants’ interviews were extensively referred to and quoted throughout this chapter, as the chapter aims to acutely address the above posed questions (and objectives). It should also be noted, as expressed in the previous chapter, pseudonyms are used when referring to the participants, as to keep their identities anonymous.

General codes were initially assigned to the transcribe data. The data was grouped according to the codes assigned, and these groupings were further categorised according to more defined codes, such as: “activities in Potchefstroom”, “SA politics”, “opportunities in Potchefstroom”, “hiding identity”, “activeness in Zimbabwe”, “connections in Zimbabwe”, “life in Zimbabwe”, “hard-working”, “hustling”, “perseverance”, and “hard workers”. From these sets of defined codes, three categories were formulated. These are: ‘Zimbabweanness’, ‘being in Zimbabwe’ and ‘living in Potchefstroom. Therefore, the formulated themes deal with the following: 1) the actors’ ‘Zimbabweanness’, that is their perceived sense of ‘being Zimbabwean’; 2) their experiences of ‘being in Zimbabwe’; and 3) their experiences of ‘living in Potchefstroom’. The second and third theme refer to the relationships, as well as the activities that actors engage in, in Zimbabwe and Potchefstroom. These categories were therefore thematically analysed in relation to each other following a semi-linear narration. This narration is semi-linear in that it sets a loosely defined A – Z (beginning to end) structuring of the narrative.

Thus, concisely, it can be said that Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom ‘carry’ their Zimbabweanness, which, in Bourdieuan terms can be said to be their habitus. Habitus, as explained in section 5.4, relates to the actors’ dispositions, trajectories, taste. It further refers to their social status, social identity and symbolic capital (section 5.4). Therefore, their ‘being Zimbabwean’ is in essence their habitus. It is this that they carry into the fields they enter.

Whilst ‘being in Zimbabwe’, their Zimbabweanness affords them a field position in Zimbabwe, as well as access to an amount of capital. Their status is that of a citizen, and they gain access to certain resources and acknowledgment from the nation-state as its member. On the contrary, ‘living in Potchefstroom’, they are plummeted down to the position and thus status of a migrant; consequently, lacking access to certain resources and fields. The level to which they ‘belong’ to SA is limited – they are predominantly foreigners, and their freedom to freely roam the country and work has regulations and
limitations. Therefore, it is through their experiences and their practices in the fields of Potchefstroom that confirm their transnational social realm and its available fields.

The section that follows commences with a concise profile of the participants, with the intention of gaining a better feel of where they come and how they experience being in Zimbabwe.

6.2.1. Profile of participants

Due to the fact that the research design is qualitative, demographic statistical data was not gathered at all. This makes it a rather difficult task to determine precisely the elements that constitute the ‘profile of the participants’. However, during the interviews, the first point of discussion that was posed to participants required that they give a subjective account of their perception of Zimbabwe, as well as what they perceive ‘being Zimbabwean’ entails. Since this was the foundational stage of the interview conversation, the probing that followed invited participants to descriptively elaborate on their particular biographical background. This included: where they live in Zimbabwe – the geographical area, the ‘type’ of setting it is (rural/urban); their family background – the number of siblings and other family they have, their socio-economic standard, the level of education, state of employment of family members; and also the ethnic group in which they belong to in Zimbabwe – these are predominantly the Shona and the Ndebele ethnic groups. This third factor was not initially asked until it became apparent that participants had a tendency to state that themselves, whilst elaborating on biographical background.

Having still garnered substantial responses with regards to participants’ demographic and biographical information, some minor, yet useful, conclusions were made, in this regard.

As per the transcripts, participants came from one of five locations in Zimbabwe, these are Bulawayo, Gweru, Harare, Masvingo and Mutare. According to Mokwetsi (2014) Zimbabwe is divided into eight provinces, and two major cities – Harare and Bulawayo – which have provincial status. This therefore implies that Zimbabwe technically has ten provinces. Brinkhoff (2018) reports on two major statistics, namely, 1) the area sizes of each province, as well as, 2) the major cities in Zimbabwe. Table 6.1 and 6.2 offer these statistical reports respectively. Table 6.1 is adopted from Brinkhoff (2018). In this table he provides the name, area size of each province, as well as the population of each province from 1982 until 2017. The table is therefore amended in such a way that it displays only
the details relevant to this discussion, that is, the name of the province; its capital city; the area size as well as the most recent population. The areas that are highlighted in yellow represent the geographical areas from which participants in this study mentioned that they come from. Table 6.1 is provided below, and the data in this table is hierarchically sorted, with the largest province (in terms of area size) on top and the smallest at the bottom:

Table 6.1: Provinces of Zimbabwe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Area A (km²)</th>
<th>Population Estimate (E) 2017-08-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Matabeleland North</td>
<td>Lupane</td>
<td>75,025</td>
<td>744,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mashonaland West</td>
<td>Chinhoyi</td>
<td>57,441</td>
<td>1,567,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Masvingo (Victoria)</td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>56,566</td>
<td>1,553,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Matabeleland South</td>
<td>Gwanda</td>
<td>54,172</td>
<td>810,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Midlands</td>
<td>Gweru</td>
<td>49,166</td>
<td>1,514,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Manicaland</td>
<td>Mutare</td>
<td>36,459</td>
<td>1,861,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mashonaland East</td>
<td>Marondera</td>
<td>32,230</td>
<td>1,366,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>Bindura</td>
<td>28,347</td>
<td>1,441,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Harare</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1,973,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Bulawayo</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>738,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zimbabwe</strong></td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td><strong>390,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,572,560</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 specifically shows the major cities, also hierarchically ranked, with the main major city at the top, and the least at the bottom. Being ranked at the bottom in this case actually implies that the city is the overall ninth major city in Zimbabwe. This table is too adopted from Brinkhoff (2018). The table was amended, once again, to ensure that it displays only the data necessary for this analysis; that is, the name of the city, as well as
the most recent sum of population statistics. Furthermore, the particular cities of origin that the participants stated they come from in Zimbabwe are again highlighted in yellow. Table 6.2 is provided below:

**Table: 6.2: Nine major cities of Zimbabwe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Population Census (C) 2012-08-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Harare</td>
<td>1,485,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bulawayo</td>
<td>653,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chitungwiza</td>
<td>356,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mutare</td>
<td>186,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Epworth</td>
<td>167,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gweru</td>
<td>154,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kwekwe</td>
<td>100,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kadoma</td>
<td>91,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Masvingo</td>
<td>87,886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Tables 6.1, it can be deduced that Bulawayo is the smallest region (479 km²) and is followed by Harare (872 km²). Then comes Mutare (36, 459 km²), Gweru (49, 166 km²), and lastly Masvingo with an area of just above 56, 500 km² (Brinkhoff, 2018). Table 6.2 highlights Harare as the major (capital) city of Zimbabwe, with the largest population. Bulawayo follows as the second largest city; Mutare is the fourth major city, Gweru is the sixth, and Masvingo is the ninth.

Figure 6.1 illustrates a map of Zimbabwe with all the provinces displayed. All the five geographical locations are displayed in this figure, as well as the specific provinces in which they are located in. Thus, what can be also stated is that the participants in this
study represent five of the ten provinces of Zimbabwe. Furthermore, and more interestingly, most participants come from 5 of the 9 major cities in Zimbabwe, which are also the capital cities of their respective provinces. A capital city is, according to Reva (2016:14), “the main city within a state by virtue of its political-administrative role”. It is the most productive and active cities in its region, and thus the “focal city of the region” (Reva, 2014:14). Therefore, what this indirectly implies is that the Zimbabweans who have managed to migrate come from the ‘better’ cities of their provinces, and thus potentially among those who have ‘better’ access to capital and resources necessary for migrating. This resonates with what Baumann (1998) refers to as winners and losers, broadly implying that those who are able to migrate are among the well-resourced and well-positioned, particularly economically. Therefore, it could be argued that they are thus the winners, compared to those who cannot migrate, as they extend their networks and realms of activities beyond the borders of Zimbabwe.

Participants, in describing their cities and provinces of origin, placed focus on the availability of industries and employment. It is through a similar criterion that they deemed regions rural or urban. For instance, when referring to her home city of Harare, Kendi (Interview 11, 2018) highlights that the city is large, busy and also comparable to the
bigger cities of SA such as Johannesburg. Thus, she deems Harare to be quite urban. In her own words, she says:

“I'm from Harare, in a town called Waterfalls. Harare is very busy, it's a big city. The capital city, so you can imagine. It's the Jo'burg of Zim. You can't compare it to Potch, this is a small town”.

Daniel (Interview 3, 2018) describes Bulawayo in comparison to Daveyton, East Rand, Johannesburg and Tembisa, Johannesburg. Though he generally sees the city as urban, he emphasises mostly the small size of Bulawayo. From his own perspective he states that Bulawayo is:

“Daniel: … a small town that you can equate it with, I've never been to Klerksdorp, but it is small. Potchefstroom looks even bigger in terms of area from end to end its bigger. I'm trying to think, maybe Daveyton.

Researcher: Daveyton in East Rand, Johannesburg?

Daniel: Yeah, that small place. So, you have the city centre which goes in terms of streets with streets going from West to East with about 10 streets going up avenues like this they go from 1 to 15 which is the whole of the city centre. Then you have the townships which are a bit wider but not so much and your decent housing from where we come from in the townships where you have 4-room homes that you can extend of course. Like your housing in Tembisa”.

Precious (Interview 12, 2018), comparing Mutare to Potchefstroom, highlights, emphasises what she regards to be the smallness of Mutare – this is contrary to the facts provided in table 6.1. She also highlights the rural nature of the region. She states, in her own words, that Mutare is:

“…a small city, more or less like Potch. It's well known for gold mine as well. All the gold is extracted from there. But I would say its rural-ish and more cultural. You can still see poverty there. It's either you are middle class, or you are poor there”.

According to Thomas (Interview 10, 2018), a student who grew up in the Midlands province in Gweru, the city is deemed to be urban rather than rural. He insists that Gweru, although some may call it a city, is but a small town with not much activity and opportunity.
For him, Gweru is bigger than Potchefstroom, but still quite less active as big cities like Harare and Bulawayo:

It’s a small town. They call it a city, but to me it’s just a town. Comparable to Potch, I would say Potch is a bit bigger. It’s a quiet place, and things move quite slow. The education and the growth are not that fast compare to big cities like Harare and Bulawayo. It’s not that fast, but it’s a good place to live. I love it there.

Jerry (Interview 15, 2018), who comes from Masvingo, describes the area as rural and non-progressive in terms of economic development. He states that Masvingo is with no operating factories since the collapse of the Zimbabwean economy. As a result, he believes that there are no formal employment opportunities; struggles for economic betterment burden the region:

“In Masvingo? Nothing there, you know it’s just hustling. Formal employment is not there. Yes, there are people who are able to be employed, but in most cases people are hustling, they are vendors, builder. That’s basically what people are doing there to earn a living. So, there isn’t much happening. But the economic situation in the whole country is affecting everyone”.

Only those participants coming from the larger cities of Harare and Bulawayo expressed anything to do with dynamics of living in the suburbs or the townships, with the majority confirming that they reside from the township areas. There are others who stated that they reside from the suburban areas of Harare, such as Waterfall and Hatfield, as well as township areas such as Gwazana.

Participants from the towns of Mutare, Gweru and Masvingo emphasise, more than anything, the rurality of their respective home regions. They mention a somewhat agrarian lifestyle, as well as their ownership of vast areas of land. They further mention what they see as the ‘smallness’ and ‘slowness’ of their respective regions, even though this is only true with regards to population size than it is about actual area size (see tables 6.1 and 6.2). Whilst they do make mention of the existence of some operating factories and companies, they emphasise that this is rapidly demising in their regions, as the majority of factories and companies have long ceased to operate. This is the extent to which participants coming from these regions expressed regarding their hometowns, no direct distinctions such as those of suburb-and-township are made. Therefore, from this it could be said that the way in which Zimbabwe is perceived and comes across differs, with
participants holding varying perspectives. Actors from different regions and different settings having differing experiences, and thus may perceive Zimbabwe and being Zimbabwean quite differently from each other. The following section delves into this conception of ‘Zimbabweanness’, or simply, ‘being Zimbabwean’.

6.2.2. ‘Zimbabweanness’: the perceived essence of ‘being Zimbabwean’

“We work. We are hard workers. Wherever we go we work. Even walking down the road you see that this one is a Zimbabwean because their feet are strong” – Nancy (Interview 5, 2018)

The literature consulted in previous chapters never explicitly delves into the subject of ‘being Zimbabwean’. However, this conception emerged in the infant stages of the data collection phase, whereby participants refer to what they perceive to be the character and nature of a Zimbabwean.

Participants emphasised that the single definitive characteristic that defines ‘a Zimbabwean’ is their work ethic, perseverance and resilience, especially in times of socio-economic and socio-political hardships and upheavals. Most insist that, unlike South Africans, Zimbabweans are proud to work, they want to earn everything and prefer this to acquiring anything for free. Regardless of the type of job. The quote from Nancy (Interview 5, 2018) at the very beginning of this particular subsection, emphasises this sternness and resilience when it comes to working hard.

Eric (Interview 1, 2018) mentioned ‘hard work’ as being a significant feat in the character profile of a Zimbabwean. Upon being asked to elaborate on exactly what he implied by this, he alleged:

“What I mean is that we are not afraid to do any job to put bread on the table. We are committed. So, it’s not necessarily that what I’m doing is according to my strengths, but out of need, I am able to come on the streets to sell” (Interview 1, 2018).

It is believed by some participants that Zimbabweans, due to the fear of dangers and hostility associated with political protesting in Zimbabwe, are generally afraid of inciting protests against the state for their conduct. Thus, as a result, Zimbabweans accept their
situation, compensating for the difficulty only by ‘working harder’ (Interview 7 & 14, 2018). Most of the times, however, there is no work (Interview 8, 2018); and thus, resulting to the necessity of improvisation. This improvisation is what Louise, Simon and Jerry (Interview 7, 8 & 15, 2015) refer to as ‘hustling’:

“So many people start their own businesses and hustle there, and Zim people can hustle. We can get a cell-phone and we sell for double the money cash in Harare. We know how to make a plan, if you are Zimbabwean, one thing we have is to make a plan” (Interview 7, 2018)

Hustling, it can be stated, essentially refers to their ability to ‘make something out of nothing’ and do whatever work is available for them. This, according to Jerry (Interview 15, 2018) can imply street-vending or one-day construction jobs. For Louise (Interview 7, 2018), hustling can also include unorthodox, though not necessarily illicit approaches, to earning money and earning a life. It is a representation of resilience as an essential characteristic of ‘being Zimbabwean’.

Therefore, coupled with their “hard work” ethic, is the practice of what some Zimbabwean participants referred to as ‘hustling’. According to Thieme (2013:392), hustling essentially is the “generative space of opportunism that moves fluidly and sometimes inconspicuously between illicit and licit work, finding their own “ways and means’”. This author goes on to state that hustling involves the ability to “carve” out opportunities from where it otherwise should not be possible. Thus, it can be argued that social resilience and the unwillingness to give in to particularly socio-economic hardships, as well as improvisation and unorthodox approaches towards monetary acquisition, is what “hustling” can be concisely described as.

