

CHANGES IN HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE FROM
1958 TO 1972 IN AN AFRICAN PERI-URBAN
AREA NEAR DURBAN.

Peter Stopforth

June 1975

CASS/5-STD

Paper prepared for the Sixth Annual Congress
of the ASSOCIATION FOR SOCIOLOGY IN SOUTHERN
AFRICA (30th June - 3rd July 1975)

Institute for Social Research
University of Natal
Durban.

CHANGES IN HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE FROM
1958 TO 1972 IN AN AFRICAN PERI-URBAN
AREA NEAR DURBAN.*

INTRODUCTION.

In the course of preparing a research report on a replicated study of household nutrition and food consumption among the same households at the dates 1958 and 1972 (Stopforth and Mack : 1975) it became necessary to rationalise an apparent increase in household size during the intervening period in order to gauge the effect of changed size on changed food consumption. By returning to the raw data describing composition of households contained in surveys at each date it became clear that substantial changes in household structure had been effected in the 14 years preceding replication : these data are the objects of analysis in this paper (an extension of an analysis contained in Stopforth and Mack : 1975, Chapter II). The surveys on which our analysis is based were both conducted under the auspices of and by personnel of The Valley Trust which is a registered Welfare Organization established as "a socio-medical project for the promotion of health" among the Zulu of The Valley of a Thousand Hills (near Botha's Hill) in Natal. The replicated survey was directed at the problem of health in the area and while we are fortunate that household information is available for the periods 1958 and 1972, the research design of the survey does not allow for any analysis of the relationship between family households and wider kinship groupings.

The first survey in 1958 was conducted under the supervision of Dr. H.H. Stott (then Medical Officer-in-charge of the Botha's Hill Health Centre) among a "sample" of 155 households in the Embo, Emaqadini and Nyuswa areas of the Valley near Botha's Hill at the behest of The World Health Organization (WHO : 1959, alternatively Stott : 1959). The sample of households was purposive and selection was determined by "ease of access" (WHO : 1959, p.100); it is also conceivable that an element of amenability to co-operation was latent in the selection process as reflected in the

* This paper was presented on the 30th April 1975 in the seminar series of the African Studies Society, University of Natal, Durban.

biased inclusion of Christian families at 1958 (95 per cent - I have failed to find a comparative figure but the overall incidence in the area during the 1950s is unlikely to be greater than 20 per cent - see as a guide Vilakazi : 1965, p.24). The population of the replicated survey (at both dates) is then characterised as settled along established transport routes with a predominant number having or claiming some sympathy with Christianity, both of which suggest a predisposition to modern influences not general in the area. The changes recorded between 1958 and 1972 are therefore not generalizable to the Valley population, though the large family households recorded in 1972 seem to be general in other vicinities (see reference to Cross below). The replication of the survey in 1972 was conducted by Kathleen Mack (Nutrition Education Officer at The Valley Trust) and the original draft report of the second survey is incorporated in a forthcoming University of Natal publication (Stopforth and Mack : 1975). This survey was conducted as an enumeration among the original 155 households. For a variety of reasons (reported below) only 105 households were incorporated in the replicated exercise.

While the benefits of diachronic and correlative data in the analysis of changed household structure can be readily appreciated, the problems of data distortion and intervening variability among many community situations and orientations over the 14 years of elapsed time weigh in the overall validity of our presentation. The possibility of distorted data reflects doubts concerning reliability, and historical intervention forms at once part of and explanation for the observed phenomena - to name them, increased household size and greater complexity of structure among family households. The question of intervening changes between 1958 and 1972 is taken up immediately below, while the reliability of data is treated in the next section but one. Apparent socio-cultural and economic changes are described in such a way that definitions of the situation emerge for both periods, 1958 and 1972, with the emphasis on conditions at 1972 which assist in understanding changes in household structure.

We are fortunate in that the area populated by the Nyuswa and Qadi people has been an object of study over the preceding two decades. Vilakazi (1965) and Mbatha (1960) studied the effects of Christianity and labour migration respectively during the fifties, which supplements the information available from the WHO publication (1959). In addition Reader (1966) studied change among the Makhanya in a similar situation south of Durban in the early fifties. Professor Krige (1962) conducted an investigation

among a sample of selected families in the Valley during the early sixties. More recently research has been conducted in the area by Sibisi and Preston-Whyte (1974), and Cross.¹⁾ From our own study of the situation (Stopforth and Mack : 1975) two related processes appear to contain the multiplicity of changes since 1958 which affect both the population studied and, more generally, the population of the area. For convenience the processes might be labelled "urban invasion" and "rural incapacity"; and although the mutual relatedness of the processes is difficult to disassemble, the former accounts in greater measure for the peri-urban status of people in this area ca. 40 km. from Durban, and the latter for the preponderance of labour migrants working in town. Geographically, the sample of households being considered here is in the vanguard of urban invasion and it can be shown that reliance on cash rather than on local production is the primary mode for consumption.

Descriptions of the general area under consideration in WHO (1959, pp. 1 - 7) and by Vilakazi (1965, pp. 3 - 4) as well as Mbatha (1960, pp. 13 - 14), which portray a largely rural physical infrastructure, are eclipsed by developments since the fifties which give the situation its peri-urban character by the seventies. Concomitant with rapid expansion of the Durban - Pinetown urban industrial complex and increased white residential settlement between Durban and the ridge area as well as on the ridge itself (Hillcrest and Botha's Hill) has been the development of transport routes in the Valley area. A comprehensive network of roads links up with the old Durban - Pietermaritzburg road which gives access to the new freeway. Consequently buses and taxis are a common sight and these linkages with the urban sector have facilitated the importation of modern goods and materials. More stores, both in the ridge area as well as in the Valley, now carry on trade. The standard of dwellings has improved, especially near transport routes, and more permanent structures characterise the present order. Accompanying improved infrastructure, socio-cultural changes are apparent²⁾: from our own research experience among a select group (Stopforth and Mack : 1975) it can be inferred that more household members are now engaged in migrant labour than previously, especially women; and that more cash is available for household expenditure; although educational achievement is still depressed, significant gains (an increase of two years) have occurred since 1958; for both men and women single marital status is proportionately higher at all age intervals since 1958, and separation and irregular unions are now more frequent. In profile, the situation at 1972 compared with 1958 has changed to the extent that families are not only larger and more complex in structure (see below) but dependent on a range of wage earners who, because

of their necessary migrant status, are increasingly more independent of the traditional order, yet unable to escape the security it offers. Increasingly the consequences are manifest in illegitimacy, fragmented conjugal units, broken marriages and a division of resources between town and the peri-urban district.

