Household Mobility Dynamics among Young Adults in Established Suburban Council Rental Housing Estates in South African Cities: A Case Study of Kenneth Gardens, Durban

Godfrey Musvoto
Durban University of Technology
Godfreym@dut.ac.za

Abstract

The household mobility dynamics of young adults are widely acknowledged as some of the central indicators of residential satisfaction and the quantitative housing deficit. Regardless of this, hardly any studies have been conducted to investigate the trend in South African neighbourhoods. This study investigated the dynamics of household mobility among young adults in the Kenneth Gardens, a subsidised council rental estate in the city of Durban, South Africa. It is based on a survey focusing on household characteristics, profiles of young adults, likely household mobility behaviour of young adults and the factors that influence the mobility of young adults. Descriptive statistical tabulations, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and cross tabulations were used in the analysis. The paper notes that established suburban council rental housing estates are multi-cultural and diverse. Likewise, household formation aspirations and mobility factors among young adults are influenced by ethnic cultural factors and cross-cultural socio-economic factors. The paper argues that the residential satisfaction of young adults and household mobility factors in diverse neighbourhoods should be differentially understood within the context of ethnic and cultural geographies. Furthermore, cross-cultural socio-economic constraints that delay the wishes of young adults to form new households must also be taken into consideration.

Keywords: *Household mobility; young adults; household formation; residential satisfaction; council rental housing*

Introduction

This paper focuses on assessing the household mobility dynamics in established suburban council rental housing estates in South African cities. It is based on the case study of Kenneth Gardens, a council rental housing estate in the city of Durban. Household mobility dynamics of the general population, and specifically those of the relatively youthful adult population, are central to residential satisfaction indicators and they are also a major factor in determining the housing demand. Across the globe, young adults are acknowledged as the biggest contributors to the quantitative housing deficits and housing demand as they are likely to be moving out of their parental homes to form new households for various reasons that include socio-cultural constructions of adulthood, the need for individual independence and privacy, employment and career development, education, marriage, and a search for a better quality of life, among other reasons. Therefore, in most developed countries, household mobility research and monitoring, especially of the young adult population group, has become part and parcel of housing and development planning policy practices. However, this has not been the case in developing countries where there has been a dearth in residential satisfaction literature in general and particularly regarding the mobility of young adults, who happen to be most of the population. This occurs in a context where young adults face several challenges in terms of residential satisfaction and household formation aspirations.

In Africa, and specifically in South Africa, 'waithood' has been identified as a common challenge that young adults face. 'Waithood' entails delayed transitions from youth to adulthood (Honwana, 2014; Fin and Oldfield, 2015). It "encompasses the multi-faceted nature of youth transition into adulthood, goes beyond securing a job and extends to social and civic participation," (Soji, 2018: 4). 'Waithood' presents a challenge to the ideals of adulthood when it comes to household formation and mobility, which do not match the lived realities due to high youth unemployment and housing backlogs, among other issues. In low-income South African city neighbourhoods, where the majority Black population group resides, and in culturally diverse low-income neighbourhoods such the Kenneth Gardens in Durban, the challenge is even more apparent due to a plethora of residential satisfaction challenges among young adults. The challenge of 'waithood' among the youth in Kenneth Gardens should also be understood in the context of the argument by Marks et al. (2018) that regardless of the precariousness of life in Kenneth Gardens due to, among other challenges, poverty, unemployment, and drug abuse, the community has been resilient and emboldened by the strong sense of unity when facing the adversities of life. Hence, this paper investigates the household mobility dynamics of young adults in Kenneth Gardens. A specific focus is on the socio-economic characteristics of households, the socio-economic attributes of young adults, likely household formation behaviour of young adults, the factors that influence the mobility of young adults, causal associations, and the analysis of variance (ANOVA).

According to Heath (1999: 546), the understanding of household aspirations of young adults is crucial to the fuller comprehension of their post-school labour market trajectories. For instance, Heath argues that marriage has been touted as the main household formation goal for young adults. However, this is not necessarily the case as young women and men's household formation is increasingly being tied to their labour market aspirations and experiences. Thus, Heath points out that any account of household formation should take cognisance of the relationship between leaving home, employment, and family formation. In addition, a study of household formation is important for the real estate industry because such demographic changes and patterns determine the demand for real estate (Di and Liu, 2006: 149). Moreover, when it comes to young adults, such a study would be especially useful, as young adults are the majority of Minimum Housing Units (MHUs), thereby constituting the bulk of the housing demand through their desire and propensity to form new households.

Literature Review

There is no theoretical or policy consensus on definition of young adults. However, the generally used conceptual and theoretical approaches in defining young adults include the stage theory, life span developmental psychology, and dialectical lifespan psychology (Dannefer, 1984). The stage theory is based on how different aspects of the self and the world "influence the formation of life structure and shape its change over time" (Levinson et al., 1978: 42 cited in Dannefer, 1984). The stages of life that are identified are childhood, adolescence, early (young) adulthood, middle adulthood, and late adulthood. Early adulthood is characterised by phases that include entering the adult world, the age 30 transition, and settling down. This stage starts from the late teens, roughly from the age of 17 up to 40 years of age. Although there is no consensus in defining young adults, internationally the ages range from 15 to 24 years of age extending to 30 or 40 years (Walker-Harding et al., 2016). Young adults contribute to most of the quantitative housing demand due to a range of biological and socio-economic factors that might lead them to break from their present household arrangements to form new households. These factors may include marriage, cultural expectations that come with adulthood, and post-school employment dynamics. "A grasp of the changing domestic and housing aspirations of young adults is crucial for a fuller understanding of their post-school labour market trajectories," (Heath, 1999: 546).

Residential mobility is defined as moves, over relatively short distances, which do not diffuse the daily activity space of people and is different from migration, which usually disrupts daily activity spaces (Roseman, 1971; Niedomysl, 2011). It is defined within the theoretical ambit of the course of life (Clark, 2006; Coulter et al., 2013). Life course theories differentiates sub-groups in society and focuses on the social pathways that define the sequence of events, transitions, roles, and experiences in the lives of individuals (Fuller-Iglesius et al., 2010: 4). The view is that life is lived in a reasonably ordered manner in patterns shaped by age, social structure, and historical change (Elder and Johnson, 2003 cited in Black et al., 2008: 39). Central to life course perspectives is timing, agency, linked lives, time and space, and life span development. When applied to residential mobility, life course theories suggest that residential mobility is a manifestation of structuration in society where it is influenced by an interplay of broader socio-economic and ethnic geographies in neighbourhoods, as well as agency and individual ingenuity (Coulter et al., 2013).

