

PB 095273

Family structures in the RSA

Anna F Steyn

(Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology, RAU)



182522539F

Co-operative Research Programme on Marriage and Family Life
HSRC, Pretoria
1993, 1994



* P B 9 5 2 7 3 *

HG/MF 4

The Co-operative Research Programme on Marriage and Family Life is located in the Group: Social Dynamics of the HSRC. The emphasis in the programme is on the structures and dynamics of family life, the nature of family disorganization and family disintegration, and the nature of changes that occur with regard to family structures and family processes in society. In this report the focus is on family structures among the different population groups in the RSA.

The opinions that are reflected in this report are those of the author and should not necessarily be regarded as those of the Main Committee of the Co-operative Research Programme on Marriage and Family Life.

Co-operative Research Programme on Marriage and Family Life

Publication series: HG/MF-4

Series editor: Ina Snyman, HSRC

RGN BIBLIOTEEK	
1995 2. 07	
HSRC LIBRARY	
STANDKODE	AANWINSNOMMER
001.3072068	PB 055273
HSRC MF 4	

ISBN 0 7969 1655 1

© Human Sciences Research Council
Printed and published by the HSRC
134 Pretorius Street
Pretoria
0002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to René Roos (née Van Rensburg) who worked with precision and a great measure of patience through more than 7 000 schedules in order to help reveal the different family structures.

A further word of heartfelt thanks to Mrs E. Wolmarans who, despite a heavy workload, typed the manuscript and prepared it for printing.

For financial support also a word of thanks to the Co-operative Research Programme on Marriage and Family Life of the Human Sciences Research Council.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I FAMILY STRUCTURES IN THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LEVELS IN THE ANALYSIS OF FAMILY STRUCTURES	1
3. KINSHIP, FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD	3
4. THE NUCLEAR FAMILY AND THE EXTENDED FAMILY IN CROSS-CULTURAL CONTEXT	7
4.1 Characteristics of the extended family and of the nuclear family	7
4.2 Incidence of the extended family and the nuclear family in different societies	11
5. THE NUCLEAR FAMILY AS IDEAL FAMILY IN MODERN SOCIETY	13
5.1 Family structures in pre-industrial Western society	13
5.2 The fit between the nuclear family and the industrial system: The nuclear family as the ideal family	15
6. FAMILY STRUCTURES IN MODERN SOCIETY	16
CHAPTER II FAMILY STRUCTURES IN THE RSA: RESEARCH DESIGN	22
1. INTRODUCTION	22
2. FAMILY STRUCTURES IN SOUTH AFRICAN SOCIETY	23
3. AIM AND METHOD OF STUDY	25
3.1 The schedule	25
3.2 The sample and data gathering	27
4. PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE INVESTIGATION	29
CHAPTER III EMPIRICAL FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO FAMILY STRUCTURES IN THE RSA	30
1. INTRODUCTION	30
2. FAMILY STRUCTURES	34
2.1 Number of persons within the different household structures	45
2.2 Educational status and family structures	48
3. TYPES OF RESIDENT RELATIVES	53

	Page
4. MARITAL HISTORY OF THE MAN AND THE WOMAN	61
5. THE IDEAL FAMILY	69
CHAPTER IV OVERVIEW	73
1. INTRODUCTION	73
2. THE FAMILY IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT	74
3. RESEARCH RESULTS	75
4. THE IDEAL FAMILY	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDIX	85

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

TABLE 1	HOUSEHOLDS AND PEOPLE IN HOUSEHOLDS: [UK] 1981	19
---------	--	----

CHAPTER II

TABLE 1	PLANNED SAMPLE AND REALIZED SAMPLE	28
---------	------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER III

TABLE 1	EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MEN PER POPULATION GROUP	30
TABLE 2	EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMEN PER POPULATION GROUP	31
TABLE 3	OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF MEN PER POPULATION GROUP	32
TABLE 4	OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF WOMEN PER POPULATION GROUP	33
TABLE 5	FAMILY STRUCTURES IN THE RSA	38
TABLE 6	AGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD IN MAN-WOMAN STRUCTURES: AGE OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD	40
TABLE 7	MARITAL STATUS OF FAMILY HEAD IN MULTI-GENERATIONAL FAMILY TYPE	42

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

		Page
TABLE 8	HOUSEHOLDS WITH EXTRAMARITAL CHILDREN PER POPULATION GROUP	43
TABLE 9	HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURES PER POPULATION GROUP	45
TABLE 10	NUMBER OF PERSONS PER FAMILY STRUCTURE PER POPULATION GROUP	46
TABLE 11	PERCENTAGE OF FAMILY STRUCTURES AND PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS WITHIN STRUCTURES PER POPULATION GROUP	47
TABLE 12a	PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN: WHITES	49
TABLE 12b	PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES WITH FEMALE HEADS ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMAN: WHITES	49
TABLE 13a	PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN: COLOUREDS	50
TABLE 13b	PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMAN: COLOUREDS	50
TABLE 14a	PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN: ASIANS	51
TABLE 14b	PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMAN: ASIANS	51
TABLE 15a	PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN: BLACKS	52
TABLE 15b	PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMAN: BLACKS	52
TABLE 16	PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES PER POPULATION GROUP	54
TABLE 17	TYPES OF RESIDENT RELATIVES PER POPULATION GROUP	55
TABLE 18	DIRECTION OF KINSHIP WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES PER POPULATION GROUP (ALL HOUSEHOLDS)	57
TABLE 19	DIRECTION OF KINSHIP WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES	58

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

	Page	
TABLE 20	PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN PER POPULATION GROUP	58
TABLE 21	PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMAN PER POPULATION GROUP	59
TABLE 22	PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES ACCORDING TO OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF MAN PER POPULATION GROUP	60
TABLE 23	MARITAL HISTORY OF MAN PER POPULATION GROUP	63
TABLE 24	MANNER IN WHICH MAN'S MARRIAGE HAD BEEN DISSOLVED PER POPULATION GROUP	64
TABLE 25	MARITAL HISTORY OF WOMAN PER POPULATION GROUP	65
TABLE 26	MANNER IN WHICH WOMAN'S MARRIAGE HAD BEEN DISSOLVED PER POPULATION GROUP	67
TABLE 27	MARITAL HISTORY OF MARRIED COUPLES PER POPULATION GROUP	68
TABLE 28	RESPONDENTS' VIEW OF THE IDEAL FAMILY STRUCTURE	70
TABLE 29	WILLINGNESS OF FAMILY TO TAKE IN RELATIVES	71
TABLE 30	TYPES OF RELATIVES THAT WOULD BE TAKEN IN	71
IN APPENDIX		
TABLE 01	FAMILY STRUCTURE RSA 1988-1989	86 - 89
TABLE 02	TYPES OF RESIDENT RELATIVES	89 - 93
TABLE 03	MARITAL HISTORY OF MEN	93 - 95
TABLE 04	MARITAL HISTORY OF WOMEN	95 - 96
TABLE 05	HOUSEHOLD SIZE	97 - 98
INSTRUCTIONS		99 - 100

CHAPTER I:

FAMILY STRUCTURES IN THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

1. INTRODUCTION

A theme that has attracted the attention of family sociologists for a considerable time but especially during the last three decades, is the nature of the family structures generally occurring in societies. Under this overarching theme the focus is, amongst others, on the types of family structures that occur; the nature of the different societies in which the different types of family structure occur; the nature of family structures in Western Europe before the Industrial Revolution; and the particular nature of family structures in modern urbanized-industrial and post-industrial society. With regard to family structures in modern society, it is particularly the premise and assumption that the nuclear family – the man-woman-child family – is the basic family structure, that has elicited severe criticism and much debate.

When the arguments in this regard are thoroughly investigated, a great measure of confusion becomes evident. One reason for this is that researchers do not always make the necessary distinction between the different societal levels – institutional level and collective level – when analyzing family structures. Another reason for the confusion is that a variety of concepts still exist, such as "extended family", "family" and "household", which are often incomparable because the same concept is used for different phenomena, or different concepts are used for the same phenomenon. Despite this confusion much clarity has been achieved in the last two decades, with a concurrent increase in substantial and theoretical knowledge.

With a view to an analysis of the different family structures which occur in different societies, it is necessary to briefly attend to a few theoretical facets, and to clearly define certain concepts.

2. LEVELS IN THE ANALYSIS OF FAMILY STRUCTURES

In the analysis of societal structures it is important to take cognizance of the two levels at which such an analysis can be done, namely the *institutional* and the *collectivity* level. When the definitions and characteristics of an institution and of a group are considered, it is self-evident that certain facets that will be taken into account when analyzing a particular structure from the point of view of the institutional level will not function in an analysis of a structure from the point of view of the collective level, and that these different approaches will lead to different interpretations.

For example, an institution is defined as a normatively regulated behaviour pattern that is attuned to providing for particular needs and interests and that is of strategic importance to society. Institutions therefore direct human behaviour, and some of the most important features of an institution are, according to Berger and Berger (1972), that it is experienced as if it has an *external reality*, that it is relatively *constant* and therefore provides a measure of permanence, and that it can exert considerable *influence and control* over the behaviour of the individual. An institution is

however not absolutely deterministic with regard to the behaviour of the individual, because it only functions as a broad framework within which behaviour can be carried out, and through which a fair degree of flexibility and variation can be achieved. Although institutions can change in the course of time, the change occurs gradually so that a measure of constancy is retained (Buckley, 1967:145).

Unlike an institution a collectivity is defined as a plurality of persons that, within a given context, are involved in a normatively regulated, distinctive and relatively stable interaction pattern, where these persons are aware that they form a distinctive unit.

When analyzing a given structure such as the family at institutional level, the focus is on the broad generalized pattern which reflects the *ideal* of what the structure ought to look like. The focus is also on what is defined as appropriate and legitimate. For example, it is specified, among others, what ought to be the appropriate positions in the structure, the relative status of the positions with regard to one another and the nature of the relatedness between the positions.

In contrast to the analysis at institutional level which is more abstract and focuses on the ideal, the focus in the analysis at the collectivity level is on determining the structure of real groups consisting of specific persons in specific positions and roles as well as on the real status hierarchy which regulates the positions and the nature of the existing relations between these positions.

The ideal as reflected at institutional level does not necessarily correspond with reality as reflected in actual, existing groups. For instance, the composition of a group may differ in reality from the ideal structure, in that a particular position may not feature in it (for example, in a family context where a father is absent), or the status hierarchy or the relations between the different positions do not materialize in the manner reflected by the ideal.

By analyzing the real, existing structures it will therefore be possible to establish which variations occur in the positions, how these variations influence the relational patterns in the structures, and to what extent the actual structures correspond with the ideal pattern.

This distinction between the analyses at institutional and at collectivity level has been acknowledged for a considerable time by sociologists from different schools of thought. For example, already in the first half of the twentieth century Znaniecki (1952) differentiated between *ideational models of relation* and *realistic patterns of behaviour* and showed that the actual patterns of behaviour did not necessarily conform with the ideational patterns of attitude. Later this difference also featured in the structural-functional perspective of Parsons (1961) and the phenomenological perspective of Berger and Berger (1972).

The difference between analyses at the institutional and the collectivity level has also been highlighted by researchers with regard to family structures. For instance, Yorburg (1983:124) stated the following with regard to the extended family as the dominant family structure in early history: "Ideals and reality, however, have rarely coincided for the masses of human beings. While the extended family has been the cultural ideal of the majority of societies, it is very likely that the common people have lived throughout history predominantly in semi-extended units." Goode (1963:7) also pointed out that for family sociologists the concept of the nuclear family was technically an ideal type which might differ from real, existing families, and he stated: "As a concept, the conjugal family is also an *ideal* in that when analysts refer to its spread they mean that an increasing number of people view some of its characteristics as *proper* and legitimate, no matter how reality may run counter to the ideal."

An extensive part of the research on family structures has been done at institutional level where the ideal image of the family as representative of all families in society was utilized. For instance, it has been found that when the family was defined, it was done at an institutional level, in terms of the ideal family structure of a particular society. This poses the threat that the ideal family structure could be

accepted by policy makers as the only real and legitimate structure, and that provision for family structures that differ from the ideal structure might be inadequate; for instance in housing and welfare services. Sociologists such as Howe (1972) and Gittins (1985) did indeed increasingly emphasize that research should focus to a greater extent on an analysis of the structure and composition of families as they feature in reality at the collectivity level. Gittins (1985:2, 4), for instance, claimed the following: "Families are not only complex; but are also infinitely variable and in a constant state of flux as the individuals who composed them aged, died, married, reproduced and moved ... Thus it is essential to start thinking of *families* rather than the family."

Despite this view that families vary a great deal, Gittins (1985:156) concluded that there are indeed a number of characteristic ideas and phenomena common to all families. She puts it as follows: "Deconstructing the concept of family shows that inherent in it are a number of quite distinct ideas and phenomena. Co-residence; marriage; power relations between men and women; power relations between adults and children; domestic labour; sexuality and sexual relations; procreation; motherhood and mothering; fatherhood; sibling relationships; definitions of kinship; gender; authority, dependence, service; economic relations — all these can be seen as important and explicit in definitions of the family."

From this it is clear that Gittins also acknowledged the institutional level. She however referred to this level as the *ideology* of the family. This use of the term "ideology" can lead to confusion, since the concept of ideology as expounded in the literature clearly has a meaning that differs from that of the ideal normative behaviour pattern which points to an institution.¹

The dominant ideology in a society can indeed have implications for family life², but to regard a particular institution as an ideology is inappropriate.

The term "ideology" will therefore not be used henceforth in this analysis of family structures. Instead, the concepts "institutional level" and "collectivity level" will suffice.

3. KINSHIP, FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD

The phenomenon of kinship and family life revolves essentially around procreation, which includes the purely biological processes of mating, conception, pregnancy and birth, and thereafter the process of caring for and socializing the children until they can live autonomously and independently as adults.

As a result of the particular nature of the biological process of procreation, the mother and the child as well as the genitor and the child are directly bound to each other by ties of blood. These relationships are referred to as genealogical or so-called consanguinal relations. A consanguinal

-
1. "Ideology" refers to the socially determined system of evaluative and factual ideas in respect of human existence which are dogmatically accepted by a collectivity and which have the function of rationalizing activities, interests and ideas; integrating the collective, explaining and simplifying complex social phenomena, and forming a basis for social interaction. An ideology has certain important features: it is comprehensive, has a utopian tenor, and is explanatory and interpretive. It is also largely directive in respect of the masses, hence its explanatory, simplifying and persuasive nature. More specifically, ideology is directed at the masses to mobilize them for action. Furthermore, submission and subjection to the ideology in its totality is presented as a prerequisite for its adherents, and to the extent that the adherents accept and subject themselves to the ideology, they will also propagate it (Prinsloo, 1986).
 2. The ideology of apartheid, for instance, led to the development of a comprehensive system of migrant labour, which had a significant influence on the family structure of the urbanized black.

relationship is therefore attained when one person descends from another, as well as when two persons descend from a common ancestor.

Consanguinal relations can be very extensive, and logically speaking include all persons who are bound to one another by ties of blood through the process of procreation. Different degrees of consanguinal relationship can be calculated, depending on how far a person is removed from a particular ancestor. Consanguinal kinship can therefore be established to the first, second, third through to the n th degree.

Although the phenomenon of procreation and genealogical relatedness is essentially biological, it determines social relationships in all societies among persons who are bound by particular genealogical ties – to such an extent that when kinship is studied in the human sciences, reference is actually essentially made to the social relationship patterns that are based on biological relationships. These genealogically-based social relationship patterns have a special bearing on the transfer of particular rights to the child, among which the rights to position, possession and transfer of possession, and group membership and the transfer of group membership are of the most important.

This transfer of rights that is based on aspects of genealogical origin leads to the phenomenon of descendency, and large differences emerge in this regard between one society and another. Basically, three forms of descendency can be established, namely:

Patrilinear descendency where kinship is established through the paternal line and group membership is transferred through men to their children. The paternal line therefore only comprises the descendants of a man that have been procreated by him: his sons, his grandsons, his great-grandsons and so on.

Matrilinear descendency, in contrast, occurs where kinship is established through the maternal line and where the rights of group membership can only be transferred by the woman to her children. The maternal line therefore comprises all persons who were procreated by a woman, her daughters, her granddaughters, her great-granddaughters and so on.

In *bilateral descendency* group membership is awarded from the side of the man as well as the woman, but these groups encounter problems with organization. For instance, problems with residence can develop because the lines of the father as well as of the mother can lay claim to the descendants.

With regard to these forms of kinship Murdock (1949:15-16) strongly emphasized that descendency is basically the allocation of social position within a particular group of relatives on the basis of which certain services can be expected and certain duties are to be performed.

Although the principles of descendency determine which persons belong to a certain line and how residential units are formed, the persons in a residential unit are not all members of the same line of descent, because the man and the woman who form the procreation unit do not both descend from the same kinship group or line. In fact, the members of a residential unit who are related have to accommodate members of other groups as marriage partners.

In groupings which form residential units and in which households are established, the persons directly involved with the biological process of procreation, namely the man and the woman between whom mating and conception take place, as well as the offspring born from this union, play an important role. In the vast majority of societies there exists a socially approved relationship between the members of the procreation unit which is fairly permanent, is entered into by means of a set of rules and rites and is known as marriage; the procreation unit has to undertake certain tasks with a view to caring for and socializing its offspring; and the unit forms the basis of an important grouping that is established residentially in a particular locality. This important grouping is referred to as the

nuclear family, and most of the definitions of the family in sociological literature at the institutional level are based on the nuclear family of man-woman-child and on its central functions. One of the best known and most quoted definitions in this regard is that of Murdock (1947:1): "The family is a social group characterised by common residence, economic co-operation, and reproduction. It includes adults of both sexes, at least two of whom maintain a socially approved sexual relationship, and one or more children, own or adopted, of the sexually cohabiting adults." This definition elicited considerable criticism because all the positions and functions as well as further requirements, namely economic co-operation and co-residence as specified by Murdock, are not necessarily present in the family in all societies.

After a thorough analysis of families in society that do not comply with all the requirements as posed by Murdock, Reiss (1965:449) formulated a definition of the family in which all possible family structures can be included: "... a small kinship-structured group with the key function of nurturing socialization."

Reiss's definition was widely accepted. Moreover, Lee (1977:80) showed that no proof could as yet be found of any society in which this definition did not apply, and he stated in this regard: "For the moment, though, since we have no evidence to contradict it, it is reasonable to proceed under the premise that all societies have groups which are structured according to kinship, and which function for (at least) nurturant socialization of the newborn."

Lee (1977:80) further showed that these two requirements were only the minimum definitive characteristics of the family, and that family systems were generally more complex and diverse than was specified by Reiss's definition. Lee said in this regard: "The variation in family systems crossculturally is indeed considerable, and the process which determines the family structure in any given society is quite complex." A fair amount of research has therefore been done with regard to the variations in family structures between as well as in societies.

With regard to the analysis of the variations in family structures it is necessary to analyze and define a few more concepts in order to dispel any vagueness or confusion. The concepts which are relevant here, are *structure* and *household*.

Structure implies a number of positions (not a number of individuals) that occur in a group. In other words, the structure of a family refers to the different categories of individuals which constitute a family. The nuclear family has basically three positions, namely man/father, woman/mother and children (boys and girls) (Lee, 1977:83).³

Apart from the positions of the family, Lee (1977:112) also included the principle of co-residence in order to operationalize it for research purposes. He stated that a family is the group of co-resident relatives who form a household⁴, where the household points to all the persons who share a residential unit, among whom there is a measure of economic co-operation and mutual dependence, who share a common kitchen and have their meals together.

3. An analysis of family structure can include much more than only position. It can also include the relations between positions, particularly in terms of power and status. For the purposes of this study the positions as such are only taken into consideration in order to establish their basic composition in the family. If one or more positions such as grandfather or grandmother are added to this basic structure, the family structure changes, and it is no longer a nuclear family.

4. According to Lee this point of departure is to some extent also a pragmatic approach because the data on family structure contained in cross-cultural data banks — primarily in the Ethnographic Atlas — are presented according to these criteria.

Normally a household develops around the nuclear family, but a household can include more positions than those of the nuclear family. A household could therefore also include all other resident relatives and resident non-relatives who eat together at the same table, are economically interdependent, and are co-resident. It must be stressed here that co-residence is an essential factor in identifying this larger household — a fact that was emphasized by Laslett and Wall (1972:26) when they stated the following with regard to persons who shared a residence: "In the first place come the man, his woman and their socially recognized children. In the second place come all the other resident relatives ... that is all those connected by blood and marriage and living with the family. In the third place come all servants, those individuals who are now rare in modern society, but who were so common at all times up to those of our parents." Laslett and Wall further pointed out that visitors and lodgers could also be regarded as members of a household if they permanently resided with the family, made a contribution to the household and had their meals with the family. Among all the co-resident individuals there had to be a measure of economic co-operation and mutual dependence as well as a pattern of shared food preparation and food intake in order to qualify as a household. From the foregoing it is therefore clear that the co-residential family group always forms a household, but that a household is not necessarily identical to a family and that it could imply more positions — that of additional relatives — than the basic man-woman-child positions, through which the family structure could be altered.⁵

Laslett and Wall (1972:27) strongly emphasized that the list of positions that are relevant for the family structure should be delimited by the requirement of a co-resident household group, and that when this principle is applied, it is fairly clear who is included and who is excluded. In this regard they stated: "Children who have left home are not included; nor are kin and affines who live close by, even if they collaborate so closely in the productive work of the family that for economic purposes they form part of it, and may frequently or usually take their meals at the family table. Such classes conform to the second or third of our criteria, but are excluded because they do not conform to the first. They are regarded as associated with the household, some of them very closely, but the association falls short of membership."

There are however researchers such as Winch (1977) and Yorburg (1975) who wanted to base the delimitation of the family structure on considerations of economic interdependence, authority structure, daily contact and psychological interdependence, whether they coincided with the household co-resident group or not, but the tendency strengthened towards taking as a point of departure for the delimitation of the family structure the co-resident household group and in this manner to distinguish between the *family* and the *network of relatives* in which the family is embedded — which will be returned to later.

Although the foregoing guidelines for establishing who the members of the family and the household are, are fairly clear, problems may occur when deciding whether a particular person is indeed a member of the family and the household. Examples of this are cases where the member travels extensively in his or her work, or is absent for long periods because of military service, or where the father is a migrant worker and is absent from home for long stretches of time, or where children are at boarding school for a large part of the year (Gittins, 1985:61-62). One way to establish whether a particular person in these cases can truly be regarded as a member of the family and the household, is

5. A household can even include a number of persons who are not related in any way, but who share a housing unit.

to ascertain whether the other members of the family and the household define him/her as a member and see the residence as his/her basic home and indeed whether the person does the same, and whether the person actually makes a contribution to the internal dynamics of the family and the household. If so, such a person can be included as a member of the household.

With this qualification in mind, the nature of variations in family structures as they generally feature in and between societies can now be considered briefly.

4. THE NUCLEAR FAMILY AND THE EXTENDED FAMILY IN CROSS-CULTURAL CONTEXT

The fact that the family has been defined at a very high level of generality as a small kinship-structured group, with the additional specification of co-residence in order to form a local group, allows for looking at the different types of family structure at more specified intersocietal and intrasocietal levels.

When studying the literature it is clear that intersocietal — or so-called cross-cultural — analysis of family structures has mostly been done from the institutional point of view, whereas intrasocietal analysis has mostly been done at the concrete collectivity level.

In a cross-cultural analysis of the family the nuclear family is taken as the most basic family type. Murdock (1949) and Stephens (1963) were the first to make a systematic analysis of the way in which nuclear families combine with one another to form larger family groups or so-called compound families. The principles on which nuclear families affiliate with one another have a dual nature and are embodied in the so-called polygamous and extended families.

The *polygamous family* consists of two or more nuclear families who are affiliated to one another by concurrent marriages, through which one of the spouses becomes a member of more than one nuclear family.

The *extended family*, in contrast, stems from two or more families who are affiliated to one another through the extension of the parent-child relationship. For instance, in the patriarchal kinship system the sons with their wives and children could reside with the parents to form an extended family type in the paternal line. The most simple form of this extended family is the so-called tribal family, where only the eldest married son resides with the family of origin to form an extended family, while the other sons with their wives each form their own household to be transformed into a tribal family in the next generation (Lee, 1977:113).

In cross-cultural analyses of family structures the focus is mainly on the incidence of the extended family as compared with that of the nuclear family.

Because of the confusion in the literature about the specific nature of the extended family, it is essential that the true characteristics of the extended family be defined and that this family type is clearly distinguished from the nuclear family and the latter's relations with relatives.

4.1 Characteristics of the extended family and of the nuclear family

Although the *extended family* may be composed in various ways — for instance, from the tribal family through to the corporate extended family (see Blitsten, 1963:251) — and therefore does not necessarily have a uniform structure, extended families in traditional society have certain essential characteristics which substantially differ from those of the nuclear family. Zelditch (*in* Christensen, 1964:496), for instance, pointed out that the extended family, as it features in the broad context of the kinship system,

is basically subject to the authority of the descendency group and must comply with the following requirements with regard to economic activities:

- * The extended family must form a basic task unit in society.
- * The "estate" of the group must be the basic source of economic prosperity and status.
- * The "estate" must not be divisible.
- * The occupational differentiation of the task unit must essentially be a kinship differentiation. As far as the external world is concerned, the members of the group are associated with the same job.