Rural incapacity is both a cause and an effect of situational ambivalence. An increasingly adverse man-land ratio (Preston-Whyte : 1974)³⁾ pushes men and women into labour migration and consequent lack of local subsistence production creates what is approaching absolute dependence on the urban wage. This is especially true for the households under discussion. In pursuing our study of nutrition among this population we discovered that not only were the greater majority of people habitually buying food that might otherwise have been locally produced (despite long standing promotion of local gardening in the area) but that the peri-urban dietary was not dissimilar to an urban African dietary reported by Manning *et al.*, (1974, p.493) for Cape Town. The situation is succinctly described by Prof. Krige (1962, p.8), "The Valley of a Thousand Hills has been labelled a 'dormitory Reserve' which provides 'standing room' for the families of migrant labourers employed in the Durban - Pietermaritzburg industrial complex."⁴⁾ It would appear that demographic pressure and land shortage have been building up in the Valley over many decades, and it seems clear that the "urban invasion" which has characterised the past decade-and-a-half has exacerbated "rural incapacity" to the extent that the family household in this peri-urban part of the Valley exists almost wholly as a unit of consumption which is relatively discrete from the unit of production (migrant labourers) which is situated in town.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND SOME QUALIFYING CONDITIONS.

Indirectly we have been arguing that traditional cultural influence and practice have waned somewhat (rural incapacity), and that modern influences and practices are manifest (urban invasion and participation) among a sample of households in the Valley - furthermore that these processes have greatly accelerated during the past decade-and-a-half. Although Goode's thesis (common forces of urban industrialism are connected with a general trend toward some type of conjugal family system) is probably nowhere held without qualification, the main theme has passed into the "received wisdom" of the discipline. While the thesis is stated more circumspectly for sub-Saharan Africa than for other non-western cultures, nevertheless Goode (1963 : p.200) presses the theme home in a way most relevant for the case presented for the Valley : "... the general trend (in sub-Saharan Africa)

seems unequivocal, since with respect to every major family element the movement⁵⁾ is definite, and there are no reverse trends." It is with a contrary case which would suggest the possibility of a reverse trend that we are concerned here.

Although we are in possession of correlated and diachronic household data, we cannot take issue with the received wisdom via Goode at the abstract theoretical level; the original research and sampling design prohibit this. Our sights are therefore set low :we wish merely to establish in the following sections of this paper that household size and family structure have indeed changed in the Valley during recent time; that these changes are contrary to sociological expectation (given the modicum of modernization urged earlier); and to enter the theoretical debate in an oblique fashion, by showing that a contrary case has not been given substance as the result of fortuitous research process (CF. discussion on the developmental cycle of the family below and forward). Essentially the problem we have set ourselves is an empirical one, and one which we hope will prove sufficiently tantalizing to suggest a more rigorous research and theoretical approach to what appears to be an emergent order taking the form of a peri-urban society on the firnges of a homeland(s).

Both the high order theoretical problem and low order empirical problem have as corollary high and low order conditional qualifications on which ultimate solutions are contingent. All these qualifications cannot be eliminated here, but their introduction and partial treatment will reflect some of the limits of credibility that can be given to our analysis. Although the theoretical problem posed is not directly approached in this paper, some high order qualifications are discussed because, finally, the empirical findings must be related to the orienting theoretical statements.

Theoretical Qualifications.

At 1958, no less than 61 per cent of households (see Table V) in the Valley "sample" are described as of simple (elementary) structure, as opposed to 21 per cent in 1972. If these figures are accepted⁶⁾ then it is possible that by the fifties nucleation had occurred as a response to urban industrialism, and that the contrary trend recorded in 1972 is associated with a completely different set of independent variables. These variables might be ecological (Preston-Whyte), tribal or jural in nature; however, it is contended that urban overflow, manifest signs of modernity, and underurbanization are sufficiently related to the presence of and participation in urban

industrialism to offset this qualification. That is, if this has indeed been the course of the process then possibly a qualification to the theory arises, and not merely a disqualifying condition.

If the effects of urban industrialism have been overstated and modernity is more apparent than real, then the present situation must be attributed to processes within the traditional culture and the 1958 - 1972 differences accounted for independently of the orienting theory. In other words, present effects would be dependent on the evolving norms of the tribal society and not on any urban or industrial variables.

If one assumes that the forms of family structure are predominantly determined by traditional cultural norms and processes, then the possibility arises that fortuitous entry to the population of households at 1958 and 1972 has coincided with different but expected phases (in this case simple in 58 and complex in 72) of the developmental cycle of the domestic group (Fortes : 1962). We can show that this is unlikely to be true. On the other hand it is most likely that traditional norms are invoked to maintain the large and complex structures recorded at 1972. But the operation in some measure of traditional norms to determine a reverse trend in the thesis under discussion in no way invalidates rejection of some part of the thesis if the empirical case is sound.

The data on household membership include the members of the household who are migrant wage earners. These people are present in the peri-urban community only at weekends and on holidays; some most weekends, others fortnightly or only once a month and a minority who return "home" irregularly. On this basis it might be argued not only that household structure has been incorrectly categorised but that the migrant situation as regards change in family structure is an inappropriate test of Goode's thesis. In that case the theoretical perspective of our endeavour falls away. However, as it is strongly suspected that similar marginal peri-urban situations are emerging in Natal as a peculiarly South African (with all its legal and political constraints) response to urban industrialism, we persist with the theoretical notion.

Empirical Qualifications.

The family household is the received unit of analysis in the present case. The unit of analysis in this paper is always the 'family household' which is defined as a co-resident domestic grouping (not without serious qualifications which will soon be evident). References to 'the family' in general serve only to emphasise the recognition that there are effective kin groupings which operate beyond the scope of the family household. Now while the situation is developing peri-urban characteristics, this change has taken place within the mandate of an older traditional order characterised by forms of organization relying heavily on kinship relationships and on tribal leadership much dependent on ascription. While the forms taken by many household structures deviate from traditional ideals, there can be no doubt that it is largely due to the retention of customary family and kinship sentiments and obligations that these structures can exist as they do. The definition of family household has a resemblance to the "homestead" under ideal traditional conditions. However, at both 1958 and 1972 among the purposive sample of households in the Valley, the domestic unit or "homestead" may have within it semi-discrete nuclear family units or sub-households which may be socially differentiated but generally are not economically separate, and the head of the family household appears to fulfill the economic functions of both head of "homestead" and head of some or all sub-households. We are dealing then with the domestic unit of the family which in our definition is synonymous with "household" and know very little about the relationship among domestic units (that might be territorially proximate) which might be defined locally as belonging to the same family. For purposes of analysis we are by using the criterion of co-residence, imposing to some extent a "modern" definition of family in a situation which retains much of the superstructure of social traditionalism. This imposition appears to be ameliorated or supported somewhat by the changes in household/homestead structure in the changing traditional milieu.

Systematic ethnography among the Zulu appears to be relatively incomplete. However, it is probably safe to assume that co-residential family groupings were historically the rule and that a hypothesis of a relationship between urban industrialism and simplification of family structure is not spurious.⁷⁾ But it is difficult under conditions of rapid change to identify and define the limits of an effective kinship grouping recognised as a family. We have no evidence that the family households under discussion do not represent a short-term response to change while problems of land distribution are being sorted out. On the other hand it appears that little

efficient use is made of land in the sampled area for agricultural production, and theoretically the household could divide into conjugal units - assuming that conjugality was a firm principle in family structure. It will become clear below that the formation of present household structures relies very much on consanguinal definition.⁸⁾ It must be recognised however that appropos of the urban industrialism thesis, the 'household definition' of family structure might be inappropriate and that strong social divisions might be operating within family households.