One of the most prominent theoretical models for explaining mobility is the model of constraint. According to Heath (1999), the model of constraint points to theoretically ascribed characteristics such as class, gender, ethnicity, and location on mobility and mobility propensity. Models of constraint also acknowledge the role of individual mobility decisions and choices that are made within a set of constraints. The constraints to household formation within the constraint model include factors such as insecurities of the youth in the labour market, structure of housing benefits, and state policies that give the role of supporting young adults to families. Similar sentiments are echoed by Di and Liu (2006: 149), who argue that household formation depends on the cost of living independently and capacity of individuals to cover this cost. Linked to this are determinants such as personal income of young adults, parental income, local housing prices, and rent.

The constraint model of household mobility is critiqued from the perspective that the continued residence of young adults in the parental home is a result of deliberate choice rather than constraints. In addition, the environment in the parental homes may also offer the desired living arrangements such as internal privacy. Constraint models are also largely economic in nature, and they are also. to a large extent. informed by traditional forms of households as well as ideal and acceptable societal standards of family life in society. According to Heath (1999), in post-modern societies, mobility and mobility propensity are viewed as also significantly influenced by the standardisation of transitional routes, the appeal of single lifestyles and pure relationships with lovers and friends. In the British context for instance, Heath (1999) notes that there has been a decline in females in their early twenties forming households based on hetero-sexual relationships. At the same time there has been a decline in young adults of both sexes remaining in the parental home until their late twenties. Heath argues that in fact there has been an increase in young adults forming non-familial households such as living alone or living with other single young adults.

Other factors such as ethnic differences and household income should also be acknowledged in the household formation behaviour of young adults. Heath points out that young people from middle class families tend to leave home earlier compared to those from working class backgrounds, and they tend to return home at a later stage. Those from working class backgrounds are less likely to return home once they have left. Ethnic differences also exist in household formation behaviour of young adults. Heath (1999) notes that young Black men are less likely than young Asian or White men to be living with their parents in their late teens, and young White women are more likely than their Asian or Black peers to be living away from their parents in their early to mid-twenties (Heath and Dale, 1994 cited in Heath, 1999: 547). However, there are also other intervening factors such as youth unemployment, skills training, and stress placed on family life that delay young adults in forming their own households.

Meyer and Speare (1985) note that the mobility of the elderly population has declined since the 1950s. However, they highlight that the main reasons for mobility by the elderly population group has been mobility for amenities, for assistance and in preparation for aging. They note that such mobility in such context may be local or long distance because of reduced capability for independent living in a new home with a supporting relative, or to a nursing home. Neighbourhoods and housing types that Meyer and Speare (1985) identify as linked to mobility by the elderly are smaller units, elderly housing complexes, and convenient locations near shopping centres. Meyer and Speare also argue that in a way more or less similar to that of the middle aged and younger population groups, the elderly can also move for lower cost housing, better quality neighbourhoods, or push factors such as changing neighbourhoods or destruction of housing. Notwithstanding this, there are also socio-demographic correlations to mobility by the elderly such as age, marital status, education level, and income level. In addition, neighbourhood satisfaction/dissatisfaction literature shows that households that were unhappy with their neighbourhood were more likely to move out and seek another neighbourhood.

Therefore, it should be noted that the decision to move out of the parental household may be affected not only by macro-economic conditions but also by social factors and individual economic variables (Dey and Pierret, 2014: 1). Several authors have shown that young men in sub-Saharan Africa and beyond are facing complex and contested transitions to adulthood because of the widening gap between the ideals of adulthood and the actual practice (Dawson, 2014: 863). High unemployment rates have delayed and compromised long-standing ideals of adulthood such as marriage, economic independence, and household formation. This has in turn brought about other social practices and even political action. Homelessness in South Africa is often a result of unemployed youth coming from broken families (Shoba, 2019).

The 'waithood' challenges in South Africa, especially with regards to household formation among the youths, are noted by Posel et al. (2011). They argue that the declining marriage rates among African youths in South Africa could be attributed to the cultural practice of bride price, which has been become unaffordable for most young couples due to high rates of unemployment and poverty among the youths. In addition to the challenges of unemployment and poverty, household mobility and formation in South Africa should be understood in the context of prevailing urban customs. For instance, Bolt and Masha (2019) point to the family home concept which is prevalent in most African townships in South Africa. According to Bolt and Masha (2019) this is a phenomenon where members of a family or related household members are awarded the right to stay in a primary residence if they wish to do so or of if they have challenges fulfilling their own household mobility choices. Therefore, it should be noted that there are cultural norms and values that mediate household formation behaviour among young adults and the delayed transitions into adulthood in general.

The delayed transition into adulthood among young adults is known as the 'waithood' phenomenon. According to Dhillon et al. (2009) and Kovacheva et al. (2018) 'waithood' refers to a situation where "institutions like education systems, the labour markets and family formation have failed to mediate young people's transitions, leaving them in essence as generations in waiting." For instance, it is widely acknowledged that home ownership is a universal aspiration, but it has also been a challenge especially for young adults (Druta and Ronald, 2017: 285). Investigating household mobility factors among young adults in low-income, multi-cultural social housing estates such as Kenneth Gardens, becomes more persuasive in the face of the 'waithood' phenomenon.

The Case Study and Methodology

Kenneth Gardens council rental housing estate was used as a case study to investigate the mobility dynamics among young adults in established council rental housing estates in the suburban areas of

South African cities. Kenneth Gardens is in the west of the Durban's inner-city area in the suburban neighbourhood of Umbilo. The estate has a rich history that spans more than four decades, when the housing apartments were established as state-owned subsidised rental housing for exclusive occupation by 'poor' working class members of the White population group. In the present-day post-apartheid South African city context, Kenneth Gardens estate is an example of how formerly segregated state housing settlements have transformed to become multi-racial and culturally diverse. At the same time the neighbourhood exhibits the challenge of quantitative housing deficits that are prevalent in most affordable housing initiatives in South African cities. The neighbourhood is characterised by a young adult and youthful population that are susceptible to HIV/AIDS and substance abuse. The neighbourhood is therefore a microcosm in terms of the factors that affect mobility of young adults in suburban established council rental housing estates in South African cities.