Simba (Interview 8, 2018) defines himself as a hustler. Only having been in Potchefstroom for 10 months (since January 2018), he is still in search of work opportunities. Thus, whilst in search of stable work, he continues to make means to ensure he has food each night – he hustles:

“Me, my brother, I’m a hustler. I hustle. I survive through hustling. Moving around, getting maybe some R1 or R2 here and there, you see? At the end of the day its R20, I buy bread and cold drink. I go home and I sleep” (Interview 8, 2018).
Jerry (Interview 15, 2018) also points to the general impact on the subsistence of Zimbabweans in Zimbabwe; especially the industry of his home region, Masvingo. As he mentions, many people lack the means to migrate even from Masvingo to bigger cities such as Harare and Bulawayo. As a result, people “hustle” in Masvingo and they work for themselves; harder than those employed in the formal industry. The very same thing is mentioned by Thomas (Interview 10, 2018) about Gweru. He believes that the lack of operating factories and businesses in the region has resulted in many having to “create their jobs” and “hustle”. However, he sees this as meaningless, as the state of the economy of Zimbabwe and the inflation results in hard work for hardly any rewards and benefits. Regardless of this, people still invest hours a day in their “hustle”.

Joy (Interview 18, 2018) mentions that Mutare residents, and most other rural regions of Zimbabwe, usually own portions of land which they use predominantly for subsistence farming. Daniel (Interview 3, 2018) also declares that it is unlikely for people in Zimbabwe to not have food, as farming and even herding livestock is a common practice, even in the current era. People, he states, will at least be attending to their farms, instead of waiting in vain for jobs and state provision. Precious (Interview 12, 2018), coming from Mutare, further emphasises this dynamic of independent subsistence farming which she regards as a practice that truly distinguishes Zimbabweans from particularly South Africans. She, among several other participants, proclaim that Zimbabweans seldom purchase vegetables and other products which they are capable of producing themselves. This is regarded as a means towards ‘hustling’ too, in that, not only will the family constantly have food, but should needs be, they are able to trade their produce for money or other resources (Interview 12, 2018).

Thus, these characteristics of hard working and resilient as the essence of being Zimbabwean are also, according to Eric, Trevor and Ivy (Interview 1, 6 & 17, 2018) a core differentiator between Zimbabweans and South Africans. It is believed that SA provides a diverse array of social grants which in turn creates dependent citizens who cannot work for themselves and rely on state provisions (focus group 1, 2018; Interview 1 & 2, 2018). In conversation with the first focus group, at Cynthia’s Hair Salon (focus group 1, 2018), one of the participants, Benny, was greeted with supportive cheers upon highlighting this difference between Zimbabweans and South Africans. He proclaimed that Zimbabweans are more enthusiastic to work compared to South Africans:
“In SA if you ask someone and say, ‘let’s dig a trench from here to there’, they won’t do it. Even if he knows he didn’t go to school and he doesn’t have any qualifications. He won’t do it. But for us we won’t ask, we will do it. It’s the way we are raised” (Focus group 1, 2018).

Another participant in this group, Gloria, added to this remark, emphasising her pride in the resilience and uncompromising work ethic that she regards Zimbabweans to have:

“Yes, whether we have qualification, whether we are lawyers or we are wearing what clothes. If the job say we must dig, we will dig. Its fine. We are used to everything. Any situation, we can handle. So, we are proud of that” (Focus group 1, 2018).

Participants believe that this disposition of hard work is innate in the Zimbabweans, some believe it is the way in which they are raised. They embody their culture and ‘way of being’ that they believe was taught to them at an infant age. This is highlighted in the fourth focus group, involving Zimbabwean students studying in Potchefstroom. Speaking to this focus group, this conception of ‘Zimbabweanness’ and being Zimbabwean seemed to continue. One of the participants, Amy (Focus group 4, 2018), states that the way they are raised instils in them a sense of culture and ethos. She highlights that as Zimbabwean children, they are raised by, and receive their norms from “Zimbabwean parents”. Shaun (Focus group 4, 2018) added to this, stating that the notion of ‘Zimbabwean parents’ applies to both the Shona and Ndebele groups. He emphasises that the manner in which they are socialised in Zimbabwe instils certain norms and values, which they all are accustomed to during the course of their lives. Upon being asked to define a “Zimbabwean parent”, Amy said the following:

“Basically, a Zimbabwean parent…no matter how much money we have at home, they make you work for it. They’re never just going to give it to you on a silver platter. I remember they told me ‘if you fail matric, it’s done’. There is nothing they can do for you; you’re already grown enough to make your own decisions. You know automatically if I don’t do this, if I don’t do that, my parents are literally going to give up on me. Basically, they tell you this is not your house, not your sofa, not your food, you are eating my food, you’re watching my TV. They always give you this constant reminder that this is their life not yours, and if you want to live the lavish life you have to work for it. You’re supposed to get better” (Focus group 4, 2014)
The students (Focus group 4, 2018), as young people, highlight that this is how Zimbabwean youth are socialised. With regards to these discussed aspects of ‘being Zimbabwean’, there is generally agreements and parallelism between the participants. Regardless of whether they were from a rural or urban area; whether a student or not, their belief that Zimbabweans are hardworking and resilient is generally accepted with expressed pride.

Eric, who is one of the older participants, and an acknowledged elder among the Zimbabweans who know him in Potchefstroom, further added to this but emphasising also the determination he regards Zimbabweans to have. He refers to how Zimbabweans dress, stating that whilst in SA, they hardly wear or even bring a fancy and suave wardrobe, but rather clothing that displays their preparedness to engage in any sort of work:

“The fact that we came looking for greener pastures we don’t even bring wardrobe, you are just in clothes, just to do those menial tasks and get through work. So, people feel like we are not tidy and don’t care. But for us, it’s a dressing to show that we are prepared to do anything” (Interview 1, 2018).

For Eric, and quite a few of the participants (Interview 4, 5, 6 &12, 2018), the only factor that is of concern is ‘earning a living’, as they believe that it is the only reason they have migrated to SA – the “greener pastures”. The frequent utterance of the phrase “greener pastures” by participants, as well as SA’s association with it, emphasises a vital finding in this study – Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom/SA places economic push (from Zimbabwe) and pull (to Potchefstroom/SA) as the primary reason for migration to SA. This highlights the economic rudiment of transnational citizenship – the migrating to where ‘the money’ is. Nancy (Interview 5, 2015) asserts, “the situation will force you to decide” to move to SA, and Trevor (Interview 6, 2018), metaphorically speaking, states that “a lion goes out there and hunts while the cubs just stay there”.

What was also interesting to note, however, was the mention of hope, faith and prayer as an entity that is responsible for the stability, resilience and endurance to persevere that Zimbabweans have. Nancy, Eric, as well as Louise (Interview 1, 5 & 7, 2018) all emphasise the faith in God that Zimbabweans have. Keeping the faith and working hard are referred to as the ‘formula’ to curb the hardships and earn a decent living – this is synonymous with Max Weber’s ‘protestant ethic’ in which he argues that “the faith came to
understand their capacity to work methodically, to pursue profit, and to acquire wealth as
evidence of their salvation” (cited by Kalberg, 2016:1). Louise, for instance, says:

“I believe in God, you know God gives us all an opportunity and if you work very hard you will
achieve. Like you will get your cars and your house and everything. So, we must just have faith
and work hard. Us we really know how to work in Zim. God will make things better if we keep
praying and working hard” (Interview 7, 2018).

Aside from the mentioned characteristics regarding ‘Zimbabweanness’, participants also
make references to the existence of two major ethnic groups of Zimbabwe; the Shona and
the Ndebele. Although no direct characteristics regarding ‘Zimbabweanness’ relating
exclusively to these groups was mentioned by any participant, what was stated by some is
that the Shona feel more Zimbabwean, whereas the Ndebele feel more South African. This
was in fact mentioned by Shona participants (Focus group 2, 2018; Interview 13, 2018).
However, Daniel (Interview 3, 2018) brings to the fore an on-going socio-political and
social tension occurring between the Shona and the Ndebele. Regarding the Shona, he
says:

“Those guys have more opportunity, even in schools they get scholarship. I have never
seen a study which proves that it’s a fact, but we have always felt that it was the case”.

Daniel went on to speak extensively regarding the relationship between the two groups. This resulted in the necessity to directly pose this subject for discussion with participants that follow. It is unfortunate that not many Ndebele participants partook in the study, but discussions with both Shona and the few Ndebele that partook were sufficient enough to make some sense of the relationship between the two groups back in Zimbabwe. The tension between these two groups can be said to play a deterministic role in any competition and struggle for resources and capital in the field. That is, being Shona or Ndebele can impact and potentially determine actors’ field positions in, as well as their citizen-and-nation-state relationship with Zimbabwe. The ethnic predicament certainly does qualify as one of the challenges of being in Zimbabwe, as Zimbabweans. The section that follows, therefore, delves into the dynamics of the relationship between the Shona and the Ndebele.
6.2.3. The Shona and the Ndebele in Zimbabwe

“It’s a question of, do you feel more at home in Zimbabwe or in South Africa? I think it’s also linked to the language issue, the tribal issue, the way people can fit. So, because of the tribal link between Matabeleland and South Africa, they relate more to the South African context.” – Reuben (Interview, 2018)

Participants generally claim that there is a divisive element between the Shona and the Ndebele in Zimbabwe. The Ndebele participants expressed that the division is political and tribal, with the top positions in government occupied by the Shona (Interview 3 & 14, 2018). The Shona participants asserted that the hostility is towards them from the Ndebele, and that they (the Shona) have no issues with the Ndebele as they are all Zimbabweans (Focus group 2 & 3, 2018; Interview 2, 11 & 13, 2018). The Ndebele participants feel as if they are not welcome in Zimbabwe, whereas the Shona feel the Ndebele want to be South Africans. Generally, the participants approve that there is tension between the two groups.

Reggie (focus group 2, 2018), for example, uses the term “hate” in describing the Shona-Ndebele relationship. He says that:

“One thing about Shonas they don’t hate Ndebele but the Ndebele hates Shona” (focus group 2, 2018).

The participants in this focus group believe that the Ndebele act and believe they are closer to being South Africans, and therefore have a tendency of regarding themselves as higher class and more cultured than the Shona. The feeling among this group (Focus group 2, 2018) is that the Ndebele are more advantaged than the Shona in SA because of being similar to being South African. However, they emphasise that the Shona dominate Zimbabwe and are more advantaged there.

Lionel (focus group 2, 2018), highlights that all the dominant politicians and officials, including former president Robert Mugabe and current president Emerson Mnangagwa,
are of Shona descent. Thus, re-emphasising the control and dominance the Shona have in Zimbabwe.

Upon posing this subject of the Shona-Ndebele relationship to Nancy (Interview 5, 2018) during the interview with her, she initially stated that people in Zimbabwe generally do not mind each other, as Zimbabwe is a culturally diverse nation. However, as the conversation progresses, she does highlight tension between the two groups. She goes as far as even associating criminal behaviour with the Ndebele, stating that:

“There are way more Shona people than Ndebele that’s why Ndebele’s come to South Africa because of the Zulu language, they’re even doing crimes and they don’t feel remorse”.

Linda and Ruth (focus group 3, 2018) both state, during the focus group interview, that their issues with the Ndebele is that they want the Shona to learn isiNdebele (the Ndebele language). They instil that there is but one province whereby isiNdebele is spoken – Matabeleland – and thus they see no justification as to why the Shona should learn the language when all Zimbabweans, they believe, can and should be able to speak chiShona (the Shona language). Reuben (Interview 13, 2018), highlights that, for him, Zimbabwe is not as diverse as it might appear to be. He deems it a homogenous nation, whereby the Shona culture, language and people essentially dominate. Furthermore, he proclaims that the Ndebele identify with SA more than they do with Zimbabwe. For them, it is easier to blend and fit into the South African, whereas, the Shona are not popular in SA – in that the general hostility from South Africans is usually towards the Shona than it is the Ndebele:

“In Matabeleland they identify themselves more as being South African whereas Shonas associate themselves as Zimbabwean. So, from that mind-set, if you’re from the Mashonaland area and you’re a visitor in South Africa, it’s not that popular. Whereas in Matabeleland it’s more common that when someone finishes schooling they might move to South Africa, it’s actually expected. In their world view, the destination is South Africa” (Interview 13, 2018)

This is also expressed by Tafadzwa (Interview 2, 2018), who is of Shona descent, and also has family ties with some Ndebele clans. He claims that, compared to the Shona, the Ndebele generally live more comfortable lives, with access to more economic capital. For him, Bulawayo is a smaller version of Johannesburg, in SA:
“There is a difference between us. I can say, from what I realised, Ndebeles have more money than us Shonas. Even the girl I dated, I could see she comes from a good background. That’s because the Ndebele live like South Africans. If you go there to Bulawayo, they call it mini Jo’burg. Everything that happens in Jo’burg happens in Bulawayo. They listen to house music and do everything like they are in SA” (Interview 2, 2018).

As mentioned, not many participants in this study were of Ndebele descent. Only three, Daniel, Thomas and the Pastor (Interview 3, 10 & 14, 2018) were of direct Ndebele descent, whereas Reuben (Interview 13, 2018) is born from a Shona father and a Ndebele mother. Reuben therefore identifies more with his Shona side, as he also grew up in Harare. Thomas expressed that he is not quite fluent in isiNdebele, as his family is based in Gweru, whereby the culture is Shona; the schools teach chiShona and English as the two languages; and the friends he has are all Shona. Thus, this resulted in Daniel and the Pastor being the most reliable of participants to express, from a Ndebele perspective, their subjective views regarding the Shona-Ndebele relationship in Zimbabwe.

Daniel and the Pastor generally tell a similar narrative with that of the Shona participants; they too believe that there is a division and general tension, with a long history that still persists in Zimbabwe. They believe, as Ndebele, that the prejudice and “hate” is towards them, as they are the minority population group. Being the minority, they are the ones symbolically coerced into adapting to the Shona culture and language, and to a large extent, they are less advantaged in Zimbabwe. Their access to certain resources, as well as the expansiveness of their networks is minimal compared to the Shona.

Daniel (Interview 3, 2018) referred to the Matabeleland massacres of the early 1980s in which a military division known as the Fifth Brigade is said to have massacred particularly the followers of liberation veteran, Joshua Nkomo, who was of Ndebele descent (see Allison, 2017; Cameron, 2017; Ngwenya, 2014). The commanders and soldiers of this unit were all essentially of Shona descent. Cameron (2017:4) for instance writes that ZANU-PF leaders, former president Robert Mugabe, current president Emerson Mnangagwa as well as the Minister of lands, agriculture and rural resettlements, Perence Shiri were amongst the core leaders of the Fifth Brigade. She states that this was a political tension between ZANU (predominantly Shona) and ZAPU (predominantly Ndebele).
Daniel, growing up in Bulawayo and around the Matabeleland provinces, expresses that this massacre haunts the people of Bulawayo to this day, and that people will always look at President Mnangagwa and the Shona holistically, as “the people who killed us” (Interview 3, 2018). In his interview, he highlights that he has aunts who were killed and raped by soldiers during those massacres. Therefore, for Daniel, the sometimes-unspoken-of tension between the Shona and the Ndebele groups is vivid and will persist for years to come.