Other empirical qualifications to our attempt reflect the fact that the surveys were conducted at periods 14 years apart, and that biases of observation can be present as a result of differential research technique and operational definitions at the two dates. These problems are dealt with immediately below.

EQUIVOCAL BUT CORRELATED HOUSEHOLD DATA.

We have already stated that a non-probability purposive sample of 155 households was surveyed in 1958. In replicating this study at 1972 an enumeration of these 155 households was attempted, and in all 105 households comprised the census at the later date (short-fall discussed below). Had the 1958 study been conducted on the basis of one or other type of probability sample, then the comparisons we are attempting to effect could have been analysed as a case of correlated samples where the overlap (second sample as a subset of the first : $n_1 > n_2$) could have been utilized to determine a statistic of variance of difference, and hence any significant changes in the populations estimated. The rules of sampling do not allow the "creation by assumption" of probability samples, so we cannot proceed on an "as if" or "theoretically given" basis with the model above (Kish : 1965, p.24). However, our diachronic data is correlated to the extent that households studied at 1972 are common to both surveys and although our emphasis is on comparison the important focus is on households at 1972, and for various reasons it would be advantageous to regard the later enumeration as a probability sample. This can be achieved by legitimate statistical manipulation (See Kish : 1965, pp. 17 - 18 in this regard). The original purposive sample of 155 households can be defined as a population of study where population values are known and do not have to be estimated (all subsequent statements refer then only to this population). The census conducted in 1972 among these households can be accepted as a probability sample of a defined population of households because : firstly, any 100 per cent census is subject to errors of observation and values could be variable; secondly, any particular population is arbitrarily

specified from a greater universe of interest. The theory behind this argument is that repeated censuses would reveal a sampling distribution that would tend to be normal.

But it would appear that we do not have a 100 per cent census. This is more apparent than real (consult Table I). Of the 50 households not included in the 1972 survey, over half had moved out of the areas of the study and for practical purposes could not be traced. Eighteen per cent of the shortfall of households had been assimilated by other extant households in the area (some of which are units in the 1972 sample); 12 per cent of households had either died out or dispersed among other households; 6 per cent could not be traced; 4 per cent of households were apparently in such disarray that no adult members were ever available for interviews; and, in one case (2 per cent) the head of household refused to be interviewed. Put another way : of the original 155 households, 18,7 per cent were physically without the locality of replication; 9,7 per cent no longer existed as households; 3,2 per cent were either not traced or impossible to conduct interviews in; and, only one householder refused co-operation, being the only genuine survey non-response. We can state then that the census in 1972 was complete (excepting as a minimum one household and as a maximum six households) with respect to bias in response, the balance of unit difference being attributable to exogenous historical factors of change. The equivocal problem of the unit difference is however a thorny one. If the households that could not be traced have reverted to or maintained a simple structure then the incidence of the conjugal or nuclear family might well be higher than we have stated. Hence one reason for treating the 1972 units as a probability sample of a defined population.

Although the same definition of the family household unit was employed during both surveys there is much room for error. In defining this unit, eating arrangements were taken into account as well as migrant absentees. That is, all people who considered they were part of the rural home, and such people (whether permanent or migrant) who were said to eat together, were defined within the unit. As it happened, within each unit all members of the group were related either by blood or marriage (except for one person during 1972 not included in the analysis). But it is clear that the definition of family household based on common co-residence "in the rural home", identification with the rural home, "shared eating" arrangements and kin inclusion of the grouping all leave room for enumeration errors even though the definition is synonomous for both surveys. With reference to scepticism about the

substantial increase in family size it is possible that migrants were under-enumerated in 1958 and overenumerated during 1972; identification with the rural home would often refer to a judgement of an interested respondent; kin inclusion might very well not refer to household but to a broader definition of family for migrant absentees; and, eating arrangements might be temporary. In mitigation it might be stated that there was a common member of the research teams at both 1958 and 1972 and the impression gained by the field researchers was that respondents (wives of head of household in most cases) were able to distinguish between the traditional sense of "home" held by kin and those who had deserted, made homes elsewhere or would only eventually return to the area.

Without dissembling then, the position is that the data introduced in the following two sections has to be digested with the sure knowledge that it refers to a very limited population, and that some of the story is missing. Further, while the advantages of diachronic study and nominal correlation of households prompt our treatment we can know much more about the situation at 1972 compared with 1958, and hence some of the comparative nature of the attempt is lost. Undaunted, we proceed with the analysis of household size and structure.

THE QUESTION OF HOUSEHOLD SIZE, 1958 AND 1972.

The mean increase of 74 per cent. in household size from 5,1 persons per household in 1958 to 8,9 persons during 1972 is described in Table II. In view of our earlier cautions regarding reliability it is necessary to rationalize this difference (especially the likely reliability of the earlier figure) as far as is possible. By the definition of family household (homestead) employed we are reasonably certain that the distribution for 1972 is reliable. Treating the census as a sample of a defined population of households, a small standard error of mean household size can be computed (0,44). Further, in an independent study in a contiguous area by C. Cross a mean household size of 9,1 persons per household has been recorded - the incidence of traditionalist families in her study is considerably higher than in the present case, which has influenced household size upward.⁹⁾ It is also clear that the remnant from 1958 which composes the 1972 sample does not introduce an upward bias in the latter result as the mean for the group at 1958 (116 households) is very similar to the defined population mean household size and well within the confidence limits for the 1972 sample mean household size (see Table II and below). The most pressing question however is the credibility of a mean household size of 5,1 persons at 1958.

The intervening variable (real or biased) which influences the possibly low mean household size at 1958 in the purposive sample is the high incidence of simple or elementary/nuclear family structures recorded. We have already remarked that the purposive sample was defined by "ease of access", and in choosing largely Christian families which then tended to favour nucleation (Vilakazi), it is not unlikely that this selection produced a skewed result (compared with the larger population). Observation or recording bias at 1958 can also not be discounted. In this latter regard it is interesting to note that Preston-Whyte (1974) makes two points which nominally support the wide gap in mean household size at the two dates, "While both Mbatha and Vilakazi (who did their fieldwork during the nineteen-fifties) mentioned the loss over the last two decades of young men to town, the situation in the 1960 - 1970 period was that these men and even their sons were returning to the Valley and seeking to reinstate themselves with their descent group heads." Further, we show below that some of the increase in size of households is due to accretion.