A survey questionnaire was administered to respondents from 140 households in the Kenneth Gardens council rental housing estate. The survey focused on interviewee profiles, household characteristics, profile of young adults per household, likely household formation behaviour of young adults, and the reasons influencing young adults' housing formation behaviour. Presentation and analysis of findings utilised descriptive statistical tabulations and inferential statistics. Inferences from the findings were based on the analysis of variance (ANOVA) and cross-tabulations. According to Zikmund et al. (2013), ANOVA is a technique used to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the means of different groups. Cross-tabulations were used to determine whether there were significant associations between the different groups of variables in this research. The validity and reliability of the findings were enhanced as respondents were drawn from 140 households, from a list 216 apartments. This was in line with the Cochran formula of calculating a sample size for the alpha level *a priori* at 0,05 (error of 5%).

Regardless of the above, limitations of the research study's methodology should be noted even though there were only a few compared to the strengths. The field work and the data collection for the study was conducted and completed just before the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on young adults' household formation behaviour was not factored in the research design. However, the research study is still valid since it is appropriately theoretically grounded in life course theories. In this respect, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the household formation behaviour of young adults in established council rental housing estates in South Africa is a suggestion for further research in this paper. It should also be noted that respondents and participants of the study came disproportionately from household representatives aged over 18 to those aged over 60. Respondents were not entirely young adults or youths and as such respondents not in the youth age group may be deemed not well versed in a subject about the youths. This was countered by the fact that interviews were solicited from adult household members with information about all the household members including young adults.

Analysis and Results

Profile of Respondents and Households

Interviewee profiles show that most of the interviewees were female and most of them were above 60 years of age. Most of the respondents in the sample were from African/Black population groups and have been staying in Kenneth Gardens for more than 14 years.

Table 1: Demographic profile of the respondents	
Participant characteristics	Frequency (%)
Gender	

Female	80 (57.1%)
Male	60 (42.9%)
Age group (years)	
0 – 14	1 (0.7%)
15 – 20	12 (8.6%)
21 -25	16 (11.4%)
26 – 30	15 (10.7%)
31 – 35	12 (8.6%)
36 – 40	12 (8.6%)
41 – 40	4 (2.9%)
46 – 50	7 (5.0%)
51 – 55	11 (7.9%)
56 – 60	13 (9.3%)
> 60	37 (26.4%)
Ethnic group	
Asian/Indian	29 (20.7%)
Black	82 (58.6%)
Coloured	11 (7.9%)
White	18 (12.9%)
Years staying in current house/dwelling	
0 -2 Years	6 (4.3%)
3 – 5 Years	12 (8.6%)
6 – 10 Years	17 (12.2%)
11- 15 Years	12 (8.6%)
> 15 Years	92 (66.2%)

Household characteristics depict that on average, most households are extended, male headed, headed by the African/Black population group head, headed by a person over the age of 60, and have two to five members. Most households in the neighbourhood rely on a monthly income from formal employment (44,3%), followed by those that rely on government grants (30,7%), and informal employment (5,0%). In addition, on average, most households have one to two household members who are employed and one to two household members who are school-going or doing some skills training.

Table 2: Household characteristics	
Household characteristic	**Frequency (%)**
Household members staying in current house/dwelling	
< 2 people	6 (4.3%)
2 – 5 people	100 (71.9%)
6 – 10 people	32 (23.0%)
11- 15 people	1 (0.7%)
Type of household	
One person household	5 (3.6%)

Nuclear household	63 (45.0%)
Extended household	63 (45.0%)
Composite household	9 (6.4%)
Gender of the household head	
Female	60 (42.9%)
Male	80 (57.1%)
Ethnic group of the household head	
Asian/Indian	28 (20.0%)
Black	80 (57.1%)
Coloured	10 (7.1%)
White	21 (15.0%)
Other	1 (0.7%)
Age group of the household head (years)	
0-14	1 (0.7)
21 -25	2 (1.4%)
26 – 30	7 (5.0%)
31 – 35	12 (8.6%)
36 – 40	19 (13.6%)
41 – 40	11 (7.9%)
46 – 50	9 (6.4%)
51 – 55	15 (10.7%)
56 – 60	20 (14.3%)
> 60	44 (31.4%)
Source of income for household head	
Formal employment	62 (44.6%)
Informal employment	7 (5.0%)
Government grants	43 (30.9%)
Other(specify)	27 (19.4%)
Estimated monthly income of the household head	
R 1 - R 4 800	68 (49.3%)
R 4 801 - R 9 600	28 (20.3%)
R 9 601 - R 38 200	35 (25.4%)
R 38 201 - R 76 400	6 (4.3%)
R 76 401 - R 153 800	0 (0.0%)
R 153 801 - R 307 600	1 (0.7%)
> R 307 600	0 (0.0%)
Size of household	
< 2 people	6 (4.3%)
2 – 5 people	100 (71.9%)
6 – 10 people	32 (23.0%)
11- 15 people	1 (0.7%)

Profile of Young Adults and Likely Household Formation Behaviour

The profile of young adults and their likely household formation behaviour is shown in Table 3. The table shows that most households on average have between one and two members who are childless adults. On the other hand, on average, most households do not have household members who are single parents with dependent children, childless couples, or married couples with dependent children. However, it should be noted that there is a high level of variance in the manifestation of the different types of young adults. It should also be noted that there is a category of young adults that could not be quantitatively measured by the different categories of young adults in the questionnaire: these are the single parent's dependent on parents. This was only captured by follow-up probing qualitative questions. In most cases when this category was identified, it had to do with teen mothers who were staying with and getting support from their parents in the extended household set up.