The Pastor (Interview 14, 2018) speaks more specifically on the effects the Shona-Ndebele rivalry and its impact on governmental, as well as community development. He deems the relationship between the two groups as a “sensitive issue” which has generally caused a disharmony in Zimbabwe:

“Sometimes you may feel betrayed, sometimes side-lined. You hardly see a political party in Zimbabwe led by a Ndebele, all key parties are led by Shona. Does that mean that there are no credible well qualified Ndebele? I would say that they are focussed on numbers and the votes rather than the qualities of a leader, this could be the reason why Zimbabwe is still suffering in its leadership and its governance” (Interview 14, 2018).

Upon posing Reuben’s remark regarding the Ndebele’s association with SA, particularly regarding whether or not the Ndebele aspire to migrate and live in SA, Daniels’s response was:

“Any Zimbabwean who you meet will tell you that they never thought they would want to leave Zimbabwe. There were people, like myself who grew up on ancestral land and we want to do something with that land” (Interview 3, 2018).

For Daniel, the Ndebele regard Matabeleland as their home. He particularly refers to Zimbabwe as his ancestral land and rejects the discourse among the Shona participants that Ndebele prefer being in SA or regard themselves as partially South African.

Therefore, from this it can be stated that both the Shona and Ndebele participants accepts that the tension between the two groups not only has created a rift between the two groups within the borders of Zimbabwe but has also created unevenness in the ‘playing field’ as well as socio-economic and socio-political inequalities. Interestingly and expectedly, both groups believe they are the disadvantaged group in Zimbabwe. The Shona, however, do
unquestionably dominate in terms of numbers, as a result there are more Shona available to occupy the majority of positions available in Zimbabwe. This subsection highlights specifically the fact that the playing field of Zimbabwe has a divisive dynamic which relates directly to the two ethnic groups who are citizens of this nation.

It can also be stated that, although many participants tend to insist that the Ndebele migrate to SA more than the Shona, the majority of the participants that were found and partook in the study were in fact of Shona descent. This obviously contradicts the discourse that states otherwise. Therefore, it in this regard, it could be stated that it may be a matter of location that results in such a low number of Ndebele participants. Perhaps bigger cities such as Pretoria, Johannesburg and Cape Town might yield different results in this regard, with the Shona-Ndebele ratio may differ to that of Potchefstroom.

Beyond these two groups are smaller groups which are hardly acknowledged. The Pastor (Interview 14, 2018), in this regard, adds that there are many such small ethnic groups and languages that are overlooked and thus, to a degree, uncommon to (or unknown by some) people outside of Zimbabwe. For instance, he mentions the Kalanga, the Tonka as well as the Northern Sotho to be among these marginalised groups and languages. Although nothing beyond this is said about these groups in this study, they are worth noting. This is because the unevenness of the playing field in Zimbabwe marginalises these groups to such an extent that they are symbolically ‘wiped out’ – no one mentions them besides the Pastor. If the Ndebele feel so displaced and marginalised in Zimbabwe, according to the participants, then sentiments and feelings of these smaller groups may perhaps be beyond imagination.

This leads to the questioning of the current situation in Zimbabwe, particularly, how the participants experience ‘being in Zimbabwe’. Do they speak expressively of this dynamic of Shona-Ndebele as well or is the lived experience in Zimbabwe generally shared by all participants? The following section progresses this narrative towards that discussion.
6.2.4. ‘Being in Zimbabwe’

“The Zimbabwean society is quite amazing. Right now as the situation is, people are going everywhere looking for money and ways of subsistence”. – Eric (Interview 1, 2018)

Being in Zimbabwe, for many participants, seemed to be the preferred nation of residence over SA. Eric, in the opening quote, refers to the Zimbabwean society as “amazing” upon being asked of his experiences of living in the Zimbabwean society. However, he also cites the socio-economic condition of Zimbabwe as the main push factor resulting in mass migration by the citizens. This, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.5), is synonymous with what scholars also insist to be the primary push factor (see for example Kiwanuka, 2009; Zanamwe & Devillard, 2010).

However, these mentioned scholars do not give accounts based on the subjective experiences of Zimbabwean migrants based in Potchefstroom. The participants in this study are more useful and also in a better position to provide this. Therefore, in giving her subjective opinion on Zimbabwe, Martha (Interview 16, 2018) says the following:

“I would say Zim is not a bad country. From my perspective it’s a great country, buts it’s in a bad path. Like now, the economic situation is so down, I think that’s the one thing that’s driving people out of Zimbabwe.”

What she mentions here is in line with the opening remark quoted from Eric (Interview 1, 2018) – a love for the home nation met with the need to sustain one’s self and survive.

Nancy mentions this predicament, declaring her pride for being Zimbabwean; her love for the nation, as well as her Shona culture. She too mentions specifically and associates the lack of employment opportunities in Zimbabwe to the economic downfall:

“Mainly there are no jobs, even people who went to school, you sit on your certificate because there are no jobs, so surviving is a problem. Even if you have a degree and you went to university everyone is sitting in the street, they are selling in the street there are no jobs” (Interview 5, 2018).
Every participant, including those in the focus group, commenced by highlighting their love and allegiance to the nation of Zimbabwe. However, they never truly explain the dynamics of being in Zimbabwe, more than they cite economic reasons as the primary reason for migrating to SA. This, they believe, is the case with most Zimbabweans in SA; migrating due to economic reasons with the intention of providing for the family. Though they feel Zimbabwe is where they prefer to be, being in Zimbabwe does not appear to promise them the future they desire.

Some of the women make specific mention of the cost of living in particular, as well as the inflated prices on products such as cooking oil and washing powder (Focus group 3, 2018; Interview 5, 12, & 17, 2018). The cost of living is regarded as the one burden making it difficult to live comfortably in Zimbabwe. Being in Zimbabwe appears to be, for the most part, an economic burden; with price inflation, scarcity of employment, and the lack of availability of currency in the banks themselves.

In conclusion, it can be stated that Zimbabweans are patriotic citizens, who are hardworking and resilient social actors. The nation is occupied by the Shona and the Ndebele, whom experience general tension between them. The Shona generally outnumber the Ndebele and therefore justify their dominance of Zimbabwe in all spheres. The Ndebele, as a minority, expressed feelings of marginalisation and unequal treatment towards them in Zimbabwe. Thus, in this regard, the players in the available fields in Zimbabwe are divided not only in terms of rural-urban, big cities-small cities, but also in terms of Shona-Ndebele. Over a long period, the country has been experiencing socio-economic upheavals, which are tied to the socio-political instabilities in the nation. Lack of employment has created immense competition in the informal sector, as well as the formal sector – which participants expressed does not compensate well enough for their subsistence. Thus, competition for economic capital is rife, whilst the capital itself is scarce. Therefore, when migrating to SA, Zimbabweans bring with them their Zimbabweanness, and they bring with them these divisions.
6.3. The reasons for migrating and ‘living in Potchefstroom’

“Now there’s no money in Zim, and how can you survive without money that’s why we run away from Zimbabwe and we look for greener pastures because there’s nothing in Zim” – Nancy (Interview 5, 2018)

The reasons for migrating are essentially economic (occupational), and in some cases educational. This was a subject of discussion in which the participants, especially the non-students working in Potchefstroom spoke quite extensively about, constantly redirecting the interview towards why in fact they had migrated to SA. Though extensive in terms of recording time, the responses of the participants to this subject were quite similar to say the least, and thus, the reasons for migrating are quite straight-forward – SA is perceived as a land promising ‘greener pastures’, and also arguably equally as important is that SA is just across the border from Zimbabwe. It is a trip that can be made in less than a day. Therefore, due to the extensiveness of the data, just a few quotes were extracted from the participants’ transcripts with the purpose of gaining knowledge of, and understanding the reasons as to why Zimbabweans migrate to Potchefstroom/SA. The introductory quote from Nancy captures what could be said to be the shared belief by all participants. Eric, however, gives a subjective account:

“I did not initially come here looking for ways to earn a living. I used to come with my family – my wife and my kids were still babies for holidays, before your independence, around 1991. We would come here to buy ‘white goods’ like refrigerators, T.V.s and so on. Those were the days. We would enjoy going around, seeing the goods we did not have at home. It was only later that I had to come back when I lost my job because South Africa was only other place I knew” (Interview 1, 2018).

Benny (Focus group 1, 2018), who was a full-time high school teacher in Zimbabwe mentions that it was the realisation of the amount of money that can be earned in SA doing various jobs. He states that people he knew from Zimbabwe, who were already in SA, were among his best source of information regarding the potential and availability of employment opportunities in SA. He then opted to pay a visit and witness SA for himself:
“Well the first time I came here; I went to Pretoria. That time I was a temporary teacher in Zim. So, I came here to visit during the school holidays, then I got a job here. It was a job for putting roof tiles. Ja, it was 2005. Then at the job I only worked for a week, and the money was better than what I was getting in a month as a teacher. Then I spent about a year here and I had to go back home because I was the breadwinner” (Focus group 1, 2018).

Upon returning to Zimbabwe, Benny commenced to make preparations to return to SA, especially upon receiving and realising the vast difference in the amount of economic capital available in SA for him. Since his relocation, he has ensured that his younger brother and sister join him in SA (Focus group 1, 2018).

Ivy (Interview 17, 2018) highlights the role her elder brother played in informing her of the availability of work and encouraging her to seize the opportunity to pursue employment in SA. Being a hairdresser, her brother informed her of the success of hair-salons in SA, as well as the bettered income she can expect. Although sceptical of her leaving home at only 25 years old, her parents allowed this to happen as they too realised the necessity to prepare for her future. With her brother already living and working in Pretoria, Ivy was convinced that the only progressive career move was migrating to SA.

For Daniel, Jerry and Martha (Interview 3, 15 & 16, 2018), it was following their resignation from their employment in Zimbabwe that lead to their contemplation of possible next moves. All being tertiary graduates in possession of academic degrees, they claim that even banks would not have any money, and therefore although one may have received their pay from work, the banks were incapable of making available their money. This was particularly the case for Daniel, who found it difficult to build a stable home for his young family and establish a life for them. Jerry states that the salary he was receiving could not even afford him a decent pair of shoes. Being a husband and father of two, providing for his family was becoming a rapidly intensifying situation.

Martha (Interview 16, 2018), although not married and having no children, was one of the main financial contributors at home. The company she worked for was at a stage where they were not compensating employees, only financing their transport costs, to and from work each day. This continued for months and began to take its toll on most of the employees, and thus, according to Martha led to the resignation of several employees, including herself. It was at this point that she considered SA as a potential destination in
search of employment. She contacted a close friend who was living and studying in Potchefstroom. She mentions her rather spontaneous decision to leave Zimbabwe and head for Potchefstroom without any real plans regarding what she plans to do upon arriving:

“So, I had a friend here she was doing Masters. So, I just said let me visit here for month in November 2013. I just resigned and told her I’m coming to SA to look for a job. I gave her my CV. So, she told me I must come. I came directly to her here in Potch. When I got here, she asked me, ‘so where are you going to look for a job’?” (Interview 16, 2018).

What Martha mentions here is in line with what Trevor and Jerry (Interview 6 & 15, 2018) regard as the simple need to migrate from Zimbabwe with the purpose of obtaining economic betterment elsewhere. They believe that in-depth planning to migrate, when to migrate or where to migrate to in SA are hardly factors of consideration for most Zimbabweans in SA. For Trevor (Interview 6, 2018), it is more a matter of simply migrating to SA than it is a matter of deciding where exactly the destination in SA should be:

“Trying to find a new living, trying to find a new thing, something new for me to earn something into my pocket. For myself I used to travel. I’ve been to Namibia; I’ve been to Tanzania. All that time I was going to those countries I was just trying to earn a living; you know how it is”.

What Trevor highlights is that the importance of the chosen destination is determined by whether or not he is able to earn a living. This is synonymous with Ong’s conception of ‘flexible citizenship’ (1998; 2006), and thus, the economic rudiment, whereby citizens claim allegiance to a nation based on whether or not they can realise their economic ambitions.

Alongside the socio-economic condition, as discussed in chapter 1 and 2 (see sections 1.1 and 2.5), many Zimbabweans who migrate to SA cite the political tension in Zimbabwe, especially during the leadership of former president Robert Mugabe. Not much regarding the political climate of Zimbabwe emerged from the interviews, with focus afforded mainly to the socio-economic condition. Perhaps the political condition of Zimbabwe is not much of a concern for the Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom, with many merely expressing general dissatisfaction with the political leaders and officials of Zimbabwe (Focus group 2 & 3, 2018; Interview 5, 8 &17, 2018). Eric probably provides the most insightful remark regarding the socio-political dynamics and their impact on migrating from Zimbabwe:
"Initially for some it was when there where political upheavals at home where people were being beaten and some dying. So, they ran away from the powers that be. We have some families who lost their family members and had to flee. But for some, because of mismanagement of the economy, there was nothing to do. You can find if you checked, only probably approximately, I don’t know now, maybe around 10%, last when I saw it was something like 6% people who are employed. Where is the rest? We are the ones who are all over the world looking for opportunities" (Interview 1, 2018).

This “some” Eric is referring to encompasses the Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, or at least those that partook in this study.

Although the socio-economic condition in Zimbabwe is cited as the main reason for migrating, students highlight specifically the ‘education’ factor as a reason specific to them. For instance, Thomas (Interview 10, 2018), as a final year student, believes he has no future seeking employment in Zimbabwe following the completion of his studies. His beliefs are situated in his perception of the socio-economic condition of Zimbabwe weighed up against the symbolic promise of ‘green pastures’ and self-betterment which SA provides. He critiques the opinions of his Zimbabwean friends who were against his decision to leave Zimbabwe for the opportunity to study and live in SA:

“They believe that they can still make money in Zim. You can create jobs and hustle in Zim, you can still find a job in Zim. I believe that is true, you can create jobs in Zim, but even if you get a job there, with the economy, it won’t sustain you and your family. So, I think it’s a better option coming here. Besides just earning money, your mind is open to meet new people. You learn how to handle life when you meet new people. It’s not like you are in a box" (Interview 10, 2018).

Thomas further explained that his initial desire was to study in Bulawayo and then perhaps head to Harare for in quest of employment, or perhaps try for an opportunity to study in the United States (Interview 10, 2018). It was, however, his parents’ decision that he pursue his studies in SA. Since doing so, he believes that his move to SA was a much better and realistic option, as his option and opportunities are numerous, whilst he remains close to home.

Amy (Focus group 4, 2018) believes and is convinced that there are no opportunities for her in Zimbabwe following the completion of her studies. She states that Gweru, where
she particularly comes from has nothing, as most companies have closed down, and Harare is already overflowing with Zimbabweans shifting from rural to urban setting in search of economic and education opportunities. Louise (Interview 7, 2018) also highlights the growing population of Harare, where she comes from, and states that it has ascended to such an extent that even the “hustlers” face rapidly intensifying competition. She therefore also highlights the unlikelihood of her returning to Zimbabwe to pursue a career:

“There are very limited jobs now. So, the best thing is to move and find another job somewhere else, even if you have a certificate like qualifications. You just have to go to another place and look for jobs. That why we are here in SA. Or maybe if you don’t find a job, you can maybe get a chance to get a sponsor to study. Because at least you are not just sitting, you know” (Interview 7, 2018).

