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## INTRODUCTION

In the absence of available comprehensive national data for ana lysis, any data however limited it may be, is of interest to depict the population structure and size.

Lesotho like most progressive 3rd world countries has since 1966 been conducting censuses of classical nature on decennial basis (UN recommendation 1974). It does not however diffen from most of these developing countries which collect census data but are not able to process the information even five (5) years after census-taking. The long gap between census-taking and the publication of nesults for public use makes the data a "mockeny of itself", because, the so-called newly published data ane, of course, at least six (6) years old, meaning that any analysis made therefrom does not present the current situation but that of six on more years back. The long delay of getting census data out, calls for micro sunveys to be conducted, not as a cross-check on validation of census data, but for immediate use representing the national character.

Research work in Lesotho has attracted many people, both near and fan. Amenicans, British and most nationals from developed world come to do research there. Currently, some international organizations provide funds fon reseanch to be done in Southern Africa in general and in Lesotho in panticular. One of the reasons which draw researchers to Lesotho is obviously the unique position in which it lies geographically. It is the only country COMPLETELY surrounded by the Republic of South Africa.

The Republic of South Africa is characterised by the apantheid system and its evils. People who want to know more about Southern Africa would prefer to come to Lesotho rather than to the Republic for fear of going against wonld-wide sanctions placed against. South Africa to isolate and condemn the practice of apartheid.

Lesotho, apart from being enclaved within the Republic, also has another unique position, in that, it is the only country in the world which lies completely on the top of mountains. All of the land is at a height of more than 1000 metres above sea level. It is a small and bapren country with an area approximately 30350 squane kilometres.

At the moment, its amable land is estimated at 300,000 hectares which is less than $10 \%$ of the total apea. The rate of enosion is such that, according to governments' report, the arable land will be totally used up in fifty (50) years if the present rate (of erosion) persists (principal Secretary, Ministry of Agric. Report; 1990).

The country is divided into foup (4) ecological zones: lowlands, foothills, dongas and sandstone. The lowlands are a narrow strip of land lying West of the mountains ranges and less than 1830 metres above sea level.

Dongas which have flat-topped hills and scapped with erosion gullies constitute less than 20 percent of the total 1 and area. A sandstone escarpment at a height of 1830 metres crosses the country along an axis from North-East to South-West. It divides the lowlands from the foothills. The mountains which lie beyond the foothills rise to a rolling upland plateau in the North-East at about 2740 m . The highest peak is Thabana Nt lenyana. The lowlands contain seven (7) out of the ten (10) district headquarters towns, most of the population and the best agnicultural land.

Because of the high altitude, the climate of Lesotho is healthy and temperate. The average annual rainfall of 700 millimetres is concentrated in the summer months from Octoben to April and very little falls in the winter months from May to September.

Mone than 92 percent of Lesotho's population lived in the rural areas by 1971. But now, because of the rural-urban migration in seanch of white-collan-jobs this pencentage has decreased. The rural-urban growth has been at a rate between $7 \%$ and $15 \%$ in the last decade. The annual growth of $5.5 \%$ has decreased the rural population to about $84 \%$. The people live in villages whose mean size varies between 94 persons pen village in the district of Mohale's Hoek and 232 persons in Leribe district. The actual range of variation in village size is much greaten, =rom a minimum of 40 persons to a maximum of about 1000.

Village homesteads in Lesotho are clustened anound a central area (that is, the chief's place) and NOT dispersed across the landscape as in the Transkei and Zululand. The relatively concentrated settlement pattern is consistent both with high veld ecology (Sansom 1974) and with the Sotho political tradition (Kuper 1975).

On the whole, about 70 percent of the population lived in the lowlands and foothills, whereas the mountains, the largest of the zones in area are relatively spansely populated. Resident pooulation densities in 1976 were projected as 35 persons pen square km in Lesotho as a whole and 275 persons/squane km of available arable land. The corresponding figures for the lowlands only were, 80 and 219 persons per square $k m$ (Monyake 1973: 90-92). At the moment, the density for the whole country is estimated as 51 persons per square km. These figures illustrate the intensity of the pressure on the country's very limited land resources.

Lesotho's economy is inextricably linked with South Africa's. The Southern African Custom's Union (SACU) agreement negotiated between Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and South Africa provides fon the distribution of customs revenues between the 4 countries according to a set formula. Revenue from the Customs Union Agreement is the langest single item of pevenue accruing to Lesotho. But this has negat ive effect on Lesotho because of the unrestricted access to Lesotho markets of South African goods. Another effect on the Lesotho economy in recent years has been the importation of inflation from South Africa. In fact, Lesotho depends totally on South Afpican goods.

Lesotho's economy showed a steady increase during the 1980's and hen GNP rose by $24.4 \%$ in real terms. However, the increase in hen population meant that GNP pen capita in fact fell. Lesotho's GDP and GNP differ widely because of migrant labour. Some 125500 Basotho men work in the mines of South Africa but their income contributes to Lesotho's GNP through deferred payments. The number of mignant workers is declining and this could lead to severe unemployment problems for Lesotho in the next decade. Because Lesotho's economy is dominated by South Africa through (SACU), she has less control oven her economic affains than many othen countries. with changes in South Africa, Lesotho's future is uncertain.

Lesotho having all aforementioned charactenistics, will the demognaphic benavioun of Basotho be influenced by them? Will they have the same fertility and mortality rates as the other Southern Afnican states? Will thein household structure be different from the others? What will be the household size compared with othen countries? Will the age sex structure of Lesotho be the same as other African countries?

The aim of this study is to attempt to answer some of these questions, using the survey conducted at Mantsebo as the principal data.

ONE: DATA
The data for this analysis comes from a supvey conducted at Mantsebo between December 18 and 22nd. 1990. Mantsebo is a "big" village in Masenu district, about thirty five (35) km from the capital (Maseru 'city'). It is thus found in the lowland area/pegion where the density is high and apable land for agricultural production is very important. Since Mantsebo is only a few kilometres from the capital, one can suspect that some of the inhabitants wopk in the city, thus the life style is likely to be influenced by the city dwelleps. Almost all the inhabitants are fapmers, the majority of them being women whose husbands are migrant workers living in the Republic.

The choice of Mantsebo is appropriate, for, it has both rural nature and urban-influence. They (the inhabitants) are villagers who are not completely detached from the urban style.

The survey was a complete count, touching all the housing units in the village. In this sense, it was a census of people in the village with 'de jure' counting.

There are about 290 households altogether with a population of about 1630 people out of which the males numbered 784 and females 845, resulting in a sex ratio of 92.7 males per 100 females. The sex ratios from the 1976 and 1986 censuses respectively give 93.3 and 95.7 .

The number of children unden 15 years is 651 constituting about 40 percent as against 39.9 , and $40.8 \%$ for 1976 and 1986 censuses respect ively.

The sex ratios for the children under 15 years are thus 103,4 ; 100,4; and 103,2; pespectively for the survey and the 1976 and 1986 censuses in that order.

Table 1.1 gives a quick comparison of 1976, 1986 census and the survey's data for the broad population groups by sex.

TABLE 1.1 (A) PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF BROAD AGE GROUPS BY SEX


The survey population consists of almost illiterates who do not know their ages accurately. Thepefore analysis of data with respect to age should be taken with some degree of reservation and caution.