From this it is clear that the solidarity of the extended family generally is strongly emphasized at the economic level. Apart from this economic solidarity the following are also essential characteristics of the extended family:

- * With regard to the position of the nuclear family within the extended family, it may be pointed out that whereas the extended family includes at least two and often more nuclear families, the nuclear family in this context does not exist as an independent autonomous unit. The individual nuclear family is embedded in the extended family and is subject to the control of the authority structure of the extended family. There is therefore hardly any "private" family life for the nuclear family, and the individual members of the nuclear family do not have sole charge of their personal affairs. An expression that is used in this regard is that the nuclear family is "encapsulated" in the extended family.
- * Where nuclear families are bound to one another by kinship, the extended family develops in a systematic manner, in that the relatives from a particular line affiliate with one another in a culturally prescribed fashion. This type of extended family therefore does not develop at random as is the case when relatives accidentally reside with a particular nuclear family.
- * The relations between the members of the nuclear family and the extended family are strongly prescriptive, and mutual aid and assistance are regarded as culturally compulsory. The primary emphasis is on the *relations among the relatives* and *not* on the relation between the spouses.

In contrast to the extended family the essential characteristics of the *nuclear family* are the following:

- * The nuclear family occupies a separate residence which is not shared with other relatives or the parents of the spouses. Where a surviving parent or another family member is taken in by the couple, it is the exception rather than the rule. There are also no principles which in themselves lead to the formation of co-resident systemic family groups that are larger than the nuclear family.
- * The nuclear family is economically independent of the wider kinship system, and for its economic maintenance it is in the first instance dependent on the income of the male head of the nuclear family or, where both the man and the woman have an occupation, the income of the couple — an income that is gained in modern society by work rendered in a structurally differentiated economic structure outside the family.
- * Primary loyalty is not between particular categories of relatives, but between the spouses, and between them and their dependent children, so that the nuclear family forms a primary unit through which solidarity with other relatives is minimized.
- * The nuclear family is autonomous, has full authority in its own sphere and insists on its privacy.

The aforementioned characteristics of the nuclear family, namely that the nuclear family has its own residential unit, that its first loyalty is towards members of the nuclear family, and that it forms an autonomous self-regulating unit, definitely do not imply that there is an absence of contact with a diffuse network of relatives. Research in this regard (see Sussman & Burchinal, 1966) showed that

there is contact with relatives, and that there is a large measure of mutual support in the form of, for instance, financial assistance, child-care, shopping, looking out for new job opportunities, care of aged and ill persons, and assistance at formal occasions such as weddings and burials. Some of this contact is also purely social, for instance visiting and shared recreation. Litwak (1959; 1960a & 1960b) referred to the nuclear family together with the group of relatives with whom it maintains contact and reciprocal relationships of support and assistance as the *modified extended family*.

In this regard Yorburg (1975) made a more detailed classification and distinguished between the *modified extended* family, where the nuclear family lives independently but remains deeply involved with the kinship network, and the *modified nuclear* family where the nuclear family lives in its own home and the ties with the kinship network mainly entail fellowship and assistance on occasion or during crises. Her scheme of the different types of family structures is presented on the next page (A typology of family structures).

Although there are various degrees of influence through the kinship network in the decision making of the nuclear family within both the modified extended family and the modified nuclear family, the nuclear family still maintains autonomy in both these family structures.

When one compares the nature of the relations among the group of relatives in the extended family with the nature of the relations between the autonomous nuclear family and its network of relatives, a serious question arises as to whether the concept *modified extended family* is truly applicable.

For example, the pattern of relations between the nuclear family and the broader kinship network is not prescriptive or compulsory, does not imply culturally binding norms and does not oblige the kinship group to undertake legal or corporate responsibilities for the duties, rights or transgressions of its constituent members, as is the case with the extended family. The pattern of relations between the nuclear family and the broader kinship system rests on free choice based on own interest, affection and sentiment, with concomitant expectations of reciprocation.

Sussman (*in* Hill & König, 1970:485) showed in this regard that not all families are equally strongly affiliated with a network of relatives, and that families can be placed on a continuum which extends from isolation from relatives to full integration with a wider kinship group. The degree to which the nuclear family affiliates with the kinship network depends, according to Sussman, on two principles, namely the opportunities for affiliation, and the rewards to be gained from affiliation and from the maintenance of the relationship. The kinship network only creates an *opportunity structure*. This can be utilized by the nuclear family; and the degree to which it is utilized depends on the degree to which the nuclear family *can maximize the payoffs of the reward system*.

A TYPOLOGY OF FAMILY STRUCTURES*

EXTENDED	MODIFIED EXTENDED	MODIFIED NUCLEAR	NUCLEAR
<p>Complete economic interdependence of kin network – common ownership of economic resources, occupational co-operation, daily exchange of goods and services.</p>	<p>Independent economic resources in nuclear family units, but daily exchange of goods and services.</p>	<p>Largely self-sufficient economically, recreation and friendship ties, occasional help in emergencies.</p>	<p>Completely self-sufficient, economically no help.</p>
<p>Psychological interdependence – socialization, emotional support, protection – almost completely confined to kin network.</p>	<p>Strong kin network, psychological interdependence, but more reliance on non-kin for socialization, emotional support, protection.</p>	<p>Weak kin network role in socialization, emotional support, protection.</p>	<p>Nuclear family, friends, experts, distant models, exclusive agents of socialization, emotional support, protection.</p>
<p>Arbitrary, linear, intergenerational authority.</p>	<p>Nuclear family autonomy, but strong kin network influence in decision making, resolving conflicts.</p>	<p>Nuclear family autonomy, weak kin network influence.</p>	<p>Complete nuclear family autonomy, kin network influence absent.</p>
<p>Daily contact, geographic proximity.</p>	<p>Daily contact, geographic proximity.</p>	<p>Regular but not daily contact, kin network within easy visiting distance.</p>	<p>Minimal contact, geographic isolation, visits on holidays or for family rituals, contact primarily by letter or telephone in literate societies.</p>

* Yorburg, 1975:6

In view of this profound difference between the nature of the relations among the members of the extended family on the one hand, and the autonomous nuclear family's relations with relatives on the other hand, it is preferable, in the case of the autonomous nuclear family, to speak of the *kinship network* or *kinship support network* rather than of the modified extended family. In the case of the

kinship support network there is no real co-residential group as is the case in the extended family and the nuclear family. The term "kinship support network" will therefore prevent confusion, and also gives a more appropriate description of the nature of the affiliation with relatives than would be the case if the term "modified extended family" were used. The latter term could however be used where additional relatives reside with the family and form part of the household but do not comply with all the already mentioned requirements of the extended family.⁶ In view of the particular nature of support networks, and the way in which they differ from the extended and the modified extended family, an analysis of these networks, although important, will not form part of the analysis of family structures in this report.

In summary it can be stated that the essential difference between the extended and the nuclear family includes the following:

- * Emphasis on loyalty: kinship relations in contrast to marriage relations.
- * Autonomy: nuclear families embedded in larger households in contrast to autonomous nuclear families.
- * Household: larger households in contrast to independent households.

With this difference between the extended family and the nuclear family in mind, the focus can now be directed at the way in which these family types present themselves in different societies.

4.2 Incidence of the extended family and the nuclear family in different societies

A considerable amount of research has already been done on the distribution of the extended and the nuclear family in different societies. In this research family structure was taken as the dependent variable and societal complexity as well as the degree of structural differentiation and the type of economy were taken as the independent variables. Important research in this regard was done by, amongst others, Nimkoff and Middleton (1960), Goode (1963), Blumberg and Winch (1972) and Lee (1977; 1979).

By utilizing Murdock's *World Ethnographic Sample* of 549 societies, Nimkoff and Middleton (1960) pointed out that family structure is related to the type of economy found in self-sustaining economies and that these vary theoretically from low to high productivity and stability. This relation implies that the more unproductive the self-sustaining economy (e.g. pure and mixed hunting and gathering societies), the better the chance that the family structure will be the independent (nuclear) family, whereas the chance of the extended family occurring is better where the self-sustaining economy is more productive and stable, as is the case in agriculture and cattle farming. Family structure is therefore a function of the food resources and spatial mobility in a society. Here we have a positive association between complexity of family structure and societal complexity.

On the surface it appears as if these findings are contrary to Goode's (1963) findings that are often interpreted to the effect that there is an inverse relationship between societal complexity and the complexity of family structures. Goode, for example, showed that the family structure towards which all societies in the overall modern industrialized and structurally differentiated society tend to develop,

6. Lee (1977:113) indicated in this regard that any family that had more than the three basic positions of man, woman and child, was known as an extended family.

is the nuclear (conjugal) family. He stated in this regard: "For the first time in world history a common set of influences — the social forces of industrialization and urbanization — is affecting every known society. Even traditional family systems in such widely separate and diverse societies as Papua, Manus, China and Yugoslavia are reported to be changing as a result of these forces ... The alteration seems to be in the direction of some type of *conjugal* family pattern — that is, toward fewer kinship ties with distant relatives and a greater emphasis on the 'nuclear' family unit of couple and children."

Further research in this regard by, amongst others, Lee (1979) Winch (1977) and Blumberg and Winch (1972) showed that the research of Nimkoff and Middleton on the one hand, and that of Goode on the other hand, are complementary rather than contradictory. Both studies indicated that the extended family system is most likely to occur in established agricultural and cattle-farming societies, in contrast to other types of economies in which it occurs less often. These studies drew the same conclusion from opposite points of departure. Nimkoff and Middleton indicated the existence of the nuclear family in societies where an agricultural economy had not yet developed, while Goode indicated that the nuclear family occurred more often in societies where the economic system had developed much further than the agricultural stage and in the direction of an industrial economy.

From this information it would appear that the relation between societal complexity and the complexity of family structure is curvilinear — a presupposition that has been confirmed by Lee (1977) and Winch (1977). Lee (1977:147) stated in this regard: "Although most 'modern' industrial nations are characterized by the conjugal family, family structure is not simply an inverse linear function of 'modernization'. There is, rather, a more intricate and theoretically meaningful association between family structure and societal complexity or differentiation; industrialization is simply one value of the latter variable."

In order to establish the exact nature of the association between family type and societal structure, and in order to shed light on these apparently contradictory findings of Nimkoff and Middleton on the one hand, and Goode on the other, Winch (1977:81) launched a very comprehensive research project. For societal complexity he utilized two indices, namely technology which included self-sustaining economy and intensity of agriculture, and organizational level which included average community size, permanence of settlement, stratification and political complexity as measured by the number of levels in the jurisdictional hierarchy outside the community. In his findings he indicated that the family structure in simple societies mostly comprises the independent or so-called nuclear family, that there is development in the direction of the extended family where societal complexity increases and extensive and intensive agriculture starts to develop, but with a further increase in societal complexity there is again a movement towards the nuclear family. In summary Winch stated the following: "Our findings agree with those of Nimkoff and Middleton in that the linear or monotonic trend over simpler societies of the Ethnographic Atlas is for the more complex to have the larger familial systems. Our data also agree with Goode in that there is a tendency for the more developed countries to have smaller familial systems. Our data reconcile the two findings by showing that there is a point of inflection, with the maximum proportion of large familial systems occurring among societies with extensive or intensive agriculture without irrigation, in societies whose largest towns are in the range 2 000 — 5 000, that have a system of hereditary aristocracy, and one or two levels of political hierarchy beyond the local community."

5. THE NUCLEAR FAMILY AS IDEAL FAMILY IN MODERN SOCIETY

In the broader context of cross-cultural analysis of family structures the work of Goode (1963) is a milestone. In this work he showed that the extended family began to disintegrate during the Industrial Revolution and the concurrent process of urbanization, together with the increasing prominence and growing independence of the nuclear family. Other researchers such as Neidhardt (1966) and Kooy (1970) found the same trends with regard to family life in Western Europe. In fact, as early as 1955 Parsons and Bales referred to these changes which the pre-industrial family became subjected to during the Industrial Revolution, as the structural isolation of the nuclear family. At institutional level there was thus an increasing tendency to see the nuclear family as the ideal family system in the urban-industrialized society – a fact that is clearly reflected in textbooks and research reports dealing with the modern family.

In due course this point of view elicited criticism, and stimulated further research on family structures in Western society. The following assumptions regarding the development of the nuclear family came under the spotlight and led to further research:

- * In Western civilization the extended family was commonly found before the Industrial Revolution, but the nuclear family itself became structurally isolated and consequently independent as a result of the Industrial Revolution (Parsons & Bales, 1955).
- * There was a good "fit" (Goode, 1963) between the nuclear family and industrial society, in the sense that the nuclear family best provided for certain needs of modern industrial society. Consequently the nuclear family came to be regarded as the ideal family structure in Western society. Moreover, some of its characteristics came to be regarded as universally applicable and legitimate, despite the small correspondence between reality and the ideal.

5.1 Family structures in pre-industrial Western society

Various socio-historical researchers gave extensive attention to the nature of family structures in a number of Western countries before the Industrial Revolution.

Furstenberg (1966:337), for instance, indicated with regard to American society that the extended family very seldom occurred in the United States of America before the Industrial Revolution, whereas Laslett (*in* Gordon, 1973:21) indicated that the extended family seldom occurred in pre-industrial England. In this regard Laslett stated: "All evidence went to show that the extended household was uncommon, indeed quite rare in the pre-industrial England of this era. Some three-generational households existed, just about the same number as in the England of the 1960s, but neither vertical nor lateral extension was at all frequent. Parents did not live with their married children, nor bachelors or spinsters with their married brothers or sisters, all that much more often than they do today." Independently of these findings about pre-industrial England, Laslett and Wall (1972) drew the same conclusions with regard to family structure in pre-industrial France, Holland, Italy, Japan and the United States of America.

Gittins (1985:15-16) shed further light on the family structure found in pre-industrial England and pointed out that apart from the nuclear family there existed many other types of family structures. For example, as a result of high mortality, single-parent families occurred, or orphans were taken in and cared for by relatives. Moreover, high mortality led to the remarriage of surviving spouses, which resulted in the reconstituted family not being an uncommon phenomenon even then. Furthermore, the household often not only consisted of members of the nuclear family, but included servants or

apprentices who were usually treated as members of the family. Integrating such additional members into the family considerably altered the structure of the household.

On the basis of this information the question arises whether a movement really occurred away from the extended family towards the independent nuclear family. In answering the question Berkner (*in* Gordon, 1973), in his analysis of the eighteenth century farming community of Waldviertel in Lower-Austria, contended that the inference that the extended family did not feature in pre-industrial times was to some degree incorrect. Berkner did not assert that Laslett's findings were incorrect, but rather that his interpretation was an overgeneralization and that Laslett and his co-worker failed to take certain important variables into account in their analyses. The most important variables in this regard are the life cycle of the extended family and the life-span of the population. In the area Berkner investigated, the dominant family form was, as in Ireland, the stem family, where one son inherited the land and the other sons received their heritage in some other form of compensation. In terms of life cycle the extended family is a phase through which most families go. When the young couple marry, they start out as members of the extended family. In the course of time the parents die, and the couple pass their mid-life in the nuclear family until one of their sons marries, bringing his young wife into the household and re-establishing the extended family. This means that at a given time the majority of families were nuclear families within a stem family system. Gittins (1985:10) furthermore pointed out that adult mortality was high in the pre-industrial era, and that children seldom knew their grandparents for a long time. Surviving grandparents lived in the household of their married children, resulting in an extended family in the true sense of the word. Lee (1977:129) also emphasized in this regard that although the nuclear family had a wide distribution, the dominant family system was the stem family.⁷

Lee (1977:129) pointed out furthermore that, as a result of the effect of the life cycle, life expectation, age at marriage and other demographic variables, not more than 30% of the families could have had three generations at a given time. He nevertheless stated in this regard: "But this does not mean that the family *system* is not extended just as a low statistical frequency of polygamous marriages in a society does not mean that the marital system is monogamous."

Research data in the era before the Industrial Revolution also generally indicated that the extended family mainly occurred in the agricultural sector. In this regard Berkner (*in* Gordon, 1973) pointed out that because Laslett had failed to control for life cycle and drew his sample mainly from urban areas, it is not surprising that he found such a small percentage of extended families in his sample. The existence of the extended family *system* in pre-industrial Europe can therefore not be overlooked.

However, Lee (1977:130) pointed out that although the extended family did occur in pre-industrial Europe, it did not occur as extensively as was the case with the omnipresent extended family in traditional China. The dominance of the stem and the nuclear families in Western Europe before the Industrial Revolution nevertheless rendered the early acceptance of the industrial economy in Western Europe possible (Lee 1977).

However, a word of caution in this regard came from Goode (1963:10, 17). According to him it is uncertain whether the existence of the nuclear family facilitated the acceptance of the industrial economy or whether the industrial economy led to the development of the nuclear family. Goode indeed warned that a causal association should not be assumed in this regard, in other words that the

7. Lee (1977:149) pointed out in this regard that the tribal family was commonly found in rural Europe, as was evident from the work of Sweetser (1964) on Finland, Drake (1969) on Norway and Winch and Greer (1968) on the USA.

Industrial Revolution paved the way for the nuclear family. He pointed out, for instance, that the ideal of the nuclear family could have been absorbed into a society before the material conditions for its existence were present, and that the ideal could therefore have prepared individuals for adapting to the demands of the new society.

5.2 The fit between the nuclear family and the industrial system: The nuclear family as the ideal family

In finding that the nuclear family had a wide distribution in industrial-urbanized society, Goode (1963:11-12) showed that there was a remarkable degree of fit between the nuclear family and industrial society in that the nuclear family could meet certain central needs of the industrial society. In essence he showed that, since industrial society is achievement orientated, geographic and social mobility is imperative. Basically, the nuclear family allows for this geographic and social mobility, and it lends itself to the achievement orientation of the individual.

In this regard there have however been several researchers who pointed out that the extended family was also functional in facilitating industrialism. Laslett (*in* Gordon 1973:23) indicated, for example, that there was an increasing tendency towards family extension among families in England during the peak of the Industrial Revolution. One interpretation in this regard is that these extended families facilitated industrialization since the extended family served as a channel of transition to the city and to finding work — a point of view that was supported by Litwak (1959:180) when he showed that the extended family can serve as a positive support for geographic as well as occupational mobility, and can therefore be functional in an industrial society.

Further research in this regard however showed that this extension of the family in the process of urbanization is temporary and that once the relatives have settled in the city, they establish their own independent households, thereby promoting the phenomenon of the nuclear family (Gordon, 1973:54).

Apart from the fact that the extended family can serve relatives as a channel of transition to the city, there has also been research that indicated that the extended family could be functional in the development of the industrial system since there is sufficient capital in the extended family to start an enterprise. An example is the *Dozoku* family in Japan. Yamane and Nonoyama (1967) pointed out that the *Dozokus* played an important role in industrializing Japan. The authors (1967:789) stated in this regard: "Therefore, it is possible that industrialization takes advantage of the *Dozoku* group in terms of land, capital, and organization. In these aspects the group tends to be functional for industrialization. The '*Dozoku* company' shows that the groups have played a part in the development of industrialization in Japan."

Yamane and Nonoyama however pointed out further that industrialization was non-functional for the *Dozoku* group, and that they disintegrated as a result of industrialization. This is especially as a result of the profound difference between the nature of interpersonal relations in industrial enterprises and the nature of interpersonal relations in the extended family. According to the authors, the disintegration of this group led to the nuclear family crystallizing as the basic family type also in Japan.

Despite authors who indicated that the extended family could be functional in the process of industrialization, the vast majority of the research indicated that the family structure with the highest frequency in industrial-urban society is the nuclear family, and that this family type is seen as the ideal family in post-industrial society (see Levy, 1966; Goode, 1963; Lee, 1977). As Lee (1977:145) put it: "As we know, industrialized societies are almost uniformly characterized by the conjugal family system as the ideal."

6. FAMILY STRUCTURES IN MODERN SOCIETY

Although the nuclear family is regarded as the ideal family in modern Western society, and Goode (1963) emphasized the fit between the nuclear family and industrial society, it does not mean that this fit is seen as unproblematic. Goode indicated, for example, that although the nuclear family is functional for the industrial system, the manner in which the nuclear family fits into the industrial system can lead to the development of a number of stressors which can render the nuclear family extremely vulnerable. The most important stressors in this regard are:

- * The nuclear family, which is characterized by autonomy and privacy, is structurally in an unsupported position in cases where spouses develop marital problems and this lack of support renders the nuclear family more vulnerable.
- * In contrast to pre-industrial families, among whom work and family life were integrated and the differentiation of labour roles reflected family duties, labour roles and family roles in the nuclear family became separated as a result of the Industrial Revolution, and this has gradually led to a profound change in family roles and an increase in stressors. For instance, the emancipation of the women and their re-entry into the labour market led to a change in traditional role differentiation. Among others, more role alternatives developed for the woman, the prescriptive nature of role differentiation decreased and personal satisfaction in fulfilling marriage and family roles was increasingly emphasized. These changes also affected the role of the man. He started helping with domestic tasks that were traditionally ascribed to the woman, although the ultimate responsibility was still vested in the woman. However this gradually changed to an emphasis on the exchangeability of roles and the responsibility of the man *and* the woman in this regard — thus a change towards the symmetrical family.

Although the roles of the man and the woman have already undergone considerable change, the process has not run its full course. Clearly defined and stable roles have not yet evolved, especially in cases where the woman is economically active outside the home. Consequently role uncertainty increases in these cases in that, on the one hand, the role of the woman fluctuates between several roles and, on the other hand, it is required of the man to incorporate into his role additional family tasks that were traditionally not ascribed to him. In this situation of constant change there may not be agreement on the way in which the man and the woman define each other's roles, and that one or both may be reluctant to develop a unique pattern for their marriage and family life through interaction by way of negotiation and informal agreement. Where the success of the marriage increasingly depends on the skill and maturity of the couple to develop a mutually satisfactory role pattern that will lead to personal development and emotional satisfaction, the inability to successfully handle a situation of role uncertainty will lead to an escalation of interrole conflict, which might constrain the marriage and render marriage and family life more vulnerable.

- * Furthermore, the emancipation of the woman and her increasing participation in occupational labour has led to the gradual erosion of the legitimacy of the traditional authority pattern in which the man was in the dominant position. Although research has mostly shown that the man retained most of the authority in the family, the woman has gained considerable authority, and today there is greater movement in the family towards a more democratic pattern. This increase in the woman's authority within the family can lead to a power struggle between her and the man that may result in an escalation of conflict, rendering the family even more vulnerable.
- * In contrast to the formal labour sphere where the relations are universalistic, specific, individualistic and affectively neutral, the relations in the family are more particular, diffuse,

collectively orientated and affective, the family being virtually the only structure where relations have a strong emotional dimension, and where emotional release and recovery can take place. The modern nuclear family is therefore characterized by intense emotionality which, although it can be very rewarding, can also be dysfunctional, as extremely high expectations are set with regard to these relations and any disappointment in this respect may be experienced as exceptionally intense and disillusioning. Moreover, external stress is also transferred to the family, which may ultimately have a negative impact on family relations. This intense emotionality and the excessive demands imposed on the marriage relationship with regard to the absorption of stress and tension generated, for example, in the work situation, therefore contribute to the vulnerability of the marriage and family life.

Overall, therefore, the strains that are unique to nuclear families in a structurally differentiated society render them extremely vulnerable – a vulnerability that results in a variety of phenomena.

There has for instance been an increase in extramarital births (Steyn *et al.*, 1987:170) which, together with the trend among mothers to keep the baby, has led to an increase in single-parent families.

There has also been an increase in divorce – the divorce figure for whites in South Africa, for instance, increased to a high 16,5 per thousand married couples in 1981 – and in the decade 1978-1987 altogether 164 483 marriages were dissolved, involving 200 098 dependent children. This increase in divorce has further boosted the increase in single-parent families.

If it is further taken into account that a great many of the persons who divorce or whose spouse is deceased, marry again – for instance, divorced persons were involved in 36,8% of the marriages that were contracted among whites in the RSA in 1985 (Central Statistical Service, 1988) – another family structure emerges, namely the reconstituted family which has implications for family dynamics.

Another factor that may contribute to structural change in the ideal nuclear family in modern society – in fact towards a more extended family – is the fact that relatives or lodgers or a combination of relatives and lodgers may reside with the nuclear family and become part of the household.

It is therefore clear that, although the nuclear family may be the ideal family system, a variety of other family structures have also developed in Western society. Because of these other family structures occurring concurrently, and also because the nuclear family changes structurally and compositionally during its life cycle, there has been an intensification of the call on the researcher to concentrate on the need collectivity level in order to determine the nature and extent of existing family structures in society.

There has indeed been a growing tide of research to establish the nature of family structures and alternative family forms in modern society, and at the same time a start has been made to analyze the dynamics and the problems characteristic of these family structures. With regard to the incidence, problems and dynamics of these other types of family structure, such as the single-parent family, the reconstituted family and the extended family, research has shown that ethnicity and social stratification impact strongly as independent variables and that the incidence of these family structures vary according to class and ethnicity (see, for instance, Sussman & Steinmetz, 1988, chapters 12-16; Zinn & Eitzen, 1987; Macklin & Ruben, 1983).

Another interesting development in this regard is that, whereas at the institutional level the family has been dealt with as a dependent variable, in research at the collectivity level family structure is increasingly used as an independent variable, while the influence of family structure on a variety of

variables such as stress (McLanahan, 1983) and child care (Floge, 1989) — to name but a few — is also being investigated.

If the nature of the research that has been undertaken is examined it is clear that it is a field of study that is increasingly being attended to by researchers, and that there has been a fairly rapid increase in knowledge and understanding in this regard. There is, for instance, already a fair amount of information available on the nature of the different family structures, the influence of family structure on the relationships among members of the family and on the development and functioning of individual members, as well as on the strengths of the different family structures.

Research has however not yet brought clarity to the following aspects: the extent and incidence of these alternative family structures in society in general; whether these alternative structures have increased to such an extent that the legitimacy of the nuclear family as the ideal family structure in Western society has lost ground; and whether some of these alternative structures have come to be regarded as appropriate for replacing the nuclear family.

