**Outline of reactions to reviewers’ comments (A, B and C):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer A Comments** |  |
| Reviewer A: Review of article for South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences 8 September 2013  1. Is the research question clear and concise?  Yes.  2. Is the research method appropriate to address the research question?  Basically yes. The descriptive analysis and the categorical response models are the right way to go for this paper, but as indicated in my detailed comments in the paper, both of these strategies could be strengthened through the addition of a couple of descriptive tables and more clarity around the form of the multivariate models. The latter models may need to be reformulated, in response to my suggestions and questions of clarity.  3. Essentially, is the article appropriate for publication in an ISI  accredited journal? Yes, after some enhancements have been implemented.  4. Please, elaborate by providing feedback on the following points: (a) If  it is not suitable, are the necessary adjustments essential or minor? What are those adjustments? (b) If so, do you have any suggestions for improvement or shortening? What are those suggestions? See my detailed comments within the article. | 1. Okay 2. A more detailed explanation of the multivariate model and its underlying purpose is provided for in the paper- from pages 11 to 17. In fact a different and more efficient model has been adopted and used as proposed by Reviewer C. See comments and reactions to Reviewer C. More details to descriptive statistics have been provided. Including details on std deviations and sizes of the subsamples in Tables 1 and 2 3. Further descriptive data is provided in Table 3 on labour market observations for each of the migration categories 4. The paper has been improved as suggested especially by reviewer C. including an equation specifying the model 5. All dummies now have reference points or benchmark categories (e.g. Black for race, and Male for gender and unemployment for the labour market, etc. And this is now made explicit in the discussion 6. Okay – acknowledged the paper can be improved for publication |
| **Reviewer B comments** |  |
| The comments and suggestions are in the paper. And are mostly editorial and on references | The comments have all been attended to |
| **Reviewer C Comments** | Reactions |
| REVIEWER C REPORT 515 Internal Migration and Labour Market Subject: Internal Migration and Labour Market ParticipSWCxwb,npoation: Exploring the 2008 and 2010 South Afri s   1. This is a potentially important paper on an area that is very under-researched. The choice of datasets and the broad objectives of the study are good. 2. However, the paper lacks rigour and clarity throughout – in the discussion of migration in South Africa, in the definition of migration adopted in the study and in the descriptive and econometric analysis. 3. I think the paper needs to be substantially revised in light of the comments below – some of which are minor, but many of which would require a rethinking of how the paper is situated, and how the econometric analysis is undertaken. 4. The paper throughout (introduction, review and discussion) needs to   recognise that typically two kinds of internal migration are identified in South Africa – temporary or oscillating migration and permanent migration.  5. Posel’s research is specifically on temporary labour migration that was institutionalised under apartheid – migrants who retain a base in their household of origin and migrate to the city, with the expectation that they will return to their household of origin after the migration episode. I don’t think that Posel ever argued that migration was expected to disappear in the post-apartheid period; rather, the expectation was that all migration to urban areas would become permanent migration i.e. Individuals would migrate with their families and settle in urban areas, so that the number of split households, which characterised apartheid because of Influx Control regulations, would decline. Unless the paper distinguishes among types of migrants, this discussion of temporary labour migration is not really relevant to the paper.  6. The paper needs to be much more explicit about how migration is defined.  This information is currently contained in a footnote. Also, the paper needs to specify that it is only considering recent migrants – i.e. people who migrated between 2008 and 2010 – and this restriction needs to be motivated.  7. What about existing migrants i.e. all those people who migrated before 2008 – presumably they are being included in the group of non-migrants (“local residents”)? How would this be justified?  8. How is informal employment (and therefore formal employment) identified  using the NIDS data?  9. In NIDS, it is possible to identify informal sector SELF employment using question E37 – is the business registered for income tax and/or VAT? But how would you get at a comparable definition for informal sector WAGE employment? There is no question on whether the wage employment is at a business that is registered for tax purposes. In NIDS, wage employment is either regular or casual (this follows the 1993 PSLSD questionnaire and not the LFS questionnaires). But some regular work can be in the informal sector (e.g. people regularly employed in a business that is not registered for tax purposes) and some people can be employed as casual labour in the formal sector (e.g. casual workers in Checkers).  10. Descriptive statistics:  Table 1:  i. Are the data weighted to account for attrition? Why is the total sample so  heavily skewed towards females?  ii. Table 1 shows that migrants are far more likely to be female than male  (and that relative to their share of the sample, females are over-represented among migrants). Is this correct? It is very noteworthy if this is indeed the case and if so, how would this be explained?  iii. What is the age range for the sample? Shouldn't the sample be restricted  to working-age adults?  Table 2:  i Are the data weighted?  ii. Standard errors need to be presented.  iii. How is income per capita generated? Is this household income per capita or  individual income earned or received? If the latter, then are zero income earners (or those with missing values for income) included in the sample?  iv Is income measured at wave 1, or at wave 2?  