On the whole, the population classified by age and sex is nearly like what Table 1.2 below shows:-

TABLE 1.2: PERCENTAGE OF AGE/SEX

| AGE GRCUP | M | \% | FEM | $\%$ | TOTAL | $\%$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $0-4$ | 110 | 14.8 | 107 | 12.7 | 223 | 13.7 |
| $5-9$ | 111 | 14.2 | 103 | 12.2 | 214 | 13.1 |
| $10-74$ | 104 | 13.3 | 110 | 13.0 | 214 | 13.1 |
| $15-19$ | 83 | 10.6 | 107 | 12.7 | 190 | 11.7 |
| $20-24$ | 58 | 7.4 | 82 | 9.7 | 140 | 8.6 |
| $25-29$ | 64 | 8.2 | 64 | 7.6 | 128 | 7.9 |
| $30-34$ | 52 | 6.6 | 60 | 7.1 | 112 | 6.9 |
| $35-39$ | 52 | 6.6 | 42 | 5.0 | 94 | 5.8 |
| $40-44$ | 34 | 4.3 | 27 | 3.2 | 61 | 3.7 |
| $45-49$ | 23 | 2.9 | 29 | 3.4 | 52 | 3.2 |
| $50-54$ | 25 | 3.2 | 28 | 3.3 | 53 | 3.3 |
| $55-59$ | 16 | 2.0 | 26 | 3.1 | 42 | 2.6 |
| $60-64$ | 20 | 2.6 | 15 | 1.8 | 35 | 2.2 |
| $65+$ | 26 | 3.3 | 45 | 5.3 | 71 | 4.4 |

tven though the age classification has some degree of unceptainty, the percentage distribution of the population does not deviate much from those of the censuses data for the whole country. Table 1.3 gives such comparison.

TABLE 1.3: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AGE SEX BY CENSUS AND SJRVEY

| AGE GROUP | WCTMEN <br> 1976 | 1986 | SURVEY | MEN |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  |  |  |  | 1976 | 1986 | SURVEY |
| $0-4$ | 13.5 | 12.9 | 12.7 | 14.7 | 13.9 | 14.8 |
| $5-9$ | 12.4 | 13.5 | 12.2 | 13.6 | 14.7 | 14.2 |
| $10-14$ | 12.6 | 12.8 | 13.0 | 13.1 | 18.8 | 13.3 |
| $15-19$ | 10.7 | 10.7 | 12.7 | 10.2 | 11.2 | 10.6 |
| $20-24$ | 8.9 | 8.8 | 9.7 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 7.4 |
| $25-29$ | 6.8 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 6.6 | 8.2 |
| $30-34$ | 5.6 | 5.8 | 7.1 | 5.6 | 5.4 | 6.6 |
| $35-39$ | 4.8 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 6.6 |
| $40-44$ | 5.2 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 5.3 | 4.2 | 4.3 |
| $45-49$ | 3.8 | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 2.9 |
| $50-54$ | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.2 |
| $55-59$ | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 2.0 |
| $60-64$ | 2.5 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.5 |
| $65+$ | 6.4 | 6.1 | 5.3 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.3 |

SOURCE:
$80 S$ July 1989, op. cit., P. 4.



A look at the age distribution does not show any consistent regularity in any of the data. The 1976 distribution of the female population shows some "eprors" in the age groups 5-9, 40-44 and 55-59. While age group 5-9 appears to suffer undepcount on shifting of age (mispeporting of age) to disfavoup the group, $40-44$ and 55-59 groups show overcounts op mispeporting of age to heap the numbers. In 1986, the same sex suffers undercounts in age groups 0-4 and 40-44.

The survey tells something 'different' for the same sex. Either the age groups $0-4$ and 5-9 were undercounted or the groups 10 - 14 and 15 - 19 were overcounted. From the population pyramind in Fig 1 above, it is clear that there is some errop. of undepcount in the group 40-44. The age group 40-44 seems to be the only group fon the women where all the three data show "enrops" - overcount in 1976 and undencounts in 1986 census and the survey. One may ask why this group has problems all tne time? Do women in this group who have relatively 'more' children report of being in the 45-49 group and those with relatively fewer childen declaring their ages as $35-39$ years? Centainly, it cannot be due to counting, the reason should be misreporting of age.

Fon the masculine sex, the 1976 census data shows 'eprors' in age groups 40-44 and 55-59. There were overcounts or misreporting in these groups. Incidentally, both sexes record the same "overcounting" in these specific age groups. Should the "enrons" therefore be from the part of nespondents or from "analytical" papt due to editing, computation on data-processing by the Statistician?

The male data for 1986 appeans to have slighly betten structure than the female. There is an apparent undercount in 0-4 age group and a similap ennop in less magnitude in 40-44.

The 1976 and 1986 censuses show roughly the same enrors in the same age groups fon both sexes. Like it is stated above, in 1975, the ernors (overcounting on misreporting of age) were apparent in groups 40 - 44 and 55-59. In 1986, the erpops (undencount) were clearly seen in 0-4 and 40-44. The $40-$ 44 problem cuts across the four sets. Women 1976 and 1986 and men 1976 and 36.

As fan as the male data for the survey was concerned the "errors' were many. Again, the figure 1 above shows that there were either undercounts in 20-24 and 30-34 groups on some overcounts in 25-29. Then the same inconsistency is pepeated from age group 45-49 to 55-59; e ither undercounts in 45-49 and $55-59$, on ovencounts in $50-54$. The ipregularity in the males' structune can best be explained by the fact that, the ages were not neponted by the men themselves. Rather, the ir wives peponted the ages of the in husbands who are away either in the Republic on to less extent in the fields. These wives certainly do not know the exact ages of the in husbands. This chanacteristics is not peculian with Mantsebo or Lesotho, but with all Afpicans. Majonity of the Titerate (educated), Afnicans do not know the exact ages of
the in spouses, let alone the illiterates. For the illiterates, the individuals do not even know the ip exact ages, how come they can tell the exact ages of their brothens, sisteps or the in spouses?? Until recently, most Africans did not know about birth certificates, and the importance of reporting births after delivery is still to be understood by the illiterate folks. Reporting birth events and subsequent issue of birth certificates ane steps for ensuning exact and accurate dates of binth. But, in Mantsebo, parents do not peport the births of the in babies with ungency because, they claim that, those who do so take years, between 2 to 3 years - to receive birth centificates. Issuing of simple birth centificates from Maseru, Birth Registration Office, only 35 Km from Mantsebo takes 2 years or more.

Even though, the age classification has some degree of uncertainty, the trend between the two sexes needs some comment. The male population fon the childpen less than fifteen (15) years, is mone than the female counterpant of the same age group. The sex ratio for this group is 103. From 15 years up, the number of women becomes more than men as anywhere else in the world. Nevertheless, the difference between the sexes cannot be punely attributed to high attrition pate due to high montality sate of men, because, in some countries like Equatonial Guinea and Togo, the sex ratio fon the broad age group 15 - 64 years is over 95 while it is 88 here in Lesotho (see Table 1,4 below). Fupthermore, while these countries give sex ratio for the aged population, 65 years and above, as 80 , the same ratio is only 58 here in Lesotho. One therefore can conclude that, acart from other errop; due to counting, misneporting of age and the rest, there is an important factor which brings about this widening difference. This facton is obviously the mignant worker/labour issue. It is this factop which can best describe the figures above. Even though, the counting was "de jure" one can imagine that workers who had left Mantsebo on the country for some years are cleaply excluded. Some of the household heads on pespondents might not have been able to pecollect such people. Mignant wonkens who have not been coming home frequently and who are NO LONGER SENDING IN MONEY regulamly are likely to be left out.

TABLE 1.4: SEX RATIO OF THE BROAD AGE GRCUPS BY COUNTRY

| AGE GRCUP | EQUATORIAL GUINEA | TOGO | LESOTHO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0-14$ | 100,0 | 100,8 | 103,4 |
| $15-64$ | 95,1 | 96,4 | 89,0 |
| $65+$ | 80.0 | 80,3 | 57,8 |

TWO: HOUSEHOLD
2.0 Before tackling the analysis in this Section it may be necessapy to define the concept of household as used in this analysis; because the definition of the word "household" is itself a problem. Household sizes have diffeped in many cases because the definition has changed. Household here is defined as consisting of all members living in a HOUSING UNIT and who ppovide for the ir own food and other means of living. The members were either all present at "home" at the time of survey ob some were absent, either gone to field, fapm, to Maseru for shopping, to work or to South Africa where they live as migrant wopkers.