Given that selection will have influenced this figure downward in 1958, it is by no means certain that the general picture in the area at that time as regards household size would have reflected 1972 sizes. In a similar type of situation south of Durban (Makhanyaland, early fifties) Reader (1966; p.76) states, "... an average number of seven persons per kraal over the tribal area may be taken as correct ... (and p.77) and suggests some drastic diminution in the modern Makhanya type-family."¹⁰ Further afield in Keiskommahoek during the late forties and early fifties among a people involved in labour migration, Wilson *et al* (1952, p.7) state, "The average number of members, for the district as a whole, is seven, but it ranges from an average of nine persons on freehold land to six in a communal village (with a note 'figures include members of homesteads away at work')." This mean of seven is somewhat reduced in Hobart Houghton and Walton (1952, pp. 62 - 63, Tables 26 and 27): a sample of 285 families in December 1948 reveals a mean of 5,95 persons per homestead, six persons if the 20 absent husbands are included in the count¹¹ (Table 26); an intensive analysis of 54 homesteads in 1950 shows a mean number of persons of 6,5 per 64 operating fires in the homesteads, including all surviving persons at home and away (Table 27). These figures suggest a mean "household" size of between six and seven, probably closer to seven, which is somewhat higher than our 1958 mean of 5,1 persons.

If the figures above can be accepted as a guide then it is possible that in the 1958 survey household size was underenumerated (remember

that the Christian bias will reduce the difference). But the difference in means between 1958 and 1972 in the Valley surveys is nearly 4 persons. Accepting the 1972 census as a random sample of households¹²⁾ with a standard error of mean household size equal to 0,44, the lower limit at a CI of 0,95 is 8,03 (CV = 10). This suggests that even a substantial underenumeration at 1958 will not make the observed difference in household size viewed from 1972 an insignificant one. On this basis it seems safe to allow and accept criticism on the possibility of an observation bias in the field recording of household size at 1958. But we would contend that it is most unlikely that any underenumeration would be cause for drastic revision of our empirical argument.

Our relative confidence in this matter derives from two findings emerging from the analysis of the raw data. Being tantalised by the magnitude of the difference in mean household size, recourse was had to the raw data of both surveys : Miss Mack constructed comparative ideographs¹³⁾ for each paired household structure at 1958 and 1972 (which then enabled us to reconstruct household structure discussed in the following section) which allowed us to trace the process effecting the differences. In comparing households at the two dates, it was clear that no gross errors in earlier fieldwork accounted for the difference being described - that is, the additions at 1972 to the 1958 households were always credible. Secondly, we were able to account substantively for the observed difference by tabulating the additions at 1972. On the basis of comparing 104 households at 1958 and 1972, the gross difference in numbers of persons is 319 or a mean addition of 3,07 persons per household (1958 - 605 persons; 1972 - 924 persons).¹⁴⁾ This difference is accounted for in the following ways:

- i) 362 children were born during the period 1958 - 1972, the mean number accruing to each household being 3,48. Not all these children were born of the original residents of the households, and 85 or 23,5 per cent of this addition are accretions to households post-1958.
- ii) 146 persons, other than children born after 1958, were accreted to households, the mean being 1,4 persons per household. These are additions to the household since 1958, although some are consanguinal kin who were not recorded as being part of the household then (CF. Preston-Whyte).

- iii) 106 persons "withdrew" from the original 1958 households (1,02 persons per household). This would be due to marriage, absconding, disappearance, movement to another area or setting up of an independent family unit elsewhere.¹⁵⁾
- iv) 83 original household members died during the intervening 14 years. This count does not include deaths of children born subsequent to 1958 who would not be shown in the 1972 count.

The expected primary component in household size increase is children born of original household members subsequent to 1958. However, contributing substantially and probably causing the unexpected magnitude of this increase is the process of accretion, both of adults and of children, from elsewhere to the households in the intervening period. The fact that so few households appear to have divided substantially means that children tend to build up in many households.¹⁶⁾

While not all possible equivocal qualifications to the reliability of the small household sizes recorded at 1958 have been satisfactorily rationalized, we contend that the datum of importance, i.e. difference in household size at the two dates, can be more than plausibly accepted as a confirmed research finding. We now proceed with an attempt to show that this finding is associated with increasing complexity in family household structure in recent time.

COMPARATIVE HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE ANALYZED.

In order to reduce 208 paired household structure ideographs to categories that could be meaningfully tabulated, we have relied exclusively on conventions used by Laslett (1972). In recognising that the concept "family does not denote a complete coresident domestic group" Laslett (1972, pp. 28 - 32) provides a system of classification for household structures which "indicate the fact of shared location, kinship and activity." While the questions of location and activity are qualified by labour migration in the present case, Laslett's classificatory table of categories and classes of household structure (p.31) has proved a useful instrument for the purpose of treating our received data in a certain way and at two points in time.¹⁷⁾ This table is reproduced here at Table III. The main categories used to classify family household structure in this Table are Simple (3), Extended (4) and Multiple (5). Briefly, a simple family (elementary or nuclear) exists when the structural principle of a conjugal link connects at least two people

in the "coresident" situation. An "extended family household" consists of a conjugal family unit with the addition of "one or more relatives other than offspring". A multiple family household comprises "all forms of domestic groups which include two or more conjugal family units connected by kinship or marriage".

Table IV compares the changes effected to family household structures for the same units between 1958 and 1972. The numbers and letters used refer to the respective categories and classes found in Table III. The distribution of classifications follows the order given in Table III and includes 104 households at both dates. As both defined population and sample number 104 households here, percentages are not resorted to. Following Table IV then, during an interval of 14 years the following changes within 104 households have occurred (changes apparent at 1972 compared with structures at 1958):

One solitary family has become extended (4b).

Of five simple families (married couples alone), two have expectedly developed into elementary families with children (3b) and three have become extended.

Among 46 simple family households (couples with children) eight have not changed form (3b) and a further four have changed only in respect of a loss of one or other parent (3c and 3d). Of the balance, eleven are now extended with a further case extended both upward and laterally; seventeen appear as multiple families with the emphasis on the form "secondary unit DOWN" (5b) and; five families are both multiple and extended.

Three simple family households with widowers as head have become extended, multiple, and multiple and extended respectively.

Four simple family households with widows as head have changed so that one is headed by a widower, two are multiple and one is multiple and extended.

Of seven families that were previously extended upwards two are now simple (3b), one extended downwards and four are multiple. Three downwardly extended families have been transformed in two ways: one as a simple structure (3b) and two as different forms of extension.

The single laterally extended structure remains unchanged in form. In the single case of a combined form of extension this structure is now both extended and multiple.

In two cases during 1958 multiple family households appeared with secondary units up - since then one family has changed in that the original secondary unit up has been replaced by another, and other units all on one level have remained in the structure (see 1958 - 5a and 5c); the other family is now classified as multiple with unit down.

Twenty-one family households at 1958 were classified as multiple with units down (four of these were complicated by extensions). Two have degenerated into a solitary and "no family" respectively. Only two multiple families have become simple family households (3b), an unexpected result if the family cycle is thought to be associated with change. Three families are now extended in form; one has a multiple definition with the unit up and four retain the form "multiple" with secondary units down. Seven of the original structures are now complicated by extensions, and the balance by more complex multiple additions.

In one case a very complex multiple family (5e) has changed to become a simple family (3b).

Of the 104 sample households at 1972, nine are constructed from amalgamations of two separate households in 1958. These separate households in 1958 were predominantly of simple structure - by 1972 extended, multiple and extended and multiple structural forms characterise these new groupings.