There is a great diversity of points of view in this regard. There are, for instance, sociologists who, on account of the stressors in the contemporary nuclear family and the consequent increase in family disintegration and the development of alternative structures, are alarmed at the way in which the family as an institution is being phased out.

This alarmist point of view is strongly supported by radical sociologists, because they are of the opinion that the nuclear family is the source of many problems and unhappiness in society. Radical feminists, for instance, contend that the locus of women and children's suppression centres in the patriarchal family (Gittins, 1985:1). Cooper (1973) even proclaimed that the family is a trap — an ideologically conditioning instrument of an exploitative society, and based on this he announced the end of the era of relatives and the death of the nuclear family.

This school of thought about the nuclear family being outmoded was *inter alia* discussed in an article by Etzioni (1977): "The family: Is it obsolete?" In this article he showed that the persons who supported this school of thought based their support on empirical data and trends in family life, such as increasing permissiveness, illegitimacy and the rising divorce rate. Berger and Berger (1983:85-86) summarized this school of thought very well: "There is also ... the point of view ... that changes in the overall society have revealed the outmoded character of the family. Supposedly the family as it is now constituted will not be able to deal with this situation and will either disappear or have to be radically refashioned. And this is supposed to be a good thing, because of the allegedly harmful, pathogenic effects of the family in its peculiar 'nuclear' form. Here too, there is the idea that the family is in decline ... The decline of this supposedly harmful institution is cheerfully applauded."

This extremely negative view of the modern nuclear family is however not supported by all persons in the field of family studies, and there are also those — according to Berger and Berger (1983) the vast majority — who, despite the problems facing the nuclear family, have a more positive approach with regard to the nuclear family; and they too base their assumptions and presuppositions on particular empirical research results which show the continued existence of the family and the importance of the family for the individual.

In this regard Berger and Berger (1983:163-164) quoted a fair amount of research that emphasized the continued importance of the marriage relationship and illustrated the strength of family ties. They showed, for instance, that 92% of adult Americans regarded the family as their most important asset; 83% emphasized their traditional family ties; 33% pointed out that they put a greater premium on family solidarity than their parents had done; and 78% showed that they regarded their family as the most significant part of their life. Various other authors such as Cox (1981:5) and Wells (1983:298)

quoted other research that supports this belief in the importance of the continued existence of marriage and the nuclear family. Wells stated for instance in this regard: "This assertion is not meant to minimize the extent of recent changes but to imply that the American people have been showing a great degree of resilience in coping with pressures that affect their family life and are likely to continue to do so." This emphasis on marriage and the family does not mean that Americans are intolerant with regard to alternative life styles and family structures; in fact research showed that there is a great measure of tolerance in this regard. Berger and Berger however pointed out that their tolerance with regard to deviant patterns neither means that Americans prefer the deviant patterns nor that these patterns have changed American conformity to conventional patterns.

It is not only in the United States of America where research findings confirmed the continued existence of the nuclear family; also in Great Britain research strongly indicated that the nuclear family is the family structure in which the greatest proportion of people find their home.

Chester (1985:185), for instance, analyzed the proportional distribution of household structures in Great Britain in 1981 together with the proportional distribution of persons in the different household structures. His results are as follows:

TABLE 1: HOUSEHOLDS AND PEOPLE IN HOUSEHOLDS: [UK] 1981*

Type of household	% of households	% of people
One person	22	8
Married couple	26	20
Married couple with dependent children	32	49
Married couple with independent children	8	10
Lone parent with dependent children	4	5
Other	9	8

* Chester (1985:185)

In his analysis Chester focused on the fact that if one looks only at the proportional distribution of households, it appears that although the nuclear family (parents and dependent children) is still the family structure that occurs most often, it constitutes less than a third of the total number of families, namely only 32%, suggesting that the nuclear family is only one structure among a variety of family structures.

When the number of persons within the different household structures is however considered, the picture changes markedly and it becomes clear that just less than half (49%) of the people in Great Britain in 1981 lived in the nuclear family (parents and dependent children) — a fact that gave the nuclear family greater proportional representation than would have been the case if only the family structures as such had been taken into consideration. If the life cycle of the family is also taken into

account, it can be pointed out that a further number of household structures could be nuclear families at a given point in time. The fact that a particular family structure at a given moment does not form a nuclear family, does not mean that it was not the case at an earlier stage, or could not be the case at a later stage. For instance, married couples with *independent* children, at some earlier stage had dependent children and were therefore nuclear families at the time. Furthermore, some of the households that consist of only a married couple may develop into nuclear families in the course of time (through the birth of children) — it depends only on the phase in the family life cycle a couple finds itself in. If the above-mentioned household structures are added to the nuclear family, 66% of the household structures could indeed at a given point in time be nuclear families, involving 79% of the population (of Great Britain).

A cross-sectional analysis of the household structures at a given point in time can therefore be misleading. Even in the event of a universal occurrence of marriage and parenthood, and an absence of divorce or early death or illegitimacy, there will be households that are not nuclear families because the married couple with children is only a developmental phase in the life cycle of the family. Nevertheless the nuclear family is regarded as "normal" and the vast majority of people experience it at some stage in their lifetime. Fluidity in family structure over time therefore does not detract from the fact that a particular family structure is defined and accepted as the legitimate family system, as Lee (1977) pointed out with regard to the extended family before the Industrial Revolution in Western Europe.⁸

Apart from the foregoing analysis, Chester (1985:188) also analyzed the occurrence of other family structures such as the single-parent family resulting from divorce, the reconstituted family and cohabitation, and showed that these family structures constitute relatively small proportions of the population who live within families. He then came to the following conclusion: "Altogether it is clear that there have been many changes in family behaviour in Britain: later marriage, greater susceptibility to divorce, a greater tendency for wives to work, and cohabitation as a temporary and childless phase in relationships between couples. But there is a very strong framework of continuity. The family based on a married couple living with their children, and committed to a permanent relationship, is still the norm. On the evidence, most people will continue not only to spend most of their lives in a family environment, but also to place a high value on it.

"To say this is not to ignore the diversity of styles among families of conventional form, or the problematical aspects of family life. Still less is it to discount the existence of other domestic forms (like the single parent family), which may not yet be sufficiently acknowledged and regarded. It is important, nevertheless, to remember that these are minorities, which for various reasons excite attention disproportionate to their number.

"Discontinuities in the family get more notice than continuities because they often involve stress or other grounds for social concern ... Lobbies for various minority forms of family life seek to legitimise what is often still regarded as deviant.

"But to win support for policies which help those who need it, it should not be necessary to try to demote the nuclear family. If policy-making goes that way (as may be happening at the margin), then it will go against the grain of majority family behaviour."

In the search for an answer to the question as to whether the nuclear family is by any means still regarded as a legitimate structure in Western society and, if so, whether it still counts as the only legitimate structure, both categories of persons in the field of family studies — those who no longer

8. See section 5.1 of this chapter.

regard the nuclear family as legitimate or merely regard it as one structure among many legitimate structures, and those who still regard it as the primary legitimate structure — call upon particular empirical data to support their points of view.

It would however appear that the vast majority of sociologists agree that the nuclear family is still the basic legitimate family structure in Western society (Berger & Berger, 1983). There are nevertheless also sociologists who started appealing for the recognition of the legitimacy of some of the alternative family structures, especially with a view to making provision in family policy for the specific needs of these alternative families (see for instance Viljoen *in* Steyn *et al.*, 1987).

However, in order to effectively make this appeal, the sociologist should be informed about both the relative incidence of the different family structures in a particular society and whether the members of the society regard the different structures as legitimate.

To date the debate about the nature and incidence of the different family structures — and more specifically the nuclear family — rests on research results from the United States of America and Great Britain. The conclusions reached from these results cannot however automatically be applied to the South African society. In order to enter this debate it is necessary to do extensive empirical research to establish the nature and incidence of the different types of family structure found among the four main population groups of South Africa.

CHAPTER II:

FAMILY STRUCTURES IN THE RSA: RESEARCH DESIGN

1. INTRODUCTION

As pointed out in the previous chapter, research with regard to family structures at the collectivity level has been conducted to an increasing extent and in a variety of societies during the last number of decades.

From an analysis of this research it is evident that a number of broad general trends and overarching findings emerge which can be applied to family life in all societies. One of these refers to the profound changes in family life and kinship structures taking place as a result of structural changes that ensued from the industrial and technological revolution and the concurrent process of urbanization that occurred in virtually all societies. One of these changes is the increasing independence and autonomy of the nuclear family, although the manner in which this family type articulates with the structurally differentiated society causes the former to be subjected to wide-ranging constraints and to become increasingly vulnerable.

This vulnerability, as illustrated by an escalating divorce rate, an increase in extramarital births and family violence, and a search for alternatives, has led to the development of alternative family structures in all these societies.

The research results referred to have however shown that knowledge of the general principles is insufficient to reveal the nature and functioning of the family in a particular society or even among the different population groups and classes in the same society. The nature of the different family structures in a particular society as well as their incidence is determined to a large extent by the particular structural characteristics of, and the course of history in that society. In every societal context there is for instance, a characteristic value system, as well as variables and environmental circumstances that may influence family life and the development of particular types of family structures, which may cause the family in that society and even among the different classes of that society to have a unique form. The nature of family problems may also be unique to each society, in that particular factors may be present in one society and not in another, resulting in different patterns of, for instance, family disintegration.

It is therefore important to note that although there are a number of overarching principles with regard to family life and family structure which are applicable cross-culturally, it is impossible to generalize findings from one society to another without qualification and further study. Consequently, research should be done in each society and for the different population groups and social classes in that society in order to establish which factors interact with family life to shape family life and the particular family structures that develop in that society.

2. FAMILY STRUCTURES IN SOUTH AFRICAN SOCIETY

When the situation with regard to family life in the RSA is examined, it is clear that, on the one hand, broad overarching principles can be applied and, on the other hand, there is great diversity with regard to family life.

During the past century or so, for instance, the South African society was subject to profound changes. The development of the mining industry, the technological and industrial revolution and wide-ranging urbanization especially since the Second World War have contributed to a process of structural differentiation, and one way or another, all the population groups have become involved with this process of change. This extensive change at societal level did not only profoundly influence the family life of the different population groups, but also led to increased stress in family life, which rendered the family in all the population groups more vulnerable.

Apart from these broad similarities, South African research has shown that a great diversity exists with regard to family life among the different population groups in South Africa. Not only are there vast differences in initial family structures, supportive networks, normative behaviour patterns and values with regard to family life among the different population groups, but there are also differences with regard to the economic and political circumstances which each population group is subject to, the manner in which each population group has experienced the process of industrialization and urbanization, and the manner in which these changes have affected family life in each population group.

As a result of the life circumstances of the different population groups there emerged a set of differential variables in each population group which uniquely influenced family life and the development of family structures in that population group. These changes have led to a series of stressors and problems that are unique in the family life of each population group.

For instance, statistics showing current trends such as increases in the divorce rate, family violence, extramarital births and child neglect, as well as in co-habitation, indicate that although the family life of all the population groups has become increasingly subject to stress and family disintegration, these problematic phenomena have been more intense and wide-ranging among some population groups than among others (see in this regard Steyn, Van Wyk & Le Roux, 1989:121-126). Among some of the population groups there has indeed been a distressing escalation of family disintegration that definitely has had implications for the way in which family structures developed among the different population groups.

Although an extensive research project has not as yet been conducted in South Africa on the nature of these family structures, a fair number of smaller research projects have been undertaken by individual researchers in various centres in South Africa. The results showed large differences in environmental circumstances and the existence of differential structures among the different population groups.

The following differential circumstances and characteristics of the different population groups have, for example, been highlighted:

With regard to the Asians, Jithoo (*in Steyn et al.*, 1987) pointed out that their original family system was that of the "joint family". As a result of their progress through westernization the joint family started to disintegrate, and the nuclear family took its place. The nuclear family among the Asians is however very vulnerable, because the stress that has emerged in this transitional period occurred in a situation where the family on the one hand is subject to a large measure of poverty and unemployment, and on the other hand has been placed in a situation where more freedom of thought

and action and new opportunities create problems for the parents when they try to transfer the traditionally accepted values and behaviour patterns to the younger generation. Although the divorce rate in this population group has consequently been escalating — from 4,8% per 1 000 in 1984 to 7,0 per 1 000 in 1988 (Central Statistical Service, 1988) — it has nevertheless been low in comparison with the other population groups. An increase in single-parent families is however to be expected among the Asians.

The circumstances under which the coloured family developed, differed profoundly from those of the Asian family. The coloured family originally was to a very large degree exposed to circumstances similar to that of the Negro in the United States of America. This contributed to a very high rate of extramarital births as well as to a rather unstable family life. Large differences in the family life of the different social classes in the coloured population group did however emerge. There is, for instance, a higher incidence of the nuclear family among the higher social classes — characterized by a man-dominant or syncretic authority pattern — than among the lower social classes where the single-parent family and the modified extended family with a woman-dominant pattern occur to a greater extent. Although the divorce rate among the coloureds is low in comparison with that of the whites, namely 8,7% in 1984 and increasing to 11,8% in 1988, these figures are not necessarily a true reflection of the full extent of family disorganization among the coloureds, because there is a high degree of co-habitation and desertion among the lower social classes (Steyn, 1961; Central Statistical Service, 1988).

In contrast to the coloureds and the Asians the extended family in a patrilineal system was the predominant family type among the traditional rural blacks. Urbanization, housing problems, the political system (with specific reference to the migrant labour system) together with economic underdevelopment and wide-ranging poverty led to profound change in the black urban family. Although a nuclear family system has developed among the elite in black urban areas (Brandell-Syrier, 1971), this family type has not occurred to the same extent among the lower social classes, who constitute the vast majority of the black urban population. The percentage of extramarital births among the lower social classes is particularly high, leading to the rise of types of family structures other than the nuclear family or the traditional extended family. For instance, there is a high percentage of single-parent families (15,6% in Pauw's (1953) study in East London). In the case of extramarital births it is however often found that the mother and the child live in the household of the mother's parents, or in cases where her father is absent, in the household of her mother. This has contributed to the high incidence of multigenerational families, among whom the matrifocal multigenerational family constitutes a very large percentage. Unfortunately there are no official statistics available on the black family, and consequently the different family structures and degrees of disorganization that occur have to be gleaned from studies in scattered centres in the RSA.

The historical background to the family life of South African whites differs to a large extent from that of the three other population groups. For example, the family life of the whites was rooted in Western European family life as influenced by Christianity. Although there is little detailed information with regard to the initial structure of the white family in South Africa, the information that is available points to the existence of large families that tended towards the extended family in which up to three generations lived together as one household. The family was further also strongly embedded in a broader kinship network, the neighbourhood and church life, and subject to strong social control and little family disorganization. Marital power was in the hands of the man, who was indisputably head of the household (Keyter, 1940; Cronjé & Venter, 1958; Van der Merwe, 1969).

The factors that contributed to extensive change in the white family are similar to those of Western Europe, although industrialization and urbanization occurred at a much later stage in South Africa

than in Western Europe. This industrialization and large degree of urbanization — that occurred particularly after the Second World War — caused drastic changes in the family life of the whites. For instance, the nuclear family started to cut the ties of kinship and those of the extended family, and began to function as an independent autonomous unit. This nuclear family was however subject to many stressors in industrial-urban life, and became extremely vulnerable. The divorce rate escalated: from 5,9 in 1955 to 16,4 in 1980 and 15,7 in 1988 — figures that imply an increase in single-parent families, in remarriages among divorcees and consequently in reconstituted families.

Although these short sketches indicate that there are different family structures in South African society, and that these family structures may indeed differ from one population group to another, no attempt has been made to study the exact nature and incidence of the different types of family structure among the different population groups.

There is therefore a large lacuna in knowledge about the family which should be addressed urgently in order to obtain not only basic knowledge about the family but also knowledge for practical application. The latter kind of knowledge is essential to the social worker, the clinical psychologist and other persons who render professional services to the family. Knowledge of family structures is even more urgently needed for designing family policy and for providing particular services such as housing, child-care and other support services. Where the nuclear family is still assumed to be the basic family structure in society and the difference between this ideal family structure and the reality of existing family structures is negated, policy makers can easily design and develop policy in such a way that the interests and needs of family structures that differ from those of the nuclear family are totally ignored.

3 AIM AND METHOD OF STUDY

As indicated in the previous section there is a serious lack of knowledge with regard to the exact nature of family structures in the RSA; a lack which could have detrimental consequences for the development of a South African family policy that would provide for the basic needs of all families in the most effective way, whatever the structure of these families. This study was undertaken to address this lack of knowledge. The aim of the study was thus to establish (i) the nature of the family structures that occur in South African society, and (ii) the incidence of the different family structures among the different population groups.

This study was essentially descriptive. In the analysis of the data the focus was in the first instance on establishing the nature and incidence of different family structures in the RSA, and in the second on determining whether the family structures differed with regard to certain socio-biographic variables, for example population group, education and occupation. In a certain sense these analyses were explorative, and hypothesis testing was not really at issue.

3.1 The schedule

Because this research was explorative, careful attention had to be paid to the manner in which data would be gathered.

Because so little was known about family structures in the RSA the researcher, who wished to establish a picture of the exact nature of these family structures, had to work inductively. It implied gathering data from families in each population group in society, and then analyzing the actual

positions found in these families and households. It was not feasible to gather the data according to pre-coded family structures, because some existing structures might have been overlooked.

The following techniques were used: In each of the households in the sample a complete survey was done of all the persons in that household, with an indication of their gender, their age and their position in the household in relation to the head of household. Thereafter an analysis was made of each household in order to establish which positions did in actual fact occur in the household. Based on this, categories were developed for determining the family and household structures in the RSA.

The data were gathered by way of the survey method which included a schedule. Because the research was focused on establishing the family structures and on analyzing them in terms of particular socio-economic variables, the questionnaire was short, and in order to get the most extensive sample possible this questionnaire was included in an HSRC omnibus survey.

The survey schedule itself had to be designed in such a way that there would be space, firstly, for at least the Christian names of all the persons regarded as members of the household, and, secondly for indicating how each person was related to the head of household. These two aspects were therefore dealt with in the form of open questions. Because these questions were central to the schedule for this project, the instructions to the fieldworkers about filling in the questionnaires were carefully designed. The following instructions were given in respect of these two questions:

- * With regard to the persons who had to be counted as members of the household, and whose names had to be entered in column 2¹:

COLUMN 2: MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD

In this column the names of all the persons who were regarded as members of the household were entered. "Members of the household" included all persons who permanently resided in the house and who had their meals together when they were at home. Children who were temporarily away but whose maintenance was provided for by the particular household — such as children at boarding school who normally spent their holidays at home — were regarded as members of the household. Where children of a divorced couple had been given into the custody of the party that was no longer a member of the particular household, the children were also not counted as members. Other members of the household that were temporarily absent as a result of, for instance, contract work but still defined the particular household as their base, were included here. Children who had already left the home, and permanently lived in an own home (rented or bought) were not included as members of the household.

Relatives who permanently resided in a particular household and ate at the same table, were included as members, and the same applied to lodgers who permanently lived in a household and shared in the meals.

However, relatives and/or friends who were only visiting, sleeping in the home and eating at the same table as the household for three months or less, were not included as members of the household.

The name of the household head was filled in first and then the name of his/her spouse. Thereafter the names were filled in of the children of the man and the woman from the eldest to the youngest, and then of the children from previous marriages or unions, first those of the man and then those of the woman. Then followed other relatives, then lodgers and other non-relatives residing at that household.

¹ The first column contained only the index number of the persons in the household.

COLUMN 3: POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD

In this column the place of the person in the household had to be described as accurately as possible in terms of his/her kinship with the head of household.

For the household head only "Head" was entered. If married, "Husband"/"Wife" was entered. In the case of the children of the couple, "Child of this marriage" was entered. Where the child was the husband's from a previous marriage, "Child of head (1) from (previous) 1st, 2nd or 3rd marriage" was filled in, and where the child was the woman's from a previous marriage, "Child of woman from 1st marriage", and so on, was entered. In the case of a resident child of the couple or of the household head, "Child of Mary", for instance, was entered, and then Mary's index number.

If the child of the household head was married the details had to be added to his/her spouse's name in Column 3; for example Mary's spouse, then Mary's index number.

In the case of resident relatives the kinship was indicated, for example:

Mother's brother's son, or

Father's mother, or

Mother's mother.

Where two or more independent families lived together in one home and ate together, they were regarded as a household and the names of all the members were entered on the form. This column was however filled in in such a way that the separate families could be distinguished. This was done by bracketing each family and numbering it, for instance "Family 1", "Family 2".

In the case of lodgers only "Non-relative" was filled in.

Apart from this open question, questions were asked about the marital history of the man and the woman in order to establish whether the family was a reconstituted one. A few socio-demographic questions were also asked in order to establish whether family structures differed in respect of population group, and educational and occupational status.

Finally, a proportion of each of the white, Asian and coloured samples were asked what they regarded as an ideal family structure. This was done in order to establish whether the family structure of a particular household corresponded with their view of the ideal structure, and whether — regardless of what has been said earlier — there was indeed a particular family structure that was regarded as ideal by the majority of the population.

3.2 The sample and data gathering

Because the services of the Opinion Survey Centre (MarkData, at time of translation) of the HSRC were utilized for gathering the data, the drawing of the sample was handled by the HSRC's Institute for Statistical Analysis (Centre for Statistics, at time of translation).

The first sample had been drawn during the first half of 1988, and the data were gathered in the second half of 1988. Because less than half of the required number of coloured, Asian and white respondents were realized in that survey, the questionnaire was included again in an omnibus survey in 1989, but only for these three population groups.

As indicated in the previous section, a few additional questions about the ideal family had been included in the 1989 survey. Because no blacks had been involved in this second sample, no analysis could be made of their views on the ideal family.

The samples for the two surveys were drawn in an identical manner and are therefore described only once.

A complex, multistage stratified cluster sampling procedure was followed to obtain about 1 000 respondents for the first sample and 1 500 for the second among each of the four main population groups in the RSA (former TBVC countries included). These samples were based on Enumerator Subdistricts (ESDs) which had been created by the Central Statistical Service for census purposes. These ESDs are delimited by dividing the country into economic regions, and the number of respondents drawn from each region is calculated as a proportion of the total population of that region.

Other strata used in this case were area (metropolitan and non-metropolitan), and residential area according to socio-economic differentiation.

The 1985 census data were used to ensure that the respondents drawn for the sample represented the population reasonably accurately.

Refusals, no contact after three visits, no qualifying respondent in the household, and spoilt or incomplete questionnaires necessitated a certain amount of address substitution, resulting in the final number of points visited being larger than that of the planned sample.

The planned sample size and the realized sample for each population group were as follows:

TABLE 1: PLANNED SAMPLE AND REALIZED SAMPLE

Population group	1988 sample (N)		1989 sample (N)	
	Planned sample	Realized sample	Planned sample	Realized sample
White	980	752	1 500	1 007
Coloured	1 008	830	1 500	1 218
Asian	1 008	991	1 500	1 430
Black	1 500	1 199	—	—

Because the section on family structure was either incomplete or filled in incorrectly in a number of schedules, not all the schedules were fit for use. The final number of schedules used for the analysis was the following:

White	1 746
Coloured	2 024
Asian	2 411
Black	1 199

The sources of data were individuals (one per household) who were older than 18 years, and who were selected by using a respondent probability table.

The respondents, with the exception of the blacks, came from both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas, but in the non-metropolitan areas only persons who lived in towns were included.

Truly rural persons were only included if they lived in towns and cities. The black sample was only drawn from the metropolitan areas.

The data were gathered by fieldworkers from the Opinion Survey Centre (MarkData) of the HSRC, and they were trained beforehand to conduct interviews and fill in questionnaires. The questions with regard to the family structures were formulated similarly for all the population groups, and the fieldworkers who worked among the different population groups received the same training.

The fieldwork for the 1988 survey was done in August 1988, and that for the 1989 survey was done in September and early October 1989.

4. PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE INVESTIGATION

Only a few problems were experienced during the processing of the data. However, some of those that did occur had important implications for interpretation and broader generalization and must therefore be mentioned.

Firstly, a few of the fieldworkers did not fully understand the question about the kinship of resident relatives in relation to the family head, and a few schedules, therefore, had to be ignored. This problem was picked up in particular during the analysis of the data of the first survey, and led to the researcher's giving special attention to the question concerned in the training of the fieldworkers for the second survey. Hardly any problems were experienced during the processing of the data of the second survey.

One problem that occurred frequently was failure on the part of fieldworkers to indicate whether the resident relatives were from the man's or the woman's side. Although this omission did not negatively influence determining the family structures, it made it impossible to indicate with absolute certainty whether resident relatives as a group were predominantly related to the man or the woman.

A final problem that influenced the interpretation of the data was the fact that the sample was obtained exclusively from metropolitan areas and towns. Although the Opinion Survey Centre had been requested to ensure that the sample would be representative of the total population, this was not achieved. Consequently generalizations from this research only apply to the urbanized part of the population (those who were resident in the metropolises and towns). This shortcoming did not have serious implications for the coloured, Asian and white populations because more than 85% of them (more than 90% for the Asians in 1985) are urbanized.

However, the absence of a sample from rural blacks had important implications for generalizations about the nature of family structures among the black population group. According to official statistics only 39% of the black population was urbanized in 1985, and the generalizations from this research could therefore not be applied to the majority of the black population. Especially if it is borne in mind that a large proportion of the rural black population still live in traditional structures, where the extended family is theoretically speaking the most important family structure, it is impossible to determine on the basis of this survey the extent to which the extended family still features among the rural population, and what the exact nature is of the predominant family structures that occur among the rural black population. This is a serious shortcoming in this research.