Table 3: Profile of young adults and likely household formation behaviour	
Profile and likely household formation behaviour	**Frequency (%)**
Childless, unmarried adults	
None	45 (32.1%)
1 - 2 people	75 (53.6%)
3 - 5 people	18 (12.9%)
> 5 people	1 (0.7%)
Single parents with dependent parents	
None	91 (65.0%)
1 - 2 people	48 (34.3%)
Childless couples	
None	133 (95.0%)
1 - 2 people	6 (4.3%)
Married couples with dependent children	
None	91 (65.0%)
1 - 2 people	48 (34.3%)
Likely transformation of young adults	
Living alone	77 (55.0%)
Living with parents	31 (22.1%)
Living with other unmarried adults	2 (1.4%)
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults is to leave family home	
Strongly disagree	3 (2.1%)
Disagree	21 (15.0%)
Neutral	5 (3.6%)
Agree	68 (48.6%)
Strongly agree	13 (9.3%)
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults is not to leave family home	
Strongly disagree	11 (7.9%)
Disagree	59 (42.1%)
Neutral	17 (12.1%)
Agree	21 (15.0%)

Strongly agree	2 (1.4%)
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults if not married is to get married and leave family home	
Strongly disagree	30 (21.4%)
Disagree	15 (10.7%)
Neutral	12 (8.6%)
Agree	78 (55.7%)
Strongly agree	5 (3.6%)
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults if not married is to get married and stay in family home	
Strongly disagree	30 (21.4%)
Disagree	11 (7.9)
Neutral	67 (47.9%)
Agree	21 (15.0%)
Strongly agree	11 (7.9%)
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults is to have children and stay in family home	
Strongly disagree	30 (21.4%)
Disagree	1 (0.7%)
Neutral	25 (17.9%)
Agree	71 (50.7%)
Strongly agree	13 (9.3%)
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults is to have children and leave family home	
Strongly disagree	1 (0.7%)
Disagree	12 (8.6%)
Neutral	90 (64.3%)
Agree	7 (5.0%)
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults if not married is to live alone	
Disagree	46 (32.9%)
Neutral	13 (9.3%)
Agree	51 (36.4%)
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults if not married is to live with others	
Disagree	52 (37.1%)
Neutral	35 (25.0%)
Agree	23 (16.4%)

On average, Table 3 shows that most young adults were likely to transform their current living standards into living alone. Most respondents also agreed that the most likely household formation behaviour of young adults was to leave the parental home, if not married, it was to get married and leave the parental home. Most households also disagreed that the likely household formation behaviour of young adults was not to leave the parental home, to get married and stay in the parental home, and that if not married, young adults will live with others. On the other hand, most respondents were neutral on whether young adults will have children and stay in the parental home or have children and leave the parental home as the likely household formation behaviour.

Factors Influencing Young Adults' Household Formation Behaviour

The factors that influence the young adults' household formation behaviour are shown in Table 4. A relatively high proportion of households strongly agreed that income levels of young adults in the household were likely to influence their formation of new households, whilst most agreed that the quality of available services in the neighbourhood were likely to influence young adults moving out of parental homes to form new households. Most respondents disagreed that changes in age, as well as gender roles, were likely to influence household formation behaviours of young adults in the household. Respondents were mostly neutral as to whether they considered changes in the number of family members staying in the household and modern communication or transformation services were likely to influence household formation behaviour.

Table 4: Factors influencing young adults' formation of new households	
Factors	**Frequency (%)**
Income level	
Strongly disagree	1 (0.7%)
Disagree	8 (5.7%)
Neutral	17 (12.1%)
Agree	34 (24.3%)
Strongly agree	50 (35.7%)
Change in household size	
Strongly disagree	30 (21.4%)
Disagree	40 (28.6%)
Neutral	58 (41.4%)
Agree	12 (8.6%)
Age gender roles	
Strongly disagree	30 (21.4%)
Disagree	42 (30.0%)
Neutral	31 (22.1%)
Agree	37 (26.4%)
Quality of available services	
Strongly disagree	30 (21.4%)
Disagree	19 (13.6%)
Neutral	34 (24.3%)
Agree	57 (40.7%)
Modern communication and transportation services	
Disagree	41 (29.3%)
Neutral	56 (40.0%)
Agree	13 (9.3%)
Agreement regarding young adults continued stay in the family	
Strongly disagree	2 (1.4%)
Disagree	1 (0.7%)
Neutral	11 (7.9%)
Agree	76 (54.3%)
Strongly agree	20 (14.3%)

Low quality of life in the other available households	
Disagree	2 (1.4%)
Disagree	32 (22.9%)
Neutral	10 (7.1%)
Agree	61 (43.6%)
Strongly Agree	5 (3.6%)

Most respondents agreed with the continued stay of young adults in the household and also that the continued stay of young adults in the household was due to poor quality of life in the other available households. In addition, most of the respondents also agreed that the availability of employment opportunities in and around the area was one of the reasons for the continued stay in the household.

Causal Associations in the Household Formation Behaviour of Young Adults

Cross tabulations were used to establish if there were associations between the independent and dependent variables in this study. Independent variables comprised of the profiles of the respondent and household attributes. Table 5 shows that the monthly income of the household head had a significant association with the presence of young adults who were childless, unmarried adults and whether the likely household formation behaviour of young adults was to get married and leave the parental home.

Table 5: Cross tabulation between variables of interest and monthly income of household head

Variable of interest		Monthly income					
		R 1 - R 4 800	R 4 801 - R 9 600	R 9 601 - R 19 600	R 38 2001 - R 76 400	R 153 801 - R 307 600	> R 307 600
Young adults who are childless unmarried adults	Chi-square = 0.000	68 (48.6%)	28 (20.0%)	35 (25.0%)	6 (4.3%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)
None		25 (17.9%)	7 (5.0%)	12 (8.6%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
1 - 2 people		35 (25.0%)	15 (10.7%)	19 (13.6%)	4 (2.9%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.0%)
3 - 5 people		8 (5.7%)	6 (4.3%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
> 5 people		0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults is to get married and leave parental home	Chi-square = 0.006	68 (48.6%)	28 (20.0%)	35 (25.0%)	6 (4.3%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)
Disagree		6 (4.3%)	5 (3.6%)	3 (2.1%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Neutral		6 (4.3%)	3 (2.1%)	3 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Agree		38 (27.1%)	14 (10.0%)	21 (15.0%)	5 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Strongly agree		3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

From Table 5, most households, regardless of the monthly income of the household head, had between one to two young adults who were childless unmarried adults. It is important to note that households with heads with a monthly income between R1 and R4800 recorded the most cases where there were no childless unmarried adults. These constituted 17.9 per cent of the total households. The monthly income of household head also had a significant association (p value 0.006) with the likelihood of household formation behaviour of young adults to get married and leave the parental home. Households with heads in the relatively low monthly income brackets, especially those earning between R1 and R4800, and R4801 and R9601, largely agreed and strongly agreed that the likely household formation behaviour of young adults was to get married and leave the parental home, in contrast to those in the higher income brackets, where young adults were likely to get married and stay in the parental home.