In general the picture is clear. Simple households have become transformed into more complex structures in the majority of cases, and there has been little tendency for previously complex structures to develop into a complementary number of simple households (recalling, however, that data is not available for the whole of the original selection of households). Table V describes comparative household structure at the two dates in a more simplified expression which highlights the decline in simple family households during the intervening 14 years. The uninitiated might well accept these distributions at face value, and assert that the empirical evidence was sufficient in itself to be utilized as a research datum (this would have been my view until recent months). When I discussed this interesting distribution with Prof. Argyle in the course of preparing the first report (Stopforth and Mack : 1975), he cautioned us that we should establish that the apparent difference in configuration of comparative structure was not due to the operation and process of the traditional developmental cycle of the domestic unit or family among the Zulu. Preston-Whyte (1974 a), pp. 182 - 184)

describes this cycle in general among local patrilineal Bantu-speaking societies. Using Fortes' (1962, pp. 4 - 5) paradigm of expansion, dispersion and replacement, the traditional cycle of the Zulu would require that male siblings with their conjugal families remain in their father's homestead until his demise (Preston-Whyte) or possibly until they could found an independent homestead. We will argue below that expansion has occurred since 1958, often in ways that are consanguinably determined though not necessarily patrilineally distinct, but that dispersion or fission of the domestic household is not occurring frequently enough to replace the original discrete conjugal units in the society (given that in any event the "house structure" in "homestead structure" is not apparent in the sample).

The first clue to an alternative explanation (given that we have already made the point of expansion due to accretion) to fortuitous entry at different phases of the typical developmental cycle at the two dates, is that while 74 per cent of simple family structures at 1958 have taken on more complex form, only 25 per cent of extended families and 9 per cent of multiple families have resulted in transformation to simple families. This is held to suggest a one-way process. In any event, if the '72 census is regarded as a probability sample of the original population and the entry thesis above posited, then the distribution showing an overwhelming tendency to complexity would require that the expansion phase was somehow synchronised for most of the 104 households - an unlikely sociological event and an incredible assumption. Further, a check on the sample remnant revealed that only 7 households had been in the vicinity for less than 20 years and 2 for less than 30 years (at 1975) and as the Umlazi rural removals to the area occurred about 1960 (post '58) it is unlikely that exogenous forces tended to set up the ensuing pattern (i.e. simple to complex structure.)

It could however be argued that 14 years is an insufficient period for the cycle to have progressed through to the dispersion and replacement phases. But altogether 48 changes (46 per cent) of head of household occurred in the intervening period, a figure substantial enough to suggest that sufficient change had occurred to obviate family cycle as a determinant of present structures. Of these changed heads of household, 26 males succeeded male heads, 13 females succeeded male heads and 8 males succeeded female heads. At 1958 there were 10 female heads, at 1972 there were 16 female heads among the 104 households.¹⁸⁾ Table VI describes the effect of a change in head of household between 1958 and 1972 on the direction of structural change among family households. Not to put too fine a point on it, the effect is limited -

the major trend remains one of increasing complexity, though there is a slight comparative tendency for more complex structures to become simple with changed head; this is probably outweighed by a greater comparative propensity for complex structures to remain complex with change of head.¹⁹⁾ This finding we assert reinforces the notion that fission is not occurring, for one reason or another, at the expected phase of the traditional developmental cycle - that is the structural distributions are real as well as apparent.

The distribution of the intervening variable age among household heads might well determine the overall distribution of the phases of the domestic cycle at 1958 and 1972. Table VII outlines this relationship. It is true that within the cohort 40 - 49 years there are more heads at 1972 which would account for some expansion, but the balance between the samples for older heads does not continue the trend (if there were one), and the paucity of simple family structures among younger 1972 heads compared with younger 1958 heads suggests that age difference is of little consequence to the formation of present family structure in this study. Our argument refuting the operation of the developmental cycle of the family or domestic unit as determining the changed comparative distribution of correlated households rests here. However, we wish to briefly point out that the use of Laslett's classification masks some of the effects which have brought about changes to the distribution of family structure over time.

It is apparent from the data on size that the households under consideration are often rural or peri-urban repositories for kin whose dependence is on migrant workers in town. Accretions within households are often indirect, the enlargements to households often occurring extra to expected conjugal accretion or with gaps in the conjugal connection (e.g. children reside in household while mother resides elsewhere). Many of the resident females with children are not married and in some cases it is difficult to imagine that they ever will marry in the accepted sense. We argue that individual households in the peri-urban area are being loaded with some kinsmen who under customary circumstances would form membership with other households (or found independent homesteads), and under conditions of urban settlement associated with industrialism would more rapidly disperse as conjugal or elementary enlarged units common to the towns (realising of course that this is often politically enforced). In order to show that the more complex households that have come into being in recent time are in fact the effects of collapsing the cycle of the family into one domestic unit, Tables VIII and IX have been prepared. It is clear that since 1958 the mode

of genealogical depth of 2 generations has shifted to a mode of 3 generations in 1972 and in four households at the later date to 4 generations.

URBAN INDUSTRIALISM AND DETERMINATION OF FAMILY STRUCTURE.

Goode (1963) nowhere falls into the trap of designating urban industrialism as a unitary independent or causal variable in the equation of modernization ("world revolution") and changing family structure : on the contrary, he is careful to insist that phenomena of urbanization *qua* urbanization are the ones to be explained.²⁰⁾ Nor, with special regard to the direction of changing family structure in sub-Saharan Africa, is he insensitive to "concealed" processes of kinship which qualify the developing, and by his thesis expected, fit between urban industrialism and the conjugal family unit (pp. 189 - 191) (although once again a "reverse trend" is denied any real efficacy, "... there is no reason to believe that there will be a return to the large households of traditional Africa" p. 189). In the present case therefore, where we are developing an argument for a reverse case in the direction of increasingly complex family structure, it is possible to manoeuvre within accompanying propositions of Goode's thesis without having to negate his generalized theoretical position.²¹⁾ The case of the Valley family household structures being presented relies not on urbanization *per se* but on orientations largely associated with urbanization as effective conditions, and the location of peri-urban settlement has an inherent component of kinship which could be expected to exercise immediate influence. If the empirical position we have asserted is accepted, then the argument (that the increased complexity of family households dependent on and participating to some extent in urban industrialism constitutes one case of a reverse trend to Goode's thesis) must be made in terms of conditional "negative utility."²²⁾ That is, (Hypothesis) if urban industrialism, then trend to conjugal family system (if P, then Q); but if Q does not follow, the next step is to consider changes to P and whether, if P¹, then Q¹, is viable within the generalized theoretical statement.

In this fashion we propose therefore the following hypothesis, which, if it could be rigorously tested and validated might account in some measure for the type of phenomena which we have employed to advance the notion of a reverse trend in family system development:

- "If urban industrialism is conditionally qualified in
- a) a way that shifts residential forms from the urban area proper to a high density and recognizably peri-urban

location characterised particularly by transport infrastructure giving effective frequent access to an urban industrial complex (this presupposes that ideological participation in the process set urban industrialization has already ensued), and

- b) a social milieu where the settlement patterns and normative definitions of kinship relations are yet determined by traditional forces despite failing rural economy, '

Then the likelihood arises that family households will expand (or remain large) rather than contracting to the conjugal grouping."