This definition does not differ much from the national definition fon households, nor does it differ much from even internat ional definition.
"In Lesotho, almost all men and a few women spend most of the in middle years absent from the in pupal homes. Yet, when their working lives are over, the lapge majopity retupn home to settle permanently. Membership of a particulap household is expressed in tepms of a continuing pesponsibility to contribute towards its maintenance. Thus, household is not defined in tepms of a co-pesidential group, nor is it defined by critepia of kinship. Although its membeps are almost invapiably kin of one sont ob another, there is striking vapiation in actual kinship composition both between households and within households oven time. The term household like in many countries does not have an equivalent term in Basotho language the Sesotho. The tepms "Nt lo" and "Lelapa" used to equate household, both have physical pefepents, pespectively to the hut and to the yard - the enclosed domestic space outside the hut. Both ape used to pefer to the house op the - ppoperty within a complex house. Lelapa may nefer both to the nucleap family as the basic fopm of domestic association and to the widen agnat ic family.
(Homestead is the area occupled by those members of the household who ape pesident in the peference community.

It consists of one on two on several huts, often forming the apices of a small enclosupe which afford, some domest ic ppivacy, bounded by mud-bpick walls or a high need fence known as Seot loana).

Mixed households then comprise pesident members who occupy a homestead in a Lesotho village and one op mope absent members who may be contributing to its income. It is difficult to distinguish cleaply between its tangible manifestation as a paptially co-pesidential group and its overall functional manifestation in tems of income-genepating activities. The term household is petained when pefepring to both these aspects of its identity, because the household pemains the unit of economic viability whether on not its members are physically dispersed at any one time. It is howeved absupd at times, because in the village, the tepm means ob pefers to actual pesidents. (Those we live with) "bao pe lulang le bona" op to those who eat from one pot "ba jang potong e le 'ngoe" and to absent migrants as those who make us live.." (Murpay 1980: 47-49).

The Labour Fopce Supvey (1985/86) defined hou sehold to consist of persons who provide for the in own food and othen means of living. Absent members who expect to go back to the household were included e.g. migrant workens who tempopapily op permanently work outside Lesotho or migpant workers tempoparily living or working elsewhere in Lesotho including students, patients in hospitals etc.

Similaply, the Household Budget Survey 1986/87, defined a household as a group of pepsons who live together in the same compound on dwellings and shape the same sleeping facilities and/on the same cooking on eating facilities. Sepvants living in the household and shaping the same cooking op eating aprangements ape considered membens. However, if they have the in own quapters (even within the same compound) where they sleep and ppepare the io own meals, they ape taken to constitute separate households.

Then in the 1986 census also, the definition of a household was taken as consisting of a person or a group of pepsons who live together and have common cateping appangements, whether on not they ape pelated by blood or mapriage.

At international level, the tenm household is defined as a group of sevenal persons who provide the in food and basic vital needs in common (United Nations 1970); on in common unden the same poof (Multilingual Demographic Dictionapy 1981). In practice, the household is often defined as a group of persons living within the same pesidence and taking the in meals in common.

Cleaply we see that, the definition of 'household' used in the Laboup Fonce Survey differs a bit from the definition used in the HBS and for this supvey. One will thepefope not be supprised if the household sizes from Labour Fonce Supvey differs from that of HBS OD from this supvey.

In Madagashy, the general census pecorded the mean sizes as 4,5, but a demographic supvey held in 1966 put the avenage household size as 5,3. Whereas the 1966 supvey defined household in the light of people who pull the ir pesoupces together, and live together as one (i.e. budgetary household), the census definition insisted on the number of people living together under the same roof (habitat) [CAHLERS 1986 P. 6].

### 2.1 FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLDS:

The supvey pecopded a total of 287 households in Mantsebo; out of which the numben of households headed by women was seventy (70) and that headed by men was 217 households. Thus, the households headed by females constituted 24,4 pencent and those headed by men, 75,6 percant.

As we shall see later, the proportion of households headed by females, be ing $24,4 \%$, is substant ial compared with the proportion of households headed by females from other countries. But when we compare this figupe with those estimated for the whole courtoy in 1986, the supvey figupe is the smallest. The following Table shows the national figupes.

## TABLE 2.1-HOUSEHOLD HEAD BY SEX

| REGION | WOMEN (\%) | MEN (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| URBAN MASERU | 25.2 | 74.8 |
| OTHER URBAN | 37.0 | 63 |
| ALL RURAL | 26.5 | 73.5 |
| SURVEY (BY SEMBAJWE) | 34.4 | 75.6 |
| SURVEY (BY SEMBA | 27.6 | 68.5 |
| LESOTHO |  |  |

## SOURCE:[i] Lesotho Household Income, Expenditure and

 Consumption Survey 1986/87.[ii] BOS, Basotho women and the ip men, July 1989, P. 9.

From the Table above, we see that the propopt ion of households headed by women is the smallest for the survey and lapgest for the othen upban regions in Lesotho, i.e. 24.4\% against 37\%. The female propoption for the national figure which is $27.6 \%$ lies between them and in fact, closer to the supvey figure than the "Other Upban." The definitions used for data collection seem to be the same, therefore these diffepences might pepresent the true chapactep.

Note that, in 1986, thene wepe about 330,000 households in Lesotho out of which 278000 wepe in pupal apeas and 52000 were in upban areas. There were about 84 percent of the total households in pupal apeas and 16 in the upban areas. The upban households ape incpeasing due to pupal-upban migpation which has incpeased the upban population by 12 percent i.e (between $7 \%$ to $15 \%$ ) during the last decade. The population in Maseru doubled from 55031 in 1976 to 109382 in 1986 be ing approximately 7 percent per annum. It is estimated that by 1996, Masenu will have about 210000 inhabitants.

Though we do not have concrete statistics about the composition and size of households in Maseru, one can expect that, household size will be small, with ? - 2 person(s) households being a considepable amount. One can expect to see young men and young givis who ape wage workens in Masenu, living on the in own.

In Lesotho, the female populat ion is mope educated than the male population. Hence, thepe will be mope females (educated and semi-educated, young on matupe, and/on single) living on the it own in one-person household working in Maseru ob other upban areas. These ladies will definitely be the heads of thiep households.

For the female headed households, the national value of 27.6\% puts Lesotho as one of the highest ppopopt ion in the 3 pd world countries. In Afpica, the propoptions pange from $10.5 \%$ in Ivory Coast to $29.5 \%$ in Kenya (Therese Locoh 1988:14) with Bukina Fasso having an exceptiona 1 low value of $5 \%$.

In Lat in Amepica howeve the ppopont ion of households headed by women/females is between 13.6\% in Mexico and 20.8\% in Dominican Republic. Thus some Afpican countries like Rwanda, (25.7\%) Lesotho, (27.6\%) and Kenya, (29.5\%) have higher proportions of households headed by females than in Lat in America. In Asia and middle East, the propontion is even less, because the in cultupe makes women mope submissive and less independent. Fon example, in the Apab wopld in the Middle East, women do not have that independence to be heads. The moslem tradition makes them 'slaves' to men. Theip participation pate to domestic issues and social life is too small.

In Asia, howeven, it is the extended fami ${ }^{\text {y }}$ y system that fopbids op prevents women to assuming impoptant poles. Nonetheless, with industrialisation, education and upbanisation touching the people, women participation pate has gone uo in places like Taiwan, Thailand Singapope and the pest. Female headed households have thus incpeased in these places, and one pepson households among women is likely to have increased considerably.