Cross tabulations between the gender of the household head and whether the likely household formation behaviour of young adults was to have children and stay in the parental home was also significant (p value 0.14). This is shown in Table 6. From Table 6, one notes that more male-headed households disagreed that the likely household formation behaviour of young adults was to have children and stay in the parental home in contrast to female-headed households. Table 6 also shows that more female-headed households, relative to male-headed households, agreed that the likely household formation behaviour of young adults was to have children and stay in the parental home. In addition, more female-headed households were neutral about the likelihood of this household formation behaviour relative to male-headed households.

Table 6: Cross tabulation between variables of interest and gender of household head

Variable of interest		Gender of household head	
		Female	Male
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults is to have children and stay in parental home	Chi-square = 0.014	**60 (42.9%)**	**80 (57.1%)**
Strongly agree		0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Disagree		5 (3.6%)	20 (14.3%)
Neutral		40 (28.6%)	31 (22.1%)
Agree		5 (3.6%)	8 (5.7%)

The age group of the household head was also significantly associated with the nature and profile of young adults that were present in the households. This is shown in Table 7. From Table 7, for instance, the degree of association between the age of the household head and the prevalence of childless unmarried adults was significant (p value 0.000). Notable from Table 7 is the fact that households that were headed by the relatively elderly age group (>60 and 56 – 60 years), which contributed to most households with one to two young adults who were childless unmarried adults. Table 7 also shows that there was also a significant association between the age group of the household head and the prevalence of single parents with dependent children, childless couples, and married couples with dependent children in households. However, it is important to note that most households had none of these three categories of young adults.

Table 7: Cross tabulation between variables of interest and age group of household head

Variable of interest		Age group (years)									
		0 - 14	21 - 25	26 - 30	31 - 35	36 - 40	41 - 45	46 - 50	51 - 55	56 - 60	> 60
Household members who are childless unmarried adults	Chi-square = 0.000	**1 (0.7%)**	**2 (1.4%)**	**7 (5.0%)**	**12 (8.6%)**	**19 (13.6%)**	**11 (7.9%)**	**9 (6.4%)**	**15 (10.7%)**	**20 (14.3%)**	**44 (31.4%)**
None		0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	5 (3.6%)	4 (2.9%)	5 (3.6%)	2 (1.4%)	3 (2.1%)	6 (4.3%)	4 (2.9%)	15 (10.7%)
1 - 2 people		0 (0.0)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.4)	6 (4.3%)	12 (8.6)	6 (4.3%)	5 (3.6)	9 (6.4%)	12 (8.6)	22 (15.7%)
3 - 5 people		0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.4%)	2 (1.4%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.1%)	7 (5.0%)
> 5 people		0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Young adults who are lone parents with dependant parents	Chi-square = 0.000	**1 (0.7%)**	**2 (1.4%)**	**7 (5.0%)**	**12 (8.6%)**	**19 (13.6%)**	**11 (7.9%)**	**9 (6.4%)**	**15 (10.7%)**	**20 (14.3%)**	**44 (31.4%)**
None		0 (0.0%)	2 (1.4%)	4 (2.9%)	8 (5.7%)	11 (7.9%)	6 (4.3%)	7 (5.0%)	11 (7.9%)	17 (12.1%)	25 (17.9%)
1 - 2 people		0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.1%)	4 (2.9%)	8 (5.7%)	5 (3.6%)	2 (1.4%)	4 (2.9%)	3 (2.1%)	15 (13.5%)
Young adults who are childless couples	Chi-square = 0.000	**1 (0.7%)**	**2 (1.4%)**	**7 (5.0%)**	**12 (8.6%)**	**19 (13.6%)**	**11 (7.9%)**	**9 (6.4%)**	**15 (10.7%)**	**20 (14.3%)**	**44 (31.4%)**
None		0 (0.0%)	2 (1.4%)	5 (3.6%)	12 (8.6%)	18 (12.9%)	11 (7.9%)	9 (6.4%)	15 (0.0%)	19 (13.6%)	42 (30.0%)
1 - 2 people		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.4%)
Young adults who are maried couples with dependant children	Chi-square = 0.000	**1 (0.7%)**	**2 (1.4%)**	**7 (5.0%)**	**12 (8.6%)**	**19 (13.6%)**	**11 (7.9%)**	**9 (6.4%)**	**15 (10.7%)**	**20 (14.3%)**	**44 (31.4%)**
None		0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	6 (4.3%)	9 (6.4%)	18 (12.9%)	7 (5.0%)	2 (1.4%)	8 (5.7%)	10 (7.1%)	35 (25.0%)
1 - 2 people		0 (0.0)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	4 (2.9%)	7 (5.0%)	7 (5.0%)	10 (7.1%)	9 (6.4%)

A significant association was also discerned between the type of household and the likely household formation behaviour of young adults. This is shown in Table 8. Extended households, in contrast to nuclear households, were likely to agree that the likely household formation behaviour of young adults was to have children and leave the parental home. Overall, the different types of households were generally neutral to the idea of young adults having children and leaving the parental home. Also notable is the fact that most households that agreed that the likely household formation behaviour of young adults was to leave the parental home, were extended households. The degree of association between household type and whether the likely household formation behaviour of young adults, if not married, was to live alone was also significant (p value 0.000). Most extended households, in contrast to nuclear households, agreed that this was the likely household formation behaviour of young adults.