Theoretically, if propositions a) and b) fall away, then family households will tend toward the more usual conjugal grouping associated with urban industrialism. The cue for conditional qualification to and general efficacy of the orienting theoretical framework proposed by Goode in the present case is the suggestion that by the fifties there was an expected response of conjugal reduction among some African families involved in the process of systems linkage between modern and traditional orders : subsequently it would appear that adverse conditions intervened to the extent that the initial trend was reversed. The fact that these conditions refer to traditional proclivities of kinship, authority and sentiment and to rural incapacity do not invalidate the sub-hypothesis above if these are balanced by some modern orientations and urban industrial participation. The history of the British working class family system as it responds to urban industrialism is a case in point. Anderson (1971), arguing from the position that pre-industrial English family structure tended to be nuclear (on the basis of Laslett and Harrison : 1963 and Laslett : 1965), has traced the development of family structure through urban industrialization in Lancashire : from nuclear through fragmented, then functional larger kin units to relatively nuclear at the present time. This development is explained on the basis of association between kinship and resources at various times so that, "... the working class have come, at least at present, something of a full circle, from pre-industrial kinship weakened because the problems were so great and the resources so small, through a functional 'traditional' kinship system, to a situation where kinship is again weakened but now, by contrast, because the problems are reduced, resources are so much increased, and ready alternatives are open to all." (Anderson : 1971, p.179) Although the pre-industrial structure is different (complex family households among the Zulu) the development may not be dissimilar in the present case.

The first development of nucleation during the fifties can be subverted by the conditions we have stipulated in the sub-hypothesis to Goode's thesis. We may now return to the "theoretical qualifications" to demonstrating a reverse trend in family household outlined earlier, and judge whether they can be incorporated in our descriptive scheme of household enlargement. It is true that much of the cause of the posited reverse trend is extra-industrial (demographic, ecological, tribal and legally-enforced underurbanization) but this can be incorporated in negative utility. It is unlikely that the effects of modernization and industrialism have been overstated, as the development of large complex households (while owing much to generalised traditional sentiments of kinship) show emergent structural forms which do not coincide with traditional family expectations. In line with this development is our assertion that the developmental cycle of the family has been disrupted and that in fact the domestic unit has a changed, more inclusive, form - which tends to negate the argument that the objects to be explained represent development of the traditional order exclusively. However, the doubtful legitimacy of classifying into households, and as co-residents, groupings of kin who are divided between local residents and urban migrants, might yet disqualify this analysis.

Our argument however is simple. Given that the empirical evidence of large complex family households in the peri-urban region of the Valley is real, then we assert that this is one response to the wider implications of the influences of modernity and urban industrialism. Further, that this response constitutes a reverse trend in the theoretical expected fit between urban industrialism and conjugal reduction of family structure proposed by Goode (1963). Finally, our inclination is to assert that this reverse trend is contingent on the conditions that have come about as a result of the operation, in concert, of the processes of "urban invasion" and "rural incapacity", and that this trend (of reversal) can itself be reversed by a change in conditions. That is, Goode's thesis prevails.

THE PROBLEM IS NOT RESOLVED.

In what may be judged to have been a rather laborious attempt, we have come to the unhappy position of being able, in cold blood, to state no more than the possibility of having apprehended a real problem. There is no intention to derogate what we have seen fit to present, but the already expressed doubts reflecting the equivocal nature of the empirical data allow a loophole for the criticism that a spurious problem has been presented and

pursued. That is, that our analysis might not reflect a reverse trend to family nucleation, but any one of a number of culturally or sub-culturally defined developments among a people involved in a transitional change away from a rural, tribal society. However, whether we have entered with the appropriate problem or not, the survey conducted in 1972 does show very large household or "homestead" groupings independently validated by Cross' contiguous, contemporary study.²³⁾ This draws attention to the need, not only for "traditional" ethnography in South Africa, but for up-to-date modern ethnographies among Africans (and other ethnic groups) living under varying conditions.²⁴⁾

There are established literatures on urban Africans and rural Africans²⁵⁾ in South Africa. There are rapidly emerging literatures on Africans in the "common sector", in border industries and in general, African "homelands". It is proposed, independently of the argument suggesting a reverse trend in family system, that a new set of problems is emerging (especially in Natal) simultaneously with the development of a new settlement pattern among some Africans in the Republic. That is the development of a peri-urban society on the fringes of "homeland" territory close or accessible to urban industrialism. If this is so, then in contrast to problems of the denuded or fragmented family often associated with migration, poverty, population explosion, adverse man-land ratios, poor agricultural yields etc., a new problem set is upon us : the problem of the hypertrophied family household (as distinct from the traditional extended family) which develops as a response not only to the rural variables mentioned above, but as much to orientations which are associated with modernity and urban industrialism.

Much study of African participation in industrialism has focussed on the twin processes of urbanization and labour migration. The emphases have been very largely either the problems encountered in urban stabilization or in quasi-stabilization (e.g. see Moller : 1974). The household settlement pattern that we describe in the peri-urban interstice of an African "homeland" might be more correctly styled as "rural quasi-stabilization."

TABLE I

RATIONALIZATION OF THE NUMERICAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN "SAMPLE"
UNITS OF THE 1958 POPULATION AND 1972 CENSUS

Rationalization of Response to 1972 Survey	Numerical difference n = 50	Percentage of difference n = 50	Percentage of 1958 Population N = 155
Households moved out of the areas	29	58,0	18,7
Households assimilated in the body of other households	9	18,0	5,8
Households died out and dispersed	6	12,0	3,9
Households not traced	3	6,0	1,9
Adult members of house- hold not available	2	4,0	1,3
Non-response	1	2,0	0,7

TABLE II

COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD SIZE DURING 1958
AND 1972(* Remnant of 116 households extant during 1972 and
analysed from 1958 data).

Household Size	1958		1958*		1972	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	4	2,58	2	1,72	1	0,95
2	17	10,97	13	11,21	4	3,81
3	23	14,84	16	13,79	5	4,76
4	40	25,81	29	25,00	6	5,71
5	21	13,55	16	13,79	6	5,71
6	13	8,39	9	5,17	13	12,38
7	7	4,52	7	6,03	11	10,48
8	11	7,10	8	6,90	13	12,38
9	5	3,23	5	4,31	9	8,57
10	5	3,23	4	3,45	6	5,71
11	4	2,58	3	2,59	4	3,81
12	2	1,29	1	0,86	4	3,81
13	2	1,29	2	1,72	5	4,76
14	1	0,65	1	0,86	6	5,71
15					1	0,95
16					2	1,90
17					3	2,86
18					2	1,90
19					3	2,86
23					1	0,95
N households	155		116		105	
N people	790		609		933	
x size	5,10		5,25		8,89	

TABLE III

LASLETT'S CLASSIFICATORY TABLE OF CATEGORIES AND
CLASSES OF HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE.