The survey figune of $24.4 \%$ is a move plausible figupe than the other upbans whose value of $37 \%$ is the highest even known.

In Rwanda, the high pepcentage of households headed by women was explained by:-

Widowhood, spatial displacement of mapoied men from the in homes to wook elsewhere, by tempopapy absence from home to other places duping the census pepiod; and most impoptantly due to emigration of mappied men to othep neighbouping countries - - to Uganda because of tpibal conflicts pesulting in vindicitiveness by Govennment, op to Kivu to wopk in the mines.

The high proportion of households headed by women in Ghana is due to: businesswomen, traders and ppofessionals (be they mappied or not) who have the in own households. In Ghana, quite a substantial pencentage of female headed households ane young unmarpied "ladies" who, because of the ir "lucpative" profession, cpeate theip own households. In most Afpican countries vepy few young unmappied ladies have the in own househoids. But in Ghana and some otheo places whepe economic situation has forced young ladies to migpate, this is not so.

What could be the peasons for the high percentage of female household heads in Lesotho and Kenya? Ceptainly, the migrant laboun system in Lesotho is the majop peason that makes women to become heads. But is thepe any othen peason on that is the sole peason? Admittedly, ove, thirty (30) percent of the men aging between 18 and 54 yeaps live outside Lesotho wonking. So is that the explanation?

Migrant workers, usually outside Lesotho, were most common among the rupal households. Almost half i.e. forty-seven (47) pepcent of these households had at least one migrant workep compared with only one fourth (i.e. 23) twenty-three percent of the upban households. Two on move migrant wopkers were mone prevalent among pupal households, which send 5 pepcent than among upban households when send 2 percent.

A supvey on Lesotho Households Income, Expenditure and Consumption, 1986/87 indicates that the main source of income for the majonity of Basotho households is pemittances from the mine migrant workers in the Republic of South Africa. The second and thipd most important soupces of income are subsistence fapming, wages and salapies. The distoibution of heads of household by sex shows some impoptant differences. Fon female headed households, for instance, subsistence fapming seems to be the most impobtant main soupce of income with the migrant pemittances and wages and salaries panking as the second and thipd impoptant majop sources of income. Fon the male headed households, on the othep hand, migrant pemittances is strongly dominating.

## HOUSEHOLD SIZE

The total population of Mantsebo according to the supvey was 1629. These people wepe found in a total of 287 households, hence the average household size gives 5.7 pepsons.

The average number of members in a household accopding to the Laboup Force Supvey was 5.3, and according to a survey by Sembajiwe and Makatjane - Feptility and Moptality Supvey 1987 - was 5.4.

The supvey figure of 5.7 is not supprising because Mantsebo being in a lowland region, is nopmally expected to be densely populated. Its proximity to the capital even makes it mope densely populated. Of coupse, the Feptility and Montality Supvey was cappied out in Mohale's Hoek district, another lowland pegion, however, its distance from the capital can cause a difference in density. Eesides, Mohale's Hoek is the only lowland pegion with the lowest density. It is the LEAST densely populaced distaict in the lowlands. The Laboup Force Survey was of a national character, and it is thepefore not suppoising that it yields a lowen value, because in the mountain and Senqu pegions, the densities are smallen, sparseily populated.

The averace size of the capital itself will most likely not exceed 5 persons because of its considerable pencentage of one-penson households.

According to the 1986 population census, the average number of persons in a household was 4.8 , a value which is fan lowen than all the supvey figupes; but which best explains the fact that the "widen" area of the country is spapsely populated and that most households ape "less dense."

Supvey figupes in Mauritania and Sudan indicate that the avenage size of a housenold is 5.5 on thereabout.

The following Table shows housenolds size from othen supveys.

> TABLE 2.2: HOUSEHOLD SIZS BY SURVEY

| CAMEROCN | 5.5 | SRI LANKA | 5.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MAURITANIA | 5.7 | SYRIA | 5.8 |
| MCROCCO | 6.2 | PERU | 5.4 |
| SUDAN | 5.5 | COLUMBIA | 5.5 |
| SOURCE: - | WFS Comparat ive Studies, No. 45, Decembed |  |  |
|  | 1985. |  |  |

All the figures ape above five persons per household.

By contrast census figupes hapdly exceed 5 pepsons; confipming that censuses being total counts do have on the average, smallep household size than surveys. The following Table shows the compapison:

## TABLE 2.3-HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY CENSUS

| GHANA | 1970 | 4.9 | CAMEROON | 1976 | 5.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RWANDA | 1978 | 4.6 | BURUNDI | 1979 | 4.5 |
| LESOTHO | 1986 | 4.8 | TANZANIA | 1978 | 4.8 |

SOURCE: [i] National Censuses pesults.
[ii] National Censuses data, Thepese Locoh: Structupes familiates et changements sociaux, un edatement des structupes traditionnelles, INED, 1987, P. 5.

Foom the two Tables above, we see clearly that the mean household sizes calculated from the censuses ape lowe. than 5 persons for all the countries except Cameroon. On the uther hand, the rean sizes calculated from the supveys are all more than 5 persons. In Synia, for instance, it is even more than 6 persons. The mean household sizes for Cameroon cleaply confinms the above hypothesis, because the supvey figure is 5,5 pepsons while the census figure is 5.2 .

## TRANSITICN

The average household size was 5.0 acconding to the 1976 census. But the 1986 figure gives the mean as 4.8. Can one say that the average size of household is declining in Lesctho? If so what can be the causes?

In the developed wopld, literatupe shows us that countries had systematic decline in the io average household sizes; save the United Kingdom which jumped from 4.4 persons in 1871 to 4.5 in 1891 before declining pegularly (UN 1973: 341).

In Afpica, however, previous analysis has shown that almost all the countries which have data for mope than one occasion, have shown a $口$ ise in average household size (Kyei, 1988: 61). Fpom the Table 2,4, we see that, apapt from the Reunion, the household size has incpeased in all the countries. The decline in household size in the Reunion is well undenstood, because it is one of the countries in Afpica where fertility has been controlled. At the moment, its total feptility pate is estimated as 2.1 persons, the Coude Bioth Rate is 20 binths per thousand. Obviously, Lesotho's feptility level and trend ape not the same as Reunion, so whene do we place Lesotho? Does its household size follow the
same evolution as happened in the advanced countries? Ob is this obsepvation due to incomplete on imppoper count ing either of the people on of the housenolds? In the developed wopld, the geneval trends of declining avapage household sizes wepe consideped to be papallel to the seculap declines in feptility, and broadly in association with the global ppocess of industoialization and urbanization. What could the decline in household size in Lesotho be then? Is feptility declining in Lesotho op is it becoming industoialized and upbanized?

TABLE-2.4 (A):HOUSEHCLD SIZES BY YEAR BY. COUATRY

|  | SIZE $1960-70$ | SIZE 1970-80 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BENIN | 4,5 | 5,4 |
| BURKINA FASSO | 5,2 | 5,7 |
| ABIDUAN | 4,4 | 5,3 |
| GHANA | 4,7 |  |
| MAURITANIA | 4,3 | 5,5 |
| TOGO | 5,7 | 5,8 |
| COMORES | 4,8 | 5,3 |
| KENYA | 4,9 | 5,6 |
| TANZANIA | 4,4 | 5,8 |
| CONGO | 4,4 | 4,4 |
| RENION | 5,0 | 4,3 |
| LESOTHO | 5,0 |  |

SCURCE: THERESE LOCOH 1987.

### 2.3 DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD SIZE

The following Table shows household by size, pencentage and by sex, according to the survey.