Tafadzwa (Interview 2, 2018), as former student who is yet to succeed in his quest for employment in SA since completing his studies, declares that it is better to keep persistently trying in SA than it is to attempt to find what he deems to be meaningful employment in Zimbabwe:

“I’m looking for work now in SA because in Zim there isn’t anything. There are no companies employing people. So, I’m looking for work here. I was telling my friend that it’s useless going back to Zim, there is no point you just going to sit down, and it will be like you didn’t go to university. I’d rather be in SA and find something. There is work here, and lots of companies”.

Therefore, regardless of their love for their home nation, the students that partook in this study all mentioned the unlikelihood of them establishing their careers in Zimbabwe. Students also mentioned that, compared to Zimbabwean students studying in Zimbabwe, their position as students studying in Potchefstroom/SA is beneficial. The standard and quality of tertiary education in SA, they believe, supersedes that of Zimbabwe and also makes available an array of possibilities for them. Shaun (Focus group 4, 2018), one of the participants in the student focus group goes as far as saying Potchefstroom is a “top-notch” region to study in and the university is a prestigious one. The student highlights the financial difficulties their peers studying in Zimbabwe have; as well as the access to an international space that provides them the opportunity to grow as well as mental stimulation.
Simba, on the contrary, provides a rather interesting and opposing justification for his migrating from Zimbabwe. Being the only participant who resides from a well-off suburban family from Harare, Simba (Interview 8, 2018) asserted that the belief that Zimbabwe is a bankrupt nation, currently under extreme poverty and socio-economic endemic is in fact far-fetched and furthest from the truth:

“Some of us who decide to come here come because they just want to come to SA. Not saying that it is because of the suffering, because there are others who are living a good life, but still they come. You understand me? Like yes, its true many others they come here because of the suffering, but it’s wrong to think that everyone is suffering. Because some like me did not come here because of suffering, I came for love and that I wanted to be in SA. I just wanted to leave, so my woman was the perfect reason to go, my man. So, for some it’s just to have a view, like tourism you see?” (Interview 8, 2018).

Simba’s point is crucial here as it adds an additional layer to this narrative, especially as most participants paint a picture of a suffering Zimbabwe, drenched in pitiful situations. He provides a ‘reason for migrating’ that is not merely socio-economical or socio-political; he alludes to more personal reasons – for love, as the woman he loves has relocated to SA. Thus, his equating of his migration to SA as “tourism”, implies that he is speak from a position of privilege.

Although Simba’s account contradicts and does an injustice to what the majority of Zimbabweans regard as reasons of hardship, his point does raise awareness to the unmentioned realities of diversity among Zimbabweans’ reasons to migrate to Potchefstroom/SA. However, as it has been discussed, the shared and common reason, for most, is socio-economic push out of Zimbabwe. Trevor (Interview 6, 2018) emphasises that choosing SA as the destination is mainly a matter of just migrating, rather than it is a matter of preferred destination. The reasons for migrating and settling on a move to SA is concisely expressed by Cynthia (Focus group 1, 2018) with this quoted extract:

“It’s about jobs, it’s about money”

Building on, the following subsection provides a discussion on the living experiences of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.
6.3.1. ‘Living in Potchefstroom’

“Prior my coming, the way I understood the SA people. I felt it was violent. The society is made up of people who don’t like life and they can kill at any time, regardless of gender.” – Eric, (Interview 1, 2018)

SA, according to most participants, is regarded as a violent and unsafe country. The extract from Eric encapsulates this feeling. It is also further expressed by Louise and Thomas, stating that Zimbabweans in Zimbabwe, although regarding SA as a land of opportunity, still feel a move to, and the experiences of living SA has the potential to be quite dangerous (Interview 10, 2018).

The majority of the participants mentioned that it was either through having a relative in SA, having friends or people they know, or having done research that they choose to migrate to SA. There are instances where some Zimbabweans migrated with no knowledge of what to expect, they move to SA pushed by the faith of finding economic prosperity and better opportunities.

They choose particularly Potchefstroom for an array of diverse reasons. Some of these reasons include peace and comfort, safety, as well as competition in the employment sector. They mention the peacefulness of Potchefstroom due to its smallness in terms of area size and population (Focus group 1, 2 & 4, 2018; Interview 1, 3, 10 & 17, 2018). This makes it more comfortable than regions such as Johannesburg, Pretoria, Durban and Cape Town. They see these big cities as noisier and busier than Potchefstroom.

Additionally, participants highlighted crime, violence and xenophobia as a fear they had prior to even leaving Zimbabwe. When asked how Potchefstroom/SA is generally perceived in Zimbabwe, and what they expected to encounter prior their migrating. Crime, violence and xenophobia are the most frequently mentioned, as South Africans are generally perceived to be a violent population (Interview 2, 5 & 9, 2018).

With regards to crime in SA, reports show that it is at the highest in the big cities, particularly Cape Town, Durban, Johannesburg, Pietermaritzburg, Nelson Mandela Bay (Port Elizabeth) and Pretoria (Pariona, 2017; Writer, 2018). Three of these cities constantly feature in the ‘top 50 most violent cities in the world’ ranking, and another making occasional appearances. Table 6.3 provides their world rankings:
Table 6.3: Most violent cities in SA (source: Writer, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>34th</td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Mandela Bay</td>
<td>41st</td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>41st</td>
<td>35th</td>
<td>42nd</td>
<td>43rd</td>
<td>46th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>49th</td>
<td>46th</td>
<td>48th</td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>41st</td>
<td>50th</td>
<td>40th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>50th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The big cities and provinces are also said to have a large population of foreigners, particularly those from the SADC region (see chapter 1, section 1.1). Therefore, unlike Potchefstroom, in the bigger cities, the competition for employment and such other economic opportunities is much more intense in the bigger cities.

When the question “why Potchefstroom?” was posed, the responses were diverse in general. However, Cynthia’s remark could be said to give a summative impression regarding the responses most participants regarding their move to Potchefstroom:

“Most of us look at the smaller towns these days because we know anyone from any country starts to go in the bigger towns like Pretoria, Jo’burg, you know? Durban, Cape Town, those are places that are common to anyone who’s out of SA. So, if you come and hear of the small towns that are out, you come here because it’s a bit hidden. So it’s easy to get jobs or something. Not like the bigger towns” (Focus group 1, 2018).

The students also state that studying in Potchefstroom was a quest for a different environment other than those constantly spoken of (Interview 7 & 9, 2018). Shaun, for example, said:

“Most Zimbabweans, when they talk of coming to study abroad, the first places that perhaps come to mind, its Cape Town, Johannesburg, places like those. So, for me Potch it’s a bit of a notch up” (Focus group 4, 2018).

Amy also added to this during the interview, highlighting once again violence particularly in Johannesburg, as well as the #FeesMustFall student protests. The fact that
Potchefstroom’s learning institutions were not among the violent protesting institutions around SA was a vital decisive factor for her choosing Potchefstroom (Focus group 4, 2018).

Both students and the working Zimbabweans stated that upon arrival in Potchefstroom, the initial feeling is specifically the difficulty of adapting, and not knowing anyone. They also feel further isolated by their lack of understanding the two most spoken languages of Potchefstroom – Setswana and Afrikaans. Neither of these are spoken in Zimbabwe, with many stating to have first heard these in Potchefstroom. For some, this has resulted in social exclusion from non-Zimbabwean groups, particularly the Tswana, who are black South African locals (Interview 4, 8 & 17, 2018), whereas others have experienced even hostility in their work places:

“Like me I’m working with Tswanas ne? I work with them. Sometimes they have that attitude, like I’m taking jobs from them. That’s because I’m highly favoured in the shop. If the boss say jump, I’m jumping the highest. I’m also living in location [Ikageng township] with them but I come here because most Zimbabwean they live in town. So, I work with them here in town. Now they say I come here and we are enemies now, but we are working together but we are like enemies, because we don’t understand each other. They will say, “you, you don’t know your rights”. I tell them I say ‘me, I’m not here for the rights, I’m just here for the work. I came here for money’. So, what my boss say I will do because I’m here to work” (Focus group 1, 2018).

Jerry, who is now also a South African citizen, believes that it is particularly difficult for Zimbabweans working in the informal sector, as this sector is dominated not just by black South African locals, but also an array of other foreign nationals (Interview 15, 2018). He generally feels he is living quite well in Potchefstroom but is among the luckier ones due to having formal qualifications as well as the ‘right’ papers. Referring to the competition in the employment sector, he says:

“Remember we have got categories. We have got people who are not skilled in any way. There also people who are skilled. So, in other words, you are talking of professionals and general labourers. So, I think in there where we are talking of people who are not skilled, that’s where you have got a lot of competition. And you will find a lot of South Africans in also that category. That creates a challenge. But then, you also get professionals. There at least, the people you interact with at that that level some of them are a bit understanding”.
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For Jerry, the challenges that may be associated with being a Zimbabwean migrant in Potchefstroom have, since acquiring his South African citizenship, been replaced by those of being a South African citizen. In his interview, he goes on to say that just like himself, many South Africans working and living in Potchefstroom come from various places in SA. The difference between himself and these South Africans is that they face no difficulties when visiting home, whereas for him, it becomes a matter of crossing the border.

Beyond the distance from home, however, is the language dynamic (Interview 15, 2018), as he is yet to learn either of the two dominant languages of Potchefstroom. The students also expressed their difficulty of adjusting to Potchefstroom due to the language dynamic, but also expressed that this difficulty is not prolonged, as they are often based on campus whereby communication in English is common. Thus, in light of this, a concise discussion regarding the language dynamic is provided in the following subsection.

6.3.2. The ‘language dynamic’

“I’m trying to even learn the language, hey but it’s hard and the people expect you to know it. It’s like you making yourself better when you want to talk in English all the time. Sometimes you feel like you are invading people, you feel like an outsider here.” - Lucy (Interview 4, 2018)

According to Stats SA (2011), the languages spoken in Potchefstroom are predominantly Afrikaans, as well as Setswana, and other official languages spoken include English, Sesotho and isiXhosa. For most Zimbabweans, the languages that they predominantly speak are either chiShona or isiNdebele, as well as English. The participants claim that most, if not all, Zimbabweans speak either Shona and English. Ndebele is spoken predominantly by the Ndebele population group and some Shona people. However, it is Shona that is more imposed on people in Zimbabwe, and thus most people speak specifically Shona and English.

Living in Potchefstroom, participants are faced with two dominate languages that they had never spoken before. Eric actually emphasises this and states that most of them as Zimbabweans had never even heard a word of Afrikaans and Setswana prior being in Potchefstroom (Interview 1, 2018). The language dynamic is seen to be one of the greatest challenges and obstacles for Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom. They are usually
faced with two options: 1) learn the languages to ensure adaptation and fitting into the Potchefstroom society; or, 2) do not learn the languages and thus maintain bonds with, and stick to fellow Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom. The majority of the participants, both working Zimbabweans and students, have opted for option 2 arriving in Potchefstroom (Interview 2, 7, 15 & 17, 2018). This, for them, justifies the reason why Zimbabweans have such close bonds with each other whilst in Potchefstroom.

6.3.3. Challenges related to permits and legal documentation

Along with language are the necessary permits and documents, not only for entry, but also for working and studying in Potchefstroom/SA. There is a belief that, although the SA government does not do anything in particular to discriminate or marginalise migrants in SA, the difficulty the migrants face revolves around the issue of permits and documentation (Interview 3, 15 & 17, 2018). The participants stated that it becomes increasingly hard to find work as formal employment requires a work permit, which they regard as too expensive (Focus group 1 & 3, 2018; Interview 4 & 17, 2018). This results in the majority of participants opting rather for refugee status, and apply for asylum, which according to Lucy (Interview 4, 2018) is much cheaper and quicker to obtain compared to the lengthier waiting period of other permits. According to the SADHA (2018) asylum holders may study and work in SA, they must relinquish any proof of identity linking them to the nation from which they fled. This is troublesome, as participants state, since they are not in possession of their identification documents, and thus find it difficult to travel between SA and Zimbabwe.

The participants never truly delve into the actual dynamics that involve permits, documentation and border politics. However, what was garnered is that the intricacy of the process, as well as the expense creates for the participants who are working a difficulty with regards to their employability – a worker’s permit is vital, and companies are required by law to request it with prospective foreign employees’ working application. Therefore, many participants opt for employment in the informal sector (Focus group 2 & 3, 2018; Interview 1 & 17, 2018).

Students find no difficulties with regards to acquiring a study permit. What they also allude to, however, are the difficulties associated with acquiring a work permit following their studies (Interview 2 & 7, 2018). Louise expresses that, for her it is illogical of SA to not make provision or some special permits for those international students who study in SA.
As a former student struggling to find work, Tafadzwa therefore settled on applying for South African citizenship, as he has lived approximately ten years in SA. He mentions the high cost of obtaining citizenship, and thus the necessity to have some sort of connections – people with knowledge of loopholes in the process:

“You have to have connections. I know a guy who got it for R12 000. He knows a guy who works at Home Affairs. So he just gave him R12 000 and his details, after 5 days it came back, everything is perfect, his ID is in the system, its legit. Everything fine. It’s just the process was made fast for him because he was willing to pay his connection money. So this guy approached my father and told him he can organise the SA IDs for us for R12 000 if we want. And even this guy from Zim works there at Home Affairs, so he knows how to check if everything is fine” (Interview 2, 2018).

In essence, the permits and legal documentation allow for the extent to which Zimbabwean migrants can be active residents of Potchefstroom; partaking in employment activities, as well as studying opportunities. Permits make it possible for them to access resources that would otherwise not be possible – that is, studying and applying for study bursaries; gaining full-time formal employment for both skilled, as well as unskilled workers (should their place of work require a working permit). Therefore, their role in the assigning of field positions for migrants in a host nation begs to be acknowledged. Progressing this Zimbabwean narrative, the next subsection discusses the Zimbabwean community of Potchefstroom – in other words, how close-knit and connected are the Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom with each other?

6.3.4. The Zimbabwean community of Potchefstroom

Generally, the participants claim that there is some sort of Zimbabwean community in Potchefstroom, though people are not as closely tied and linked as the Ethiopians and Pakistanis are (Focus group 3, 2018; Interview 4, 5 & 17, 2018). There is an informal group they have formed, which plays the role of a support group. The idea behind this group is that members make monthly monetary contributions as a type of insurance in the case of emergencies, such as illness or even death (Interview 1, 5, 15, 17, 2018).

What was of immediate interest upon conversing with the participants on this subject, however, is what one participant, Linda (Focus group 4, 2018) mentioned as the best feature of being part of this group:
“Like now when you are in the group and everyone is speaking Shona it’s nice, it is like we are at home. It’s nice. And even when I see someone that is speaking Shona I will see my brother, my mother, my sister.”