CATEGORY	CLASS
1. Solitaries	a) Widowed b) Single, or of unknown marital status
2. No family	a) Coresident siblings b) Coresident relatives of other kinds c) Persons not evidently related
3. Simple family households	a) Married couples alone b) Married couples with child (ren) c) Widowers with child (ren) d) Widows with child (ren)
4. Extended family households	a) Extended upwards b) Extended downwards c) Extended laterally d) Combinations of 4a - 4c
5. Multiple family households	a) Secondary unit(s) UP b) Secondary unit(s) DOWN c) Units all on one level d) <i>Frèresches</i> e) Other multiple families
6. Intermediate 'Stem families'	5b 5b and 5a 5b and 5a and 4a
<i>Frèresches</i> alternative definitions	5d 5d and 5c 5d and 5c and 4c 5d and 5c and 4c and 2c

TABLE IV

COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE CLASSIFICATION OF
 FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS AT 1958 AND 1972 ACCORDING TO
 CATEGORIES AND CLASSES OF HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE
 CREATED BY LASLETT

1958	1972	n
1a N=1	4b	1
3a N=5	3b 4b 4c	2 2 1
3b N=46	3b 3c 3d 4a 4b 4c 4d 5a 5b 5c 4a and 4c 5a and 4c 5b and 4b 5b and 4d	8 2 2 1 4 5 1 3 13 1 1 1 3 1
3c N=3	4b 5b 5b and 4b	1 1 1
3d N=4	3c 5c and 4a 5c and 5a 5e	1 1 1 1
4a 4a and 4c N=7	3b 4b 5b 3b	1 1 4 1
4b N=3	3b 4b 4d	1 1 1
4c N=1	4c	1

Continued/

TABLE IV Continued from previous page.

1958	1972	n
4d N=1	5b and 4d	1
5a 5a and 5c N=2	5b 5c and 5a	1 1
5b 5b and 4b 5b and 4c N=21	1a 2a 3b 4b 4c 5a 5b 5b and 4b 5c and 4a 5c and 5a 5c and 5b and 4b 5c and 5b 5b and 4b 4b 5c and 4a and 4b	1 1 2 1 1 1 4 2 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1
5e N=1	3b	1
1a and 2d 3a and 3d 3b and 3b 3b and 4b 3b and (5b and 4b) 3d and 3b 3d and 4b 4c and 3d N=9	2d 2b 5b; 4a 4a 5c and 4a and 4c 4c and 4a 5b 4b and 4c	1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1

N=104

TABLE V

COMPARATIVE STRUCTURE OF 104 HOUSEHOLDS 1958 AND
1972
LASLETT'S CATEGORIES (see TABLE III)

Family Household Structure	1958		1972	
	N	%	n	%
1. Solitaries	1	1,05	1	0,96
2. No family	0	0,00	3	2,88
3. Simple family households	58	61,05	21	20,19
4. Extended family households	11	11,58	25	24,04
5. Multiple family households	19	20,00	31	29,81
5 and 4. Multiple, Extended family households	6	6,32	23	22,12
	95*		104	

* The shortfall of 9 households represents cases where two households have amalgamated since 1958 to form one household and these are omitted here as being too difficult to accommodate in this simplified table.

TABLE VI.

DICHATOMOUS CROSS-TABULATED CHANGES IN FAMILY
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE ACCORDING TO WHETHER THE
HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD CHANGED IN THE INTERVENING
PERIOD 1958 - 1972

S = Simple structure (elementary, fragmented elementary, solitary structure).

C = Complex structure (any structure showing extension to elementary core).

Direction of change in family household structure between 1958 - 1972.	All households %	No change in head of household %	Household head changed.			
			All changes %	M ↓ M %	M ↓ F %	F ↓ M %
S → S	17	24	8	4	15	14
S → C	46	46	45	52	31	43
C → S	9	6	13	11	8	29
C → C	28	24	34	33	46	14
N =	102*	54	47**	27	13	7

* 2 households omitted from total = 104.

** 1 case of female succeeding a female (S → C) not shown here.

TABLE VII.

COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF SIMPLE HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE
AT 1958 AND 1972 ACCORDING TO AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD
EXPRESSED IN PERCENTAGES.

Age of Head of Household in years	1958		1972	
	% in Cohort	Simple Structure	% in Cohort	Simple Structure
20 - 29	4	75	6	0
30 - 39	28	72	15	31
40 - 49	26	70	34	34
50 - 59	21	55	22	26
60+	21	36	23	8

n = 104

TABLE VIII.

COMPARATIVE GENEALOGICAL DEPTH AMONG FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS DURING
1958 AND 1972 MEASURED ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF GENERATION UNITS.

Number of Generation Units	1958	1972
	N	n
1	6	3
2	66	34
3	32	63
4	0	4
TOTAL	104	104

TABLE IX.

PERIODIC CROSS-TABULATION OF
GENEALOGICAL DEPTH IN FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS AT 1958 AND
1972 ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF GENERATION UNITS.

Number of Generation Units	1972				
	1958	1	2	3	4
1	0	3	3	0	6
2	1	26	37	2	66
3	2	5	23	2	32
n (1972)	3	34	63	4	104

NOTES

1. Miss R.C. Cross is a post-graduate student of the University of Michigan attached to the Department of African Studies at the University of Natal, who has conducted field studies among the Nyuswa during the past 3 years. I have had the benefit of her experiences in the field as well as a sight of draft manuscripts prepared for degree purposes.
2. It must be recognised that the period of change under discussion here is not the only period at which changes have occurred in the Valley. Throughout his book, Vilakazi describes changes in custom and institutions vis-a-vis the ideals of the traditional order which he attributes to Christianity in association with school education. At approximately the same time, in the fifties, Mbatha devotes much of his thesis to showing that the migrant labour system had subverted much of the traditional way of life.
3. Dr. Preston-Whyte notes that Mbatha (1960, pp. 71-72) recognised that allocations of land in the fifties were being made on a smaller scale than previously. By the end of the sixties Dr. Preston-Whyte states: '....at least half of the fields of recent immigrants in the area were less than a quarter of a hectare, and some less than an eighth in extent. The size of the fields cultivated by women of established imindeni are, furthermore, said to be smaller than in the past.'
4. The terms quoted in Prof. Krige's passage are attributed to Brookes, E.H. and Hurwitz, N. *The Native Reserves of Natal*, Natal Regional Survey, Vol. 7 (1957, p.72).
5. This movement refers, of course, to the trend toward types of conjugal family structure.
6. Vilakazi (1965, p.24) notes the tendency toward nucleation among Christian households in the fifties. Reader (1966, p.334), speaking of a comparable situation south of Durban at the beginning of the fifties, concludes: 'The family group has closed in to the resilient elementary family with a minimal number of extra dependents, economically active where possible.'
7. See for example Laslett (1972) who claims that the historical view in England of the large extended family prior to industrialization is largely mythical. Hsu (1943, pp. 555-562) shows that similar views of the large traditional Chinese families are false.
8. Consanguinity among urban Africans can be masked to some extent by detached settlement of family members in a town house - which, over time, no doubt forges new types of relationship between spouses and their children. However, despite regulations to the contrary, the elementary enlarged family is probably ubiquitous (or potentially ubiquitous) in Southern African towns (Stopforth: 1971, pp. 9-13); extended urban industrial families were not unknown in 19th Century England (Anderson: 1971, pp. 43-67). In a recent study of a newly-developed border industrial township between Durban and Pietermaritzburg the consanguinal definition of family obligation was manifest more strongly than is the case in most urban studies of the family (Stopforth: 1975, pp. 19-26).