TASLE 2.4 (f) AHCUSEHCLD BY SIZES, PERCENTAGE AND. SEX

|  | MALE \% |  | FEMALE * |  | TOTAL \% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T FERSCN HCUSERULD | 4 | 1.8 | 4 | 5.7 | 8 | 2.8 |
| 2 PERSONS | 9 | 4.2 | 10 | 14.3 | 19 | 6.6 |
| 3 PERSONS | 21 | 9.7 | 14 | 20.0 | 35 | 12.2 |
| 4 PERSONS | 42 | 19.4 | 12 | 17.1 | 54 | 18.8 |
| 5 PERSONS | 39 | 18.0 | 6 | 8.6 | 45 | 15.7 |
| 6 PERSONS | 23 | 10.5 | 5 | 7.1 | 28 | 9.8 |
| 7 PERSONS | 25 | 11.5 | 6 | 8.6 | 31 | 10.8 |
| 8 PERSONS | 23 | 10.6 | 2 | 2.9 | 25 | 8.7 |
| 9 PERSONS | 14 | 6.5 | 2 | 2.9 | 16 | 5.6 |
| $10+$ " | . 17 | --7.8 | -9 | - 12.9 | -25 | - 9.7 |
|  | 217 | 100.0 | 70 | $\underline{160.0}$ | $\underline{287}$ | 100.0 |

MEAN
5.8
5.0
5.7

The above distribution shows that, for the country as a whole, the modal household size is 4, being 19\%. The median household size is 5 and the mean household size is 5.7 persons.

For the female households, the modal size is 3, the median 4 and the mean is 5 persons while the male households have 4 as the modal size, 5 as the median and the mean being 5,8 persons. In Rwanda, the mean household size was 4,6, that of the male households was 5 and the female households had 3,4 pepsons.

Like it has been stated above, these ape not comparable, because Rwanda's data comes from census whilst this is supvey. We have said that the sizes differ according to whether they ape from census on from supvey. Note that, while the survey gives 5,7 persons as the size for the country, the 1986 census puts it as 4,8 pepsons.

Below is a Table of percentage distribution of households by number of pepsons, by countries and by censuses and supveys.

## TABLE.2.5: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD BY NLMBER OF PERSONS BY COUNTRY:

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LESO } \\ & \text { THO } \\ & -(A) . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAME } \\ & \text { ROON } \\ & \text { (B) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MORO } \\ & \text { CCO } \\ & \text { (A) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAUR } \\ & \text { TANIA } \end{aligned}$ $(A) .$ | PERU <br> (A) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COLUM } \\ & \text { BIA } \\ & -(A) \ldots \end{aligned}$ | RWAINDA (B) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 PR. HSH. | 2.8 | 12.9 | 4.5 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 5.4 | 7.7 |
| 2 PRS. HSH. | 6.6 | 15.0 | 9.4 | 10.5 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 14.2 |
| 3 PRS. HSH. | 12.2 | 13.0 | 9.5 | 12.5 | 11.8 | 13.1 | 17.2 |
| 4 PRS. HSH. | 18.8 | 11.8 | 11.2 | 13.6 | 13.9 | 13.5 | 15.2 |
| 5 PRS. HSH. | 15.7 | 10.4 | 11.5 | 13.7 | 14.7 | 13.7 | 13.1 |
| 6 PRS. HSH. | 9.8 | 8.9 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 12.9 | 12.7 | 11.1 |
| 7 PRS. HSH. | 10.8 | 7.1 | 11.5 | 9.5 | 10.8 | 9.4 | 8.7 |
| 8 PRS. HSH. | 8.7 | 5.5 | 10.1 | 7.0 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 6.1 |
| 9 PRS. HSH. | 5.6 | 4.0 | 7.4 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 3.7 |
| 10+ PRS. HSH. | -9.7 | -11.4 | . 73.7 | - 10.0 | -.7.0 | 9.8 | -3.0 |
|  | 100. | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 160.0 | 160.0 | 160.0 |
| MEAN | 5.7 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 4.6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PRS. = PERSONS } \\ & \text { HSH. = HOUSEHOLJ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & A=- \text { SUR'IEY } \\ & B=\text { CENSUS } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SOURCE: WFS - COMPARATIVE STUDIES NO. 45, DECEMBER 1985, P. 66 - 67.

A close look at the Table shows that, the supvey data does not deviate much from the supvey data from Maupitania. They both have the modal household size as 4, median size as 5 and mean size of 5.7 pepsons. Nevertheless, whepeas the ppopont ions of households with mope than 6 persons is 34.2 and 31.4 percent for Lesotho and Maupitania pespectively, the one-penson households differ mapkedly. We have only $2.8 \%$ from the supvey while the Maupitania's figupe is 7.3.

What could be the small value of $2.8 \%$ for Lesotho? Incidentally, it is the least value for all the one-person households ever known. In the eapliep analysis, it was agreed that the more pupal a country is, the smalled the value of one-person households. The mope upbanized and industrialized a society is, the higher the propootion of one-person housaholds. While the propontion of households with more than 6 pepsons is mope ob less the same for all the countries, panging from 31.4 to 35 pepcent with only few exceptions, the difference in the one-person households is quite lapge, (i.e. from 2.8 to 12.98 percent).

Thus, Lesotho should be the MOST pupal and the LEAST industrialized or upbanized of all of them; and Mantsebo is peally a village!

The pesults from the Labour Force Survey show that the lapge houscholds wepe mope fpequently found in the pupal apeas, which had (88) eighty-eight pencent of all households in Lesotho. The propopt ion with 9 or move was 13 percent in pupal apeas compaped with 6 pencent in the upban areas. The equivalent figure for the supvey is 14.6 pencent, which is even higher than the pupal figupe. Fop small households with one or tiwo pepsons, it was obsenved that, they were most fyequent in upban apeas. The following Table gives the comparison.

$$
\text { TABLE 2.5 } 5 \text { HOUSEHOLOS BY SIZE, 'REGION' MANTSEBO }
$$

| SIZE | UREAIV( ${ }_{\text {\% }}$ ) | RURAL ( ${ }_{\sim}^{*}$ ) | LESOTHO(\%) | SURVEY (*) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-2 | 30.0 | 13.8 | 15.8 | 9.4 |
| 3-4 | 29.0 | 24.1 | 24.7 | 31.0 |
| 5-6 | 22.5 | 29.6 | 28.7 | 25.5 |
| 7-8 | 12.6 | 19.1 | 18.3 | 19.5 |
| $9+$ | -5.9 | -13.3 | 12.4 | 14.5 |
|  | 160.0 | 100.0 | 160.0 | 760.0 |

SOURCE:
CCMPUTER TABLE 2.1
The propontion of one on two persons households is 30 percent $f(0$ or the urban apeas, 13.8 for the pupal, 15.8 for the whole country and only 9.4 percent from the supvey. The supvey figupe is even smallen than that of the pural apeas. Does it mean that Mantsebo is the smallest village in the countoy? Such chapactepist ic needs mope probing, centainly. Papadoxically, however, the modal household size is $3-4$, just as the upban, while ine pupal apeas and the national figupe put the modal size as 5-6.

Out of the 287 households coveped in the supvey, only 10 of them were not found in SINGLE HOUSING UNITS. One housing unit contained three households and about three units housed two households each. The pest was such that each homestead (housing unit) contained a hou sehold.

Members of a panticulap household wepe, in fact, members of nucleus family comprising (absent) father, mother and childpen. On the avepage the supvey gives de jupe household composition as a man, his wife and three op foup childpen of whom two ape gipls. Each household has two ob three childpen below fifteen yeaps and one youngsten between the ages fifteen and twenty-foup (15-24) and who incidentally is a female. Members of (hopizontal) collatepal pelatives in households ape not as prevalent as observed in Westepn and Eastepn Afpica. In these places, Western and Eastern, cousins, aunts and uncles do live in the same household, and cipculation of childpen among pelatives is common. (see Hilapy, Page, 1986).