CHAPTER III:

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO FAMILY STRUCTURES IN THE RSA

1. INTRODUCTION

As indicated in the previous two chapters, family structures differ greatly from one society to another, and within each society differences emerge between the different ethnic groups and also between the different socio-economic classes. The development of these differences can be attributed to the differences in the cultural contexts in which family structures are anchored, as well as to the differences in the historical events family life in different societies and different ethnic groups in a single society have been subject to. The socio-economic circumstances under which families live could possibly also contribute to differences in family structures because these could determine the living conditions of families as well as their ability to provide for necessities such as housing, food and clothing.

It has already been pointed out in the previous chapter that vast differences have emerged in the RSA in respect of the cultural context and historical circumstances of the four population groups. There are however also important socio-economic differences between and within the different population groups on the basis of which different family structures developed.

TABLE 1: EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MEN PER POPULATION GROUP

Educational status	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. None	1	0,1	102	7,0	27	1,3	125	14,7
2. Gr 1 - Std 5	7	0,5	447	30,7	304	14,6	230	27,1
3. Std 6 - Std 9	435	31,5	713	49,0	1 107	53,2	392	46,1
4. Matric	460	33,3	103	7,1	407	19,6	62	7,3
5. Higher than Matric	478	34,6	89	6,2	235	11,3	41	4,8
TOTAL*	1 381	100	1 454	100	1 080	100	850	100

* Because some families for various reasons did not have a male household head, the columns do not add up to the number of households in the realized sample (see Table 1, Chapter II).

Before an analysis is made of the family structures in the RSA, a brief look should be taken at the socio-economic position of the different population groups as reflected in the educational and occupational statuses of the household head and his/her spouse.

From the foregoing table it is clear that the male members of the white group had the highest educational status. Almost 68% of this population group had matric or higher, while only 0,6% had Std 5 or lower. In contrast, the black population group had the lowest educational status. For example, 14,7% had had no schooling, while altogether 41% had reached Std 5 or lower, or had not received any schooling. Only 12,1% of this population group had matric or higher. The educational status of the Asians and coloureds was positioned intermediately between that of the whites and the blacks, with the Asians closer to the pattern of the whites, and the coloureds closer to the pattern of the blacks. For instance, only 15,9% of the Asians had Std 5 or lower, or no schooling (1,3%), while 30,9% had matric or higher. Among the coloureds, in contrast, 37,7% had Std 5 or lower, or no schooling (7%), while only 13,3% had matric or higher.

There were not only profound variations between the population groups, but also within them. Among the whites 99% had Std 6 and higher. Among the coloureds, the Asians and the blacks the largest percentages had educational levels of between Std 6 and Std 9 (49%, 53,2% and 46% respectively), with substantial percentages who had achieved lower levels of schooling (37,7%, 15,9% and 41,8% respectively) and only very small percentages who had achieved levels higher than Std 9 (13,3%, 30,9% and 12,1% respectively – see Table 1).

TABLE 2: EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMEN PER POPULATION GROUP

Educational status	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. None	4	0,3	148	8,1	191	8,3	157	13,9
2. Gr. 1 - Std. 5	15	0,9	693	37,8	622	26,9	400	35,4
3. Std 6 - Std 9	648	40,4	846	46,2	1 135	49,2	487	43,2
4. Matric	567	35,3	78	4,3	242	10,5	52	4,6
5. Higher than Matric	371	23,1	66	3,6	119	5,2	33	2,9
TOTAL*	1605	100	1 831	100	2 309	100	1 129	100

* Not all the families included an adult woman. The columns therefore do not add up to the number of households in the sample.

With regard to the educational level of the women a pattern almost identical to that of the men emerged for the different population groups, except that overall the educational level of the women was slightly lower than that of the men in each of the population groups. For example, among all the population groups a smaller percentage of women than men had reached matric or higher, while a larger percentage of women had reached Std 5 or lower, or no schooling at all. The educational

category with the largest percentage of women is, as in the case of the men (except among the whites), Stds 6-9, with 40,4% of the whites, 46,2% of the coloureds, 49,2% of the Asians and 43,2% of the blacks in that category.

As among the men the educational level of the whites (women) was the highest, while black women were in the worst position. The educational level of the Asians and the coloureds was positioned intermediately between that of the first two groups, with the level of the Asians closer to the whites and that of the coloureds closer to the blacks.

Apart from the differences between the groups there was also, as in the case of the men, variation within the population groups. White women showed the least variation, and 98,8% of them had achieved Std 6 or higher. Among the coloureds, Asians and blacks there were however substantial proportions who only had Std 5 or lower, or no schooling at all (45,9%, 35,2% and 49,3% respectively), while there was also a significant percentage of women who had reached matric or higher (7,9%, 15,7% and 7,5% respectively).

These differences in educational status between and variation within the different population groups are reflected in their occupational status, as shown in Tables 3 and 4.

TABLE 3: OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF MEN PER POPULATION GROUP

Occupational category	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. Prof. & manage.	411	29,3	103	7,0	292	14,1	43	5,0
2. Adm. & cleric.	94	6,7	73	5,0	326	15,7	69	8,0
3. Skilled labour	266	19,0	223	15,2	552	26,7	188	21,8
4. Service careers	14	1,0	37	2,5	27	1,3	40	4,6
5. Agric. & transp.	9	0,6	13	0,9	1	0,1	3	0,3
6. Tech. & trade	260	18,5	285	19,4	238	11,5	105	12,2
7. Mining & indust.	127	9,1	438	29,8	327	15,7	179	20,8
8. Housewives	-	-	-	-	2	0,1	-	-
9. Eco. non-active	222	15,8	299	20,3	305	14,7	235	27,3
TOTAL	1 403	100	1 471	100	2 070	100	862	100

Table 3 shows certain similarities, but also certain differences between the population groups. The fact that hardly any agricultural or related occupations were present in the sample can be attributed to the fact that the sample was only obtained from the urban areas. There were also very few respondents from the service careers – the blacks having the highest proportion, namely 4,6%.

The occupational category in which the largest percentage of white men worked, namely 29,3%, was the professional and management category. In contrast, for the blacks and the coloureds this occupational category was the one where the smallest percentage of people worked, namely 5% and 7% respectively. The Asians were intermediate between these two extremes, with 14,1% of the respondents working in the professional and management category.

The occupational category in which the largest percentage of coloureds worked (29,8%), was mining and industry. This occupational category was the one in which the second largest proportion of blacks and Asians worked, namely 20,8% and 15,7% respectively, and one of the occupational categories in which the smallest proportion of whites worked, namely 9,1%. The occupational category in which the largest proportion of blacks and Asians worked, was that of skilled labour, with 21,8% and 26,7% respectively. There was also a substantial proportion of whites and coloureds in skilled occupations, namely 19,0% and 15,2% respectively.

The population group with the largest proportion of economically non-active persons was the blacks with 27,3%, followed by the coloureds with 20,3%, in contrast to the Asians and the whites, where only 14,7% and 15,8% respectively were economically non-active.

Table 3 therefore shows clearly that among all the population groups there were people working in all the occupational categories; but there was differential participation, with the whites more in the professional category, the coloureds more in the industrial and mining category, the Asians more in the skilled labour category and the blacks more in the skilled labour and the industrial and mining categories. There was also differential occurrence with regard to the economically non-active men in the sense that here the population group with the highest frequency was the blacks, with 27,3% in contrast to only 14,7% among the Asians.

The distribution of the women in the different occupational categories is presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4: OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF WOMEN PER POPULATION GROUP

Occupational category	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. Prof. & manage.	216	13,5	141	7,5	119	5,1	78	6,9
2. Adm. & cleric.	377	23,5	124	6,6	162	7,0	38	3,3
3. Skilled labour	119	7,4	84	4,5	110	4,8	82	7,2
4. Service careers	11	0,7	107	5,7	7	0,3	222	19,5
5. Agric. & transp.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Tech. & trade	11	0,7	12	0,6	9	0,4	48	4,2
7. Mining & indust.	16	1,0	272	14,5	177	7,6	62	5,5
8. Housewives	785	48,9	1 012	54,0	1 702	73,5	605	53,3
9. Eco. non-active	71	4,4	120	6,4	31	1,3	1	0,1
TOTAL	1 606	100	1 872	100	2 317	100	1 136	100

As can be seen from Table 4, among the women certain similarities also emerged with regard to occupational status, although certain differences could also be observed.

For example, the occupational category in which the women had the smallest participation was in most cases that of technical and trade, with only 0,7% of the white, 0,6% of the coloured, 0,4% of the Asian and 4,2% of the black women working in this category.

The category in which most of the women of all the population groups were engaged, was that of housewife, with 48,9% of the white, 54% of the coloured, 73,5% of the Asian and 53,3% of the black women falling in this category. From this it is clear that the whites were the population group in which most of the women were occupationally engaged, while the Asians were the population group in which least of the women were occupationally engaged.

The two occupational categories in which the largest proportions of white women were occupationally engaged were administrative and clerical (23,5%) and professional and management (13,5%). The two occupational categories in which the largest proportions of coloured women were engaged were mining and industry (14,5%) and professional and management (7,5%). Among the Asians the two occupational categories in which the largest proportions of women were engaged were mining and industry (7,6%) and administrative and clerical (7%), while for the blacks the categories of greatest engagement were service careers (19,5%) and skilled labour (7,2%). It is interesting to note that although the professional and management category was the one in which the second largest percentage of women among two of the population groups fell, the percentage participation among the different population groups differed noticeably, namely 13,5% for the whites and 7,5% for the coloureds.

As in the case of the occupational involvement of the men, it was clear that the women in all four population groups were engaged in all the occupational categories, but that there was differential participation with the whites more active in the administrative and clerical as well as the professional and management category, the coloureds and the Asians more in the mining and industrial category, and the blacks more in the service careers.

Against the background of these differences in the educational and occupational status of the different population groups an analysis can now be made of the family structures found among the different population groups.

2. FAMILY STRUCTURES

As shown in the previous section the gathering of data with regard to family structures was not done on the basis of pre-coded (possible) family structures, but the names of the members of the household together with the relationship of each member of the household to the household head were entered on the schedule. All these data were carefully analyzed in order to establish which positions were present in each household, and from this each possible family structure was determined, based on the actual positions that occurred in each household.

It is important to note that where relatives resided with a family, the exact nature of a relative's kinship (for instance, father, mother, cousin, brother, sister) or the question as to whether the person was a blood relation on the father's or the mother's side was not taken into consideration for the purposes of this analysis. Where it was however indicated in the original analysis that the married/unmarried children with their children resided with the household head and/or his/her spouse, and three or more generations therefore resided in the same household and the household head was in the oldest generation, the family was classified as "multigenerational". If additional relatives were also



DATE DUE - VERVALDATUM

IBL 4300

4/10/95

Teng 17/10/95

~~1996~~ -03-12

TERUG

IBL 2848

391596

5/4/96

Teng 17/5/96

TERUG

7653 6/8/2001

indicated on the schedule as residing with this latter type of family, and these relatives were not the grandchildren or great-grandchildren of the household head, this type of family was classified as a multigenerational family plus additional relatives.

Because it was important, however, to determine specifically what type of relatives resided with the family with a view to establishing whether particular patterns emerged in this regard, a separate and more comprehensive analysis was made of the nature of the kinship ties between the resident relatives and the household head and his/her spouse.

After a careful analysis had been made of all the different positions that occurred in all the households, altogether 41 family structures emerged (see Appendix Table 01). From a careful analysis of this detailed table the following was clear:

- Not all the family structure types occurred among all the population groups (for example, there were no: man and grandchildren; woman, children, relatives and non-relatives; or man, woman and married children without children).
- Some of the family structures that emerged (for example, man, woman and non-relatives; woman, relatives and non-relatives; and woman and non-relatives) occurred very seldom, so that they could not legitimately be regarded as institutionalized patterns.
- Some of the family structures appeared in fairly large numbers among all four population groups (for example, man, woman and children).
- Some of the structures did indeed occur among all four population groups, but in some cases the frequency was considerably higher than in the others.

Because 41 family structures constituted an exceptionally large number, and some of the structures did not occur very often, interpretation as well as further analysis was going to be very difficult. With this in mind it was decided to combine some categories which showed a logical coherence, anticipating that such a procedure would render more comprehensive or overarching family structures. In combining these categories, special care was taken to prevent the loss of types of family structures that appeared in fairly large numbers (such as single-parent families, nuclear families and multigenerational families).

One of the structures that occurred fairly seldom was additional non-relatives residing with a family. For example, among 16 of the types of structures that were elicited originally, non-relatives did indeed reside with the family, but the frequency of these 16 family structures came to a total of 215 (2,9%) of the 7 370 families in the entire sample. The phenomenon of taking in non-relatives occurred differentially among the different population groups. For instance, it occurred mostly among the coloureds, where 7,2% of the families took in a non-relative; second came the whites with 2,4%, and thereafter the Asians with 1,5% of these families. The population group among whom fewest families took in non-relatives, was the blacks with only 0,4% of the families.

In further analyses the families with resident non-relatives were grouped with families with resident relatives, and the resident relatives and resident non-relatives were termed "additional members".

The more detailed family structures were combined in order to elicit the following more comprehensive structures:¹

¹ For the frequencies of the more detailed structures, see Table 01 in Appendix.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Single living: | Single-living man
Single-living woman |
| 2. Single living and add. members: | Man and grandchildren
Man and relatives
Man and non-relatives
Man, relatives and non-relatives
Woman and grandchildren
Woman and relatives
Woman and non-relatives
Woman, relatives and non-relatives |
| 3. Man and child: | Man and children
Man and married children without children |
| 4. Woman and child: | Woman and children |
| 5. Man, child and add. members: | Man, children and relatives
Man and married and unmarried children without children |
| 6. Woman, child and add. members: | Woman, children and relatives
Woman, children and non-relatives
Woman, children, relatives and non-relatives
Woman and married children without children
Woman and married and unmarried children without children |
| 7. Man and woman | |
| 8. Man, woman and children | |
| 9. Man, woman and add. members: | Man, woman and grandchildren
Man, woman and relatives
Man, woman and non-relatives
Man, woman, relatives and non-relatives |
| 10. Man, woman, children
and add. members: | Man, woman, children and relatives
Man, woman, children and non-relatives
Man, woman, children, relatives and non-relatives
Man, woman and married children without children
Man, woman and unmarried and married children without children |
| 11. Multigenerational family,
male head | |
| 12. Multigenerational family, male
head and add. members: | Multigenerational family, male head and add. members
Multigenerational family, male head and non-relatives
Multigenerational family, male head, relatives and non-relatives |

13. Multigenerational family, female head

14. Multigenerational family, female head and add. members:

Multigenerational family, female head and relatives
Multigenerational family, female head and non-relatives
Multigenerational family, female head, relatives and non-relatives

15. Several non-relatives:

Non-relatives
Exceptions

It was sometimes difficult to decide where to fit a specific, more detailed structure into the overarching category system because some of the structures were clearly in a particular phase of the family cycle. A good example was the man-woman-child and/or married children without children family structure in which, should the resident married children have a child at a later stage, the family would clearly form an extended or multigenerational family. Significantly the population group in which the occurrence of this type of family structure was highest, were the Asians, where family life is rooted in a strong cultural tradition of extended families. For example, 80 of the 98 families who had this type of structure, were Asian, and they constituted 3,3% of the total Asian sample (see Table 01, Appendix). Because these families did not yet include a third generation at that stage, they could not be classified as multigenerational, but since they included children-in-law they could not be classified as nuclear families either. Consequently they were classified in the structure category of man-woman-child-additional members.

The frequency distribution of the families in these comprehensive structures for the different population groups was as follows:

TABLE 5: FAMILY STRUCTURES IN THE RSA

Structure*	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. Single living	259	14,8	43	2,1	26	1,1	8	0,7
2. Single liv. & add.	42	2,4	61	3,0	37	1,5	51	4,3
3. Man & child(ren)	7	0,4	23	1,7	11	0,5	16	1,3
4. Woman & child(ren)	82	4,7	195	9,6	141	5,8	111	9,3
5. M & c & add.	-	-	3	0,1	6	0,2	7	0,6
6. W & c & add.	19	1,1	72	3,6	41	1,7	43	3,6
7. Man & woman	418	23,9	116	5,7	129	5,4	35	2,9
8. Man, woman & child	809	46,3	812	40,1	1 328	55,1	442	36,9
9. Man, woman & add.	21	1,2	51	2,5	49	2,0	29	2,4
10. M & w & c & add.	59	3,4	234	11,6	352	14,6	110	9,2
11. Multigen., male head	12	0,7	210	10,4	180	7,5	173	14,4
12. Multigen., male head & add.	2	0,1	25	1,2	15	0,6	22	1,8
13. Multigen., female head	6	0,3	146	7,2	88	3,6	135	11,3
14. Multigen., female head add.	1	0,1	21	1,0	7	0,3	16	1,3
15. Several non-rel.	9	0,5	4	0,2	1	0,1	1	0,1
TOTAL	1 746	100	2 016	100	2 411	100	1 198	100

* M — Man; W — Woman; C — Child(ren); Add. — Additional members.

When analyzing Table 5 a number of important differences among the different population groups surfaced.

(i) Households with single-living persons occurred most regularly among the whites (14,8% of the households) but they occurred minimally among the other population groups (coloureds 2,1%, Asians 1,1% and blacks 0,7%). When adding the single-living person who took in additional persons, it amounted to a slighter larger proportion of households among the coloureds, Asians and blacks (5,1%, 2,6% and 5% respectively), but the single-person households for the whites increased to 17,2%. It would therefore be fair to state that the single-person household was a phenomenon that predominantly occurred among the white population group, but that it was also beginning to develop among the other population groups.

(ii) With regard to the single-parent family, it was the woman-child family structure which occurred most, and among all the population groups. This family structure occurred mainly among the black and coloured population groups (9,3% and 9,6% respectively), and noticeably less among the whites and Asians (4,7% and 5,8% respectively). When other single-parent families, in other words the man-child families and the single-parent families with additional members, were added to the woman-child families, this trend was strengthened, with 14,8% of the black and 15% of the coloured households being single-parent families, while only 6,2% of the white and 8,2% of the Asian households were single-parent families. If the results of other research with regard to family life in the different population groups were taken into consideration together with the socio-cultural and historical background of the different population groups, it might be stated that single parenthood among the blacks and coloureds was probably a result of extramarital births to a greater extent than was the case among the whites and Asians, whereas single-parent families among the whites probably occurred mostly as a result of divorce or the death of a spouse.

However, associations could not be inferred from the gathered data because the questionnaire did not explicitly enquire about the extramarital children in a family. It is doubtful whether reliable information in this regard could be gathered in such a survey, because the definition of illegitimacy differed among the different population groups (see Moeno, 1969).

(iii) The nuclear family structure also revealed a number of variations. The true nuclear family, namely man-woman-child, was the family structure which overall had the highest frequency among all the population groups, although the specific incidence differed considerably from one population group to another. For example, this family structure occurred by far the most often among the Asians with 55,1%, followed by the whites with 46,3%, the coloureds with 40,1% and the blacks with 36,9%.

It was however important to take the man-woman structure into cognizance when dealing with the nuclear family, because the man-woman structure could merely be a phase in the life cycle of the nuclear family. For example, it could either represent the phase before the birth of the first child or the empty nest phase. When the age distribution of household heads in the man-woman structure was taken into consideration, this view was confirmed.

The man-woman structure appeared among 23,9% of the whites, whereas it occurred much less frequently among the other population groups, namely only in 5,7% of the coloured, 5,4% of the Asian and 2,9% of the black families.

When the age of household heads among the man-woman families was taken into consideration, it was noticeable that the largest proportions of these families fell in the two extreme age groups, namely where the household head was 20-24 years – in other words the settling phase of the family – or among the age group 60+ – in other words in the empty nest phase. Among the whites 57,2% of the man-woman structures fell in these two age categories, in contrast to only 17,5% of the man-woman-child families. Among the coloureds 42,2% of the man-woman families fell in these two age categories, in contrast to 18,4% among the man-woman-child families. Among the Asians it was 53,1% and 15,3% respectively, and among the blacks, where only a very small percentage (2,9%) fell in the man-woman structure, it was 31,5% and 19,2% respectively.

TABLE 6: AGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD IN MAN-WOMAN STRUCTURES
AGE OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD

Fam. structr.	Age distribution (%)					Total
	20-29 yrs	30-39 yrs	40-49 yrs	50-59 yrs	60 yrs	
White M W	15,1	11,0	11,2	20,6	42,1	100% (418)
M W C	12,9	33,9	32,4	16,2	4,6	100% (808)
Colourd. M W	15,5	25,0	18,1	14,7	26,7	100% (116)
M W C	11,1	33,6	32,2	15,7	7,3	100% (809)
Asian M W	36,7	18,8	13,3	14,8	16,4	100% (128)
M W C	10,0	32,3	33,1	19,4	5,3	100% (324)
Black M W	8,6	25,7	25,7	17,1	22,9	100% (34)
M W C	5,2	25,8	34,8	20,1	14,0	100% (442)

When these man-woman structures were counted as nuclear families, the picture regarding the percentage of nuclear families per population group changed considerably. For example, 70,2% of the white, 60,5% of the Asian, 45,8% of the coloured and only 39,8% of the black families were nuclear families. When the households with single-living persons were ignored and only the households that had formed around families of one kind or another were counted, the percentage of nuclear families per population group increased further, especially among the whites. The figures are as follows:

White	85,9%
Asian	61,1%
Coloured	47,0%
Black	40,1%

It is clear from the above that when only households that had developed around families were taken into account, the nuclear family was the major family type occurring among the whites, and that it was also prominent among the Asians. Among the other two population groups, namely the coloureds and

blacks, it occurred in less than half of the households, although it was the most common structure found.

(iv) With regard to the other two types of nuclear families with additional members, namely the structure of man-woman-additional members and man-woman-child-additional members, there was also a differential distribution among the population groups.

Firstly, it was noticeable that the percentages of man-woman-additional members structures for all the population groups were very similar, and basically very low, namely 1,2% for the whites, 2,5% for the coloureds, 2% for the Asians and 2,4% for the blacks. Secondly, the major difference between the population groups emerged with regard to the man-woman-child-additional member structure, where the frequency among the whites was only 3,4% of the total number of families, while the proportions were 11,6% for the coloureds, 9,2% for the blacks and 14,6% for the Asians.

The additional members who resided with most of the families were relatives of one kind or another and the highest frequency of families that took in non-relatives occurred among the coloureds, where 32,6% of the families with additional members took in non-relatives. Among the other population groups this percentage was much lower, namely 0,5% for the whites, 1,5% for the Asians and 2,9% for the blacks.²

(v) A last important family structure with a fairly substantial but differential manifestation among the different population groups was the multigenerational family. With regard to this family structure, mainly two types emerged, namely one with a male family head and one with a female head. Each of these subdivided into structures with and without additional members. Because the multigenerational family with additional members occurred infrequently – ranging from 0,1% among the whites with a male family head to 1,8% among the blacks with a male family head – it was decided to combine these two subtypes for the purpose of the analysis.

- The male-headed multigenerational family was the family type which had by far the highest frequency among the blacks, namely 16,2%. The occurrence of this family type was also fairly substantial among the coloureds, namely 11,6%, and among the Asians, namely 8,1%. Among the whites it was however very low – only 0,8% of the families with a multigenerational structure had a male head.
- The same pattern of differential frequency emerged with regard to the female-headed multigenerational family. Here again the black family had the highest frequency, namely 12,6% of all the families. The coloureds and the Asians also had fairly substantial frequencies, namely 8,2% and 3,9% respectively, while this family type occurred very seldom among the whites, the frequency being 0,4%.

The question that emerged here was what the marital statuses of the head of the multigenerational households were, especially in the case of families with female heads.

² Calculations made from Table 01 in Appendix.

TABLE 7: MARITAL STATUS OF FAMILY HEAD IN MULTIGENERATIONAL FAMILY TYPE³

Population group	Marital status (%)						
	Married	Never married	Widowed	Divorced	Living together	Total	
Black	M. head	89,2	5,7	-	4,6	0,5	100% (194)
	F. head	3,3	-	2,0	78,1	10,6	100% (151)
Coloured	M. head	85,9	1,7	8,1	3,8	0,4	100% (234)
	F. head	5,4	3,0	50,9	37,7	3,0	100% (167)
Asian	M. head	87,2	1,5	7,2	4,1	-	100% (195)
	F. head	-	-	70,5	29,5	-	100% (95)
White	M. head	92,9	7,1	-	-	-	100% (14)
	F. head	16,7	-	16,7	5,0	16,6	100% (6)

From Table 7 it is clear that in most of the male-headed multigenerational families the family head was still married, namely in 89,2% of the black families, 85,9% of the coloured families and 87,2% of the Asian families.

With regard to the female-headed multigenerational family, the family head was still married in only a small percentage of families, namely 3,3% of the black, 5,4% of the coloured and none of the Asian families.

Among the black multigenerational families with female heads 78,1% of the women were divorced and 10,6% co-habited, while among the coloureds 50,9% of the female heads were widows and 37,7% were divorced, and among the Asians 70,5% of the female heads were widows and 29,5% were divorced.

It is notable that among the female family heads in the multigenerational families a very small percentage had never been married or merely co-habited. Only among the blacks these female family heads co-habited – in 10,6% of the cases. It is also notable that among the black multigenerational families with female heads there was a high percentage of divorcees among these heads, namely 78,1%. These statistics were difficult to control because official black divorce statistics were not recorded in the past. A question which emerged in this regard is therefore whether these divorces occurred on the basis of civil divorce proceedings, or whether the dissolution of these marriages was effected on the basis of traditional and indigent law.

³ The white multigenerational families with either a male or a female head were not taken into consideration in this calculation because their numbers were insignificant.