v As above: What is the age range for the sample? Shouldn't the sample be  restricted to working-age adults?  11. Regressions:  i. The regressions are not properly explained or motivated. For example,  there is no explanation of the dependent variables in the regressions. What was the sample for the regression presented in Table 3? Did it include all adults 15 years and older, regardless of whether they were economically inactive (e.g. because they were still in school or studying, housewives or retired)? i.e. Did the zeroes in the dependent variable include those “informally” employed (to the extent that this can be identified), the unemployed and the not economically active?  ii. It's not clear why three different probit models are estimated. Why not  rather estimate a multinominal logit, to take into account employment and unemployment (and economic inactivity or being out of the labour force) as different outcomes, rather than estimate separate models?  iii Shouldn’t the age range be limited to the working-age population?  iv How is Black defined – and what was the omitted race category?  v The education categories need to be specified more clearly. What was the  omitted category: currently only matric and no education are specified in the regression. Does this mean that tertiary and incomplete secondary were included in the same omitted category?  vi Were the regressions weighted to control for attrition between the waves?  vii How is unemployment defined? | 1. Okay 2. The discussion has been revised to give a clear definition on migration adopted in the paper. On page 7 and page 10 migration is defined as relocation across the 2 waves of the NIDS and nothing more. The paper now acknowledges the different dynamics of migration especially in the apartheid era (i.e. temporal and permanent) but because the focus is on trends with the NIDS panel data such definition differentiations, although important, would difficult to execute. At the time the research was conducted the could only allow for an exploration of migration over 2 years. But with more waves further definitions and differentiations can be explored. Also the paper looks at individual migration not households which would allow for identification of more permanent migrations. 3. The paper is a lot more thorough in reporting statistics and econometric modelling. The discussion has adopted the analysis of the multinomial model as proposed by this reviewer (page 11 to 17 discusses the proposed inclusive multinomial model including in Appendix 3.  And has reported on weightings performed and standard deviation in the descriptive statistics 4. See reactions on 5 below 5. The paper has responded on this comment on how migration has been defined within the context of the NIDS data and how migration before the commencement of the NIDS study was not considered for ease of analysis – this has been acknowledged as an area of possible future research. 6. The paper is now very explicit on migration definition as explained in 5. It is also made explicit that migration before 2008 is excluded from the discussion since the NIDS does not ask for migration in 2006 to make the comparison balanced to migration between 2008 and 2010 the years in which the NIDS data were collected. 7. This is acknowledged as a limitation in the discussion. It is possible that some people may have migrated recently before 2008. And could be included in the analysis, but the NIDS papers that this paper is based in its comparison of trends also did not consider migrations before 2008. And it was believed that to compare apples to apples a decision to follow the same approach would more prudent. 8. A discussion on what constituted the labour has been hugely expanded to accommodate this NB comment. Page 12 is dedicated to this definition. 9. 9. The paper is explicit that it adopted a broad definition of unemployment. Whiles the NIDS data had excluded discouraged workers in its definition of unemployed this paper has included them. Further the paper now explicitly differentiates between formal and informal employment through 4 variables available in the data: formal contracts/business registrations/ verbal contracts/ non registrations of business to identify informal employment. However the discussion does not differentiate between permanent and casual workers and it is acknowledged that this is a limitation. The paper cant do everything through its proxy variables. 10. i. The NIDS data provides a weighting that has been applied in the analyses which is specifically created to accommodate attrition between 2008 and 2010. This is now made explicit.   ii. Yes this is correct – females outweigh males. And the analysis takes care of the fact in reporting the rations of migration from those unequal representations. The model also uses the weighting provided by the NIDS team to accommodate for weighting and attrition  iii. The sample age range is 15 to 104. But when analyzing employment the paper used the ages 15 to 60 as the labour force – when seniors are discussed this is made explicit.  Table 2   1. Yes data is now weighted 2. Standard deviations are reported 3. Wage income per capita is used and is derived from total household wage in 2010. This is now made explicit 4. Income and other variables re measured at wave 2 and this is made explicit in the discussion 5. The paper takes working age as provided for in the employment variable of the NIDS data. Respondents above 60 are excluded unless otherwise stated.   i.  A lot of effort has been put into explaining the model and be more explicit about its specification and its purpose. This model which is inclusive was proposed by this reviewer. The revision is from page 11 to 17  The dependent variable has been re specified to include only those identified as employed in the original data but it also includes the discouraged. It does not include the economically inactive.    ii. A multinomial model with 3 categories has been adopted for this discussion as proposed  iii. only the working age are now discussed and this is made explicit. Hence the estimations have somewhat changed  iv. Black has been replaced by race which includes 4 races as provided for in the NIDS data. Category 1 is now used for comparison   1. The education variable and its category is made explicit.     Vii unemployed is broad- discouraged workers are included and this is also made explicit |
|  |  |