Table 8: Cross tabulation between variables of interest and type of household

Variable of interest		Household type			
		One person	Nuclear	Extended	Composite
The likely household formation behaviour of young adults is to have children and leave parental home	Chi-square = 0.000	**5 (3.6%)**	**63 (45.0%)**	**63 (45.0%)**	**9 (6.4%)**
Strongly disagree		0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Disagree		1 (0.7%)	2 (1.4%)	9 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Neutral		0 (0.0%)	35 (25.0)	47 (33.6)	8 (5.7%)
Agree		0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	5 (3.6%)	1 (0.7%)
The likely household formation behaviour of young adults if not married is to live alone	Chi-square = 0.000	**5 (3.6%)**	**63 (45.0%)**	**63 (45.0%)**	**9 (6.4%)**
Disagree		1 (0.7%)	20 (14.3%)	23 (16.4%)	2 (1.4%)
Neutral		0 (0.0%)	3 (2.1%)	8 (5.7%)	2 (1.4%)
Agree		0 (0.0%)	16 (11.4%)	30 (21.4%)	5 (3.6%)
The likely household formation behaviour of young adults if not married is to live with others	Chi-square = 0.000	**5 (3.6%)**	**63 (45.0%)**	**63 (45.0%)**	**9 (6.4%)**
Disagree		1 (0.7%)	20 (14.3%)	31 (22.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Neutral		0 (0.0%)	13 (9.3%)	20 (14.3%)	2 (1.4%)
Agree		0 (0.0%)	6 (4.3%)	10 (7.1%)	7 (5.0%)

Cross tabulations between population group of household heads and the way young adults were likely to transform their living arrangements also showed a significant association between these variables (p value 0.000). This is shown in Table 9. In Table 9, one notes that most of the young adults among the Black population group households, were likely to transform their living arrangements into living alone. This was different from the Coloured and White population groups, where young adults were likely to continue staying in the parental home.

Table 9: Cross tabulation between variables of interest and population group of household head

Variable of interest		Ethnic group				
		Asian/Indian	Black	Coloured	White	Other
The way MHU(s) are likely to transform their current living standards into	Chi-square = 0.000	**28 (20.0%)**	**80 (57.1%)**	**10 (7.1%)**	**21 (15.0%)**	**1 (0.7%)**
Living alone		9 (6.4%)	60 (42.9%)	2 (1.4%)	6 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Living with parents		7 (5.0%)	8 (5.7%)	5 (3.6%)	10 (7.1%)	1 (0.7%)
Living with minor unmaried adults		0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)
The likely household formation behaviour of young adults in the household is to get married and stay in parental home	Chi-square = 0.000	**28 (20.0%)**	**80 (57.1%)**	**10 (7.1%)**	**21 (15.0%)**	**1 (0.7%)**
Strongly disagree		0 (0.0%)	7 (5.0%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Disagree		7 (5.0%)	55 (39.3%)	1 (0.7%)	4 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Neutral		6 (4.3%)	5 (3.6%)	5 (3.6%)	5 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Agree		3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	5 (3.6%)	1 (0.7%)
The likely household formation behaviour of young adults in the household is to get married and leave parental home	Chi-square = 0.000	**28 (20.0%)**	**80 (57.1%)**	**10 (7.1%)**	**21 (15.0%)**	**1 (0.7%)**
Disagree		3 (2.1%)	3 (2.1%)	3 (2.1%)	5 (3.6%)	1 (0.7%)
Neutral		5 (3.6%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Agree		7 (5.0%)	58 (41.4%)	4 (2.9%)	9 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Strongly agree		1 (0.7%)	4 (2.9%)	0 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
The likely household formation behaviour of young adults in the household is to leave parental home	Chi-square = 0.000	**28 (20.0%)**	**80 (57.1%)**	**10 (7.1%)**	**21 (15.0%)**	**1 (0.7%)**
Strongly disagree		0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Disagree		6 (4.3%)	4 (2.9%)	4 (2.9%)	6 (4.3%)	1 (0.7%)
Neutral		2 (1.4%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Agree		8 (5.7%)	52 (37.1%)	2 (1.4%)	6 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Strongly agree		0 (0.0%)	10 (7.1%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)

Table 9 also shows another significant association between the population group of the household and the likely household formation behaviour of young adults, which in turn showed that for those households headed by a member of the Black population group, young adults were likely to get married and leave the parental home. This contrasts with the Coloured and White population groups, where most respondents were neutral. Another notable association was between the population group of the household head and whether the likely household formation behaviour of young adults, if not married was to live alone (p value 0.000). Overall respondents from the Indian, Coloured, and White population groups disagreed regarding this likelihood, in contrast to the Black population group. The trends among the Indian, Coloured, and White population groups were more or less similar as the proportion in each of these population group, in terms of the household formation behaviour of young adults, was more or less similar.

Table 10: Cross tabulation between variables of interest and size of household

Variable of interest		Size of household			
		>2	2 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults in the household is to leave parental home	Chi-square = 0.019	**6 (4.3%)**	**100 (71.4%)**	**32 (22.9%)**	**1 (0.7%)**
Strongly disagree		1 (0.7%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Disagree		0 (0.0%)	19 (13.6%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Neutral		1 (0.7%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Agree		0 (0.0%)	45 (31.1%)	22 (15.7%)	1 (0.7%)
Strongly agree		0 (0.0%)	8 (5.7%)	5 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Likely household formation behaviour of young adults in the household is not to leave parental home	Chi-square = 0.001	**6 (4.3%)**	**100 (71.4%)**	**32 (22.9%)**	**1 (0.7%)**
Strongly disagree		0 (0.0%)	8 (5.7%)	2 (1.4%)	1 (0.7%)
Disagree		0 (0.0%)	37 (26.4%)	22 (15.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Neutral		0 (0.0%)	13 (9.3%)	4 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Agree		1 (0.7%)	18 (12.9%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Strongly agree		1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

The size of the household also had a significant association with the prevalence of young adults and their likely household formation behaviour. This is shown in Table 10. Young adults from relatively larger households, especially those with 6 to 10 members and those with 11 to 15 members, were most likely to either get married and leave the parental home or leave the parental home to stay alone unlike the relatively smaller households with 2 to 5 members.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

ANOVA was used to establish if there was a statistically significant difference between independent groups of variables. The focus was on comparing independent groups within interviewee profile attributes: household attributes, young adults' attributes, and the factors influencing the household formation behaviour of young adults. Variations on the impact of the population group of young adults on household formation behaviour was significant (p value 0.000). This is shown in Table 6 below.

Table 11: Variations in the impact of population group on young adults' household formation behaviour

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Factor Analysis (FA)_Young adults	Between groups	29,018	3	9,673	5,618	0,001
	Within groups	234,142	136	1,722		
	Total	263,160	139			

Post-hoc analysis of the variations in the population group of young adults on household formation behaviour showed that the actual difference among population groups was between the African and Indian population groups. This is shown in Table7 below.