For Ivy (Interview 17, 2018) the feeling of togetherness and interacting about Zimbabwe, in their native chiShona language, produces a euphoric feeling – the feeling of being a Zimbabwean. However, what could be argued here is that only chiShona-speaking Zimbabweans are truly accommodated here. IsiNdebele, for instance, is not the language of choice, as it is also said by many participants that chiShona is the dominant language and every Zimbabwean can speak it (Focus group 2 & 4, 2018; Interview 6, 9 & 11, 2018).

The students also acknowledged that their close-knit student group is centred around chiShona (Focus group 4, 2018; Interview 7 & 9, 2018). TK (Interview 9, 2018), for instances, remarked:

“You have to be able to speak Shona otherwise you'll feel left out. Everyone in Zim can speak Shona, even the Ndebele, so when we are here we speak Shona when we get together. It’s always excited and fun. We even teach other, like those ones who don’t speak it well, like the Ndebele guys. We also teach each other Setswana bra. Like the ones who have learned always share. It's a cool vibe bra. We are like family here”.

The Pastor, as a Ndebele man with a Ndebele family, emphasised that in his own Ndebele household, chiShona is the dominant language. He also proclaims that the dominant group at home (the Shona) will still intend to maintain their dominance even in SA, therefore, this is particularly why all things Zimbabwean, including the language of communication whilst in SA, is chiShona (Interview 14, 2018).

Whilst this may be the case, that the Ndebele can also speak chiShona, it could perhaps be that the Ndebele are said to ‘blend’ into SA easier since they can easily speak isiZulu (Interview 13, 2018). In fact, it is in this regard that many participants, particularly the Shona, proclaim that some Zimbabweans hide their identity when in SA in order to fit and feel South African (Focus group 3, 2018; Interview 5, 13 & 17, 2018). The Ndebele are said to be the more likely to do this according to some participants. This notion of ‘concealed identities’ is discussed in subsection 6.3.4.
Tafadzwa believes that Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom are quite connected in that they know each other but form various small cliques which occasionally come together for activities such as braais, birthdays and graduation celebration. However, he considers the bond not to be strong due to the jealousy between those who are succeeding and those who are struggling to stabilise themselves in Potchefstroom (Interview 2, 2018). Therefore, this causes rifts between some Zimbabweans. This, he claims, justifies the reason behind the formation and the essential necessity for the recreational soccer group he co-created. In fact, for Tafadzwa, the actual benefit of the group is beyond just recreation for Zimbabwean men in Potchefstroom, he believes that this is probably the best sphere for them to unite and reflect on Zimbabwe and create a feeling of being at home. Though it may appear as simply a group of friends meeting weekly for leisure, to him it is their arena of uniting as ‘homeboys’; an opportunity to be proudly Zimbabwean, engaging in conversation about Zimbabwe, in a Zimbabwean language (particularly chiShona), with fellow Zimbabweans:

“Ja, so when we meet, we talk about like, how Zimbabwe is. We talk about what’s happening in Zim, and we try to catch up on the economic things, the social things and what’s happening in Zim. So, it’s sort of like a group that’s just meeting up as Zimbabweans to catch up and see what’s happening in our home country” (Interview 2, 2018).

Thomas (Interview 10, 2018) believes this lack of bond is particularly between the two main categorical groups of Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom – the students and the non-students who are usually unskilled and/or informal labourers. Thomas states that the non-students are particularly the ones who choose not to interact with students, claiming that students have no experiences of the hardships most Zimbabweans face, as they receive either money from parents at home if not study bursaries. Therefore, for Thomas, there is a division between these groups, even though Zimbabweans generally know each other and frequently meeting in various spaces such as church or birthday parties (Interview 10, 2018).

In line with Thomas, are Louise and TK (Interview 9, 2018) who also believe that students are closer and more strongly bonded with other students, than they are to non-student Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom. In fact, TK goes on to explain that as students in SA, they are sometimes referred to as a “sasco” by those not studying, especially those back home in Harare:
“A sasco is like a cheese-boy. You are spoiled and rich, and probably higher class and have money. When they call you sasco that’s what they think. Even if it’s not true. So, they say all of us studying in SA are people with money and we are sascos. Even if it’s not true, but you are just a sasco [laughs]. So, people treat you like a higher class person. Some really don’t like you much. It’s crazy”.

This notion of a sasco brought about rise to the question of ‘being Zimbabwean status’, particularly the manner in which those who have moved to SA are perceived by those at home. This also includes how they perceive each other, as well as how they perceive themselves and the meaning of ‘being Zimbabwean’ in Potchefstroom – away from Zimbabwe.

6.3.5. Concealed identities: factors of ‘fear of discrimination’, safety, ‘fitting-in’ and social acceptance

This subsection stands in contrast with the subsections above which presented a proudly and openly Zimbabwean position from the participants, whereby they describe various characteristics and traits which make them who they are - Zimbabweans. However, the practice of concealing their identity in certain circumstances whilst in SA questions the extent to which they are open about their ‘Zimbabweanness’. As this subsection explains, factors related to their safety, the fear of discrimination, their desire to fit in as well as their desire for social acceptance whilst in Potchefstroom/SA contribute to the concealing of identities. Precious highlights the commonness of this practice, alluding to the stigma Zimbabwe has due to its economic condition as a cause for the concealment of identity:

“There are many people who do that, and I don’t know why? I don’t know if it’s the hatred of coming from a poor country or whatsoever, but it’s not good. That’s where we belong” (Interview 12, 2018).

Although Precious states she is unaware of the reasons as to why some Zimbabweans conceal their identities, her remarks highlight a rather intriguing dynamic: that of belonging and identity. As mentioned by Calhoun et al. (2007:261), an actor’s social identity not only signals their habitus to other actors, but also affords them with their initial position upon entering fields. Many participants highlighted the reality of such a situation among them as
foreigners in Potchefstroom/SA. Once again, this brings rise the debate of the Shona and the Ndebele, only this time the arena of tension is in Potchefstroom/SA. The belief, by particularly the Shona participants, is that hiding of identity is common among the Ndebele due to their language being similar to isiZulu, which is spoken as a mother tongue by approximately 23% of South Africans, with the related isiXhosa following at 16% (Stats SA, 2011:24). It is therefore said by many that the Ndebele can easily blend into the society in SA and can go as far as pretending to be of South African descent.

TK (Interview 9, 2019), for instance, does not see it to be a phenomenon associated with the Ndebele. In fact, he believes that many Zimbabweans who learn the languages spoken in SA have the potential to hide their Zimbabwean identity, pretending to be South Africans. As a Shona, he mentions his own cousins who are fluent in isiZulu and their refusal to be acknowledged as Zimbabweans:

“For me, we’re all African, man. The borders were created by European colonisers. So, for me whatever you want to identify with, I’m cool with it. I mean I also have cousins who are like that, they identify themselves as South Africans. For example, I have a cousin on this campus, she is Zimbabwean. If I tell people she is my cousin, she gets mad because no one knows she’s not South African. She would literally kill me if I introduced her to you as a Zimbabwean” (Interview 9, 2018).

TK goes on to highlight that he sees the concealment of identity not as a factor associated with the Ndebele, but a factor associated with fear. He refers to xenophobia as if it is an abstract noun. As if it is a ‘suffering’ in itself, which they fear and constantly seek safety from (Interview 9, 2018). Many other participants also believe that the prime reason behind concealing identities is not merely due to adapting in SA, but more for the pursuit of safety, social acceptance and entry into social fields. The history of xenophobia in SA; particularly the attacks and killings of black African migrants by black South African citizens, are well known and commented on across the world in various media and scholarly publications (see Hagensen, 2014; Solomon, & Kosaka, 2017; Tella, 2016).

Many participants in this study expressed that there is a level of social anxiety which the term ‘xenophobia’ evokes. Linda, one of the focus groups group members (Focus group 3, 2018) showed sensitivity to even saying the term; she refers to it as “that word starting with X”. So, regarding Zimbabweans who conceal their identity, she says:
Linda: “You know what can I say? I don’t blame them. They are afraid of what, what do you call that name in English?”

Researcher: “Xenophobia?”

Linda: [laughs] “I’m afraid to say it. They are afraid to die of that so you see if someone sees me they will start saying “ikwerekwere” or what. That’s bad. So, people will end up pretending. I have one brother of mine who will tell you that he does not know Shona, but we are Shonas. He does not want to speak it. He is afraid” (Focus group 3, 2018).

Daniel (Interview 3, 2018), who is a Ndebele-speaking Zimbabwean gives an interesting account of his experience of working in Pretoria. He worked as a security guard with a few South Africans and other foreigners. His experience in this case involves a fellow Zimbabwean whom he worked with in Johannesburg. Daniel mentions that this particular man was perceived as a South African. He says the following:

“A call came through and I could hear someone talking and talking. I was acting like I was sleeping and I hear this person speaking about cows and I hear him mention Lupane. Lupane is a town after Bulawayo so I begin asking myself, ‘where is Simone from?’ Then I hear him say “aboMamo”, this is a very common name for children born to the Moyo surname. It is a playful term of endearment. So, I hear him ask how are “aboMamo” which left confused because I could hear this man is mentioning Ndebele words. I believe that to this day people believe that he is South African” (interview 3, 2018).

As a derogatory term often directed towards black African migrants in SA, being classified as *ikwerekwere* signals individuals out as black African migrants who are particularly ‘leeches’ to SA (see Makoni & Severo, 2017; Mthonjeni, 2013; Zondi, 2017). In this regard, it is clear and justifiable as to why such a classification would result in social anxiety, to such an extent that individuals conceal their identities; opting for an alternative/counter identity that may grant them safety, acceptance and entrance in the social realm. Being perceived as citizens of SA offers security on a social level. Therefore, concealing their identity, for some, is a ‘social contrivance’ or ‘social instrument’ for safely navigating a foreign realm which may be hostile – it is sort of like a shield to repel, or rather covertly evade any hostility that their ‘foreigner’ status may yield. It could be said it is dangerous and potentially fatal to be openly Zimbabwean in an ethnocentric South African nation.
6.3.6. ‘Relationship are affected’: the impact of migration

“You know, to not get to see your children grow, anything could happen, and you wouldn’t know what was going on because the situation is forcing us to leave our children behind. It’s a problem.” – Nancy (Interview 5, 2018)

Whilst forming community/family-like social bonds and connections with each other as Zimbabweans, and whilst toggling between identities for some, the relationships they once had and held dear in Zimbabwe are either tarnished or slowly dissolving. All participants interviewed expressed the impact their migrating has had on the family and friendship relations they have in Zimbabwe. Precious, for instance, recently lost her uncle and was unable to attend the funeral. Sending financial contributions towards the funeral preparations was her only way of feeling a part of the ceremony (Interview 12, 2018). She alluded to how her family and friends in Mutare generally receive her as conceited, as well as the effect this has on her and children in SA:

“The relationship back home is just, it’s very difficult. Like when I told you last time that my uncle passed on and I didn’t go. They think you don’t want to join other people and just taking it as you are better than everyone and such things. But it is not even like that. I cannot afford to go there and come back and at the same time it is not holidays, I have to work. So, I don’t have to go, at least if I can send a little money then maybe it is better. It’s like we are no longer very close, like we are not even related. They just don’t know that you are struggling. I cannot even put a R100 for airtime to just call home. It is a lot of money and you can’t speak to everyone”

Eric believes that there is pressure on the Zimbabweans living in Potchefstroom to show off some level of wealth and prosperity upon returning home:

“You can’t be the same person that left there with nothing and then go back with nothing again” (Interview 1, 2018).

For Eric, moving to SA already exalts one’s position in Zimbabwe, indirectly applying pressure on Zimbabweans to work by all means towards the acquisition of some form of visible or tangible success and gains. Daniel (Interview 3, 2018) cites this as one of the
core reasons as to why many Zimbabwean migrants in SA take years before ever returning home, just for a short visit.

Students in this regard also alluded to the same factor of friendships in particular dissolving. Family is seen to be expectedly supportive of the pursuit of education (Interview 2, 7, 10 &16, 2018). In the case of being a parent away from their children, or a spouse away from their partner, the Pastor (Interview 14, 2018) says:

“There is always the anxiety of that I’m here and I don’t know what’s happening to my family”

Therefore, it can be argued that being physically away from the home nation hinders the relationship between those at home and those away. There are instances of anxiety, as highlighted by the Pastor, that is experienced particularly by those who have left spouses and children behind in Zimbabwe. Being physically away from Zimbabwe with intention of gaining better education or economic opportunities in order to provide and assist the family back home is contradicted by the physical absence and detachment of the migrants from their (social) relationships with family and friends.

6.3.7. Activities in Potchefstroom: what do we do as Zimbabweans?

“The majority of us are into trading, like buying and selling. Some have gotten portions of land from the farms they are working in around Potch. They are doing vegetable farming and chicken. Others are students. Some try for white-collar jobs, like working in government departments and colleges. But there’s only a few of them.” – Eric (Interview 1, 2018)

Throughout this chapter thus far, it has been evident that the two main activities Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom engage in are ‘working’, as well as ‘studying’ (particularly tertiary education). Furthermore, their activities towards ‘keeping in touch with Zimbabwe’ are also acknowledged in this subsection. Eric was the most reliable and extensive participant in this regard. Other participants merely synoptically reuttered the core of what he had already stated.
**General recreational practices**

According to the participants in this study, Potchefstroom offers them an opportunity to safely venture into a less competitive employment sector, whereby opportunities for both formal and informal employment are available (provided the ‘right’ papers are in order). However, outside of these two main activities, Zimbabwean migrants also engage in recreational practices, which Eric regards as being ‘normal’ and common even among South Africans:

“We do still do our Zimbabwean things here in Potchefstroom. We all grew up with reggae and the uplifting message it teaches. Even here in Potch we have birthday parties, anniversaries, and so on. These are things we do a lot at home with our families, so we try to foster and uphold them here. So, we started together for my kids and son-in-law and daughter-in-law and their kids. We used to invite people, and they also so it fit that we do it as a community. We have even tried to make a support society for ourselves in the event of death and other problems, we can contribute and help each other. We realised that if a misfortune falls, with all our families far away, the only family close by are the ones who come from home. We are trying to make this group formal.” (Interview 1, 2018)

Participants generally noted some, if not all, of these entities listed and described by Eric, as being common among them. The significant difference compared to non-Zimbabwean groups is that they speak exclusively chiShona as they enjoy recreation activities with each other.

Amy and Shaun (Focus group 4, 2018) mention their adventurous quests around Potchefstroom “hunting” for vegetables and other foods that are available in Zimbabwe:

Amy and Shaun: “I became more comfortable with speaking my home language because I have a lot of people to speak to in it, and hunting down vegetables and eating the basic meal which was the highlight of my year.”

Researcher: “What meal is that?”

Amy and Shaun: “Sadza, and covo, you don’t find these green veggies at OK, you hardly ever find it.”

These two participants essentially engage in this practice of ‘vegetable hunting’ as a weekend recreational activity. They hunt specifically for vegetables they regard to be scarce in SA, and potentially more common in Zimbabwe. This scarcity or, in most cases,
unavailability of their familiar and preferred foods resulted in some migrants such as Jerry to engage in subsistence farming.