When multigenerational families – whether with the male or the female family head and with or without additional members – were all added together, it was very clear that this family structure constituted a substantial part of the families of some of the population groups, namely:

Black population	28,8% of the families
Coloured population	19,8% of the families
Asian population	12,0% of the families
White population	1,2% of the families

A final remark that could be made about the incidence of the multigenerational family, especially with regard to the coloureds and the blacks, is that the high incidence of extramarital births probably contributed to the development of this family type among these two population groups. With regard to the coloureds official figures indicated that there was a fairly high incidence of extramarital births (see Steyn *et al.*, 1987). Various research reports with regard to the blacks indicated a similar trend among urban blacks (see Steyn *et al.*, 1987; Moeno, 1969; Pauw, 1953). Among these population groups the mother and the extramarital child lived mostly with the parents of the mother and they were accepted without stigma. Consequently some multigenerational families develop in this way (see Pauw, 1953; Steyn, 1961).

TABLE 8: HOUSEHOLDS WITH EXTRAMARITAL CHILDREN PER POPULATION GROUP

Present: Extramarital child	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
Defin. yes	6	0,4	358	17,8	23	1,0	339	28,3
Possibly	11	0,6	87	4,3	24	1,0	32	2,7
Defin. no	1 725	99,0	1 568	77,9	2 363	98,0	828	69,0
TOTAL	1 742	100	2 013	100	2 410	100	1 199	100

Although the incidence of extramarital children was not specifically studied in the current research, the presence of extramarital children in a household could be inferred by analyzing the questionnaire columns "Relatedness to household head" and "Marital status". Because in some of the questionnaires these columns were not filled in properly, there was doubt as to whether the children of a number of households were indeed extramarital. In such cases the code "possible" was created. After the analysis of all the questionnaires three categories were therefore created with regard to the presence of extramarital children in the household, namely "Definitely yes", "Possibly" and "Definitely no".

Their distribution among the different population groups can be gleaned from Table 8.

From this table it is clear that the largest percentage of households with extramarital children occurred among the blacks followed by the coloureds. It should be remembered that these figures did not reflect the extramarital birth rate, and that they only indicated households where extramarital children were housed. The possibility existed that there was more than one woman in the household with an extramarital child, and that one woman might have had more than one extramarital child, but this was not reflected in Table 8. The true extramarital birth rate might therefore have been higher than was reflected by the percentage of households in which extramarital children were present.

It was therefore quite possible that the larger proportion of single-parent and multigenerational families among the blacks and the coloureds might partly have been the result of this larger proportion of households that included extramarital children.

(vi) Finally, with regard to the household structures, it can be pointed out that households in which several non-relatives co-habited, occurred very seldom, namely in only 15 cases of the total sample of 7 389, in other words in only 0,2% of the cases. These 15 cases were therefore not taken into account in further analyses.

When analyzing the family structures it was evident that there were family structures that still showed low frequencies in the more comprehensive table. Because 15 family structure types were still too many for the purpose of analysis, some of them were grouped together in order to facilitate their analysis in further cross-tabulations with other variables. The following family structures evolved from such a combination:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Single living: | Single living <i>together with</i>
Single living and add. members |
| 2. Single-parent family: | Man and children <i>together with</i>
Woman and children |
| 3. Single parent and add. members: | Man, child and add. members <i>together with</i>
Woman, child and add. members |
| 4. Nuclear family: | Man and woman <i>together with</i>
Man, woman and children |
| 5. Nuclear family and add. members: | Man, woman and add. members <i>together with</i>
Man, woman, children and add. members |
| 6. Multigen. male head: | Multigen., male head <i>together with</i>
Multigen., male head and add. members |
| 7. Multigen. female head: | Multigen., female head <i>together with</i>
Multigen., female head and add. members |

The distribution of these families among the different population groups was as follows:

TABLE 9: HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURES PER POPULATION GROUP

Family structure	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
Single living	301	17,2	104	5,1	63	2,6	59	5,0
Single-parent fam.	89	5,1	218	11,3	152	6,3	127	10,6
Sing. par. & add.	19	1,1	75	3,7	47	1,9	50	4,2
Nuclear family	1 227	70,2	928	40,1	1 457	60,5	477	39,8
Nuc. fam. & add.	70	4,6	285	14,1	401	16,6	139	11,4
Multigen. male head	14	0,8	235	11,6	195	8,1	195	16,2
Multigen. fem. head	7	0,1	167	8,2	95	3,9	151	12,6
TOTAL	1 746	100	2 016	100	2 411	100	1 198	100

2.1 Number of persons within the different household structures

In the analysis of the household structures among the different population groups it was not only important to gain information about the relative frequency of the particular household structures among the different population groups, but also to determine the number of people who lived within a particular structure. For example the percentage of families structured in a particular way might not have been very large, but the number of family members within this structure could have been so large that the total number of the population living in this structure might have been quite large. Because a particular family structure has unique dynamics which might influence the family members in a specific way, it was important to establish the percentage of the population that could potentially be influenced by that structure.

On the basis of a cross-tabulation of family structure with family size a calculation was made for each population group with regard to the total number of persons living within a particular family structure, and this distribution is presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10: NUMBER OF PERSONS PER FAMILY STRUCTURE PER POPULATION GROUP

Family structure:	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
Single living	259	4,9	43	0,4	26	0,4	8	0,1
Sing. liv. & add.	111	2,1	223	2,1	125	1,2	252	3,6
Man & children	18	0,3	79	0,8	33	0,3	63	0,9
Woman & children	216	4,0	747	7,2	474	4,1	485	6,9
Man, c & add.	-	-	14	0,1	30	0,3	44	1,0
Woman, c & add.	82	1,5	392	3,8	215	1,9	256	3,6
Man & woman	836	15,7	232	2,2	258	2,2	70	1,0
Man, woman & c	3 266	61,2	3 928	37,8	5 957	52,0	2 291	32,0
Man, w & add.	71	1,3	203	2,0	184	1,6	149	2,1
Man, w, c & add.	336	6,3	1 519	14,6	2 178	18,9	723	10,2
Multigen. male head	71	1,3	1 600	15,5	1 265	11,0	1 386	19,6
Multigen. male head & add.	11	0,2	250	2,4	129	1,1	200	2,8
Multigen. female head	27	0,5	1 011	9,6	561	4,9	999	14,1
Multigen. female head & add.	5	0,1	156	1,2	45	0,4	144	2,0
Several non-rel.	27	0,1	34	0,3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	5 339	100	10 431	100	11 502	100	7 070	100

When the percentage of persons within each family structure was compared with the details in Table 5, namely the frequency of the different family structures, it was clear that shifts had occurred. For instance, the percentage of single-living persons among the whites was 4,9% compared to the 14,8% households with single-living persons. The percentage of persons among the whites in the complete nuclear family, namely man-woman-child (61,2%), was considerably higher than the percentage of nuclear families (46,3%). By contrast, the percentage of persons in the nuclear family among the other

three population groups was lower than the percentage of nuclear families. Furthermore, the percentage of persons in the nuclear family plus additional persons category, as well as in the multigenerational family types was higher among these three population groups than the percentage of households within these structures. This shift was more obvious when the family types were combined as reflected in Table 11.

TABLE 11: PERCENTAGE OF FAMILY STRUCTURES AND PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS WITHIN STRUCTURES PER POPULATION GROUP

Family structure	Population group							
	White		Coloured		Asian		Black	
	% str.	% pers.	% str.	% pers.	% str.	% pers.	% str.	% pers.
Single living	17,2	7,0	5,1	2,5	2,6	1,3	5,0	3,8
Single-parent fam.	5,1	4,3	11,3	9,0	6,3	4,4	10,6	7,8
Sing. parent & add.	1,1	1,5	3,7	3,9	1,9	2,2	4,2	4,6
Nuclear family	70,2	76,6	40,1	40,0	60,5	54,2	39,8	33,0
Nuclear fam. & add.	4,6	7,6	14,1	16,6	16,6	20,5	11,4	12,3
Multigen. male head	0,8	1,5	11,6	17,9	8,1	12,1	16,2	22,4
Multigen. female head	0,1	0,6	8,2	10,8	3,9	5,3	12,6	16,1
Several non-relatives	0,5	0,1	0,2	0,3	0,1	0,0	0,1	0,0
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

The most important trends that emerged from Table 11 were the following:

- The percentage of single-living persons was lower than the percentage of structures amongst all the population groups, the largest difference being among the whites.
- The percentage of persons living within the single-parent family was lower than the percentage of single-parent structures amongst all the population groups. The population groups that still included the highest percentage of persons within the single-parent family were the blacks (12,4%) and the coloureds (12,9%).
- With regard to the nuclear family, 70,2% of the white household structures were nuclear families, but 76,6% of the population lived within these families, which further highlighted the importance of the nuclear family for the whites. Among the Asians 60,5% of the household structures were nuclear families, but only 54,2% of the population lived in nuclear families, while among the coloureds the percentages were very similar (40,1% nuclear families as opposed to 40% of the population). Among the blacks the nuclear family constituted 39,8% of the family structures, and only 33% of the population lived within the nuclear family.

- When the nuclear family plus additional members was regarded as a modified extended family, and its frequency was added to that of the multigenerational family where the man was the household head, as well as where the woman was the household head, it was clear that a substantial proportion of especially the black population group lived within this family type. Although this family type constituted 40,2% of all family structures, 50,8% of the black population group lived within this family type. Among the coloured and the Asian population groups a considerable proportion of the population also lived within these family structures, namely 45,3% and 37,9%, whereas these structures constituted only 33,9% and 25,6% respectively of the total number of structures among these population groups. With regard to the whites only 9,7% of the population lived within these structures, which constituted 5,5% of all the household structures.

When the percentage of the populations living within the different family structures was viewed globally once again, it was clear that the importance of the household structures that were highlighted among the different population groups in the first analysis was further confirmed by the percentage of the populations within these structures. For instance, the nuclear family appeared to be the most important family structure among the whites, and that was also the family structure that occurred most often among the Asians. Among the blacks and the coloureds the extended family structures had a high frequency and the largest percentage of the population lived in the modified extended and multigenerational family. This should therefore be taken into cognizance in housing programmes. Although the largest percentage of the Asians lived within the nuclear family, the modified extended, and the multigenerational families were also important for this group because a substantial percentage of them lived within these family structures. The single-parent family was the family type which occurred most often among the coloureds and the blacks, but it also occurred among the whites and the Asians, although to a lesser extent. In family policy this trend should also be taken into consideration.

2.2 Educational status and family structures

Apart from the important differences with regard to the incidence of the types of family structures among the different population groups, another important issue had to be considered, namely whether important differences emerged within each population group with regard to the differential incidence of family structures within the different social strata.

Because the educational status of the man was an important indicator of the status of the family, an analysis of the family structure according to the educational status of the man could indeed give an indication of whether there was a differential incidence of family structure types within a particular population group. In the case of female-headed family structures the analysis could be made on the basis of the educational status of the woman.

This analysis was complicated because the frequencies of some of the family structures were very low. In order to make this analysis possible, an analysis was only made of the family structures that had a high incidence within each population group. For this analysis the proportion of a particular family structure within a particular educational status category was calculated. For instance, it was calculated what percentage of all the families in the educational status group of Std 5 and lower were nuclear families, and what percentage was in the educational status group of Std 10, and so on.

TABLE 12a: PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN: WHITES

Educ. status of man	Single living	M & W	M, W & C	M, W, C & Add.
None	-	-	-	-
Gr. 1 - Std 5	-	14,3	57,1	14,3
Std 6 - Std 9	3,2	33,1	53,6	4,4
Std 10	4,6	30,0	57,8	4,3
Std 10+	6,5	25,9	60,5	3,6

TABLE 12b: PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES WITH FEMALE HEADS ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMAN: WHITES

Educ. status of woman	Single living	W & C	W, C & Add.
None	-	-	-
Gr. 1 - Std 5	13,3	26,7	6,7
Std 6 - Std 9	12,7	4,8	1,5
Std 10	8,8	4,9	0,9
Std 10+	12,4	4,9	0,8

Because there were only seven men and 15 women with Std 5 and lower, this category was not taken into consideration for the interpretation of the data.

From Table 12a it is clear that the higher the educational status category of the man the higher the proportion of single-living men and of nuclear families. Furthermore, the higher the educational status of the man the smaller were the proportions of man-woman and nuclear families with additional members.

According to Table 12b the proportions of households in the different educational status groups of the women were more or less the same for the woman-child families, there was a proportional decrease in the number of woman-child plus additional member households with an increase in the educational status, while the proportion of women who lived alone showed a curvilinear trend, namely high for the low educational status, then a decrease in the proportion of households among the intermediate educational status groups, and once again an increase in the proportion of households among the high educational status groups.

With regard to the coloureds the proportions of the dominant households in the different educational status groups of the man and of the woman were as follows (Tables 13a and 13b):

TABLE 13a: PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN: COLOUREDS

Educ. status of man	M & W	M, W & C	M, W, C & Add.	Multigen. male head
None	5,9	38,2	7,8	32,4
Gr. 1 - Std 5	10,1	46,4	14,1	19,1
Std 6 - Std 9	6,8	58,9	16,5	9,8
Std 10	5,8	61,2	20,4	4,9
Std 10+	9,0	61,8	15,7	2,2

TABLE 13b: PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMAN: COLOUREDS

Educ. status of woman	W & C	W, C & Add.	Multigen. female head
None		12,1	20,3
Gr. 1 - Std 5		13,9	9,7
Std 6 - Std 9		13,6	4,5
Std 10		11,6	-
Std 10+		10,6	1,5

From the foregoing tables the following is clear: As was the case among the whites, it was evident that the higher the educational status of the man the higher the proportion of nuclear families. This trend also applied to the nuclear family plus additional members, except that in the very highest educational status group there was once more a smaller proportion of this type of family structure.

With regard to the multigenerational family, the opposite trend was found, namely the higher the educational status of the man, the smaller the proportion of multigenerational families with a male head of household. The same trend emerged among the multigenerational families with a female head of household, namely the higher the educational status of the woman, the smaller the proportion of multigenerational families with a female head of household.

With regard to the single-parent families with female heads there was the following slight tendency: the higher the educational status of the woman, the smaller the proportion of single-parent families with female heads in the particular category.

With regard to the Asians the proportions of the dominant households per educational status category were as follows (Tables 14a and 14b):

TABLE 14a: PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN: ASIANS

Educ. status of man	M & W	M, W & C	M, W, C & Add.	Multigen. male head
None	11,1	51,9	11,1	18,5
Gr. 1 - Std 5	5,3	52,3	15,5	21,1
Std 6 - Std 9	4,9	65,0	17,2	8,4
Std 10	9,6	64,1	19,7	1,7
Std 10+	7,2	71,1	12,8	3,0

TABLE 14b: PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMAN: ASIANS

Educ. status of woman	W, C & Add.	Multigen. female head
None	17,3	16,2
Gr. 1 - Std 5	12,0	5,8
Std 6 - Std 9	5,4	1,5
Std 10	1,2	0,8
Std 10+	1,6	0,0

From the foregoing tables it is clear that the same trend that was distinguished with regard to the nuclear family among the whites and the coloureds was evident among the Asians, namely that the higher the educational status of the man, the larger the proportion of nuclear families in the particular (educational) category. With regard to the man-woman-child plus additional members there was an increase in the proportion of nuclear families with additional members concomitantly with an increase in the educational status of the man, except among the very highest educational status group where, as among the coloureds, there was a decrease in the proportion of man-woman-child plus additional member structures.

A further similarity to the coloureds is that there was among the male-headed as well as the female-headed multigenerational families a decrease in the proportion of multigenerational families with an increase in the educational status of the man and of the woman respectively.

A final similarity to the coloureds — although the trend was not as obvious among the coloureds as among the Asians — was the substantial decrease in the proportion of female-headed single-parent families when there was an increase in the educational status of the woman.

The distribution of household structures among the different educational statuses of the blacks, is shown in Tables 15a and 15b:

TABLE 15a: PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN: BLACKS

Educ. status of man	M, W & C	M, W, C & Add.	Multigen. male head
None	39,2	11,2	33,6
Gr. 1 - Std 5	47,6	9,6	24,9
Std 6 - Std 9	56,9	14,0	16,1
Std 10	51,6	17,7	6,5
Std 10+	61,0	12,2	4,9

TABLE 15b: PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMAN: BLACKS

Educ. status of woman	W & C, together with W, C & Add.	Multigen. female head
None	12,8	21,0
Gr. 1 - Std 5	11,3	14,8
Std 6 - Std 9	16,2	8,2
Std 10	11,6	1,9
Std 10+	9,1	3,0

From the foregoing two tables it is clear that the blacks resembled the other population groups in many respects.

As was the case with the other three population groups it was found that among the blacks there was an increase in the proportion of nuclear families with an increase in the educational status of the man. Also with regard to the nuclear family plus additional members there was, as was the case with the coloureds and the Asians, with the exception of the category of Std 5 and lower, an increase in the proportion of families per status category with an increase in the educational status of the man, except among the very highest educational status group where there was a decrease in the proportion of nuclear families with additional members.

Another similarity between the blacks on the one hand and the coloureds and the Asians on the other hand was that among the male-headed as well as the female-headed multigenerational families there was a decrease in the proportion of multigenerational families with an increase in the educational status of the man and woman respectively.

Among both the categories of female-headed single-parent family and female-headed single-parent family plus additional members, there was generally a decrease in the proportion of such families with

an increase in the educational status of the women with the exception of the category Std 6-9. This high proportion of female-headed single-parent families in the category Std 6-9 could be related to the high incidence of teenage pregnancies among the blacks.

Overall the following could be stated with regard to the relation between educational status and family structures: Although there were major differences between the different population groups with regard to the proportion of families that met the definition of the nuclear family structure, among all four population groups the proportion of nuclear families increased directly according to the educational status category of the man.

The multigenerational family did not occur significantly among the whites. Its incidence was higher among the coloureds, Asians and blacks, but it did occur in differential proportions among them. Among all three of these population groups there was a similar pattern, namely the higher the educational status of the family head in male-headed as well as female-headed multigenerational families, the smaller the proportion of this type of family.

Finally it was clear that among all four of the population groups the proportion of female-headed single-parent families, with or without additional members, decreased with an increase in the educational status of the woman.

It would therefore appear that when educational status was taken as an indicator, the nuclear family occurred more among the higher status groups, while the single-parent family and the multigenerational family, whether male-headed or female-headed, occurred more among the lower classes.

3. TYPES OF RESIDENT RELATIVES

Apart from establishing the nature of family structures it was important to establish the types of relatives who resided in the different household structures, and to determine whether a particular pattern emerged in this regard. It is important to note that in this analysis the three (or more) generations namely parents, children and grandchildren, who co-resided as a multigenerational family, were regarded as a family unit. Consequently the third generation, namely the grandparents or the grandchildren, were not regarded as "additional". In other words, only the persons who had been indicated by the respondents to be additional relatives, for instance the uncles, aunts or cousins, were regarded as additional members.

In an analysis of the resident relatives it was important to firstly establish what proportion of the families from the grand total within each population group did in fact take in relatives as additional household members.

The number of households with a particular structure that took in additional relatives and their proportional distribution were as follows:

TABLE 16: PROPORTION OF FAMILY STRUCTURES WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES* PER POPULATION GROUP

Family structure	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
Man & relatives	11	0,6	15	0,7	14	0,6	27	2,3
Woman & relatives	12	0,7	35	1,7	21	0,9	24	2,0
Single father & rel.	-	-	3	0,1	6	0,3	7	0,6
Single mother & rel.	12	0,7	55	3,1	39	1,6	43	3,6
Nuclear family & rel.	68	3,9	230	11,2	396	16,3	136	11,5
Multi-gen. man & rel.	1	0,1	17	0,8	-	-	-	-
Multi-gen. woman & rel.	-	-	15	0,7	7	0,3	16	1,3
TOTAL	104	6,0	370	18,3	483	20	253	21,3
GRAND TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS	1 746	100	2 017	100	2 411	100	1 198	100

* Keep in mind that the purely multigenerational family was not taken into account in this table because that structure was recorded separately.

As is clear from Table 16 additional relatives were taken in at a minority of the household structures among all the population groups, but major differences nevertheless emerged in this regard between the different population groups. The population group among whom the highest frequency of households with additional relatives occurred, was the blacks with 21,3% of the household structures. Among the whites it occurred least and only 6% of the household structures had additional relatives. The coloured and the Asian populations were placed intermediately between the other two groups, but they were nevertheless closer to the black population group with respectively 18,3% and 20% of the household structures that took in additional relatives.

The household structure with additional relatives that occurred most often amongst all the population groups was the nuclear family with relatives. It occurred among 16,3% of the Asian families, among 11,5% of the black families and among 11,2% of the coloured families, while it occurred only among 3,4% of the white families.

The household structure with additional relatives that occurred second most among all the population groups was the single-parent family consisting of a woman and children together with relatives. Among the blacks 3,6% of all the households had this structure, among the coloureds 3,1%, among the Asians 1,6%, while among the whites only 0,7% of all the household structures had a woman and child plus additional relatives structure.

Apart from the percentage of household structures where additional relatives were taken in, another important issue was the nature of the relationship between these additional relatives and the household head and his/her spouse. In order to establish this, the same procedure that was utilized

during the establishment of the different types of household structures was used. All the questionnaires were perused in order to establish the nature of the kinship of the resident relatives in each household. In this way a total of 69 categories of relatives and combinations of relatives were found among all four of the population groups. In view of this large number of categories of resident relatives and the relatively small number of households in the sample that took in relatives (1 210 households or 16% of the total sample), it is understandable that the frequency in some of the table cells was very low, and that there were also several empty cells (see Appendix A, Table 02).

In order to get a better overview of the data, these detailed categories were combined to form more comprehensive categories. On account of this, 14 categories of relatives emerged. Their distribution among the four population groups is reflected in Table 17.

TABLE 17: TYPES OF RESIDENT RELATIVES PER POPULATION GROUP

Type/Category of relative	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
02 Father	8	8,2	13	4,0	30	7,4	7	2,8
03 Father & rel.	1	1,0	4	1,2	11	2,7	3	1,2
04 Mother	44	45,4	40	12,2	104	25,5	33	13,1
05 Mother & rel.	8	8,2	21	6,4	61	15,0	23	9,2
06 Father & mother	6	6,2	7	2,1	30	7,4	1	0,4
07 Fa., mo. & rel.	-	-	3	0,9	12	2,9	8	3,2
08 Brother/s	8	8,2	46	14,0	36	8,8	33	13,1
09 Brother/s & rel.	-	-	11	3,3	19	4,7	10	4,0
10 Sister/s	6	6,2	46	14,0	1	10,0	32	12,7
11 Sister/s & rel.	4	4,1	31	9,4	12	2,9	29	11,6
12 Brs. & sisters	-	-	18	5,5	12	2,9	22	8,8
13 Brs., sis. & children	2	2,1	36	10,9	7	1,7	26	10,4
14 Only rel.	7	7,2	47	14,3	30	7,4	23	9,2
15 Grandpa/ma & rel.	3	3,1	6	1,8	3	0,7	1	0,4
TOTAL	97	100	329	100	408	100	251	100

From Table 17 it is clear that among the whites and the Asians the mother was the resident relative with the highest frequency, namely 45,4% and 25,5% respectively. Among the Asians there was a further 15% of the households where the mother together with other relatives (namely brothers, sisters, nieces, nephews and cousins) resided with the family. When the categories where a father or a mother or both parents resided with the family were added, this category formed a substantial proportion of the households with resident relatives, namely among the whites 59,8% and the Asians 40,3%. Among the coloureds and the blacks this category of resident relatives occurred considerably less, namely 18,3% and 16,3% respectively. It must however be taken into consideration that among these two population groups there was a fairly high frequency of multigenerational families that were recorded as a separate structure. The frequency of households in which a grandparent(s) resided was therefore considerably higher than is reflected by the 18,3% and the 16,3%.

A category of relatives that also showed a high frequency was the category of brothers or sisters, or brothers and sisters together with their children. This category showed a higher frequency among the coloureds and the blacks. For instance, among 44,4% of the coloured households where there were resident relatives, these relatives were brothers, sisters or both and/or their children, while this was the case among 45% of the black households. This category of relatives was also taken in by the whites and the Asians, but to a much smaller extent than among the coloureds and the blacks. Among the Asians there were brothers/sisters and/or their children present in 23,4% of the households with resident relatives, while amongst only 16,5% of the white households with resident relatives these categories of relatives were present.

It is important to note that although there was a differential incidence of resident relatives among the households of the different population groups — namely the father and/or mother categories appearing more regularly among the whites and the Asians — and the brother and/or sister, with or without their children, more among the coloureds and the blacks — these resident relatives were all relatives of the first order. In a small percentage of households with first-order relatives there were, however, also relatives of the second order, namely cousins or uncles or aunts or the children of uncles or aunts. Apart from these there were among all the population groups households that had taken in relatives of the second order only (grandfathers, grandmothers, cousins, uncles, aunts, and so on), namely 8,1% of the Asian households, 9,6% of the black households, 10,3% of the white households and — the highest — 16,1% of the coloured households.

In establishing if there were particular patterns with regard to the resident relatives, an analysis was not only made of the type of resident relatives, but it was also established whether the relatives were predominantly related to the father's or the mother's side. Unfortunately some of the questionnaires were filled in in such a way that kinship could not be established. A large percentage of the questionnaires did however contain the relevant information, and this is reflected in Table 18.