Table 12: Post-hoc analysis of variations in the impact of population group on young adults household formation behaviour

Dependent Variable				Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% confidence interval	
							Lower bound	Upper bound
FA_Young adults	LSD	African/ Black	Coloured	0,25233	0,42132	0,550	-0,5808	1,0855
			White	0,61192	0,34153	0,075	-0,0635	1,2873
			Indian	1.13070*	0,28348	0,000	0,5701	1,6913

There were also variations within different household attributes in terms of the way they associated with the likely household formation behaviour of young adults. For instance, the race of the household, size of the household, and the number of employed household members.

Table 13: Variations in the impact of household characteristics on household formation behaviour of young adults

Household attribute			Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Race of head	FA_Young adults	Between groups	28,681	3	9,560	5,505	0,001
		Within Groups	234,468	135	1,737		
		Total	263,149	138			
Size of household	FA_Young adults	Between groups	34,353	2	17,176	10,432	0,000
		Within groups	222,272	135	1,646		
		Total	256,625	137			
Employed household members	FA_Young adults	Between groups	35,635	3	11,878	7,249	0,000
		Within groups	221,223	135	1,639		
		Total	256,858	138			
Household members are unemployed and looking for employment	FA_Young adults	Between groups	20,820	2	10,410	5,998	0,003
		Within groups	236,037	136	1,736		
		Total	256,858	138			

Post-hoc analysis indicated that there was a significant and specific difference between the Black-racial group-headed households and those that are headed by the Indian population group.

Table 14: Post-hoc analysis of variations in the impact of household characteristics on young adults household formation behaviour

Dependent variable				Mean difference (I-J)	Std. error	Sig.	95% confidence interval	
							Lower bound	Upper bound
FA_Young adults		African/ Black	Coloured	0,45250	0,44203	0,308	-0,4217	1,3267
			White	0,41345	0,32313	0,203	-0,2256	1,0525
	LSD		Indian	1.16821*	0,28938	0,000	0,5959	1,7405
FA_Young adults	LSD	< 2 people	2 – 5 people	-1.67667*	0,53933	0,002	-2,7433	-0,6100

			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		6 – 10 people	-2.44792*	0,57084	0,000	-3,5769	-1,3190
	2 – 5 people	< 2 people	1.67667*	0,53933	0,002	0,6100	2,7433
		6 – 10 people	-.77125*	0,26061	0,004	-1,2867	-0,2558
	6 – 10 people	< 2 people	2.44792*	0,57084	0,000	1,3190	3,5769
		2 – 5 people	.77125*	0,26061	0,004	0,2558	1,2867
FA_Young adults	None	1 – 2 people	-1.11894*	0,28683	0,000	-1,6862	-0,5517
		3 – 5 people	-1.74343*	0,42731	0,000	-2,5885	-0,8983
LSD		> 5 people	-1.87200*	0,94069	0,049	-3,7324	-0,0116
FA_Young adults	None	1 – 2 people	-.76056*	0,23736	0,002	-1,2300	-0,2912
LSD		3 – 5 people	-1,06140	0,60605	0,082	-2,2599	0,1371

Findings

From the empirical study, the dynamics and factors that influence the likely household formation behaviour of young adults in Kenneth Gardens are in support of life course theories of residential mobility. Life course theories argue that residential mobility in general, and that of young adults, is influenced by broader socio-economic and ethnic geographies in neighbourhoods. Likewise, the racial group of the household, culture of the racial group, household type, and level of income were all factors that impacted the likely household formation behaviour of young adults.

It was clear that households in Kenneth Gardens exhibit diversity and multi-culturalism in terms of racial groups, household typologies, household sizes, income levels, and gender of household heads. Stand-out socio-economic attributes of households include the fact that there was a relatively equal representation of nuclear and extended households in the neighbourhood. In addition, most households were low income and had between two and five household members. The dominant household racial groups in descending order are Black, Indian, White, and Coloured. On average, it was found that the most common type of young adults in the neighbourhood across all the households were childless unmarried adults. These were likely to transform their living arrangements into living alone after leaving the parental home.

However, in line with the key propositions of life course theories, there were other socio-economic factors that intervened in the likely household formation behaviour of the young adults. Household formation cultural practices differed along racial lines. The household formation behaviours and aspirations of young adults from the Black racial group households, were to get married and leave the parental home, in contrast to young adults from other racial groups, especially the Indian racial group. Overall, it was apparent that young adults from the Black racial group households aspired to, and were likely to, leave the parental home upon getting married or when their income level improved. Therefore, a sign of adulthood among the Black population group's households, was for young adults to get married and leave the parental home or to get employed and leave the parental home. The income level of young adults in the Black population group's households was a constraint in the preferred household formation behaviour of leaving the parental home. Another constraint that was identified in the absence of income among these young adults, was the poor quality of life in

other available households. Therefore, in the absence of income, young adults were likely to continue staying in the parental home against their household formation aspirations and against the cultural aspirations of the Black population group.

It is apparent that the 'waithood' phenomenon is prevalent and is a challenge among the Black population group's households in Kenneth Gardens. Young adults from the Black population group aspire to get married and leave the parental home, but they are constrained by lack of income and by the fact of poor quality of life in other available households. This finding concurs with the study by Posel et al. (2011) which points to the declining marriage rates among the Black African youth in South Africa due to the unaffordability of pride price in a context where there are relatively high unemployment and poverty rates. The phenomenon of family homes in South Africa's low-income neighbourhoods, which is noted by Bolt and Masha (2019), also seemed to mediate the continued residence of young adults in households regardless of delays in realising their household formation aspirations. As was noted earlier in the findings of this study, a relatively sizable proportion of households were neutral, with some even agreeing with the continued stay of young adults in the household regardless of the challenges that they were facing. This finding also further supports the finding by Marks et al. (2018) that the established council rental housing estate of Kenneth Gardens has become resilient in the face of challenges such as poverty and unemployment through communalism among other strategies. It is therefore plausible for one to argue that the household formation behaviour of young adults in council rental housing estates, and perhaps low-income neighbourhoods in South Africa in general, are being mediated through communalism and the family home phenomenon in the face of the 'waithood' challenge. Furthermore, it should also be noted that there were other non-cultural factors such as the size of the household and the level of income, which also had an association with the likely household formation behaviour of young adults.