It is true that household composition in Lesotho is pestpicted to papents and the io own childpen. But occasionally, one finds gpand-childpen living with the in grandpapents. Fop example, a mappied son who is a migrant wopken in the Republic of South Afpica nopmally sends his "family" to live with his parents in the same household. This nopmally happens in the cases when the mappied son's wife is young or the mapriage is young. His papents then become the custodian, looking afted his wife and children, while he himself becomes the breadwinnep of the entipe family - mothers (papents), his wife and childpen.

In a case where an aged mother op papents have two on mope mappied sons wooking in the mines, the youngest son's wife and children stay in the parents household; but the olden sons' wives can stay on the in own if matuped enough and so wish. Otherwise all of them stay with thein in-laws in the same houseold on in the same compound. Ceptainly, this practice is not applied strictly to the "educated" wives who ape likely to be working in the urban apeas. The contact with the ir in-laws, however, is pegulap even if they stay in upban apeas.

The household composition from the supvey is similan to what was obtained from the household Budget Supvey 1986-87. They got the size to be 5.2 persons composed of two on mope adults and three or mope childpen. As it is expected, they found out that in Maseru, the most
common household composition is 2 adults and 1-2 children which constitutes 17.9 percent of all households. Concepning the other upban apeas, they obseoved that most households ape made up of thpee on move adults and three on more childpen, something similab to the supvey's pesults.

The HBS pepopt continued that, for one person households, Masepu has the highest percentage of 13.8 compared to 11.1 pepcent from the other upban apeas, 6.9 pepcent for pupal apeas and 7.7 pepcent for all households. One-pepson households nopmally consist of widowed or divorced people staying alone op one member of a family unit staying alone while the pest of the family members, staying elsewhere.

### 2.5 ABSENT. MEMBERS FROM THE-HOUSEHOLD:

About 117 households out of the 287 , be ing 40,8 pepcent have at least one male migrant wooker in the Republic of South Afpica. These migrants ape almost all wooking in the mines. Only 12 percent of the households which send migrant workers to South Africa have move than 1 male wopkep, 88 pepcent of them (households) send on ly one pepson (man).

More than the other countries within the pegion, Lesotho depends on migrant labour. The average number of miners working in the gold and coal mines of South Afpica rose to a peak of 129000 in 1977, papt of an estimated total of 174000 Basotho wopking in all sections in South Africa. Aften 1977, as a pesult of mechanisation in the mines and economic constraints in the mining sector, few new miners have been pecruited pesulting in an incpease of criminal activity amongst frustrated youths.

Many miners go straight from herding at pemote cattle posts in the mountains to the stpenuous mining wopk at the age of 18 . $50 \%$ can ne ither pead nop wite and spend 35\% of theip working life ( 15 years) away from home. 50\% of all miners have no agpicultupal land and the majon impact of the mignant laboup system is that the pesponsibility fop paising of children is left entipely with the in wives left behind (Mupray 1980, P. 68).

Looking at the proportion of men aged jetween 20 and 60 years who leave Lesotho to work in the Republic, the survey pevea ls that 32 percent does so. The avepage age of these migpant workens is 38,1 yeaps, and according to Muppay, the dupation of the io stay while irooking outside Lesotho is between 15 and 33 yeaps.

By contrast, the supvey shows that only 15\% of the households have male workers wopking outside the pepiphery of the supvey apea, Mantsebo. Since Mantsebo is neap Maseru, one can believe that these male wopkers wopk in the city. These workeps constitute 15 percent of the male population between 20 and 60 yeaps. The ip mean age is 42.4 years, an age which is higher than that of the migpant wopkeps outside the country.

The peason for this higher mean age, could be that, these group constitutes petiped migrant wopkers who ape NOT strong enough to do agricultural/field wonk. Some even do not have land to do field wopk. They thepefope decide to work as aftepnoon house guapds op shop supervisors and the like. Of coupse there ape some other youngen men who may either be working in the offices as clepks in Masepu ob some other big towns; on who may be drivers/mates and the rest. The mixtupe of these petiped wopkeps and the young clepks gives a mean age which is not too much deviated from the mean age of the other - mignant workens outside Lesotho.

On the other hand, the supvey indicates that 9,1 pepcent of the households have women between the age group $20-$ 55 yeaps wopking outside the survey apea. Those women incidentally constitute 9,9 pepcent of the women in the same age group $20-55$ years. The ir mean age is 28,9 years. Thus as expected, pelatively younged women wook in Masenu op other big towns, compared with some old men (petiped! who work in big towns, outside the survey apea.

Establishing separate households is a function of age, and in fact, it is inversely proportional to age. A good index of the rate of separate household formation is the headship rate.

The concept of headship rate is very important because it is a way out for projecting households. Like econumic activity (participation) rate, household headship rates also show some biases in the age-sex distribution. The rates are high for males and low for females. For the males, they are low for young ages below thirty years and high for those above thirty five. For women, they are generally low except at the advanced age of 60 years and above when their husbands had died and left them as heads.

When the rates are classified according to marital status, we get very high rates for married males, high for widowed females and low rates for unmarried (single), both males and females. The married female rates are obviously luw since the man is more often declared as a head in married households. The woman becomes temporary head when the man is travelled or is working in different location or at the other extreme, when the man has more than one wife and stays with only one. The other wives then become heads in "their households." With the Akans in Ghana, the matrilineal system of inheritance (where the children belong to the mother-line) encourages married females to become heads. In the rural areas or when a man and his wife come from the same tuwn, the woman always stays with her parents or in her parents house(hold) with her children. She only goes to share the night with the husband in his house and returns to her "home" the next morning. In such cases when her parents are not there or dead, she obviously becomes the head.

The fullowing Table shows the household headship rates for Lesotho according to the survey.

AGE

## Males

| NO. OF TOTAL | RATES | NO. OF |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HEADS |  | $(\%)$ | HEADS |  |


| $15-19$ | 83 | 0 | - | 107 | 1,2 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $20-24$ | 3 | 58 | 5,2 | 1 | 82 | 1,2 |
| $25-29$ | 20 | 64 | 31,3 | 2 | 64 | 3,1 |
| $30-34$ | 23 | 52 | 44,2 | 5 | 60 | 8,3 |
| $35-39$ | 44 | 52 | 84,6 | 3 | 42 | 7,1 |
| $40-44$ | 27 | 34 | 79,6 | 5 | 27 | 18,5 |
| $45-49$ | 20 | 23 | 87,0 | 8 | 29 | 17,2 |
| $50-54$ | 21 | 25 | 84,0 | 8 | 28 | 28,6 |
| $55-59$ | 15 | 16 | 93,8 | 10 | 26 | 38,5 |
| $60-64$ | 19 | 20 | 95,0 | 7 | 15 | 46,7 |
| $65+$ | 25 | 26 | 96,2 | 21 | 45 | 46,7 |

The data at our disposal will unfortunately not permit us to find the headship rates classified by marital status.

But as seen above, the rates do not deviate from the normal trend. They are low for females and high for males. The rates jump after 35 years for the males. They approach 100 percent after 60 years showing that almost all the males in the advanced age group are heads of their households. This is a typical African phenomenon because in African context, the grownups are not sent lo HOMES FOR THE OLD PEOPLE as done in developed countries. Instead, they stay with the children and grandchildren and automatically become heads. Note that, in Africa, the respect for old-aged persons has not died out, but is still an important factor to our way of life.