TABLE 18: DIRECTION OF KINSHIP WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES PER POPULATION GROUP (ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

Direction	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
N.a. (Do not take in relatives)	1 652	94,6	1 691	83,5	2 021	83,8	954	79,6
Woman's kin	49	2,8	190	9,4	95	3,9	114	9,5
Man's kin	25	1,4	95	4,7	240	10,0	119	9,9
Kin on both sides	1	0,1	8	0,4	11	0,5	5	0,4
Not indicated	3	0,2	39	1,9	44	1,8	7	0,6
TOTAL	1 747	100	2 023	100	2 411	100	1 199	100

As is clear from this table there were differential patterns with regard to the direction of kinship with the resident relatives. For instance, the whites and the coloureds, although differing noticeably with regard to the percentage of structures that included resident relatives, had the same pattern with regard to the direction of kinship with the resident relatives: in approximately two-thirds of the households the relatives were on the woman's side, while in approximately one-third of the households the relatives were on the man's side. In both these population groups there was a very small percentage of households that took in relatives on the man as well as the woman's side, although the percentage among the coloureds (1,9%) was larger than among the whites (0,2%).

By contrast, almost 75% of the Asian households took in relatives from the man's side. This pattern of intake was probably the result of the patriarchally orientated extended family which historically has had a high incidence among the Asians.

Despite the traditional patrilinear family form and patrilocal residence among the traditional black population, the pattern of taking in relatives among the blacks differed totally from the pattern among the Asians in that approximately just as many households took in relatives from the woman's side as households that took in relatives from the man's side. This was evidence of an urban trend to move away from the typical pattern of patrilocal residence.

With regard to the households with resident relatives from both sides, there was only a small percentage among the Asians (1,8%) and the blacks (0,6%), as was the case with the whites and the coloureds.

The aforementioned trends were better highlighted when the families that did not take in relatives were ignored and only the households that did indeed take in relatives were observed, as is clear from the following table (Table 19).

TABLE 19: DIRECTION OF KINSHIP WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES

Direction	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
Woman's kin	49	65,3	190	64,9	95	27,4	114	47,9
Man's kin	25	33,3	95	32,4	240	69,4	119	50,0
Kin on both sides	1	1,3	8	2,7	11	3,2	5	2,1
TOTAL	75	100	293	100	346	100	238	100

A final important question that emerged in the analysis of households with resident relatives was whether educational status and occupational status played a role. As indicated earlier, the educational status of the man as well as that of the woman was the highest for the whites and the lowest for the blacks. In this section it is indicated that the number of households with resident relatives was lowest for the whites, highest for the blacks with the coloureds and Asians in between, which indicated that ethnic stratification did indeed play a role in the integration of relatives into the household. A question that arose in this regard was whether stratification also played a role within each ethnic group, in other words whether the households in the different strata differed with regard to the intake of relatives.

Although it could not be inferred from the data in which social strata the households fell, it was clear that the educational status and occupational status of especially the man (see Steyn & Van Rensburg, 1985) were important indicators of social status and an indication of such status could be gleaned from an analysis of educational level reached in relation to the taking in of relatives.

From Table 20 it is clear that there were remarkable similarities between the different population groups, but that there were also differences. Among all four population groups in the category where

TABLE 20: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES* ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN PER POPULATION GROUP

Educational status	Population group			
	White (%)	Coloured (%)	Asian (%)	Black (%)
1. None	3,7	8,8	3,7	18,4
2. Gr. 1 - Std 5	11,5	15,4	11,5	16,1
3. Std 6 - Std 9	17,7	15,5	15,7	21,9
4. Std 10	22,6	24,3	22,6	33,9
5. Std 10+	15,7	16,9	15,8	24,4

* These percentages were calculated by expressing the number of households that fell in a particular educational status group and that took in relatives, as a percentage of the total number of sample households in that educational status group.

the male household head had Std 10 (the second highest category of educational status) the greatest proportion of households took in relatives, with the whites having the smallest proportion, namely 22,6% of the households, and the blacks having the largest proportion, namely 33,9% of the households. The category where the second highest proportion of the households took in relatives was, among the coloureds, the Asians and the blacks, the category where the man had the highest possible educational status, namely Std 10 plus further education, while among the whites it was the category where the man had an educational status of Std 6-9. The two categories among all the population groups where the smallest proportion of households took in relatives, were those where the man's educational status was lowest. Overall, it therefore seems as if a curvilinear relation emerged in the sense that at the lowest educational status level the proportion of households that took in relatives was smallest, at the intermediary to higher educational level a larger proportion of households took in relatives, whereas in the highest educational category a smaller proportion of households took in relatives.

TABLE 21: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF WOMAN PER POPULATION GROUP

Educational status	Population group			
	White (%)	Coloured (%)	Asian (%)	Black (%)
1. None	-	11,5	8,9	16,6
2. Gr. 1 - Std 5	-	18,4	13,8	17,2
3. Std 6 - Std 9	6,2	15,9	19,0	19,3
4. Std 10	5,1	11,5	17,4	30,8
5. Std 10+	4,9	13,6	20,2	36,4

Although it was the educational status of the man that played the decisive role in determining the status of the family, the woman's educational status could play a supplementary role in modern society, and therefore the pattern of intake of relatives was also analyzed on the basis of the educational status of the woman.

In this regard it could be expected that, on account of homogamy in the choice of a marriage partner, a similar pattern would emerge as in the case of the man, but it is clear from Table 21 that this was not the case. From this table it is clear that there was a similar pattern among the Asians and the blacks, which indicated that the higher the educational status of the woman the larger the percentage of households that took in relatives. This difference in the patterns of intake of relatives among the blacks with regard to the educational status of the man and the woman could be explained on the basis of a fact that was highlighted by Brandell-Syrier (1971), namely that men that have only high school education often marry women with higher qualifications than they themselves have, particularly nurses and teachers, which raises the men's status. If the category where the largest proportion of households took in relatives was the category with the second highest educational status of the man,

namely matric, it follows logically that the category where the largest proportion of households took in relatives was the category with the highest educational status of the woman, namely matric plus higher education.

Unfortunately the data with regard to the Asian family were insufficient to draw a similar conclusion.

With regard to the coloureds there was not an obvious pattern in respect of taking in relatives among the different categories of educational status of the woman. Among the whites no households took in additional relatives in the two lowest categories, while in the three categories with the highest educational status it seems that the higher the educational status of the woman, the weaker the inclination to take in additional relatives.

Apart from educational status, occupational status of particularly the man was, as indicated, an indicator of social status. It was therefore expedient that the intake of relatives in households according to the occupational status of the man be analyzed.

TABLE 22: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH RESIDENT RELATIVES ACCORDING TO OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF MAN PER POPULATION GROUP*

Occupational status	Population group			
	White (%)	Coloured (%)	Asian (%)	Black (%)
Prof. & manage.	3,9	21,6	19,2	23,3
Adm. & cleric.	7,4	15,1	20,6	31,9
Skilled	7,1	16,1	16,5	18,1
Technical	6,5	18,7	17,6	22,1
Mining & indust.	3,1	14,9	17,6	20,7
Eco. non-act.	3,1	12,4	11,1	20,0

* Service careers were omitted because of the small numbers in this career category.

From Table 22 it is evident that the tendency towards a curvilinear association that existed between the educational status of the man and the intake of relatives (see Table 21) also was present with regard to the occupational status of the whites, Asians and blacks. Although there was a degree of fluctuation, the general tendency among these three population groups was for the category with the lowest occupational status of the man, namely economically non-active, to have the smallest proportion of households that took in relatives, for the intermediary to the higher occupational status categories of the man to have a larger proportion of households in each occupational category that took in relatives, and for the highest occupational category of the man, namely professional and management, to once again have a smaller proportion of households that took in relatives. Among the coloureds however it seemed that, apart from a measure of fluctuation, there was a tendency towards a linear relation in the

sense that the higher the educational status of the man, the larger the proportion of households that took in additional relatives.

It was decided not to analyze the proportion of households that took in relatives according to the occupational category of the woman, because there was an exceptionally high percentage of housewives among all the population groups (whites 48,9%, coloureds 54,1%, Asians 73,5%, blacks 53,3%) to whom an occupational status could not be ascribed, and who, if they were employed could have been distributed throughout the status groups; thus a true reflection of the relation between the status of the woman as such and the intake of relatives would have been impossible.

Overall it would appear therefore that although there was a differential pattern of intake of relatives among the different population groups, with the whites having the smallest proportion of households that took in relatives and the blacks having the largest proportion doing so, there were important similarities among the groups in that a curvilinear relation, as indicated above, existed with regard to social stratum differentiation.

4. MARITAL HISTORY OF THE MAN AND THE WOMAN

As indicated in the first chapter, an exceptionally important relationship in the establishment of a family and a household is the socially accepted one between a man and a woman which produces offspring. This relationship is the most important focal point in the formation of a family and a household in any society, and the positions of the man and woman are central to the family structure, and as such are often the starting point of an analysis of the family and household structure. If the relationship between the man and woman is dissolved for one reason or another — through death, divorce or desertion — the family structure is very directly affected and a single-parent family comes into being.⁴ When one or both of the former spouses remarry, another type of family and household structure emerges, namely the reconstituted family which faces a unique set of problems.

The implications for the structure and dynamics of the family are not particularly significant when the previous marriage of either the man or woman remains childless, although former spouses may still have an influence on a particular marriage relationship. When however children are born from one or both of the previous marriages a reconstituted family is established, and it is here where the positions of stepfather, stepmother, stepbrother and stepsister or half-brother and half-sister are relevant. Although the stepfather and stepmother assume the positions of own father and own mother, the ensuing relationship is not necessarily similar to the relationship of the natural parents; thus the relationship of the step-parents is often characterized by unique problems.

The unique relationship problems of the reconstituted family can be further complicated by a dissolution of this marriage and another remarriage of the former spouses — a factor that has become a strong reality particularly against the background of the increase in the divorce rate in the RSA during the past few decades.

If the possible positions of especially the stepfather and stepmother in a family or household structure are considered, it is important that in an analysis of family structures the focus will also be on the proportions of households in which either the father or mother or both remarried after the death of

⁴ Single-parent families can also be established by way of extramarital births.

a spouse or after divorce and/or where one or both of the spouses married more than twice.

The marital history of the man as well as that of the woman was therefore obtained by a questionnaire item asking each about the way in which the first and subsequent marriages had been dissolved, and whether another marriage had occurred after the dissolution.⁵ After all the relevant information had been obtained, these marital histories were carefully studied and categorized on the basis of the manner in which the marriage had been dissolved, and on whether a subsequent marriage was entered into. Altogether 28 categories could be established in this way and all frequencies are given in Appendix A in Table 03 and Table 04.

Because it was difficult to analyze such a large number of categories — especially since the frequencies in some of the cells were very small — it was decided to combine some of these categories by only taking into consideration the number of marriage dissolutions (not the nature of the dissolutions), and whether there was another marriage at the time of the research. In this way the number of categories was reduced to 12. The marital history of the man in the different population groups is given in Table 23.

⁵ Brief co-habitational relationships and co-habitation relationships before the first marriage were not taken into account here.

TABLE 23: MARITAL HISTORY OF MAN PER POPULATION GROUP

Marital history	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. Never married	57	3,3	17	0,8	12	0,5	26	2,2
2. Cur. not mar.:								
a. Aft. 1st mar.**	38	2,2	63	3,1	50	2,1	35	2,9
b. Aft. 2nd mar.	4	0,2	5	0,2	-	-	2	0,2
c. Aft. 3rd mar.	1	0,1	-	-	-	-	1	0,1
d. Aft. 4th mar.	-	-	6	0,3	4	0,2	1	0,1
3. Cur. married:								
a. In 1st mar.	1 117	64,3	1 288	64,0	1 965	81,7	728	60,7
b. In 2nd mar.	156	9,0	84	4,2	48	2,0	61	5,1
c. In 3rd mar.	13	0,7	4	0,2	1	0,0	3	0,3
d. In 4th mar.	2	0,1	1	0,0	1	0,0	-	-
4. Co-habiting:								
a. Never married, co-habiting	15	0,9	23	1,1	3	0,1	10	0,8
b. Co-habiting aft. 1st, 2nd mar.	16	0,9	8	0,4	3	0,1	2	0,2
c. N.a. (no man in the house)	317	18,3	514	25,5	317	13,2	330	27,5
TOTAL	1 736	100	2 013	100	2 404	100	1 199	100

* Currently not married.

** After 1st marriage.

From Table 23 it is clear that there were important similarities among the different population groups with regard to the marital history of the man, but that differences in this regard also emerged. For example, the categories with the highest frequency among all the population groups were those where the man was still in his first marriage. Within this category differences did however occur. The Asians, for example, had by far the highest frequency, with 81,7% of the households in which the men were still in their first marriage, while the other three population groups had much lower frequencies but all

were within close range of one another, namely 64,3% of the white men, 64% of the coloured men and 60,7% of the black men being in their first marriage at the time of the study.

The category with the second highest frequency amongst all the population groups was the one in which there was no man in the house, and this therefore included all women who had never married and lived alone, all single-parent families and all female-headed multigenerational families. However, here too differential frequencies occurred among the different population groups. The lowest frequency occurred among the Asians (13,2%), followed by the whites (18,3%), while the incidence was notably higher among the coloureds (25,5%) and the blacks (27,5%).

The following category that also had substantial frequencies amongst all the population groups was that of men who lived in a second marriage. The whites had the highest frequency here with 9%, the blacks and the Asians were fairly close to each other with 5,1% and 4,2% respectively, while the coloureds had the lowest frequency with only 2%. The frequency of men who lived in a third or a fourth marriage was very low, with the whites once again having the highest frequency, namely 0,8%, while the incidence among the other three population groups did not exceed 0,3%. In households where the man lived in a second, third or fourth marriage, there was a possibility of a reconstituted family. The potential for a reconstituted family with a stepfather was therefore highest among the whites with 9,5% and lowest among the Asians with 2,1%.

The category of households where men did not remarry after the first or more marriages had a fairly low incidence among all the population groups. The incidences in this category for all the population groups were reasonably close to one another and ranged from 2,3% among the Asians to 3,6% among the coloureds.

The category that was the lowest among all the population groups was that of co-habitation, whether it was where a man had never married or where a previous marriage had been dissolved and the man was co-habiting with a woman. Co-habitation had the highest incidence among the whites with 1,8%, while it had the lowest incidence among the Asians with 0,2%. The blacks with 1% and the coloureds with 1,5% fell between the aforementioned groups.

Although no attention was given to the manner in which marriages were dissolved in the foregoing analysis it was important to briefly determine whether there were indeed differences among the population groups in this regard. Appendix A Table 03 confirms the existence of such differences.

In order to find the relative frequencies of the marriages that had been dissolved by death, divorce or desertion, each dissolved marriage was counted as one. If a particular marriage had been dissolved by death, and the man had remarried and this marriage as well as his third marriage had been

TABLE 24: MANNER IN WHICH MAN'S MARRIAGE HAD BEEN DISSOLVED PER POPULATION GROUP

Cause of dissolution	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
Death	59	23,2	101	50,2	73	59,8	60	50,4
Divorce	193	76,0	86	42,8	39	32,0	49	41,2
Desertion	2	0,8	14	7,0	10	8,2	10	8,4
Number dissolved marriages	254	100	122	100	122	100	199	100
Number households	230	13,2	171	8,4	107	4,5	105	8,9

* Percentage of the total number of households per population group

dissolved by divorce, and his fourth marriage had been dissolved by death, it was regarded as four dissolved marriages. The manner in which marriages had been dissolved in the different population groups appears in Table 24.

From this table it is clear that most of the marriages that were dissolved among white men had been the result of divorce, namely 76%, while fewest marriage dissolutions among Asian men had been the result of divorce, namely only 32%. Death as the cause of the dissolution of marriages among whites only featured in 23,2% of the marriages, while among Asians it occurred in 59,8% of the cases. Also among the coloureds and blacks death had been the cause of marriage dissolution in more than half of the cases, namely 50,2% and 50,4% respectively.

Desertion as a cause of marriage dissolution seldom occurred among the white men, namely among 0,8% of the cases only, while it occurred more often among the other population groups: 7% among the coloured men and 8,4% among the black men.

The marital history of the woman could also contribute to the development of a reconstituted and/or single-parent family, and the incidence thereof is reflected in Table 25.

TABLE 25: MARITAL HISTORY OF WOMAN PER POPULATION GROUP

Marital history	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. Never married	61	3,5	100	5,0	20	0,8	42	3,5
2. Cur. not mar.:								
a. Aft. 1st mar.	215	12,4	399	19,8	295	12,3	283	23,6
b. Aft. 2nd mar.	33	1,9	18	0,9	-	-	4	0,3
c. Aft. 3rd mar.	2	0,1	-	-	-	-	-	-
d. Aft. 4th mar.	1	0,1	-	-	4	0,2	-	-
3. Cur. married:								
a. In 1st mar.	1 130	65,1	1 323	65,7	1 996	83,0	770	64,2
b. In 2nd mar.	136	7,8	60	3,0	24	1,0	22	1,8
c. In 3rd mar.	20	1,2	-	-	-	-	-	-
d. In 4th mar.	1	0,1	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Co-habiting:								
a. Never married, co-habiting	17	1,0	21	1,0	3	0,1	12	1,0
b. Co-habiting aft. 1st, 2nd mar.	14	0,8	10	0,5	2	0,1	1	0,1
c. N.a. (no woman in house)	106	6,1	82	4,1	60	2,5	65	5,4
TOTAL	1 736	100	2 013	100	2 404	100	1 199	100

As in the case of the marital history of the man, there were in the marital history of the woman similarities but also important differences among the population groups. Apart from this there were important similarities but also differences between the marital history of the men and women in general.

For instance, the category with the highest frequency for all the population groups was, as in the case of the men, the category of women who were in their first marriage at that stage. As in the case of the men the frequency among Asian women was the highest, with 83% in this category, and much lower among the other groups but fairly close to one another with 65,7% for the coloureds, 65,1% for the whites and 64,2% for the blacks.

Unlike the men who had a fairly high percentage living in a second marriage, the category among the women that had the second highest percentage was the one where the woman after the dissolution of her first marriage (whether through death, desertion or divorce) had not married again. For instance, 23,6% of the black and 19,5% of the coloured women did not marry again after the dissolution of their first marriage, while among the whites and Asians, with 12,4% and 12,3% respectively, the frequency was considerably lower but nevertheless notable. The frequency of women who lived alone after the dissolution of a second and even a third and fourth marriage was however very low and decreased to between 2,1% for the whites and 0,2% for the Asians.

The percentage of women who lived within a second, third or fourth marriage was considerably lower among the men and it was found here that the whites scored the highest with 9,1%, as opposed to the coloureds, Asians and blacks who had exceptionally low scores namely 3%, 1% and 1,8% respectively. These marriages might therefore also have been reconstituted families with a stepmother.

It was also found that, unlike Table 23 which shows a fairly high percentage of households without a man, Table 25 shows a far smaller percentage of households without a woman. In fact it only varied from 6,1% of white households to 2,5% of Asian households, with the blacks and the coloureds being intermediately positioned with 5,4% and 4,1% respectively.

Because so many more women than men remained unmarried after the dissolution of a first and subsequent marriage and as so many men were in a second and subsequent marriage after the dissolution of a previous marriage, and as there was a considerably larger percentage of households without men than households without women, it would appear that after marriage dissolution men remarried more often than women.

As in the case of the marital history of the men the question arose as to how the women's marriages had dissolved. As for the men, the frequencies were calculated from Appendix, Table 04, namely each time a marriage had been dissolved it was counted, so that when a particular woman had been divorced three times, it counted as three dissolved marriages. The frequencies are given in Table 26.

TABLE 26: MANNER IN WHICH WOMAN'S MARRIAGE HAD BEEN DISSOLVED PER POPULATION GROUP

Cause of dissolution	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
Death	226	46,4	335	66,2	268	79,3	234	74,5
Divorce	252	51,8	134	26,5	59	17,5	70	22,3
Desertion	9	1,8	37	7,3	11	3,2	10	3,2
Number dissolved marriages	487	100	506	100	338	100	314	100
Number households	424	24,4*	488	24,2	326	13,6	310	25,9

* Percentage of the total number of households per population group

From Table 26 it is clear that more than half (51,8%) of the marriage dissolutions among white women had been the result of divorce, whereas among the other three population groups dissolutions had mainly been caused by death, namely among the coloureds 66,2%, Asians 79,3% and among the blacks 73,5%.

Desertion had not played a significant role in marriage dissolution among the women, except for the coloureds where 7% of the marriages had been dissolved as a result of men deserting women.

Compared to the men, the marital history of the women in the sample showed that among the latter death was more often the cause of marriage dissolution. This was probably related to the fact that the life expectancy of women is higher than that of men.

A final aspect in the analysis of the marital history of men and women that had to be dealt with was determining what proportion of the households in the population were possibly reconstituted families.

In the separate analyses of the marital history of men and women it has already been shown in what proportion of the households the men and in what proportion of households the women were in a second or even a later marriage. The total number of possible reconstituted families could however not be determined by merely adding the figures for the man and the woman, because both spouses in a marriage could have been in a second or subsequent marriage, and if the number of marriages for the man and the woman had merely been added together, a particular marriage could have been counted more than once, which would have given a distorted picture of the total number of possible reconstituted families. In order to determine the possible number of reconstituted families it was therefore necessary to determine the number of marriages of the husband in relation to the number of marriages of the wife in a contingency table. For this calculation only those families where both the husband and the wife of the married couple were present were taken into account. Households based on mere co-habitation were not taken into consideration for this calculation. The percentage in Table 27 is the percentage of the frequency within a particular cell of the total number of households of the particular population group.

TABLE 27: MARITAL HISTORY OF MARRIED COUPLES PER POPULATION GROUP

Pop. group and No. mar. in which man lives	Pop. group and No. mar. in which woman lives							
	1st mar.	%	2nd mar.	%	3rd mar.	%	4th mar.	%
White								
1st mar.	1 061	61,1	49	2,8	5	0,3	1	0,1
2nd mar.	64	3,7	78	4,5	12	0,7	-	-
3rd mar.	4	0,2	7	0,4	2	0,1	-	-
4th mar.	-	-	1	0,1	1	0,1	-	-
Coloured								
1st mar.	1 251	62,1	36	1,8	-	-	-	-
2nd mar.	61	3,0	23	1,1	-	-	-	-
3rd mar.	3	0,1	1	0,0	-	-	-	-
4th mar.	1	0,0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian								
1st mar.	1 944	80,9	16	0,7	-	-	-	-
2nd mar.	40	1,7	7	0,3	-	-	-	-
3rd mar.	1	0,0	-	-	-	-	-	-
4th mar.	1	0,0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black								
1st mar.	717	59,8	9	0,8	-	-	-	-
2nd mar.	48	4,0	13	1,1	-	-	-	-
3rd mar.	2	0,2	-	-	-	-	-	-
4th mar.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

From Table 27 it is clear that families in which both the husband and the wife lived in their first marriage had the highest frequency among all the population groups. The highest frequency was found among the Asians where in 80,9% of all their households both the man and the woman were living in

their first marriage, and the lowest frequency in this regard was among the blacks (59,8%). The whites and the coloureds with 61,1% and 62,1% respectively did however not have a much higher frequency than the blacks.

As is clear from Table 27, among all population groups there were marriages in which one of the spouses was in his/her first marriage while the other was in a second, third or even fourth marriage, and where there was therefore either a stepfather or stepmother. This category of reconstituted family occurred most often among the whites – among 7,1% of all households. Among the blacks 5%, and among the coloureds 4,9%, of all households fell in this category. Among the Asians this type of reconstituted family occurred least often – only among 2%.

Apart from these families where at least one of the spouses was in a first marriage, there were also households where both the spouses were in a second or third marriage. Here, too, the highest frequency was among the whites, with 5,9% of all households falling in this population group. Among the coloureds and blacks only 1,1% of all households fell in this category, while it occurred least often among the Asians with only 0,3% of all families in this category.

Overall the percentages of likely reconstituted families among all population groups were as follows:

White	13,0%
Black	6,1%
Coloured	6,0%
Asian	2,3%

When taking into consideration that the reconstituted family could have unique adjustment problems, the frequency of this family type among the different population groups was high – especially among the whites, blacks and coloureds. Cognizance must therefore be taken of this family type in the formulation of a family policy with a view to providing services that could assist the family members with their adjustment problems.

5. THE IDEAL FAMILY

When the family structures that emerge among the different population groups are reviewed, it is clear that a kaleidoscope of different types of family structures are found.

Although the nuclear family had the highest relative frequency among all the population groups, its incidence varied fairly extensively from one population group to another. For instance, the whites had the highest percentage of nuclear families, the Asians had the second highest and the coloureds and blacks the lowest, with less than half of the households in the latter two population groups being nuclear families. Furthermore, in each population group there was a great diversity of other family structures, ranging from single-parent families to multigenerational families that could be matrilocal or patrilocal. Even among the whites where the highest percentage of nuclear families was found, there were still 30% of the households that had structures other than that of the nuclear family.

When one considers all the strains that the modern nuclear family is subjected to as well as the increase in the divorce rate and the great diversity of family structures among the different population groups, the question arises as to whether there should not be a move away from Goode's (1963) claim that the nuclear family is still the ideal family in the industrial-urban society in general – and in South African in particular.

In order to answer this question, in the second phase of the fieldwork each respondent was asked to indicate which positions, in their opinion, should be in a family, whether relatives ought to reside with a family, and if so, which relatives. Unfortunately no blacks were involved in the second phase of the fieldwork, and these details are therefore unavailable for them — a pity particularly since the blacks had the lowest percentage of nuclear families, as well as the lowest percentage of persons living within a nuclear family.