Conclusion

Young adults face the challenge of 'waithood' in terms of the delays when it comes to their household formation aspirations. There is a disjuncture between the goal of forming a new household, either to live alone or upon marriage, because of lack of income or low quality of life in low-income households. This mostly applies to young adults from the Black population group. A significant association was discerned between the population group of the households, the likely household formation behaviour, and the factors that influence the household mobility of young adults. This was in turn qualitatively explained by the existence of differential cultural factors among different population groups that influence the household mobility of young adults. Young adults from the Black population group's households aspired to, and were more likely to, leave the parental home to form new households. In addition, young adults from the Black population group's households were influenced to form new households by factors such marriage, having children, and socially constructed ideals and identities of adulthood, to form new households. This contrasted with the other population groups such as the White, Coloured, and Indian population groups, where culturally there was no expectation for young adults to leave the parental home upon marriage, or upon having children. In addition, a key finding of the paper was that there were cross-cultural socio-economic factors that intervened in the young adults' household mobility, such as the gender of household head, household income, size of household, age of household head, the personal income of young adults, and the quality of life in other available households.

References

Bolt, M. and Masha, T. 2019. Recognising the family house: a problem of urban custom in South Africa. *South African Journal on Human Rights,* 35(2): 147-168.

Clark, W., Deurloo, M. and Dieleman, F. 2006. Residential mobility and neighbourhood outcomes. *Housing Studies,* 21(3): 323-342.

Coulter, R., Van Ham, M. and Findlay A. 2016. New directions for residential mobility research: Linking lives through time and space. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(3): 352–374.

Crull, S. R. 1979. Residential satisfaction, propensity to move and residential mobility: A causal model. Available: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8197&context=rtd (Accessed 28 June 2020).

Dannefer, D. 1984. Adult development and social theory: A paradigmatic reappraisal. *American Sociological Review*, 49(1): 100-116.

Davies-Withers, S. 1998. Linking household transitions and housing transitions: A longitudinal analysis of renters. *Environment and Planning A*, 30(4): 615-630.

Dawson, H. 2014. Youth Politics: Waiting and envy in a South African informal settlement. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 40 (4): 861-882.

Dey, J. G., and Pierret, C. R. 2014. Independence for young millennials: moving out and boomeranging back. Available: https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2014/article/independence-for-young-millennials-moving-out-and-boomeranging-back.htm (Accessed 20 February 2021).

Dhillon, N., Dyer, P. and Yousef, T. 2009. Generation in waiting: An overview of school to work and family formation transitions. In: Dhillon, N. and Yousef, T. eds. *Generation in waiting: The unfulfilled promise of young people in the Middle East.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press, 11-38.

Di, Z. X. and Liu, X. 2006. The effects of housing push factors and rent expectations on household formation in young adults. *The Journal of Real Estate Research*, 28(2): 49-166.

Druta, O. and Ronald, R. 2017. Young adults' pathways into home ownership and the negotiation of intra-family support: A home, the ideal gift. *Sociology,* 51(4): 783–799.

Finn, B. and Oldfield, S. 2015. Straining: Young men working through waithood in Freetown, Sierra Leone. *Africa Spectrum,* 50**:** 29-48.

Friesen, B., and Koroloff, N. 2018. Housing and transition: Meeting the needs of young adults with mental health conditions. Available: https://www.pathwaysrtc.pdx.edu/pdf/proj-4-SPAC-housing-transition.pdf. (Accessed 08 February 2021).

Fuller-Iglesias, H., Smith, J. and Antonucci, T. C. 2010. Theories of aging from a life-course and life-span perspective. In: Sussman, S. W. ed. *Life Course Perspectives on Late Life Health Inequalities*. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 3-25.

Gibbs, A., Sikweyiya, Y., and Jewkes, R. 2014. 'Men value their dignity': securing respect and identity construction in urban informal settlements in South Africa. *Global Health Action,* 7(1): 1-10.

Heath, S. 1999. Young adults and household formation in the 1990s. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(4): 545-561.

Honwana, A., 2014. Youth, waithood, and protest movements in Africa. Available: https://africanarguments.org/2013/08/youth-waithood-and-protest-movements-in-africa-by-alcinda-honwana/ (Accessed 17 February 2021).

Hosegood, V., Benzcer, J. and Splarsh, G. C. 2005. Population mobility and household dynamics in rural South Africa: Implications for demographic and health research. *Southern African Journal of Demography*, 10(1/2): 43-68.

Kovacheva, S., Kabaivanovb, S. and Roberts, K. 2018. Interrogating waithood: family and housing life stage transitions among young adults in North-West Africa countries. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth,* 23(4): 441-456.

Levinson, D. J., Charlotte, N. D., Edward, B. K., Maria, H. L. and Braxton, M. 1978. *Seasons of a Man's Life*. New York: Knopf.

Marks, M., Erwin, K. and Fleetwood, T. 2018. *Voices of resilience: A living history of the Kenneth Gardens Municipal Housing Estate in Durban.* Durban: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Meyer, J. W. and Speare, A. 1985. Distinctively elderly mobility: Types and determinants. *Economic Geography,* 61(1): 79-88.

Niedomysl, T. 2011. How migration motives change over migration distance: Evidence on variation across socio-economic and demographic groups. *Regional Studies,* 45(6): 843-855.

Posel, D., Rudwick, S. and Casale, D. 2011. Is marriage a dying institution in South Africa? Exploring changes in marriage in the context of ilobolo payments. *Agenda,* 25(1): 102-111.

Roseman, C. C. 1971. Migration as a spatial and temporal process. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 61(1): 589-598.

Shoba, S. 2019. Homeless young people need more than just jobs. Available: https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2019-06-17-homeless-young-people-need-more-than-just-jobs/ (Accessed 16 February 2021).

Soji, Z. 2018. Waithood, developmental pathways, coping and resilience among South African youths who head families. *Southern African Journal of Social Work and Social Development,* 30(3): 1-18.

Walker-Harding, L.R., Christie, D. and Joffe, A. 2017. Young adult health and well-being: A position statement of the society for adolescent health and medicine. *Journal of Adolescent Health,* 60(6): 758-759.

Zikmund, W. G., Barbin, B. J., Carr, J. C. and Griffin, M. 2013. *Business research methods.* 9th Ed. Mason, USA: South-Western Cengage Learning.