**Subsistence farming**

Jerry is among those who has a portion of land for farming. The farming is predominantly of Zimbabwean vegetables, as well as an array of green vegetables, emphasising that a Zimbabwean meal is nothing without green vegetables. His farm is mainly subsistence, however, he does occasionally attempt selling some of his produce to other Zimbabweans, though this particular business venture does not gain as much support as it should, as Jerry states, since other Zimbabweans negotiate free supply of vegetables:

> “The farm started as something for me and my family as we were wanting to get the kind of vegetables we have at home that are not here in SA. You know, with vegetables it becomes tiresome because these guys they don’t just easily buy and support us, they just want to just come and take. They say we are friends, so they just want to take [laughs]. Even when you go around selling, they give you a hard time when it comes to giving you your cash [laugh]” (Interview15, 2018).

**Maintaining linkages and ‘keeping in touch’ with Zimbabwe**

Some of the activities Zimbabwean migrants engage in assist them in bringing and keeping Zimbabwe, as well as the feeling of being in Zimbabwe, as Zimbabwean. While this is certainly the case, it does not imply that Zimbabweans are therefore settled in Potchefstroom as Zimbabweans and thus cutting any ties and possible returns to the actual land of Zimbabwean. Transnationalism and transmigration scholars assert that a clinical cutting of ties is never the case, as migrants will in some way of another maintain their linkage to their home nation (see chapter 2, section 2.4). Whether this link will be a semi-physical presence in Zimbabwe, and to Zimbabweans in Zimbabwe, through activities in Zimbabwe, such as financial or some other investments; or through activities with other Zimbabweans in the host nation (Potchefstroom/SA). Reuben, for instance, says:

> “While I sit here, I try to make sure I do something at home, because I know one day I may go. That’s my plan, I still have interests at home. I have a project at home, I go as and when I’ ready to go and work on the project. Over and above, it means running two homes at once, being here and working on my project back home” (Interview 13, 2018)
This implies that generally participants will have some form of constant communication and presence in their home nation. The distance, for instance, is a particular issue for Lucy, which, she stated, results in her constantly being on her phone, sending messages, pictures and makings video-calls; communicating with family and friends back home (Interview 4, 2018). She is among many participants who state that the one means of communication that they rely on is social media and messenger-applications, particularly WhatsApp. Gloria states that the destination, at the end, will once again be Zimbabwe, thus maintaining connections if of importance for her:

“We keep in touch, because its home, because one day we will go back for good. If things go well there, we will go back. Now we can only use WhatsApp and even video call. Then sometimes we can go home maybe twice a year, or maybe the kids come and visit” (Focus group 1, 2018)

Eric also recognises particularly the vital roles that the WhatsApp app, as well as video-calling have played in the attempt to maintain relationships with relatives and friends in Zimbabwe, as well as remaining informed on the happenings in Zimbabwe daily. He acknowledges how it has brought home closer to him and his family, especially having lived in SA for over 15 years (Interview 1, 2018). For him, however, it is the connection that Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom have with each other – as a Potchefstroom-Zimbabwean group – that is much more significant. Eric spoke extensively in this regard, mentioning even the role his wife plays among the Zimbabwean community in Potchefstroom:

“We stay mostly connected with others here in Potch. For example, my wife, they have a prayer group. They pray and help each other as women. At one point they were putting money together and buying cooking utensils and assisting each other and share information.”

Therefore, in this regard Eric, as well as Cynthia (Focus group 1, 2018) also state that coming together to assist and buy certain products together is more economical than pursuing such activities individually. This way, the goods travel in one trip back to Zimbabwe to be received by family, or other recipients awaiting them. Currency itself is
hardly sent to Zimbabwe, however, as it would lose its value due to the high inflation in Zimbabwe, hence the sending of goods instead (Interview 1, 13, 15 &17, 2018).

However, should the necessity to send currency arise, participants state that mobile phone applications are useful in that regard. All that is required are mobile data bundles (Interview 4, 2018). Trevor makes reference of another common medium usually useful for sending currency – Makuru. Makuru (2018), according to the official website, makes provision for a “trusted and secure” means of sending “money around Africa”. For Trevor, it is quick and convenient, whilst also benefiting the countries from which currency is sent to, and received from:

“You go there by PEP stores and you tell them you want to send this much money, and due to the deal between Mukuru and the SA bank, they convert and receive the money in US dollars. This transaction is also benefitting this country its legal” (Interview 6, 2018).

Cross-border deliver service

With the growing need and demand for a delivery service that transports goods such as food and building material back to Zimbabwe, Jerry states that he is one of the providers of such a service:

“We are building this other trailer for the business because the other one is small now. It’s like when you ask how connected we are. People are sending stuff to Zimbabwe, they are building houses there, and that’s where my other business comes in now. This business. Transporting stuff. When you are sending food, like maybe saying you want to send people in Zim stuff, that the link we fulfil. We close that gap. And just facilitating that people can always send things and give their families back home what they need” (Interview 15, 2018).

What Jerry fulfils with this delivery transport service is literally the closing of the gap between Potchefstroom and Zimbabwe. This service further makes provision for those Zimbabweans that would otherwise be unable to send any goods home due to either the financial cost, time or perhaps lack of the ‘right’ papers to effortlessly cross the border.

6.3.8. Conclusion

“We are proudly Zimbabwean and hardworking people. If it were not for the economic meltdown, we wouldn’t have found ourselves in these shores. But we
The above quotation from Eric provides a rather summative conclusion regarding ‘being Zimbabwean’, as well as the reasons and needs to migrate to Potchefstroom. They are hardworking and patriotic, driven out of Zimbabwe by socio-economic upheavals, as well as the need to survive and provide for the family. From the above analysis, it was brazen to observe that the perception, interpretations and practices of Zimbabwean migrants towards their citizenship yield two fundamental themes, through which these can be understood, that is: 1) ‘Being in Zimbabwe’; and 2) ‘Living in Potchefstroom’. Understanding these two themes, in the manner in which they have been discussed throughout this chapter, bring closer the answer to the overarching question in this research study: what are the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom?

6.4. The dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom: a conclusive discussion

The following section provides a discussion towards answering the overarching question of this research study: what are the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom? Towards an answer to this question, this chapter provided the perceptions, interpretations and practices that Zimbabwean migrants engage in while in Potchefstroom, as well as their lived experiences of Zimbabwe. Through understanding these, it is possible to understand the varying dynamics that result in the acquisition of transnational citizenship for Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.

6.4.1. Transnational vertical and horizontal relationships

The discussion provided in this subsection addresses the vertical and horizontal relationships which Zimbabwean migrants are confronted with. This involves the (vertical) relationship they have with the nation-state of Potchefstroom/SA and Zimbabwe
simultaneously, as migrants of Potchefstroom and citizens of Zimbabwe. Furthermore, this also includes the (horizontal) relationship between the Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom and the Zimbabweans in Zimbabwe as well as those in Potchefstroom/SA. The horizontal relationship also includes the local South Africans and also other non-Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom/SA.

**Vertical relationships and power distributions**

The Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom essentially have a vertical relationship with Zimbabwe, and this is particularly the home nation-and-citizen dichotomy. In this regard, Zimbabwean migrants are in fact citizens of Zimbabwe living outside of Zimbabwe, in a foreign nation. As citizens, they share a national habitus, which is particularly a Zimbabwean habitus – being Zimbabwean. However, beyond the generally shared feeling of being Zimbabwean, Zimbabweans from rural regions experience the socio-economic condition of the country much more intensely than those from urban regions. Those coming from Harare (the capital city), for instance, highlight the existing, though demising, industries in this region, coupled with the availability of education institutions, as well as the government offices. Whereas, those coming from regions such as Mutare or Masvingo highlight the scarcity of employment opportunities, and thus the necessity of people to either hustle for themselves or migrate to the larger cities. Therefore, the experiences of different citizens in relation to the general structure, bureaucracy and economic condition of Zimbabwe, affects the manner in which they can navigate the country and their access to capital and better positions, based on where they are located in Zimbabwe. Thus, it could be argued that the country is structured in such a way that certain citizens are better positioned to benefit in terms of education, employment and economic opportunities than others are.

On the other hand, Zimbabwean citizens are migrants in Potchefstroom/SA, whereby, unlike the Zimbabwe realm their status limits their mobility as well as their general activeness in the country. This means that, since they are outside of the territory of Zimbabwe, they fall under the regulations of Potchefstroom/SA, their host nation. Therefore, meaning that they are engaged in a hierarchical (top-down) relationship with Potchefstroom/SA, whilst they remain in such a relationship with Zimbabwe. Their requiring of permits to partake in the employment sector and schooling in SA places them in a field position lower ranked than those that are occupied by other actors, particularly the South African locals, who do not require such permits.
Furthermore, most participants highlight obtaining asylum seekers’ permits when they enter and settle in Potchefstroom/SA, as these permits are quicker to obtain and are much more cost effective than other permits such as a general worker’s permit. However, the asylum seekers’ permits further limits their mobility in Potchefstroom/SA, as this permit assigns to them refugee status, which implies that they are a vulnerable foreigner requiring refuge and protection within SA. They must relinquish all their identity documents connecting them to their home country to be granted asylum. The asylum permit therefore places them in a much lower field position than general worker’s permit would, though neither permit grants them anything close to what South African citizenship would – this particularly being the freedom to navigate, negotiate and compete in any of the available fields, free of hassles. In this regard, however, their Zimbabweaness is compromised; it is now also officially interlinked with being South African. The reality is that: not having the ‘right’ papers, is legally regarded as a direct infringement of the official/legal doxa of Potchefstroom fields, and thus makes the Zimbabwean migrants ineligible to compete in any of the available fields.

Their dilemma of being both a citizen and a migrant simultaneously brings to the fore the question of belonging and identity. Where, on one side, the migrants will understand themselves and also identify with ‘being Zimbabwean’ and belonging to Zimbabwe, as this is where they acquired their primary habitus. The primary field position and symbolic capital acquired from the primary habitus is most valuable in the Zimbabwe realm. It is in this realm that they are free to roam the territory; free to enter the employment sector; free to partake in political practices such as voting (beyond just having subjective opinions from across the border). Thus, being Zimbabweans essentially places them, at least in Zimbabwe, in better field positions, allowing them to compete for, particularly in their case, positions and resources in the employment/economic field.

However, as a migrant, and thus a foreigner, entering the fields of Potchefstroom, they are already at a disadvantage, possibly in lower field positions in the fields they enter, and requiring ‘special’ permission and acknowledgment prior to them entering and competing in a field – permits. Therefore, their dilemma as citizens and migrants is the position and amount of power such statuses afford for them in the fields they encounter in Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe. It is a conglomeration of favourable and unfavourable positions granted by their status: in Zimbabwe, being a citizen is favourable, and thus the primary habitus and national Zimbabwean habitus is ideal for them in this realm; the migrant status is not as ideal in the Potchefstroom/SA realm, and as a result it is not their
primary habitus that is essential for their navigating and competing in the fields available in Potchefstroom/SA, but their socialised subjectivity which assists them to understand and have a ‘feel for the game’ within the fields in which they enter in Potchefstroom/SA. This implies that it is what they personally do, experience and encounter – their perceptions, interpretations and practices – while living in Potchefstroom/SA, that determines ability and extent to which they can enter and actively partake in competition for capital and positions in the Potchefstroom/SA realm.

**Horizontal relationships**

Zimbabwe as a realm of action and power relations, also has internal social dynamics, particularly the Shona and Ndebele tension. This tension, as it has been alluded to, may also facilitate the occurrences on the field. With regards to the employment field, it could be argued that one of the groups is likely to dominate certain industries of occupation, especially as per region these industries are located. Participants generally felt the Shona were those most capable of occupying the majority of available positions, and thus acquire the largest amounts of capital due to their dominance in Zimbabwe. Therefore, this creates particularly for the marginalised group, an uneven playing field. Thus, although other groups are recognised as citizens of Zimbabwe, as well as their recognising each other in this way too, the Shona are stronger actors in Zimbabwe.

As Zimbabwe is predominantly a Shona nation-state, the findings also show that the Ndebele (those with a Zimbabwe-Ndebele habitus) feel marginalised and less privileged than the Shona (with a Shona-Zimbabwe habitus). The feeling is that, since the government and as well as the top officials consists mainly of individuals who are of Shona descent, the nation/-state prioritises the Shona; also placing the Shona culture and language as the main culture and language of Zimbabwe.

However, in Potchefstroom/SA, Zimbabweans generally have a close relationship with each other, sometimes even using terms such as ‘family’ to describe their relationship. They maintain bonds through which they are able to openly express their Zimbabweanness; enjoying Zimbabwean food and engaging in socio-political conversations regarding Zimbabwe, and thus expressing and ‘living out’ their Zimbabwean culture in a foreign land – that is, being Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom/SA. They even have support groups through which they support each other should emergencies such as death emerge. However, the close bonds are divided between the students and working (non-students) Zimbabweans. Students are closer to students than there are to the non-
students; similarly working Zimbabweans are not as close to the students as they are to other working Zimbabweans who are also likely to have their families with them in Potchefstroom/SA.

The Shona and Ndebele tension is semi-reversed within the Potchefstroom/SA realm, as the Ndebele possibly adapt quicker to the environment, easily passing as members of the Zulu clans. This leaves the Shona at a similar, if not worse, position than that of the Ndebele within the terrain of Potchefstroom/SA. Once again, the question of belonging and identity arises. By virtue of being recognised as a migrant in Potchefstroom/SA, Zimbabweans automatically can make claims of ‘belonging’ to SA, even if that ‘belonging’ has its limits. However, being identified as a migrant also has its disadvantages particularly in the social realm. Being a foreigner, especially a black African migrant in SA, has its challenges, particularly negative stigmatisation and xenophobic discrimination. In this regard, it is the Ndebele that are said to truly find means to negotiate and forge relationships with South Africans due to the close relation of the Ndebele and Zulu cultures and languages. The Shona participants claim that xenophobic hostility is likely to be experienced by them more than the Ndebele, however, generally, it was found that regardless of the similarities between the Ndebele and Zulu cultures and languages, the Ndebele still regard themselves as Zimbabweans, and thus, foreigners in SA, citing Zimbabwe as the country to which they belong.

With regards to their active presence in the Potchefstroom/SA realm, the participants in this study make no direct reference to their relationship with other non-Zimbabwean foreigners. They do acknowledge the presence and closeness of the Ethiopians and Pakistanis, for instance. However, their significant horizontal relationships are particularly with South Africans in Potchefstroom. Zimbabweans cite particularly the language dynamics as the main obstacle preventing meaningful relationships with South Africans. This creates hostility in their places of work, more so if they work with or among South Africans.

The doxa of Potchefstroom require them to, at least, grasp one of the two main languages of the region, as this allows for easier navigation of the fields available in Potchefstroom. However, many of them already state that they feel excluded, like outsiders, due to their inability to communicate in the local dialects of Potchefstroom. They feel that South Africans, in general, do not accept them as Zimbabweans; further making it difficult for the Zimbabweans to openly and effectively enter and act in a field in Potchefstroom/SA as a Zimbabwean.
Desperation to enter and play the field can result in the Zimbabweans to go to extents which may result in the ‘need’ to conceal their identity, using a counterfeit identity in order to gain some degree of symbolic capital. This also allows for better social field positions – they become regarded as South Africans by those who are unaware their true Zimbabwean identity. Furthermore, this gains them degrees of social acceptance from South Africans, and safety from any hostility or xenophobic sentiments. Thus, being in SA, among South Africans, impedes on their proudly being Zimbabwean, as well as their openness to be Zimbabweans in SA.