9. Cross' data shows a differential in household size between church-attending Christians (mean size 9.1) and lapsed or nominal Christians (mean size 7.2). The mean for traditional households is much higher, at 11.6 persons.
10. The range among wards is from a mean of 6 persons to 10 persons: 4 of the 10 wards show a mean of 7 persons per kraal (homestead).
11. Only 20 husbands are absent, probably because December is a period when many migrants take their annual vacation and return home. These figures include all household members, not only conjugal kin.
12. As households are the units of the sample and in this case we are referring only to the units and not to elements that cluster in them, the confidence limits will be accurate to the extent that we are correct in our inferences from Kish concerning the randomness of a census. If we are correct then it is unnecessary to correct for cluster interference (see Cochran: 1963, pp. 64-67).
13. Laslett's term ideograph is used in preference to the more usual term genealogy because we reflected only presence (by our definition) at each date and not people on the basis of kinship relationships if they were without the household.
14. This separate exercise results in slightly different element totals which can be easily rationalized. The loss of one household, due to insufficient information, changes mean household size at 1972 from 8,89 to 8,88 persons. The 116 households from 1958 which constitute the remnant from which the 1972 sample is drawn are treated now as 104 households (amalgamations) with the consequence that the lower divisor yields a mean household size of 5,82 for the 1958 remnant as opposed to 5,25 (see Table II). Indirectly this does show how some increase to the 1972 sample occurred as well.
15. Note that lack of knowledge about these "withdrawn persons" might be held as a qualification to the notion that nuclear families have drastically declined since 1958 - if indeed many of them have founded independent families of their own. Our data is more static than the probable dynamics of the total migrant situation.
16. Thirty-one percent of all children born since 1958 appear to be illegitimate (as far as can be deduced from scrutiny of the raw data).
17. Our emphasis is on unit structure and not the dynamics of kinship. Laslett's table takes no account of polygamy. In the present case this account is of little consequence. Only one clear case of polygamous structure is evident at 1958 and 1972 (same family) and the two 'houses' have been treated as two separate households (husband common to both) at both dates. During the intervening 14 years the first house has changed from a simple household (3b) to a multiple household (5b), and the second from an extended (4a) to a simple household (3b) (see Table III).
18. But note that among the 155 households recorded at 1958 there were 25 female heads. Therefore 30 percent of households not included in the 1972 survey were headed by females, suggesting that mobility and female headship are associated in some way.

19. Regarding sex of changed head: when males succeed males there is a greater chance of complexity occurring; when females succeed males complexity is reinforced; and when males succeed females there is a greater likelihood of a simple structure ensuing.
20. This is ubiquitous in his book, but see especially Goode's (1963, p.374) concluding chapter: "...a common theoretical error is to treat 'urbanization' as a single variable, but to include in that variable almost all the social changes that are now going on. Since these are the changes that are taking place, one cannot treat them as causal variables."
21. Indeed it would be foolhardy to suggest an opposite view. For any number of reasons it is largely true that urban African family structure tends toward the conjugal model - two recent studies in border areas characterised by ad hoc urban-type settlement reveal limited family sizes; in Phalaborwa a weighted mean family size of 5,59 persons (Schlemmer and Stopforth: 1974, p.14) and for a sample of workers from a factory in Hammarisdale a weighted mean size of 6,07 persons (calculated from Stopforth: 1975, p.34).
22. Negative utility describes the method of accommodating new evidence within the limits of a predictive hypothesis - that is, hypotheses of the 'if', 'then' type. See Becker (1958, pp. 501-502) for an example of the use of negative utility.
23. It is anticipated that Cross' thesis, when presented, will provide much of the ethnographic information required to provide a fuller explanation of these phenomena.
24. New and imaginative approaches to conducting contemporary ethnography among non-rural people can be found in Valentine (1968).
25. There appears to be somewhat of a dearth of literature concerning Africans on 'white' farms.

S. 489

REFERENCES.

- Anderson, M. 1971 *Family Structure In Nineteenth Century Lancashire*. Cambridge, The University Press.
- Becker, H. 1958 Culture Case Study and Greek History. *ASR*. 23, 5, 489 - 504.
- Cochran, W.G. 1963 *Sampling Techniques*. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Fortes, M. 1962 Introduction, in Goody, J. (ed.) *The Developmental Cycle In Domestic Groups*. Cambridge, Cambridge Papers In Social Anthropology, No. 1; The University Press.
- Goode, W.J. 1963 *World Revolution and Family Patterns*. London, The Free Press, Collier-Macmillan LTD.
- Hobart Houghton, D. and Walton, E.M. 1952 *The Economy of A Native Reserve*. Keiskammahoeek Rural Survey, Vol.II. Pietermaritzburg, Shuter and Shooter.
- Hsu, F.L-K. 1943 The Myth of Chinese Family Size. *A.J.S.*, 48, 5, 555 - 562.
- Kish, L. 1965 *Survey Sampling*. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Krige, E.J. 1962 *Some Aspects Of The Impact Of The Valley Trust On The Nyuswa and Qadi Tribes Of The Valley Of A Thousand Hills*. Botha's Hill, The Valley Trust.
- Laslett, T.P.R. and Harrison, J. 1963 Clayworth and Cogenhoe, in Bell, H.E. and Ollard, R.L. (eds) *Historical essays 1600 - 1750 Presented to David Ogg*. London, Black.
- Laslett, T.P.R. 1965 *The World We have Lost*. London, Methuen.
- Laslett, P. (ed.) 1972 *Household and Family in Past Time*. Cambridge, The University Press.
- Manning, E.B., Mann, J.I., Sophangisa, E. and Truswell, A.S. 1974 Dietary Patterns In Urbanized Blacks. A Study In Guguletu, Cape Town, 1971. *South African Medical Journal*. 48, 12, 485 - 498.
- Mbatha, M.B. 1960 (Unpublished M.A.) *Migrant Labour And Its Effects On Tribal And Family Life Among The Nyuswa Of Botha's Hill*. Durban, Department of Bantu Studies (now African Studies), University of Natal.
- Moller, V. 1974 Some Aspects Of Mobility Patterns Of Urban Africans In Salisbury. Proceedings of the *Geographical Association of Rhodesia*. Number 7, 22 - 32.
- Preston-Whyte, E. 1974 *Ethnographic Oddity Or Ecological Sense? Nyuswa-Zulu Descent Groups And Land Allocation*. Paper read at a Kinship Seminar of the African Studies Institute. Johannesburg, University of the Witwatersrand.
- Preston-Whyte, E. 1974a) Kinship and Marriage, in Hammond-Tooke, W.D. (ed.) *The Bantu-Speaking Peoples Of Southern Africa*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Reader, D.H. 1966 *Zulu Tribe In Transition*. Manchester University Press.



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>