The details with regard to the ideal family for the whites, the coloureds and the Asians were as follows:

TABLE 28: RESPONDENTS' VIEW OF THE IDEAL FAMILY STRUCTURE

Ideal family structure	Population group					
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%
1. MWC*	898	93,2	997	88,2	1 291	92,6
2. MWC & fa./mo.	18	1,9	25	2,2	13	0,9
3. Multigen.	-	-	29	2,6	43	3,1
4. MWC & rel.	5	0,3	13	1,1	10	0,7
5. Man, woman	14	0,8	23	2,0	13	0,9
6. Woman, child	3	0,2	40	3,5	18	1,3
7. Other	26	1,5	4	0,4	6	0,4
TOTAL	964	100	1 131	100	1 394	100

- * MWC = Man, woman, child
- Fa./Mo. = Father and mother of man and/or woman
- Rel. = Any relatives

From Table 28 it is clear that the nuclear family of man, woman and children was indicated by the vast majority of the respondents of all three population groups as the ideal family type. For instance, 93,2% of the white, 88,2% of the coloured and 92,6% of the Asian respondents indicated the nuclear family as the ideal family structure. The alternative family structure with the highest percentage among any of the population groups was the woman-child family, with 3,5% of the coloured population viewing this family type as the ideal family. However, only a very small percentage of the whites regarded the woman-child family as the ideal family, namely 0,2%.

Some Asians favoured the multigenerational family, with 3,1% of their respondents regarding it as the ideal family type. This percentage was however very low when taking into account that the Asians traditionally regard the multigenerational family as the most desirable (Jithoo *in* Steyn *et al.*, 1987). The multigenerational family was the family structure favoured by 2,6% of the coloured respondents but none of the whites saw this as the ideal structure.

The alternative family structure that was indicated most often by the white families as the ideal family structure was a nuclear family which also included the father and/or mother of the man and/or the woman. Altogether 1,9% of the white respondents indicated this as the ideal family type. A substantial percentage of the coloured respondents also indicated this as their ideal family, namely 2,2%, while 0,9% of the Asian respondents indicated it as the ideal family.

Although respondents in all three population groups offered alternatives to the ideal structure, only small percentages did so, and it therefore suffices to say that the nuclear family was still regarded by all three population groups as the ideal family structure.

Apart from the question on the ideal family structure, the respondents were also asked whether a family should be willing to take in relatives and if so, which relatives they would take in. The response to this is given in Tables 29 and 30.

The data in Tables 29 and 30 confirm the view that the nuclear family was the ideal family. From Table 29 it is clear that only a small percentage of the respondents would be willing to take in additional relatives in their households, namely 6,2% of the coloureds, 6,4% of the whites and 9,5% of the Asians. More than 90% of the respondents in all population groups were therefore unwilling to

TABLE 29: WILLINGNESS OF FAMILY TO TAKE IN RELATIVES

Willingness	Population group					
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%
Definitely not	527	54,1	691	58,7	751	53,1
Preferably not	385	39,5	414	35,1	528	37,3
Definitely yes	62	6,4	73	6,2	135	9,5

TABLE 30: TYPES OF RELATIVES THAT WOULD BE TAKEN IN

Type of rel.	Population group					
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%
1. None	992	93,6	1 113	93,7	1 273	90,5
2. Mother	-	0,9	7	0,6	12	0,9
3. Father	-	-	2	0,2	1	0,0
4. Parents	33	3,4	18	1,5	82	5,8
5. Brother/s and/or sister/s	1	0,1	13	1,1	18	1,3
6. Uncle and/or aunt	2	0,2	-	-	-	-
7. Gr. children	4	0,4	11	0,9	10	0,7
8. Any rel.*	14	1,4	2	2,0	11	0,8
TOTAL	985	100	1 188	100	1 407	100

* Includes: Any relatives who would need it, or were in trouble, or where the respondents did not give a precise indication of which relative.

take in additional relatives with their families. The respondents who were unwilling to take in additional relatives did not all express their aversion to the idea equally strongly, and more than 30% of the respondents in each population group stated that they would prefer not to take in relatives, while more than 50% in each population group stated that they would definitely not take in relatives.

Table 29 nevertheless shows that where the respondents were willing to take in relatives, these additional relatives would, in the majority of cases, be the father or mother or parents. For instance, 4,3% of the whites, 2,3% of the coloureds and 6,7% of the Asians expressed their willingness to take in a parent or parents. There was also a measure of willingness among the coloureds and Asians to take in a brother or a sister: 1,1% of the coloured respondents and 1,3% of the Asians. However, these small percentages confirm that the nuclear family was indeed the ideal family for these three population groups.

Despite the fact that the nuclear family was regarded as the ideal family by the different population groups, the family structures that occurred in reality showed a large variety and had many more nuances. This finding confirms the fact that the ideal, as seen at institutional level, and reality as embodied in concrete family life, do not necessarily correspond.

It is therefore extremely important not to focus exclusively on the nuclear family in family research and in textbooks, but also to thoroughly research the other types of family structures in order to reveal the family dynamics of these structures and consequently to handle any developing problems more adequately.

CHAPTER IV: OVERVIEW

1. INTRODUCTION

There is currently a serious debate in family sociology about the question of whether the nuclear family is still the basic and only legitimate family structure in the industrial-urban society, or whether alternative family structures have increased to such an extent that they should feature as legitimate structures alongside the nuclear family. In the most extreme cases the question has even emerged as to whether the nuclear family can still be regarded as a basic legitimate structure at all (Cooper, 1973; Etzioni, 1977).

The origin of this debate can mainly be seen as a reaction to the fact that for a considerable time the importance of the nuclear family in the industrial-urban society was overemphasized in family studies. Broadly speaking this overemphasis was probably the result of two factors. In the first instance there was a tendency among researchers to concentrate on the institutional level rather than on the collectivity level in analyses of marriage and family life, thus studying the broadly generalized pattern of family life and shaping conceptions of the ideal family structure, defined as appropriate and legitimate for each particular society.

In the second instance theorists started emphasising the formation of the nuclear family as the basic family in the industrial-urban society on account of the changes that occurred in the family in the course of the industrial revolution and the process of urbanization. This movement was probably initiated by Parsons and Bales (1955), who showed that the nuclear family became independent during the industrial revolution and that this led to the so-called structural isolation of the nuclear family. Later researchers such as Neidhardt (1966) and Kooy (1970) showed the same tendencies with regard to family life in Germany and Holland respectively.

In this regard Goode (1963:1) even went to the extent of showing that in world history there was for the first time a set of influences, namely the social forces of industrialization and urbanization, that had an impact on each known society and that led to the convergence of all family systems in greatly diverse societies towards the so-called nuclear family. Goode was of the opinion that there was a remarkable fit between the nuclear family and industrial society in the sense that the nuclear family best complied with the demands and needs of modern industrial society. The result was that the nuclear family came to be regarded as the ideal family structure and that progressively more people began to accept particular characteristics of the nuclear family as appropriate and legitimate, despite how little reality corresponded with this ideal.

The view that the nuclear family was the ideal family in industrial-urban Western society was summarized as follows by Lee (1977:145): "As we know, industrialized societies are almost uniformly characterized by the conjugal family system as the ideal."

Although Goode regarded the nuclear family as the ideal for industrial-urban society, it does not mean that he regarded this fit as unproblematic. He showed for instance, as did later researchers, that although the nuclear family was functional for the industrial system, the industrial system and the way in which the nuclear family fitted into it were not necessarily functional for the nuclear family, and that several strains could develop in the nuclear family within the context of industrial society. Overall, these strains that were unique to the nuclear family in industrial-urban society rendered the family

particularly vulnerable, and this in the long run resulted in a diversity of family structures emerging alongside the nuclear family.

On account of this development the demand for research on the concrete collectivity level increased (Gittins, 1985) in order to determine the different family structures that occurred in society; the extent of their occurrence; and the internal dynamics of each type of structure.

The debates about the incidence and legitimacy of different family structures have progressively featured in research on alternative family structures and the problems that face them. For instance, research in this regard showed, amongst others, that ethnicity and social stratification could be important inputs as independent variables with regard to the differential incidence of family structures in a society (see for example Zinn & Eitzen, 1987; Sussman & Steinmetz, 1988).

Starting with the work of Murdock (1947) and subsequently that of Nimkoff and Middleton (1960), Goode (1963), Blumberg and Winch (1972), Winch (1977) and Lee (1979), it became increasingly evident that the nature and incidence of different family structures within a particular society could be determined to a large extent by the structural features, the level of economic development and the complexity of that society, together with the historical course of events in the society. For instance, in each society there have been a unique value system, other variables and environmental circumstances that influenced family life and the development of particular types of family structures, which could have led to the family within that society attaining a unique form. In this regard it is therefore impossible to generalize the findings about one society to another.

The nature of family structures therefore has to be revealed by research in each society and for each population group and social class in that society. It also has to be determined which specific factors within a particular society interacted with family life in order to determine the nature of family life and the development of particular family structures.

2. THE FAMILY IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

When the situation with regard to family life in the RSA is taken into consideration, it is evident that there are factors that profoundly but differentially affect family life amongst all the population groups.

For instance the development of the mining industry, the technological and industrial revolution and the extensive urbanization especially since the Second World War until the present have contributed to the process of structural differentiation. All the population groups have been affected by this process in some way. This broad change on societal level has not only profoundly affected the family life of the different population groups, but has also resulted in increasing pressure on the family life of the different population groups.

Independent research in a variety of contexts in South Africa indicates that there is great diversity with regard to family life among the different population groups here. Not only are there large differences with regard to initial family structures, support networks, normative behaviour patterns and values with regard to family life among the different population groups, but there are also differences with regard to the economic and political circumstances under which each population group has experienced the historical process of industrialization and urbanization, and the way in which these changes have affected family life in each population group.

As a result of the difference in the life circumstances of the different population groups a set of differential variables has emerged in each population group that has influenced family life and the development of family structures in that particular population group in a unique way, and has led especially to family life facing a series of strains and problems unique to that population group.

Although this research indicated the existence of a diversity of family structures among the different population groups, there has to date been no attempt to determine the exact nature, composition and extent of the different types of family structures among the different population groups, or whether noteworthy differential patterns have been emerging in this regard.

The aim of this study has therefore been to establish the types of family structures and their extent among the different population groups in South African society. The research has essentially been explorative and therefore descriptive.

Because so little is known about the actual family structures in the RSA it was decided to work inductively by analyzing the empirical data with regard to the positions in a sample of families in each population group. It was unfeasible to gather data based on structures that had been worked out and categorized beforehand because certain empirical structures could be overlooked in this way. Therefore, in each household in the sample a complete survey was made of all the persons in the particular household, with an indication of their gender, age and the nature of their kinship to the household head. Thereafter the positions that actually occurred in each household in the sample were analyzed and on this basis categories were developed for the family and household structures among the population groups.

3. RESEARCH RESULTS

The analysis of the gathered data regarding the structure of households and families of the different population groups in the RSA confirmed the point of view taken in this research, namely that explorative research should be undertaken within each society to establish the unique pattern of concrete family structures for each society as a whole and for the different population groups in each society.

For instance, the results show very clearly that although there is a measure of correspondence in the family structures that emerge in the different population groups, there are distinct differential patterns with regard to the incidence of these family structures among the different population groups.

With regard to the incidence of the different family structures it can be pointed out that the true nuclear family, namely the man-woman-child family, is the family structure that, overall, has the highest frequency among all the population groups, although the proportion of these frequencies differs considerably from one population group to another. This family structure occurs most often among the Asians, then the whites, and least among the blacks. When the man-woman family, which is regarded as a phase in the life cycle of the family, is added to the nuclear family, the nuclear family becomes the structure that occurs most among the whites (70,2%), second most among the Asians, and least among the blacks (39,5%).

From this it is evident that the nuclear family is the structure occurring predominantly among the whites and that it has also developed strongly among the Asians. Among the other two population groups, namely the coloureds and the blacks, the nuclear family, although still the structure with the highest frequency, was found in less than half of the households. Other family structures therefore emerge in these two population groups, *inter alia* the multigenerational family.

With regard to the multigenerational family two types could especially be distinguished, namely the male-headed and the female-head multigenerational family. The male-headed multigenerational family has by far the highest frequency among black households (16,2%), and occurs fairly substantially among the coloureds (11,6%). Among the Asians it still occurs to a fair degree (5,1%), but can hardly be taken into consideration (0,8%) among the whites.

The same pattern of differential frequencies occurs among the female-headed multigenerational families. Here, too, the blacks have the highest frequency (12,6% of all the families). The coloureds also have a fairly substantial frequency (8,2%) and once again the Asians and whites (respectively 3,9% and 0,4%) show very low frequencies in this regard.

When the multigenerational families are all added together — whether with a male or a female head — it is evident that this family structure forms a substantial part of the families of some of the population groups, namely:

Black population	28,8% of the families
Coloured population	19,8% of the families
Asian population	12,0% of the families
White population	1,2% of the families

A last type of family structure that has elicited much attention in the literature of family sociology and which can be mentioned here, is the single-parent family. From the analyses it is evident that the family structure that has the highest frequency in this regard is the woman-child family. It is a family type that is more prevalent among black households (14,8%) and coloured households (15%), while it only occurs among 6,2% of white households and 7,7% of Asian households. If this research is considered against socio-cultural and historical backgrounds, the single-parent families among the blacks and coloureds are more likely to be the result of extramarital births, and those among the whites and Asians are most likely the result of divorce or the death of a spouse.

Apart from establishing the relative frequencies of the different types of family structures it was also important to determine the percentage of the population who lived within a particular family structure.

When the percentage of the population in the different population groups within the different family structures is considered globally, it is evident that the type of family structure which has been highlighted as important among the different population groups, is confirmed by the percentage of the populations within these structures.

For instance, with regard to the nuclear family it is clearly evident that 70,2% of the white household structures are nuclear families, while 76,6% of the population live within these families - which further highlights the importance of the nuclear family among the whites. Among the Asians 60,5% of the household structures are nuclear families, but only 54,2% of the population live within nuclear families, while among the coloureds the two percentages are very similar (40,1% nuclear families as opposed to 40% of the population). Among the blacks the nuclear family constitutes 39,8% of the family structures, but only 33% of the population live within the nuclear family.

If the nuclear family plus additional members is regarded as a modified extended family, and its frequency is added to that of the multigenerational family (male-headed as well as female-headed), it is evident that a substantial proportion of especially the black population live within this family structure. Although these family types constitute 40,2% of all the family structures, 50,8% of the black population live within this family structure. Among the coloured and Asian population groups a considerable percentage of the population live within these family structures, namely 45,3% and 37,9% respectively, whereas these structures constitute only 33,9% and 25,6% respectively of the total number of structures among these population groups. With regard to the whites only 9,7% of the population live within these structures while the household structures in this regard constitute 5,5% of all the household structures.

With regard to the percentage of persons living within the single-parent family it is clear that it is smaller amongst all the population groups than the percentage of single-parent structures. The population groups that have the largest percentage of persons living within single-parent families are the blacks with 12,3% and the coloureds with 12,9%. Overall it would therefore appear that with regard to the whites the nuclear family is still basically the legitimate family structure, and that Chester's (1985) finding with regard to England, namely that the family, based on a married couple and their children, and committed to a permanent relationship, is still the norm, corresponds to the findings of this study in respect of the whites in the RSA.

This statement definitely does not mean that the existence of other types of family structures is denied. Care must however be taken that these minor types of family structures on account of their specific problems, and which often attract more attention than the structures within the parameters of the accepted norm, are not in themselves elevated to the norm. Chester's contention can therefore be supported: "But to win the support for policies which help those who need it, it should not be necessary to obscure the factual prevalence of conventional family arrangements, nor is it necessary to try to demote the nuclear family. If policy-making goes that way (as may be happening at the margin) then it will go against the grain of majority family behavior."

While this statement is applicable to the white family, it is definitely not the case with regard to the other population groups. The percentage of family structures other than those of the nuclear family, and the percentage of the population who live within these family structures, clearly indicates that the nuclear family can only be regarded as one of a possible number of legitimate family structures.

For instance, the multigenerational family among the blacks can definitely be regarded as a legitimate family structure, and even the single-parent family, although not constituting such a high percentage as that of the multigenerational family, is probably a legitimate structure and cannot be ignored. Exactly the same applies to the coloured population where the multigenerational family as well as the single-parent family have a relatively high frequency.

Among the Asians, on the other hand, only the multigenerational family has such a high incidence that it can be regarded as a legitimate family structure. The single-parent family, as is the case among the whites, has such a low frequency that it can only be regarded as a minor type of family structure.

Taking into consideration that the incidence of the multigenerational family among the blacks, coloureds and Asians, and the incidence of the single-parent family among the blacks and coloureds is so high that these family structures are regarded as legitimate among these population groups, it is of paramount importance that these structures are taken into account in the development of a family policy and a family-building programme. These family structures cannot be ignored or explained away merely because the nuclear family is still accepted as the only legitimate structure among these population groups.

Although thus far attention has only been given to the nuclear family, the single-parent family and the multigenerational family, other types of family structures have materialized. These have developed because additional relatives were taken into the basic types of family structures. Admittedly, only a minority of the household structures in all the population groups take in additional relatives, but differences do indeed emerge among the population groups with regard to the relative incidence of these structures. The population group with the highest frequency of households with additional relatives is the blacks with 21,3% of the household structures. This structure occurs least among the whites and only 6% of the white household structures include additional relatives. The coloured and Asian population groups are in between the other two groups, but are closer to the black population group, with 18,3% and 20% of the household structures respectively taking in additional relatives.

Apart from the question about the percentage of household structures where additional relatives are taken in, it is also important to establish the nature of the kinship in relation to the household head or his/her spouse, and to determine whether a particular pattern emerges.

From the analyses it is clear that there is a differential incidence of the categories of resident relatives in the households among the different population groups. For instance, it is clear that for the whites as well as for the Asians the resident relative with the highest frequency is the mother, namely 45,4% and 25,5% respectively. Among the Asians there is a further 15% of the households where the mother together with other relatives (namely brothers, sisters, nieces and nephews or cousins) reside with the family. When the category of resident parent or parents is added, there is a substantial percentage of the households among the whites (59,8%) and the Asians (40,3%) who do indeed take in relatives. Among the coloureds and blacks these categories of resident relatives constitute a lower percentage, namely 18,3% and 16,3% respectively. It must however be remembered that among these two population groups there is a fairly high frequency of multigenerational families, which are included as a separate structure. The frequency where a grandparent or grandparents are present in a household is therefore noticeably higher than reflected by this 18,3% and 16,3%.

Categories of relatives that also show a high frequency are those of brothers or sisters with or without their children. These categories especially show high frequencies among the coloureds and blacks. For instance, among 44,4% of the coloured households with resident relatives there are brothers, sisters or both together with their children, while among 45% of the comparable category of blacks there are brothers, sisters or both together with their children. These types of relatives also resided with the Asians and whites, but considerably less than among the coloureds and blacks. Among the Asians 23,4% of the households with resident relatives have brothers and/or sisters and/or their children, whereas among the whites these categories of relatives are present in only 16,5% of the households with resident relatives.

Apart from the question about the nature of the kinship it is also important to pay attention to whether the relatives are related on the woman's or the man's side. The analyses in this regard show a tendency among the coloureds and whites towards relatives on the woman's side in about two-thirds of the families with resident relatives. Among the Asians, on the other hand, the resident relatives were on the man's side in three-quarters of the cases, whereas among the blacks an approximately equal proportion of the resident relatives were on the man's and the woman's side. This pattern among the blacks is a deviation from the traditional pattern of residence in the patrilocal communities.

Another interesting fact that emerges from the analyses is that, apart from the differential patterns of intake of relatives among the different population groups, there are also differences within each group based on educational status. Among all four population groups there is a tendency towards a curvilinear relation between the educational status of the man and the intake of additional relatives, in the sense that where the male household heads have the lowest educational status category the proportion of households with additional relatives is the smallest, that in the intermediate and higher educational status categories a larger proportion of households take in relatives, whereas in the highest educational status categories the proportion of households with resident relatives is once again smaller.

When considering the resident relatives among the different population groups overall, it is clear that, although particular tendencies emerge with regard to the type of kinship with resident relatives, in other words whether the relatives are related on the man's or the woman's side, and the manner in which educational status affects the taking in of relatives indeed it cannot be claimed that a fixed cultural pattern emerges. It is therefore preferable in this regard to use the concepts "modified

extended family" or "modified nuclear family". In the case of the multigenerational family — whether with a male or a female head — the concept "modified extended family" is probably more applicable, whereas the concept "modified nuclear family" is probably more applicable in cases where nuclear families take in additional relatives.

A family type that also features briefly in the analyses is the reconstituted family. From the analyses of the marital history of the man and woman it becomes evident that in the vast majority of cases amongst all the population groups the man and the woman live within a first marriage. Among all the population groups there are however families where the man and/or the woman are within a second or even later marriage. This phenomenon occurs most often among the whites with 13% and least often among the Asians with only 2,3%. The blacks and the coloureds are intermediately positioned with 6,1% and 6% respectively.

Because these reconstituted families may have unique adaptation problems it is necessary that this family type is taken into consideration in family policy formulation with a view to providing such families with the necessary services.

4. THE IDEAL FAMILY

When the family structures which emerge among the different population groups are thoroughly investigated it is evident that there is a kaleidoscope of different types of family structures. Although the nuclear family is the family structure that has the highest relative frequency among all the population groups, its incidence varies fairly extensively from one population group to another. A great variety of other family structures are consequently found within each population group, ranging from single-parent families to multigenerational families, whether matrilocal or patrilocal. Even among the whites where the highest percentage of nuclear families is found, there are still 30% of households that have other structures.

In view of all the strains the modern family is subject to, the increase in the divorce rate, and the great diversity of family structures among the different population groups, the question arises whether Goode's (1963) contention that the nuclear family remains the ideal family in the industrial-urban society should still be supported.

The analysis of the data that were gathered with regard to the ideal family clearly shows that despite the diversity of family structures that occur among the whites and especially the coloureds and Asians, the vast majority of the respondents in all three of these population groups, namely 93,2% of the whites, 88,2% of the coloureds and 92,6% of the Asians, regarded the nuclear family as the ideal family structure. The discrepancy between the concrete family structures and the ideal family structure is not particularly large among the whites, and it is fairly self-evident that the whites, where the nuclear family has a particularly high incidence, would also indicate the nuclear family as the ideal family structure. However what is of importance, is the large discrepancy between the family structures that empirically occur among the Asians and coloureds and their conception of the ideal family structure. Among the Asians as well as the coloureds the multigenerational family has such a high incidence that it could be accepted as a legitimate structure; nevertheless, 90% of the respondents in these population groups regard the nuclear family as the ideal family. The possibility therefore exists that the high incidence of the multigenerational family is less due to its being regarded as a legitimate structure, and more to housing shortages and poor economic circumstances. If these economic circumstances can be

successfully counteracted, the family structure among the Asians and coloureds might increasingly move in the direction of the nuclear family.

In view of the fact that the nuclear family has the lowest frequency among the blacks, and that more than half of the blacks live within the modified extended (multigenerational) and modified nuclear family (nuclear family plus additional relatives) it is a pity that information about their views of the ideal family could not be gathered in order to establish whether the same tendency is also evident among them.

In conclusion it must be pointed out that despite the nuclear family being regarded as the ideal family by three of the population groups, it is important to note that the family structures that actually occur among these population groups have many more nuances and show a much larger diversity than the nuclear family itself. This finding confirms the fact that the ideal at the institutional level and reality as embodied in existing family life do not necessarily correspond.

It is therefore of paramount importance that an actual attempt should be made in family research and textbooks not to focus exclusively on the nuclear family but, firstly, to establish the population's conception of the ideal family and, secondly, to thoroughly research the concrete family types in order to appropriately manage the problems which may occur in all these family structures and to take cognizance of these problems in the development of family therapy, family-building programmes and eventually in the development of family policy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BECK, S M & BECK, R W (1984): The formation of extended households during middle age. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 46:277-288.
- BERGER, P L & BERGER, B (1972): *Sociology: A biographical approach*. New York: Basic Books.
- BERGER, P L & BERGER, B (1983): *The war over the family: Capturing the middle ground*. London: Hutchinson.
- BLITSTEN, D R (1963): *The world of the family*. New York: Random House.
- BLUMBERG, R L & WINCH, R F (1972): Societal complexity and familial complexity: Evidence for the curvilinear hypothesis. *The American Journal of Sociology*. 77(5):898-920.
- BOULDING, E (1983): Familia faber: The family as maker of the future. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 46: 257-266.
- BRANDELL-SYRIER, M (1971): *Reef town elite: A study of social mobility in a modern African community on the Reef*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- BUCKLEY, W (1967): *Sociology and modern systems theory*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- CALDWELL, J C *et al.* (1984): The determinant of family structure in rural South India. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 46:215-229.
- CASTILLO, G T, WEISBLAT A M & VILLAREAL, F R (1968): The concepts of nuclear and extended family: An exploration of empirical referents. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*.
- CENTRAL STATISTICAL SERVICE (1988): *Report No 03-07-01: Marriage and divorce: Whites, coloureds and Asians in South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- CHESTER, R (1985): The rise of the neo-conventional family. *New Society*. 9:185-188.
- CHRISTENSEN, M T (1964): *Handbook of marriage and the family*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- COALE, A J *et al.* (1965): *Aspects of the analysis of family structure*. Princeton, N J: Princeton University Press.
- COLEMAN, M & GANONG, L H (1984): Effect of family structure on family attitudes and expectations. *Family Relations*. 33:425-432.
- COOPER, D (1973): *The death of the family*. Victoria, Australia: Penguin Books.
- COX, F D (1981): *Human intimacy: Marriage, the family and its meaning*. New York: West Publishing Co.
- CRONJÉ, G & VENTER, J D (1958): *Die patriargale familie*. Kaapstad: HAUM.
- DRAKE, M (1969): *Population and society in Norway, 1735-1865*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ELLIOT, F R (1986): *The family: Change of continuity*. London: MacMillan.
- ELLIS, C (1984): Community organization and family structure in two fishing communities. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 46:515-526.