6.4.2. Dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom

This subsection provides a discussion towards concluding on the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants. This is done by addressing the main research question of this study, which is:

What are the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom?

Therefore, what is first addressed is the way in which this chapter captured the transnational citizenship in relationship to Zimbabwe, and that Zimbabwean migrants do in fact have a transnational citizenship. Following this is a discussion on the usefulness of the theory of practice in analysing and understanding the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.

Transnational citizenship

From the discussion in subsection 6.4.1, it can be argued that the holistic analysis provided in this chapter captures the definition of transnational citizenship, as it was presented in chapter 1 and 2. Therefore, it could be argued that, if a transnational citizenship is determined by the engagement in transnational activities by migrants, then Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom do indeed have a transnational citizenship, which is constituted by their experiences of ‘living in Potchefstroom while ‘being in Zimbabwe’ simultaneously. The experiences also inspire their practices whilst in Potchefstroom.
Through their practices, they are able to maintain socio-economic participation (through the sending of goods and currency to Zimbabwe in order to assist and provide for family still living there). They are also able to engage in socio-cultural and recreational activities with other Zimbabweans and form a somewhat Zimbabwean community whilst in Potchefstroom/SA.

The Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom, for instance, also maintain strong opinions regarding the socio-political climate of Zimbabwe and their dissatisfaction of how this has affected the economy and standards of being in Zimbabwe. The Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom feel generally feel affected by any occurrences in Zimbabwe, as their families are still living there. The price inflation, for instance, affects some of them in terms of their economic standings and stability in Potchefstroom, since for many of them, they are also usually among the main assistors and providers at home. Therefore, 1) their having any bond and connection with Zimbabwe whilst in Potchefstroom/SA – even if it is through reading and watching news or engaging in dialogue with other Zimbabweans; as well as 2) their navigating and competing in the legal, political, social, economic and cultural fields available in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm is what constitutes their transnational citizenship – and all the participants in this study had a transnational citizenship.

The dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom

This study, from the onset, strived to address the overarching objective for this study, which was to investigate and determine the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. The study successfully covered transnational citizenship, particularly through the utilisation of a specific theoretical lens – the theory of practice – which revealed the dynamics of transnational citizenship. Analysing the dynamics of transnational citizenship using this theoretical framework highlighted that the practices of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom/SA result from the interplay of habitus and capital, whilst perceiving and interpreting the doxa of a field.

Furthermore, the field consists of two core and diverse distributions of power – that is, the vertical and horizontal distributions. The Zimbabweans encounter both vertical (bureaucratic and structural) - as citizens of Zimbabwe and migrants of Potchefstroom/SA simultaneously, as well as horizontal (social) power relations and dynamics as they navigate, negotiate and compete for capital and social positions. As migrants in the host
nation, their ‘belonging’ to SA is limited compared to that of citizenship holders, who do not only belong, but are ‘members’/part of SA.

Socially, their migrant status in Potchefstroom does not only disadvantage them, but place them in danger to some extent, or at least in fear of danger. The reputation South Africans have regarding their hostility towards foreign black Africans implants in migrants a fear and opinion they carry even prior being in SA – thus, symbolically, Potchefstroom/SA represents a hostile field.

In Zimbabwe, citizenship status should generally grant participant relatively easy access into fields as well as access to economic, social and cultural capital. The privileges that their citizenship in Zimbabwe should afford them are impeded by the historical socio-political and socio-cultural tension between the Shona and the Ndebele, especially in home nation that is, as mentioned, predominantly Shona. In this regard, the Ndebele feel marginalised in grand field of Zimbabwe, with the majority of top position occupants in the available fields being of Shona descent. It was interesting to note that the study does not go to the extent of discussing cultural capital as a dynamic induced by the participants, as well as the extent to which cultural capital is zero-sum in nature (or not) – that is, the extent to which the more some Zimbabwean migrants have cultural capital results in the less some have.

In this regard, therefore, it can be affirmed that indeed, Bourdieu’s theory of practice proves useful in analysing the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. This framework provided for the opportunity to analyse the practices of Zimbabwean migrants while they negotiate and compete in the fields available in Potchefstroom, as well as to understand that practices are a conjunction of habitus and capital, while perceiving and interpreting the field and its doxa. Therefore, in analysing the practices of the Zimbabwean migrants, the vertical and horizontal power relations that they encounter and engage in, in the fields they enter were also analysed, as it is through the navigating and negotiating these power relationships that capital and field positions can be obtained (or lost). Figure 4.3, in chapter four provides clear illustration of the transnational vertical and horizontal relationships among Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom. It is through these relationships and practices related to, and inspired by them, that a transnational citizenship is constituted among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.
6.5. Conclusion

The study was therefore successful in showing that indeed migrants never completely cut ties with their home nations. They maintain their, in this particular case study, Zimbabweanness through keeping in touch with family and friends back home, as well as by maintaining close relationships and connections with their fellow compatriots in whilst in their host nation. This was found to particularly be the case in relation to Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. In all they do, they still send goods and money home, with some even building their homes in Zimbabwe. It was found that the migrants that were interviewed still have desires to return to Zimbabwe one day, even though it might not be in the near future. It could be said that migrants have love and an ever-existing bond to their home nations but are faced with the need and desire of particularly economic betterment, which result in them having to migrate to their host nation.

This chapter, therefore, succeeded in realising its set objective, which was: to determine the perceptions, interpretations and actions on citizenship amongst Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom, and how it constitutes a transnational citizenship orientation. Through highlighting and describing the participants’ perception, interpretation and practices towards their citizenship while in Potchefstroom/SA, it was determined that the dynamics of transnational citizenship are their experiences and practices whilst they are in Potchefstroom/SA, and how through these practices, they are able to negotiate and compete for capital and field positions in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm. These practices emerge from the interplay of habitus and capital, while observing the doxa of the field in which the migrants enter and act in.
Chapter 7: Conclusions and recommendations

7.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to bring to closure the investigation and discussion on the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. The chapter starts off by concluding on the realisation of the six objectives proposed in chapter 1. This is then followed by a conclusive discussion on the empirical findings, as well as the usefulness of the theory of practice as a theoretical anchor analysing the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. In closure, therefore, this chapter provides some of the limitations of this particular study as well as some recommendations for further research. The following section therefore sets off by offering a conclusive discussion on all the objectives the study aimed to address.

7.2 Conclusions on the objectives of the study

As it was established in the primary stages of this research study, the overarching objective which the study aimed to address was to determine the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. In addressing this objective, the question had to be asked: what are the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom? Therefore, in offering a concise answer to this posed question, the study addressed six objectives. These are all discussed conclusively in this subsection.

The first two of these objectives aimed to determine what the applicable literature to the understanding of migration and citizenship, respectively, was. The first one, in this regard, reads as follows:

1.4.1. To determine the contribution of applicable literature to the understanding and interpretation of migration.

It was determined that SA is one of the most preferred destinations for Zimbabwean migrants. Ever since 1994, following the apartheid era, the migration of particularly Zimbabweans into SA increased, as the new SA was deemed to be a land full of economic
opportunities not only by black South Africans, but also by foreign black Africans from across Africa. Scholars particularly cite economic betterment as the primary push and pull factor resulting in Zimbabwean migration to SA. However, as Kiwanuka (2009) stated, Zimbabwean migration to SA is often circular, in that Zimbabweans maintain fluid back and forth movement between SA and Zimbabwe. Thus, it was determined that Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom/SA do not necessarily make clinical breaks from Zimbabwe, they are in a fluid circular movement between the two countries. However, circular migration implies that actors are either located in country A or B. Therefore, in this regard, it was determined that transmigration is the ideal notion for the understanding of the migration trends of Zimbabwean migrants in SA.

Transmigration emphasises simultaneous existence of the Zimbabwean migrants in both SA and Zimbabwe, rather than existence and activeness in one country at a given time. This, therefore, goes beyond circular migration – both SA and Zimbabwe in this regard, as well as the occurrences in each realm, in this regard have to be considered simultaneously. It was therefore concluded that, unlike neoclassical migration, the notion of transmigration efficiently describes the kind of migrants Zimbabweans in SA are; ‘forced’ by the ‘economic’ condition of Zimbabwe to look elsewhere for better employment and economic opportunity in order to provide for their families which they leave back home, but ever stay connected and in touch with them.

1.4.2. To determine the contribution of applicable literature to the understanding and interpretation of citizenship and transnational citizenship.

In addressing this objective, and thus analysing the available literature, it was found that classical citizenship is often associated with the vertical relationship between the nation-state and the citizens, as well as the horizontal relationship between the citizens in civil society. These relationships are regarded to exist particularly within the terrains of a particular nation-state, and thus confines the citizens to this single state. This is regardless of whether actors possess, single, dual or multiple citizenship status, as these three fall under the umbrella of classical citizenship. Citizenship, in this regard, is therefore a ‘formal legal status’ which individuals can obtain within the terrains of a nation. It is a status that is acquirable through active presence in the legal, political and social fields of a nation, and thus it is dependent on the grounds of the legal, political and social rudiments. Flexible citizenship, which is a contemporary conception of citizenship, introduces to these three rudiments, the economic rudiments, and thus insists that actors can claim citizenship by
virtue of their ability to enter and act in the economic field of a given nation. Thus, the economic rudiment is crucial in their pledging allegiance to a particular nation.

Therefore, in relation to Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, also in light of the transmigration discussed in chapter two, it was found that transnational citizenship would be the ideal conception of citizenship relevant for this study, as well as from which to understand Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. This conception of citizenship, firstly, introduces the cultural rudiment, as transnationalism also emphasises the cross-border movement and exchange of cultures as well. It was argued that transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom would imply that upon leaving Zimbabwe and settling in Potchefstroom/SA, the Zimbabwean migrants maintain connections and bonds with their Zimbabwean compatriots at home, and those in Potchefstroom/SA.

The classical nation-state-and-citizen dichotomy is rejected and replaced with a society-and-citizen dichotomy, which implies that national borders are loosened and thus actors are not confined to activities in one nation at a time. They are now in the transnational social realm, which is a semi-physical national realm, composed of the conjoining of the host and home nation, this results in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe (trans)national realm. It was therefore concluded in this regard that the conception of transnational citizenship, in line with that of transmigration, and the overarching philosophy of transnationalism, is ideal for understanding Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, as it makes provision to delve into the connections migrants maintain with their home nations whilst located in their host nation.

1.4.3. To determine the applicable theoretical lens for understanding the dynamics of transnational citizenship.

Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of practice was regarded as the most relevant theoretical anchor for analysing the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. The theory of practice refers to actors’ activities and practices in the fields they enter in the grand field. Actors occupy positions in the field and compete for better positions and more capital, through negotiating the vertical and horizontal power relations. These vertical and horizontal relationships relate to the classical notion of the agency-structure dichotomy, and the theory of practice allowed for the analysis of these relationships in a field. This refers to the analysis of the nation-state/society-and-citizen, as well as the citizen-and-citizen/migrant relationships respectively, particularly the way in
which actors can navigate and compete for capital and positions in fields characterised by these vertical and horizontal relationships. The discussion in this regard intended to show that the vertical and horizontal relationships are characterised by the dynamical interplay of habitus, capital and practice.

It was particularly stated that practice results from the interplay of habitus and capital, whilst perceiving and interpreting the doxa of the field. The theory of practice set up for the investigation of the perceptions, interpretations and practices of the Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, and how these constitute a transnational citizenship. Therefore, it was established that: to analyse and investigate the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, is in fact an investigation into the practices that actors engage in as they vertically and horizontally negotiate and challenge for capital, positions and thus power in the fields available in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe transnational realm. The next object in this regard was to establish the applicable research methodology to study the dynamics of transnational citizenship.

1.4.4. To describe the applicable research methodology used for a study of the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom.

The instrumental exploratory single case study research methodology was regarded as the most applicable research methodology. This allowed for the thorough investigation of the phenomenon of transnational citizenship among a particular population – the Zimbabwean migrants, in a particular location – that is, Potchefstroom. A study of this nature, as it was explained, is qualitative and seeks specifically to understand a particularly phenomenon, as opposed to providing generalisable findings. Therefore, this directed the study away from a quantitative (post-positivist) approach.

It was established that in order to carry out this investigation, purposive and snowball sampling were employed. Employing purposive sampling in conjunction with snowball sampling resulted in the identification of the relevant prospective participants, and thus, the execution of 20 face-to-face semi-structured in-depth interviews with individual participants, as well as 4 focus group interviews. Upon obtaining consent regarding the willingness to partake in the interview from the participants, the interviews were recorded on a voice-recording device. The interviews were an in-depth and detailed engagement with the research participants. The data were transcribed verbatim and manually coded.
The codes were sorted into defined categories, and it was through the thematic analysis of these categories that a Zimbabwean narrative was ‘weaved out’ from the empirical findings. From this narrative, the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom were, therefore, determined, as well as the way in which they constitute a transnational citizenship.

1.4.5. To determine the perceptions, interpretations, and practices of citizenship amongst Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom and explain how they constitutes a transnational citizenship orientation.

This objective was collectively addressed through the analysis of the empirical findings collected, and chapter 6 was dedicated to addressing this particular objective. Section 7.3 therefore delves into a conclusive discussion of the empirical findings, and as a result, addresses this objective.

7.3 Conclusions on the empirical findings and theoretical framework

It was found that the conception of transnational citizenship, as it was defined in chapters 1 and 2, is relevant in understanding Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, as Zimbabweans are generally still tied to, and maintain connections with their home nation whilst they are living in Potchefstroom. Furthermore, they maintain connections with their compatriots in Zimbabwe, as well as those in the host nation with them, and in this way, they maintain their Zimbabweanness – that is, being Zimbabwean. In this regard therefore, the Zimbabwean migrants are in vertical and horizontal relationships in both Potchefstroom/SA and Zimbabwe simultaneously, and they navigate and negotiate these relationships in the fields they enter, towards the acquisition of capital and field positions.

Thus, it was emphasised that Zimbabweans are both citizens of Zimbabwe and also migrants of Potchefstroom/SA simultaneously – this is the vertical relationship. As citizens of Zimbabwe living as migrants in Potchefstroom/SA, they are confronted by the structure and bureaucracy of the two nations simultaneously. On the on hand, their habitus is obtained from being Zimbabwean and they are also afforded the privileges of citizenship; they can partake and engage in the legal, political, civic, economic and even cultural fields.
of Zimbabwe. They hold certain positions and amounts of capital in each of these fields by virtue of being Zimbabwean citizens, and they can freely navigate and compete in the available fields with no permit, but their Zimbabwean citizenship, required.

On the other hand, Zimbabwean migrants require permits and legal documentation to enter and settle in Potchefstroom. This earns them the status of a migrant. However, it was found that since most migrants opt for asylum instead of a general worker’s permit, they earn the status of a refugee, which is a migrant that is particularly vulnerable and seeks protection. Acquiring asylum seekers’ permits requires them to relinquish all of their identity documents connecting them to their home nation, and this particular dynamic creates an array of predicaments when it comes to, for instance, visiting home. Therefore, the vertical relationship they have with Potchefstroom/SA requires them to obtain special permits in order to enter the grand field and partake in the fields available to them, as failure to do this would be a direct infringement on the doxa of the Potchefstroom fields.