There is no doubt that the survey figures are good in this wise, because they compare fairly well with other rates from some African countries. The following Table shows the comparison.
$\frac{\text { TABLE 2.6.2: COMPARISON OF LESOTHO HOUSEHOLD HEADSHIP }}{\text { RATES }(\%) \text { WITH OTHER AFRICAN COUNTRIES }}$

|  | LESOTHO |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AGE | MALES | FEMALES |  |  |


| $15-24$ | 2,1 | 0,5 | 21,3 | 5,4 | 15,0 | 7,7 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $25-34$ | 37,1 | 5,7 | 84,2 | 14,1 | 69,4 | 15,6 |
| $35-44$ | 82,6 | 11,6 | 96,0 | 21,4 | 86,9 | 23,5 |
| $45-54$ | 85,4 | 28,1 | 98,1 | 32,0 | 93,1 | 30,8 |
| $55-64$ | 94,4 | 41,5 | 98,6 | 49,0 | 94,5 | 42,7 |
| $65+$ | 96,2 | 46,7 | 96,5 | 64,5 | 94,0 | 47,6 |
| MEAN AGE 52,7 | 57,9 | 50,1 | 57,7 | 51,3 | 55,0 |  |

All across the countries, the rates for the male heads exceed 80 percent after 35 years. The above Table shows that, the rates for Lesotho are luwer than for Ghana and Rwanda. They get close together only after 55 years.

The low rates seen in the male households for the young ages before thirty years can best be explained by marriage and migrant-labour factors.

The (young) men marry late (in their thirties) due to the high bride wealths (Lobola). Those married leave their young wives with their pareats who serve as custodians while they, the youngmen, leave the country to work in South Africa. Their parents obviously become the household heads and they, the breadwinners. The migrant labour issue could be the same reason for the low rates for the female heads before age 45 years. At age 45 years, their husbands could have got them their own households which would permit these women to be heads (temporary or otherwise depending on where their husbands would be).

In Lesotho, the female literacy rate is very high, that is, one of the highest in the continent. One wonders why the high level of female literacy rate has not transformed itself to make the headship rates high. One would expect that these "highly educated young women" would have their own households, therefore raising the rates for the age group $25-44 \mathrm{high}$. In Ghana, the creating of household among young unmarried girls has made the headship rates high for the young ages. They are higher than the rates from the other countries for the ages from 15 years up to the age 44 years.

In Rwanda, the high headship rates among the wales has been explained by total and universal warriage. Unlike other countries, especially in the developed world, almost all the grown-up men (aged 50 years and above) get married. The tradition is such that, the moment one gets married, he establishes his own household, whether he be young or not. (The intensity of first marriage at 50 is 0,987 in Rwanda. That means thal only one male person out of 100 men does not get married, see Kyei 1988 for more discussion on this topic).

It has been pointed out in the above that, the proportion of households headed by females in Africa is higher than the other regions in the developing world. The female headship rates also confirm such hypothesis. The following Tables show headship rates for Lesotho, Rwanda and some Latin American countries.

# TABLE 2.6.3: AGE SPECIFIC HOUSEHOLD HEADSHIP RATES BY COUNTRY (MALES) 

LES RN GH COL C/RICA DOM/R MEX PAN PERU

| $15-24$ | 2 | 21 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 10 | 9 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $25-34$ | 37 | 84 | 69 | 64 | 65 | 64 | 71 | 62 | 62 |
| $35-44$ | 83 | 96 | 87 | 85 | 84 | 87 | 89 | 84 | 88 |
| $45-54$ | 85 | 98 | 93 | 90 | 92 | 90 | 93 | 89 | 94 |
| $55-64$ | 94 | 99 | 95 | 89 | 88 | 91 | 93 | 90 | 92 |
| $65+K$ | 96 | 97 | 94 | 80 | 80 | 84 | 86 | 85 | 84 |
| MEAN AGE 52,7 | 50,2 | 51,3 | 51,1 | 51,1 | 51,2 | 50,8 | 51,5 | 50,2 |  |

SOURCE:

```
SUSAN de VOS OP. CIT. P. 513 - 514
KYEI 1988, P. 86, 90, 93.
```

$\frac{\text { TABLE } 2.6 .3(B): \text { AGE SPECIFIC HOUSEHOLD HEADSHIP RATES }}{\text { BY COUNTRY (FEMALES) }}$
LES KW CH COL C/RICA DOM/R MEX PAN PERU

| $15-24$ | 0,5 | 5,4 | 7,7 | 1,5 | 7,5 | 2,5 | 0,8 | 1,3 | 1,1 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $25-34$ | 5,7 | 14,1 | 15,6 | 5,7 | 6,0 | 9,8 | 3,9 | 8,8 | 4,5 |
| $35-44$ | 11,6 | 21,4 | 23,5 | 13,4 | 12,2 | 17,3 | 9,0 | 15,7 | 9,0 |
| $45-54$ | 28,1 | 32,0 | 30,8 | 23,3 | 20,2 | 27,8 | 16,5 | 24,5 | 16,6 |
| $55-64$ | 41,5 | 49,0 | 42,7 | 28,6 | 26,5 | 37,2 | 25,9 | 33,5 | 26,3 |
| $65+$ | 46,7 | 64,5 | 47,6 | 31,4 | 35,0 | 47,3 | 33,3 | 42,3 | 28,9 |
| MEAN AGE | 57,9 | 57,7 | 55,0 | 57,5 | 58,4 | 57,8 | 60,1 | 58,1 | 58,9 |

## SOURCE:

SAME AS THE ONE ABOVE (TABLE 2.6.3)
The rates for Basotho women are low compared with those from Ghanaian and Rwandan women. Only at the age of 50 that the rates for Lesotho and Ghana get so close. But comparing the rates from Lesotho and those from some Latin American countries, we see that the rates from Lesotho are not low. It is true that for the first group 15 - 24 years, the Lesotho rate is the lowest. However, it closes up after the age 25 years and in fact, surpasses all the rates from the Latin American countries after age 45.

As far as the mean age for becoming a household head is concerned, we see that, the lower the rate for the young ages, the higher the mean age. This trend holds for both sexes. Because the rates are lower for Basotho especially for the young age groups, the mean age is higher than those in Ghana and

Rwanda for both sexes. When we take the female rates, however we see that, because the rates for the young age groups are low for Lesotho and for the Latin American countries, the mean age for a woman to become a head of a household is almost the same for Lesotho, Columbia, Dominican Republic and Panama.

### 2.7 HOUSEHOLD HEADS AND THEIR PROFESSION:

The following Table shows the classification of household heads by profession, based on the data from the survey.

## TABLE 2.7.1: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS BY PROFESSION AND BY SEX..

| MALES |  |  |  | FEMALES |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROF | NO. OF HEADS | \% | MEAN <br> HOUSEHOLD <br> SIZE <br> (MHHS) | NO. OF HEADS | \% | MEAN <br> HOUSEHOLD <br> SIZE <br> (MHHS) |
| NON-AGRIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (SELF-EMPLOYED | 18 | 8,3 | 5,5 | 18 | 25,7 | 6,2 |
| "LABOURER" | 29 | 13,4 | 5,2 | 3 | 4,3 | 4,0 |
| FARMER | 23 | 10,6 | 7,3 | 13 | 18,6 | 3,3 |
| UNEMPLOYED (BU' | ACTIVE)14 | 6,5 | 6,0 | 8 | 11,4 | 3,5 |
| UNEMPLOYED ( ${ }^{\text {NO }}$ | ACTIVE) 26 | 12,0 | 6,5 | 22 | 31,4 | 5,6 |
| "HIGHLY SKILLED | PROOF" 22 | 10,1 | 6,0 | 3 | 4,3 | 4,3 |
| MIGRANT WORKERS IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RSA (MINES) | 77 | 35,5 | 5,6 | - | - | - |
| NON CLASSIFIED | 8 | 3,7 | - | 3 | 4,3 | 3 |
|  | 217 | 100,0 |  | 70 | 100,0 |  |

For the male distribution, we see that about 40 percent, being the majority of the household heads are working in South Africa. About 7 percent of the heads are without employment, but are still searching for work, 12 percent are not employed because they are old and not active. The proportion of the heads who are in agricultural sector is the same as those in "highly skilled profession." Those heads who work in other areas outside agriculture constitute about 21 percent, with 8 percent being self-employed and 13 percent as employed rural workers or "labourers."