The horizontal relationships in Zimbabwe are defined particularly by the Shona-Ndebele tension. It was generally found that the Ndebele feel marginalised and less advantaged than the Shona in Zimbabwe. The Ndebele participants that contributed to this research study believe that they will always remain as some sort of second-class citizens in Zimbabwe. Their belief is that political decisions, academic and economic development in Zimbabwe generally prioritise and seek to benefit the Shona. Besides the notions of hate and intolerance towards the Ndebele, most of the Shona participants do not reject these claims by the Ndebele participants. They believe that Zimbabwe is predominantly a Shona nation and is dominated by Shona people. It was therefore established that the Shona are the more powerful actors in the fields of Zimbabwe, and thus potentially ‘enjoy’ the privileges of citizenship more than the Ndebele.

In Potchefstroom/SA, however, Zimbabweans form close bonds and relationships with each other, creating some form of Zimbabwean community to some degree. However, it was found that the ‘Zimbabwean community’ does not quite exist, but a semi-formal support group does exist, particularly among the working Zimbabweans. The Zimbabwean students claimed that they are not as closely linked with non-student Zimbabweans, and as a result, they have their own close groups as students.

Within these groups, it was found that the one defining characteristic that made them feel Zimbabwean in Potchefstroom was the freedom to speak chiShona, eat Zimbabwean foods, and engage in conversations about the social life, socio-politics and socio-
economics of Zimbabwe. The Shona culture and language were put forth as being the epitome of ‘being Zimbabwean’. Ndebele were seen as able to simply fit into the society of Potchefstroom/SA, hiding and passing as the Zulus of SA. This results in the concealing of identities. However, as it was found and discussed, this concealing of identities goes beyond the Ndebele wanting to blend into SA, it is influenced by fear of discrimination and the desire for social acceptance by South Africans, as South Africans are perceived to be hostile to black African foreigners.

Therefore, generally, Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom do feel like foreigners in Potchefstroom and they feel that South Africans do not quite embrace them due to their ‘foreigner’ status. This is a result of their general inefficiency with the dominant languages of Potchefstroom and the reluctance of the South African citizens to constantly communicate in English with them. The working Zimbabweans particular feel that this is probably the prime reason as to why they cannot form relationships with South Africans. They have never been exposed to the core languages of Potchefstroom – Afrikaans and Setswana – and as a result, they feel marginalised and excluded by the local South Africans.

The students generally expressed a slightly different experience in this regard. Although they too acknowledge the disadvantages that emerge with their inefficiency in the languages of Potchefstroom, they do however highlight that being based at an educational institution for most of their time in Potchefstroom, English is generally a language that is used by a large majority of other students and academic staff. Therefore, the students do not feel totally excluded, though they mention the lack of ‘closeness’ with South African students and other non-Zimbabwean students, and as a result they form their own Zimbabwean student friendship groups, whereby they are conjoined by their nationality being Zimbabweans and particularly the Zimbabwean language, chiShona. IsiNdebele was never cited as a language commonly used in Zimbabwean groups among the students or even the working Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom/SA.

Therefore, through investigating these vertical and horizontal relationships in the fields, as well as through investigating and understanding the perceptions, interpretations and practices of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, it was established that Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom do indeed have a transnational citizenship. The theory of practice was also deemed the most applicable theoretical framework for studying the dynamics of transnational citizenship among this group. Through this theory the vertical
and horizontal relationship of Zimbabwean migrants, as they compete for capital and positions in the fields they enter in Potchefstroom were analysed.

The theory revealed the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants and established that these are: the practices that they engage in whilst in the fields of Potchefstroom. These practices emerge from the interplay of their habitus and capital, whilst they perceive and interpret the doxa of the fields they enter. However, their primary habitus is not a determinant of their positions in Potchefstroom, as it would be in Zimbabwe; it is their subjective socialisation that assists them in navigating and competing in Potchefstroom/SA. In other words, it is their learning and being socialised into learning the doxa of Potchefstroom.

It was therefore established that this study successfully investigated the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. It achieved this through particularly understanding the perception, interpretations and practices of Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom, as they navigate and negotiate the vertical and horizontal relationships in the Potchefstroom/SA-and-Zimbabwe realm.

The following section discusses the limitations of the study, as well as delves into some recommendations for further research into this area of focus.

7.4 Limitations of the study and recommendations for further research

Due to this research study being a case study, investigating a particular phenomenon among a particular population, utilising a particular methodology, limitations were always inevitable. These limitations can however be directed towards the pursuit of further research into particular, in this case, the dynamics of transactional citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. Thus, some recommendations towards further research are also provided in this subsection. This subsection, bringing this dissertation to closure, offers a discussion towards addressing the last objective of this study, which reads as follows:

1) To provide conclusions and suggest recommendations that can be made regarding the dynamics of transnational citizenship of Zimbabwean migrants
The study affords its focus particularly to the phenomenon of transnational citizenship, and thus does not explicitly delve into other phenomena of transnationalism such as transnational communication and transnational communities to name a few. Indeed, some of these mentioned phenomena are alluded to in this study, however, their dynamical nature as well as their significance particular in Potchefstroom/SA remain unknown. Therefore, it could be suggested that, in light of expanding scholarly research into the area of transnationalism, research into the dynamics of transnational communities for instance and dynamics that characterises such a community in the context of Potchefstroom/SA, would make for an interesting exploratory case study. This, more than anything, is useful for the development of a non-existing body of scholarly research.

Furthermore, the exclusion of a direct investigation into the relationship between the Zimbabwean migrants and the local South Africans, especially the effect the South Africans have on the transnational citizenship of Zimbabweans. This can also extend to include an investigation to the relationship between the Ndebele Zimbabweans and the Zulu South Africans, as the ability of the Ndebele to blend and fit into the South African society, passing as South Africans to those who are not aware, was highlighted by many participants. Thus, investigating these horizontal relationships and their impact on habitus as well as openly being Zimbabwean. This would further include research into the notion, or rather, practice of ‘concealing identities’ which is prominent among Zimbabweans for dynamical reasons ranging from fear of discrimination to social acceptance. Such relationships, it could be argued have an impact on the dynamics of transnational citizenship and would open an array of dynamical conclusions should they be studied.

It was also found in this study that some participants regard migrating to SA as a general ‘upgrade’ from living in Zimbabwe, in a similar way as if those in Mutare may regard migration to Harare as an ‘upgrade’. Those in the rural regions of Zimbabwe do mention having migrated and worked in Harare at some point, prior to eventually deciding to migrate to SA. This speaks to the notion of rural-urban (small city/big city) dynamics which this particular study does not quite address. Therefore, it would make for an interesting investigation to understand the rural-urban (small city/big city) dynamics Zimbabwean migrants experience whilst in SA. This would require an investigation, for instance, into the dynamics of the relationships between Zimbabwean migrants in Johannesburg and those in Potchefstroom.

What emerged to be a methodological limitation emerged during the analysis phase, whereby the data had to be coded and sorted. Due to the research design being
qualitative, the idea of using a short questionnaire to capture the demographical and biographical information of the participants was not at the fore. It is also not a direct requirement of such a design to afford concern on statistical data, therefore, this does not necessarily allude to any methodological short-comings. However, when dealing with the raw transcriptions of empirical data, such an addition to the methodological approach would enhance sorting and the ‘meaning’ of the data, for instance, as follows: accurate statistics regarding the participants’, for instance, age group; gender, ethnic group (in this case, Shona or Ndebele), home province, level of education and socio-economic status in Zimbabwe.

This information may not necessarily contribute directly to the study, as it would only be the statistical information of the participants that partake in the study (32 participants including the 4 focus groups), so it would not qualify for generalisability. It can afford the researcher an opportunity to garner a simple understanding of the participant, as well as assist the researcher in differentiating between the various responses of participants; further determining if individuals coming from differing provinces and cities, and having differing socio-economic status have the same subjective sentiments, opinions, practices and experiences in both Zimbabwe and Potchefstroom.

Population is limited to only Zimbabweans, excluding other prominent migrant groups in Potchefstroom, such as Nigerians, Ethiopians as well as Pakistanis. These three are specifically mentioned here, as they are the other groups of foreigners that the participants in this study kept generally referring to. What would be of great interest with these groups is that, unlike Zimbabweans who are right next door to SA, these other groups all come from nations that are quite a distance away from SA, and thus could yield other multi-complex dynamics.

Therefore, it could be suggested that a multi-case research study be executed in order to provide comparative responses from participants. This would not only serve to understand the individual narratives of each of those migrant groups, but would allow for the opportunity to compare and contrast responses from each group to determine if there are any similarities or differences, as well as the significance thereof. Furthermore, this comparative multiple case study would be beneficial in terms of weaving together a ‘grand’ narrative of the migrant groups located and living in Potchefstroom.

Zimbabweans constantly commented on the close bond nationals from places like Ethiopia and Pakistan have whilst in Potchefstroom. What could be presumed from such is that
these other migrant groups, being so far from home compared to Zimbabweans, could perhaps feel a much stronger need to create strong bonds with their compatriots in order to ‘create’ a true sense of being and feeling at home whilst away from home, and living in Potchefstroom/SA. This may be recommended for further research into this phenomenon of transnational citizenship, that is the tightness of the bonds formed by other migrants located much further away from the SADC region (such as Ethiopia) or even the African continent (such as Pakistanis), compared to those who are from nations much closer to SA such as Zimbabwe.

Lastly, another dynamical phenomenon to investigate with regards to nationalism and citizenship, could be that of post-nationalism. Though completely outside of the scope of this study, the fact that post-nationalism completely disregards any borders and the existence (or influence) of a nation would make for an interesting and multilateral investigation into post-national citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom. Such would bring serious questions to the discussion on belonging and identity – asking, for instance, who really belongs where? Also, what constitutes belonging to a society? In fact, if citizenship can be defined outside of national realms, and also beyond connections to a country, what is a nation in the contemporary era? What is its purpose? Of course, these are abstract questions which perhaps could open a path towards a post-national discussion of the dynamics of citizenship.
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Appendix A: Informed consent form

Confidential

SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCES (Building F13) at the North West University, Potchefstroom

‘An investigation into the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom’

My name is Kwezi Sontange, I am a sociology Masters student at NWU (Potchefstroom) and I am currently conducting interviews for my research study, titled: “An investigation into the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom”. The study aims to provide an understanding of what it means to be a Zimbabwean citizen living in Potchefstroom; the types of activities that Zimbabwean citizens do, and also the way in which Zimbabwean citizens stay connected to each other and connected to Zimbabwe. I would like to ask you a few questions related to my research, as I am looking for the most suitable people to provide me with an understanding of being a Zimbabwean citizen living in Potchefstroom. The most suitable people to provide such information, for me, are the Zimbabwean citizens.

Therefore, I would appreciate it if you would assist me by your participation in an interview. The interview will be recorded and will take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. Since your participating in this interview is of your own free-will, you are not obliged to be participate and you may request to withdraw from the interview at any point, for whatever reason. However, I would appreciate your participation. At no point will your name be revealed in my research. All of the information you provide will be kept confidential and known only by myself. Your identity will remain anonymous, so your name and personal details will only be known by myself. Later, the information will be captured onto a database with that of all the other interviews and the data will be used as part of my Masters research study. All the recorded information you provide will be stored securely at the NWU, at the department of sociology. If you are willing to participate in this research interview, I will only require you to complete the section below and we can schedule a time and date for the interview.

I herewith declare that the interview process was explained to me. I understand it and therefore give my consent to participate in the interview.

Date: ______________ Signed at: ____________________ Signature: ____________________

Any queries may be directed to:
Prof. Johan Zaaiman - 018 299 2563 / johan.zaaiman@nwu.ac.za or
Dr. Gift Mupambwa - 074 534 6616 / senymupa@hotmail.com

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudo name of participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location (Residential area)</td>
<td>Date of interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Interview schedule

1. Opening

After pressing record: Hi, and thank you for making some time, and also for giving consent for me to interview you.

As I mentioned to you before giving you a consent form to complete and sign, and I am currently conducting interviews for my research study, titled: “An investigation into the dynamics of transnational citizenship among Zimbabwean migrants in Potchefstroom”. The study aims to provide an understanding of what it means to be a Zimbabwean citizen living in Potchefstroom; the types of activities that Zimbabwean citizens do, and also the way in which Zimbabwean citizens stay connected to each other and connected to Zimbabwe. I would like to ask you a few questions related to my research, as I am looking for the most suitable people to provide me with an understanding of being a Zimbabwean citizen living Potchefstroom. The most suitable people to provide such information, for me, are the Zimbabwean citizens. Therefore, I am really grateful that you agreed to this interview.

Do you have any questions before we start?

2. Main interview

2.1. Please tell me about Zimbabwe and being a Zimbabwean citizen

(Any differences/similarities between Zimbabwe and SA? Potchefstroom?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe (checklist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Doxa/habitus of Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capital &amp; positions available and occupied in Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Their social status and identity in Zimbabwe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does Zimbabwe/Zimbabweans differ from SA/SAns? And from Potchefstroom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Zimbabwean to each other, to SA citizens and other foreign citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SA citizens and other foreign nationals to Zimbabweans – in Zimbabwe, SA, Potchefstroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. How do you experience living in SA as a Zimbabwean citizen?

What does it mean for a Zimbabwean citizen to live in Potchefstroom?

Why would Zimbabweans live in Potchefstroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretations and perceptions of …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … the Potchefstroom context, doxa, capital, available position, [what they can mobilise, what is available for them?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … their status and identity position in Potchefstroom as Zimbabweans, [According to SA citizens, fellow Zimbabwean, her foreign nationals]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effects on personal life, family life, at home and in Potchefstroom,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … their status as a Zimbabwean citizen and/or SA citizen,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … their relationships and connection in Zimbabwe &amp; SA,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are there differing interpretations according to gender, age, etc?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. **What sort of activities (practices) do you do while in Potchefstroom?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- What do they do in Potchefstroom? Was migrating a means to better opportunities? (i.e. Enter fields and gain better positions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What opportunities are available to Zimbabweans in Zimbabwe/SA/Potchefstroom? [For example how do you generate income/make a living? Where do earnings go? Typical uses, etc.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How connected are Zimbabweans in Potchefstroom? Types of networks and networking Religion/church, work, food, sports and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What sort of things do you do, eat, practice, etc. that is related to being Zimbabwean? [Maintenance of ‘Zimbabwean-ness’.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Political activeness whilst in Potchefstroom? Feelings towards Zimbabwe/SA politics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staying connected with Zimbabwe/other Zimbabweans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Any challenges associated with practices and activities? Staying connected to Zimbabwe?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. **What else about Zimbabwean citizens in Potchefstroom do you think should be known?**

_Is there something I have not asked you that you think I should know? Any additional comments or recommendations that you would like to state? Recommendations for me as I progress with the research?_

3. **Closing**

I really appreciate the time you have given to me. I have truly learned a lot. I will keep in touch with regards to my progress.

Thank you.