For the female distribution on the other hand, the majority of the heads are the 'old-women' who are unemployed. These are the widows and who by their age become heads. Their working children send money to keep them. The next group are those females who are self-employed working in non-agricultural sector. They form about 26 percent. The heads who work as paid 'labourers' or are "highly skilled professions" constitute the minority being only 4,3 percent in each case.

On the level of household size classified according to the profession of the head, it is interesting to note the discrepancies. For the male-headed households, the largest size is found among the farmers; there are over 7 persons in these households. The smallest size is found in the households headed by paid 'labourers'; Lhere are about 5 persons in such households. The reasons for these observations are quite clear. Traditionally, farmers want more children to till the land and hence have high fertility rate or large family size whose members may be related by blood, adoption or the like. The 'poor labourers,' whether educated or not, would naturally not like to have 'big' responsibilities, hence will reduce the number of children desired.

What is interesting to note is the households headed by unemployed but looking for jubs, and those headed by "highly skilled professionals." They both have the same size of 6 persons. The second largest size comes from households headed by unemployed and non active due to old age, and the smallest but one comes from the self-employed headed households.

One can understand why the households headed by the inactive old-persons are large, because in these households, the daughters-in-law and their children (especially those young and newly married ones) stay with their parents in-law while their husbands work outside the country. But why the househulds headed by self-empluyed non-agriculturists have salll size is sumething one cannot easily explain.

When we look at the Cemale headed households, we note that, the largest size being 6 persuns cumes from those headed by self-employed non-ayriculturists. For the male counterparts, the size was the smallest but one; about 5,6 persons are found in the households headed by the inactive old-women. Incidentally, the rank for the size is the same for both male and female households. The households with the smallest mean size are those headed by farmers. The size is 3,3 persons. In the male households, the largest size was found among those headed by farmers, but here they are the sinallest size. The households headed by the "highly skilled professionals" maintain their "medium size" in both cases, males and females. There are about 4 persons in the female headed households and 6 persons in the male households.

Elsewhere the household sizes were classified according to the level of education for the female heads.
$\frac{\text { TABLE 2.7.2: HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION }}{\text { FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLDS }}$

| LEVEL OF EDUCATION | SIZE | LEVEL OF EDUCATION | SIZE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HIGHER SCHOOL AND ABOVE | 5,5 | PRIMARY SCHOOL | 4,7 |
| SECONDARY SCHOOL | 5,9 | NO SCHOOLING | 4,9 |

One would expect that, highly educated women, who have attained higher levels of education, would have lower fertility rate and consequently have smaller household size (in a society where no circulation of children is common). However, the above Table shows that the household size of female heads who have complied higher education is the second largest. Rather, households headed by females who have completed some primary school education have the smallest size of 4,7 persons. What is more astonishing is that, households headed by females who have completed secondary school education have larger size than those headed by females who have had NO SCHOOLING. Does it mean that the level of education attained has no influence on the household size? Or are these heads staying with other siblings or relatives? It is a common knowledge that, the level of educational attainment (beyond the primary school) (especially for females), influences the fertility level (see Caldwell 1973). Is this not true for Basotho women? If so why is the household size not depicting that? Why is it that the households headed by "highly educated women" have mean size larger than those headed by "less educated women?"

## CONCLUSION

The foregoing discussions have shown that, in spite of the unique geographical position of Lesotho, its household structure does not differ from other households in the region or in the continent. For example the proportion of households headed by females falls within the range found in Africa (that is, falls between 10,5 percent in Ivory Coast and 29,5 percent in Kenya!. [Countries with high proportion of female headed households are those which send male migrant "workers" to foreign countries. There are some countries which though do not send male workers outside, because of high divorce rate or the system of inheritance, makes this proportion high. For instance, Mauritania is a Moslem and Arab country where women's freedom and participation to domestic and social life is checked. But because of the high rate of divorce, about 20 percent of the household heads are females. In Ghana, the matrilineal system of inheritance encourages women to become heads].
he household size in Lesotho compares well with the sizes from other countries in the third world. Neither the 1986 figure of 4,8 persons per household is smaller, nor the survey figure of 5,7 persons is bigger.

The composition of the household members is just what is expected: household head with his family and a few relatives from the vertical line. Nonetheless, the proportion of
one-person households is very small in Lesotho. The survey figure is the smallest ever known, implying that, Lesotho is not developed but is rather predominantly rural and Mantsebo is a village.

Concerning the classification of household heads by profession, it is on record that, the majority of the male heads are workers in South Africa. Household heads who are self-employed and working in the non-agricultural sector form the minority. For the female headed households, the heads who are unemployed and not-active form the majority, and the "highly skilled professionals" as well as the paid "labourers" form the minority.

There is no regular trend for the household sizes classified by the profession of the head; especially, when the two sexes are compared. Neither does the size classified by the level of education attained by the female heads, agree with the hypothesis put forward by Caldwell, nor does the size classified by profession conform to any known trend or hypothesis. [According to Caldwell, the higher the level of education attained by a woman, the smaller the number of children she would have. And for that matter, the smaller the household size except she stays with younger siblings or relatives].

As far as the household headship rates are concerned, the rates from the survey do not deviate from known rates either obtained from some African countries or from some Latin American countries.

Concerning the transition of household size in Lesotho, there is some fuzz about it. The size was 5 persons per household in 1976 but was 4,8 persons in 1986 (that is, according to the estimates from the two censusses). Thus, the mean size is seen decreasing. But the figures from surveys show that the size is increasing when compared with the 1976 census data. So we are not sure of the direction of the transition which is taking place.

If the size is declining, then the better, because heads will have fewer months to feed. Conversely, if the size is increasing as the survey data has shown, then there is some danger ahead. Because, this study has shown that, the majority of the heads are migrant workers in South Africa. Nursing the fear that the changes going on in the present South Africa might result in the expulsion of "foreign" migrant workers, it is clear that this will definitely have an adverse effect on Basotho nation and consequently make household members to suffer. Underfeeding and malnutrition could be the result at last.

But where more households are to be formed or the existing ones were to be disintegrated to reduce the mean size, then there would be the need for more housing units to be constructed and more land to be available. It has been stated above that erosion is eating all the land away, therefore the household/housing problem is not solved. No matter the existing
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number of households and the average size, more households will be created, because the population is increasing and relatively more people are becoming adults; and would own their independent households.

In view of the fact that this paper has not sought to find the levels of fertility and mortality, it cannot give the number of households which will be added to the existing ones in the future. All the same, it is absolutely certain that more new ones will be formed, whether the population is increasing or not. Because, even in the developed countries, where growth rates have dwindled (because fertility rates have got smaller), more households are being formed especially the one person households. In Italy for example, the proportion of one person households has increased by over $40 \%$ during the last five years. How many households will be formed every year is the open question.

We still come back to the question: 'Is the household size decreasing or increasing in Lesotho?' How do the people in authorities view the household size? By looking at the average housing unit in the country, do they consider the size as problematic -- as creating congestion because of overcrowding? Or do they believe that it is underpopulated?

Planners and decision-makers have a growing need for statistical information to determine the effect of economic growth on the well-being of the population and to take corrective measures where necessary. Analysis of household structure is one of the most effective ways of investigating and understanding the problems of the people. Hence, there is the need for consideration of household structure in Lesotho.
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