- ESPENSHADE, T J & BRAIN, R E (1982): Life course analysis and multi-state demography: An application to marriage, divorce and re-marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 44:1025-1036.
- ETZIONI, A (1977): The family: Is it obsolete? *Journal of Current Social Issues*.
- FINE, M A (1986): Perceptions of stepparents: Variation in stereotypes as a function of current family structure. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 48:537-543.
- FLOGE, L (1989): Household structure, child care, and employment of mothers. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 51:51-64.
- FURSTENBERG, F F (1966): Industrialization and the American family: A look backwards. *American Sociological Review*. 31:326-337.
- GITTINS, D (1985): *The family in question: Changing households and familial ideologies*. London: MacMillan.
- GLICK, P C (1984): Marriage, divorce, and living arrangements: Prospective changes. *Journal of Family Issues*. 5: 7-26.
- GLICK, P C (1988): Fifty years of family demography: A record of social change. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 50:861-872.
- GLICK, P C & LIN SUNG-LING (1986): More young adults are living with their parents: Who are they? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 48: 107-112.
- GOODE, W J (1963): *World revolution in family patterns*. London: Collier-MacMillan.
- GORDON, M (1973): *The American family in social-historical perspective*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- HILL, R & KÖNIG, R (1970): *Families in East and West: Socialization process and kinship ties*. Paris: Mouton.
- HOWE, L K (1972): *The future of the family*. Simon & Schuster.
- KEYTER, J DE W (1940): *Die huwelik en gesin*. Nasionale Pers.
- KIECDT, K J & ACOCK, A C (1988): The long-term effects of family structure on gender-role attitudes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 50:709-717.
- KOOY, G A (1970): *Het modern-Westerns gezin*. Hilversum: Paul Brand.
- LASLETT, P & WALL R (1972): *Household and family in past time*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- LEE, G R (1977): *Family structure and interaction*. New York: Lippincott Co.
- LEE, G R (1979): Marital structure and economic systems. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 41: 701-713.
- LEVY, M J (1966): *Modernization and the structure of societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- LITWAK, E (1959): Occupational mobility and extended family cohesion. *American Sociological Review*. 25:9-21.
- LITWAK, E (1960(a)): Geographic mobility and extended family cohesion. *American Sociological Review*. 25:385-394.

- LITWAK, E (1960(b)): The use of extended family groups in the achievement of social goals: Some policy implications. *Social Problems*. 7:177-186.
- MACKLIN, E D & RUBIN, R M (1983): *Contemporary families and alternative lifestyles*. London: Sage Publications.
- McLANAHAN, G S (1983): Family structure and stress: Longitudinal comparison of two-parent and female headed families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 45:347-357.
- MOENO, S N (1969): *The urban African: Family disorganization with special reference to the problem of illegitimacy*. Pretoria: Unisa. M.A. dissertation.
- MURDOCK, G D (1949): *Social structure*. New York. The Free Press.
- NEIDHARDT, F (1966): *Struktur und Wandel der Gesellschaft: Die Familie in Deutschland*. Opladen: C W Leske Verlag.
- NIMKOFF, M F & MIDDLETON, R (1960): Types of family and types of economy. *The American Journal of Sociology*. 66:215-225.
- OSKAMP, S(Ed.) (1987): *Family processes and problems: Social psychological aspects*. London: Sage Publications.
- PARSONS, T (1961): *Theories of societies*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe Ill.
- PARSONS, T & BALES, R F (1955): *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Glencoe Ill.: The Free Press.
- PAUW, B A (1953): *The second generation: A study of the family among urbanized Bantu in East London*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- PRINSLOO, R (1986): *Die verband tussen Ideologie en Wetenskap met verwysing na Sowjet-ideologie en Sowjet-sosiologie in die post-Stalin era*. Johannesburg: RAU. M.A.-verhandeling.
- REISS, I L (1965): The universality of the family: A conceptual analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 27:443-453.
- SANTI, L L (1987): Change in the structure and size of American households, 1970-1985. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 49:833-837.
- SCHEIRER, M A (1983): Household structure among welfare families: Correlates and consequences. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 45:761-772.
- SHAH, A M (1974): *The household dimension of the family in India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- SHANAS, E. & STREIB, G F (Ed.) (1965): *Social structure and the family: Generational relations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- STEPHENS, W N (1963): *The family in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.
- STEYN, A F (1961): *Die rolle van die man en vrou in die Kaapse kleurlinggesin*. Stellenbosch: Ongepubliseerde D.Phil.-proefskrif.
- STEYN, A F (1990): Aard en voorkoms van verskillende gesinstrukture in die samelewing. *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Sosiologie*. 21:119-129.
- STEYN, A F, STRIJDOM, M G, VILJOEN, S & BOSMAN, F J (1987): *Marriage and family life in South Africa: Research priorities*. Pretoria: HSRC.

- STEYN, A F & VAN RENSBURG, M C J (1985): *Sosiologie*. Kaapstad: Academica.
- STEYN, A F, VAN WYK, D & LE ROUX, T (1989): *Die gesin: Gister en vandag*. Kaapstad: Academica.
- SUSSMAN, M B & BURCHINAL, L G (1966): Kin family network: Unheralded structure in current conceptualization of family functioning. In: Faber, B (Ed.) *Kinship and family organization*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- SUSSMAN, M B & STEINMETZ, S K (1988): *Handbook of marriage and the family*. New York: Plenum Press.
- SWEETSER, D A (1964): Urbanization and the patrilineal transmission of farms in England. *Acta Sociologica*. 7:215-224.
- SZINOVACZ, M E (1977): Role allocation, family structure and female employment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 39:781-791.
- VAN DER MERWE, C F (1969): *Die Afrikaanse landelike en stedelike gesin: Vergelykende ondersoek*. Pretoria: RGN Instituut vir Sosiologiese Navorsing.
- WELLS, J G (1983): *Current issues in marriage and the family*. New York: MacMillan.
- WHITE, M J & TSUI, A O (1986): A panel study of family level structural change. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 48:435-446.
- WINCH, R F (1977): *Familial organization: A quest for determinants*. New York: The Free Press.
- WINCH, R F & GREER, S (1968): Urbanism, ethnicity, and extended familism. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 32:265-272.
- YAMANE, T & NONOYAMA, A (1967): Isolation of the nuclear family in kinship organization in Japan: A hypothetical approach to the relationship between family and society. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 29:783-796.
- YORBURG, B (1975): The nuclear and the extended family: An area of conceptual confusion. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. 6:5-14.
- YORBURG, B (1983): *Families and societies*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ZINN, M B & EITZEN D S (1987): *Diversity in American families*. New York: Harper & Row.
- ZNANIECKI, F (1952): *Cultural sciences*. Urbana: University of Ill. Press.

APPENDIX

Table 01

Table 02

Table 03

Table 04

Table 05

Instructions

TABLE 01: FAMILY STRUCTURE RSA 1988-89

Family structure	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. Single-living man	73	4,2	12	0,6	-	8,3	4	0,3
2. Man & children	7	0,4	23	1,1	11	0,5	16	1,3
3. Man & grand-children	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0,2
4. Man & relatives	11	0,6	13	0,6	14	0,6	25	2,0
5. Man & non-relatives	10	0,6	4	0,2	1	0,0	-	-
6. Man, relatives & non-relatives	-	-	2	0,1	-	-	-	-
7. Man, children & relatives	-	-	1	0,0	4	0,2	7	0,6
8. Single-living woman	186	10,6	31	1,5	18	0,7	4	0,3
9. Woman & children	82	4,7	195	9,7	141	5,8	111	9,3
10. Woman & grand-children	1	0,1	12	0,6	4	0,2	13	1,1
11. Woman & relatives	10	0,6	19	0,9	17	0,7	10	0,8
12. Woman & non-relatives	9	0,5	7	0,3	1	0,0	-	-
13. Woman, relatives & non-relatives	1	0,1	4	0,2	-	-	1	0,1
14. Woman, children & relatives	11	0,6	42	2,1	20	0,8	41	3,4
15. Woman, children & non-relatives	7	0,4	17	0,8	15	0,1	-	-
16. Woman, children relatives & non-relatives	-	-	9	0,4	-	-	-	-

TABLE 01: FAMILY STRUCTURE RSA 1988-89 (continued)

Family structure	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
17. Man & woman	418	23,9	116	5,8	129	5,4	35	2,9
18. Man, woman & children	809	46,3	812	40,3	1 328	55,1	442	36,9
19. Man, woman & grandchildren	4	0,2	13	0,6	8	0,3	9	0,8
20. Man, woman & relatives	13	0,7	24	1,2	40	1,7	20	1,7
21. Man, woman & relatives	4	0,2	21	0,4	1	0,0	-	-
22. Man, woman, relatives & non-relatives	-	-	5	0,2	-	-	-	-
23. Man, woman, children & relatives	50	2,9	168	8,3	288	11,9	105	8,8
24. Man, woman, children & non-relatives	8	0,5	46	2,3	4	0,2	3	0,3
25. Man, woman, children, relatives & non-relatives	-	-	13	0,6	1	0,0	1	0,1
26. Man, married children without children	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27. Man, unmarried children, married children without children	-	-	2	0,1	2	0,1	-	-
28. Woman, married children without children	-	-	-	-	5	0,2	-	-

TABLE 01: FAMILY STRUCTURE RSA 1988-89 (continued)

Family structure	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
29. Woman, unmarried children, married children without children	1	0,1	4	0,2	14	0,6	2	0,2
30. Man, woman, married children without children	-	-	2	0,1	17	0,7	1	0,1
31. Man, woman, unmarried children, married children, without children	1	0,1	5	0,2	42	1,7	-	-
32. Multigenerational family with male head	12	0,7	210	10,4	180	7,5	173	14,4
33. Multigenerational family, relatives, male head	1	0,1	16	0,8	15	0,6	22	1,8
34. Multigenerational family & non-relatives, male head	1	0,1	8	0,4	-	-	-	-
35. Multigenerational family, relatives & non-relatives, male head	-	-	1	0,0	-	-	-	-
36. Multigenerational family with female head	6	0,3	146	7,2	88	3,6	135	11,3
37. Multigenerational family, relatives, female head	-	-	12	0,6	7	0,3	16	1,3

TABLE 01: FAMILY STRUCTURE RSA 1988-89 (continued)

Family structure	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
38. Multigenerational family, non-relatives, with female head	1	0,1	6	0,3	-	-	-	-
39. Multigenerational, family, relatives, non-relatives, female head	-	-	3	0,1	-	-	-	-
40. Exception	-	-	4	0,2	-	-	-	-
41. Several non-relatives	9	0,5	-	-	1	0,0	-	-
"Missing"	(1)		(7)				(1)	
TOTAL	1 746	100	2 017	100	2 411	100	1 198	100

TABLE 02: TYPES OF RESIDENT RELATIVES

Type of relatives	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. No resident relatives	1 648	94,3	1 685	83,3	2 002	83,0	948	79,1
2. Father	8	0,5	13	0,6	30	1,2	7	0,6
3. Father & brothers	1	0,1	1	0,04	4	1,2	-	-
4. Father & brothers' child(ren)	-	-	-	-	1	0,04	-	-
5. Father, brother(s) & br's child(ren)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0,1
6. Father & sister(s)	-	-	1	0,04	2	0,1	-	-
7. Father & sisters' child(ren)	-	-	1	0,04	3	0,1	2	0,2
8. Father, sister(s) & sisters child(ren)	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	-	-

TABLE 02: TYPES OF RESIDENT RELATIVES (continued)

Type of relatives	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
9. Father, brothers & sisters	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. Father, brothers sisters & br. or sist. children	-	-	-	-	1	0,04	-	-
11. Fat. & m. cousin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. Father & f. cousin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Father, male & female cousins	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14. Mother	44	2,5	40	2,0	104	4,3	33	2,8
15. Mother & brothers	4	0,2	3	0,1	16	0,7	4	0,3
16. Mother & brothers child(ren)	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	2	0,2
17. Mother, brothers & brothers child(ren)	-	-	2	0,1	1	0,04	2	0,2
18. Mother & sister(s)	2	0,1	8	0,4	9	0,4	4	0,3
19. Mother & sisters children	-	-	-	-	1	0,04	2	0,2
20. Mother, sister(s) & sisters children	-	-	-	-	4	0,2	3	0,3
21. Mother, brother(s) and sister(s)	-	-	2	0,1	6	0,2	1	0,1
22. Mother, brother(s) & sister(s) & br. or sisters children	-	-	1	0,04	5	0,2	4	0,3
23. Mother, sister(s) & female cousin(s)	-	-	1	0,04	2	0,1	-	-
24. Mother & sister(s) & male cousin(s)	-	-	-	-	1	0,04	-	-

TABLE 02: TYPES OF RESIDENT RELATIVES (continued)

Type of relatives	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
25. Mo. & fem cousin	1	0,1	-	-	5	0,2	1	0,1
26. Mo. & male cousin	-	-	3	0,1	5	0,2	-	-
27. Mo. male & female cousins	-	-	-	-	1	0,04	-	-
28. Mother & uncle	1	0,1	-	-	5	0,2	-	-
29. Father & mother	6	0,3	7	0,3	30	1,2	1	0,1
30. Father, mother & brother(s) (with/without wife)	-	-	2	0,1	3	0,1	-	-
31. Father, mother, br. (with/without wife) & br's children	-	-	1	0,04	1	0,04	-	-
32. Father, mother & sister(s)	-	-	-	-	2	0,1	-	-
33. Father, mother, brother(s) & sister(s)	-	-	-	-	6	0,2	8	0,7
34. Brother(s)	8	0,5	46	2,3	36	1,5	33	2,8
35. Brother & his wife	-	-	3	0,1	8	0,3	2	0,2
36. Brother, wife & their children	-	-	5	0,2	8	0,3	3	0,3
37. Brother(s) & brother(s) children	-	-	1	0,04	2	0,1	1	0,1
38. Brother, wife, children & sister	-	-	-	-	1	0,04	2	0,2
39. Brother(s) & male cousin(s)	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	2	0,2
40. Brother(s) & female cousin(s)	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	-	-

TABLE 02: TYPES OF RESIDENT RELATIVES (continued)

Type of relatives	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
41. Sister(s)	6	0,3	46	2,3	41	1,7	32	2,7
42. Sister & husband	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	-	-
43. Sister, husband & their children	1	0,1	4	0,2	-	-	1	0,1
44. Sister(s) & sisters' children	3	0,2	21	1,0	8	0,3	26	2,2
45. Sister(s), sisters' children & br's children	-	-	1	0,04	1	0,04	1	0,1
46. Si & male cousin(s)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0,1
47. Sisters & female cousin(s)	-	-	2	0,1	2	0,1	-	-
48. Si, male cousin(s) & female cousin(s)	-	-	2	0,1	1	0,04	-	-
49. Brother(s) & sister(s)	-	-	18	0,9	12	0,5	22	1,8
50. Brother(s) children	-	-	7	0,3	3	0,1	5	0,4
51. Sister(s) children	2	0,1	21	1,0	4	0,2	11	0,9
52. Brother(s) & sisters children	-	-	3	0,1	-	-	3	0,3
53. Brother(s), sis.(s) & br's and/or sisters children	-	-	5	0,2	-	-	7	0,6
54. Male cousin(s)	2	0,1	10	0,5	14	0,6	2	0,2
55. Male cousin, wife & children	-	-	2	0,1	-	-	6	0,5
56. Female cousin(s)	4	0,2	16	0,8	9	0,4	3	0,3
57. Female cousin & husband	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	2	0,2

TABLE 02: TYPES OF RESIDENT RELATIVES (continued)

Type of relatives	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
58. Female cousin & children	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	4	0,3
59. Male cousin(s) & female cousin(s)	-	-	2	0,1	1	0,04	1	0,1
60. Grandmother	2	0,1	4	0,2	1	0,04	-	-
61. Gr. mo. & mother	-	-	2	0,1	-	-	-	-
62. Gr. mo., sister & sisters child(ren)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
63. Grandfather	1	0,1	-	-	1	0,04	-	-
64. Gr. father, parents & brother(s)	-	-	-	-	1	0,04	2	0,2
65. Uncle	-	-	5	0,2	2	0,1	-	-
66. Uncle, sister & male cousins	-	-	-	-	1	0,04	-	-
67. Uncle, br's & sisters	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	2	0,2
68. Aunt	1	0,1	-	-	-	-	2	0,2
69. Aunt, sister, brother & sisters children	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE 03: MARITAL HISTORY OF MEN

Marital history	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. Never married	57	3,3	17	0,8	12	0,5	26	2,2
2. Never married/ co-habit	15	0,9	23	1,1	3	0,1	10	0,8
3. M1*	1 120	64,1	1 288	63,6	1 966	81,5	728	60,7
4. M1Dt	17	1,0	44	2,2	43	1,8	24	2,0

* M = Marriage, Dt = Death, Dv = Divorced, Ds = Desertion

TABLE 03: MARITAL HISTORY OF MEN (continued)

Marital history	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
5. M1Dt/co-habit	1	0,1	-	-	1	0,04	1	0,1
6. M1Dt M2	33	1,9	33	1,6	20	0,8	24	2,0
7. M1Dt M2Dt	1	0,1	4	0,2	-	-	1	0,1
8. M1Dt M2Dt M3	1	0,1	-	-	-	-	1	0,1
9. M1Dt M2Dv	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. M1Dt M2Dv M3	1	0,1	2	0,1	1	0,04	-	-
11. M1Dt M2Dv M3Dv M4	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	-	-
12. M1Dt M2Ds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. M1Dt M2Ds M3Ds	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0,1
14. M1Dv	21	1,2	13	0,6	4	0,2	9	0,8
15. M1Dv/co-habit	15	0,9	4	0,2	1	0,04	1	0,1
16. M1Dv M2	122	7,0	48	2,4	22	0,9	31	2,6
17. M1Dv M2Dv	3	0,2	-	-	-	-	-	-
18. M1Dv M2Dv M3	9	0,5	2	0,1	-	-	1	0,1
19. M1Dv M2Dv M3Dv M4	2	0,1	-	-	1	0,04	-	-
20. M1Dv M2Dt	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	1	0,1
21. M1Dv M2Dt M3	2	0,1	-	-	-	-	1	0,1
22. M1Dv M2Dt M3Dv	1	0,1	-	-	-	-	-	-
23. M1Dv M2Dt M3Dt M4Dt	-	-	6	0,3	4	0,2	2	0,2
24. M1Ds	-	-	6	0,3	3	0,1	2	0,2
25. M1Ds/co-habit	-	-	5	0,2	1	0,04	-	-

TABLE 03: MARITAL HISTORY OF MEN (continued)

Marital history	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
26. M1Ds M2	2	0,1	3	0,1	6	0,2	6	0,5
27. Not applicable (no husband)	318	18,2	515	25,4	318	13,2	330	27,5
28. Unknown/"Miss- ing"	6	0,4	9	0,5	5	0,3	-	-
TOTAL	1 747	100	2 024	100	2 411	100	1 199	100

TABLE 04: MARITAL HISTORY OF WOMEN

Marital history	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1. Never married	61	3,5	100	4,9	20	0,8	42	3,5
2. Never married/ co-habit	17	1,0	21	1,0	3	0,1	12	1,0
3. M1	1 130	64,7	1 323	65,4	1 998	82,9	770	64,2
4. M1Dt	129	7,4	283	14,0	253	10,5	217	18,1
5. M1Dt/co-habit	3	6,2	5	0,2	-	-	-	-
6. M1Dt M2	37	2,1	26	1,3	7	0,3	12	1,0
7. M1Dt M2Dt	14	0,8	7	0,3	-	-	2	0,2
8. M1Dt M2Dt M3	3	0,2	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. M1Dt M2Dv	3	0,2	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. M1Dt M2Dv M3	5	0,3	-	-	-	-	-	-
11. M1Dt M2Dv M3Dv M4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. M1Dt M2Ds	-	-	2	0,1	-	-	-	-

TABLE 04: MARITAL HISTORY OF WOMEN (continued)

Marital history	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
13. M1Dt M2Ds M3Ds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14. M1Dv	81	4,6	88	4,3	35	1,5	58	4,8
15. M1Dv/co-habit	11	0,6	3	0,1	1	0,04	1	0,1
16. M1Dv M2	96	5,5	30	1,5	15	0,6	8	0,7
17. M1Dv M2Dv	8	0,5	4	0,2	-	-	1	0,1
18. M1Dv M2Dv M3	10	0,6	-	-	-	-	-	-
19. M1Dv M2Dv M3Dv M4	1	0,1	-	-	-	-	-	-
20. M1Dv M2Dt	9	0,5	5	0,2	-	-	1	0,1
21. M1Dv M2Dt M3	2	0,1	-	-	-	-	-	-
22. M1Dv M2Dt M3Dv	2	0,1	-	-	-	-	-	-
23. M1Dv M2Dt M3Dv M4Dt	1	0,1	-	-	-	-	-	-
24. M1Ds	6	0,3	28	1,4	8	0,3	8	0,7
25. M1Ds/co-habit	-	-	3	0,1	1	0,04	-	-
26. M1Ds M2	3	0,2	4	0,4	2	0,1	2	0,2
27. Not applicable (no woman)	106	6,1	82	4,1	61	2,5	65	5,4
28. Unknown/"Missing"	9	0,6	10	0,5	3	0,2	-	-
TOTAL	1 747	100	2 024	100	2 411	100	1 199	100

TABLE 05: HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Household size	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
1	260	14,0	43	2,1	25	1,0	8	0,7
2	499	28,6	191	9,4	190	7,9	72	6,0
3	317	18,1	270	13,3	349	14,5	116	9,0
4	374	21,4	404	20,0	626	26,0	201	16,8
5	194	11,1	397	19,6	556	23,1	214	17,8
6	73	4,2	248	12,3	348	14,4	170	14,2
7	16	0,9	174	8,6	157	6,5	133	11,1
8	8	0,5	118	5,8	66	2,7	109	9,1
9	4	0,2	54	2,7	43	1,8	60	5,0
10	1	0,1	39	1,9	22	0,9	47	3,9
11	-	-	27	1,3	5	0,2	26	2,2
12	-	-	9	0,4	7	0,3	18	1,5
13	-	-	14	0,7	2	0,1	10	0,8
14	-	-	10	0,5	4	0,2	5	0,4
15	-	-	9	0,4	3	0,1	5	0,4
16	-	-	4	0,2	1	0,04	1	0,1
17	-	-	1	0,04	1	0,04	1	0,1
18	-	-	-	-	1	0,04	1	0,1
19	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	-	-
20	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	1	0,1
21	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	-	-
22	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0,1

TABLE 05: HOUSEHOLD SIZE (continued)

Household size	Population group							
	White	%	Coloured	%	Asian	%	Black	%
23	-	-	1	0,04	1	0,04	-	-
24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	-	-	-	-	2	0,1	-	-
26	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	-	-
27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	-	-	1	0,04	-	-	-	-
"Missing"	(1)		(6)		(1)		(1)	
TOTAL	1 746	100	2 018	100	2 410	100	1 199	100

INSTRUCTIONS

1. COLUMN 1: INDEX

In this column all members of a household are numbered sequentially.

2. COLUMN 2: MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD

In this column the names of all the members of the household are filled in. All persons who permanently live in the house and who take their meals together when they are home are taken as members of the household. Children who are temporarily away from home, for instance at boarding school, but whose maintenance is provided for by the particular household, and who normally spend their school holidays at home, are seen as members of the household. Where children in the case of a divorce are given into the custody of the parent who is not a member of the particular household, the children are not counted as members of the household. Other members of the household who are temporarily absent from home, for instance contract workers who still identify the household as their basis, are included. Children who have already left home and permanently reside in an own home (rented or bought) are not included as members of the household.

Relatives who permanently reside and eat together with a family, are included as members, and the same applies to lodgers who permanently reside and eat together with a family.

However, relatives and/or friends who temporarily visit a household and sleep and eat there together with a family for less than three months are not included as members of a household.

With regard to filling in the questionnaires, the name of the household head and then the name of his/her spouse is filled in. Thereafter the names of the children of the man and the woman in chronological order from the eldest to the youngest are filled in. Thereafter the names of children of a previous marriage or relationship, first of the man, then of the woman, are filled in. Then follow additional relatives residing with the family and thereafter lodgers and other non-relatives.

3. COLUMN 3: POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD

In this column the position of the person in a household must be defined as precisely as possible in terms of his/her relationship to the household.

For household head only "M" is entered. If married, "Wife/Husband of head" is entered. In the case of the children of a couple, the following is entered: "Child of this marriage". A man's child from a previous marriage is indicated as "Child of head (1) from previous 1st (or 2nd or 3rd) marriage", and the children of a woman from a previous marriage are indicated similarly, namely "Child of woman out of 1st marriage", and so on. The child of a couple's child is indicated as "Child of Mary" + index number ... and then the parents' names as in the previous column.

In the case of relatives the closest relation is indicated, for instance:

"Mother's brother's son", or
"Father's mother", or
"Mother's mother".

Two or more separate families living in the same housing unit and eating together, are regarded as one household and the names of all the members are entered on the form. However, to be able to distinguish between the separate families, they are placed in brackets and are termed "Family 1", "Family 2", and so on.

In the case of lodgers only "Non-relative" is entered.

4. COLUMN 7: MARITAL HISTORY OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD AND/OR SPOUSE

Only the marital history of the household head and his/her spouse is given here. If the household head has no spouse, only one marital history is given. Here only previous marriages and not previous co-habiting unions are relevant. When however a couple is currently co-habiting, their marital history is entered. Filling in the questionnaire is to be done in the following way: Suppose the man has been married three times and the third marriage is the current one, the series of marriages are numbered M1, M2 and M3. The dissolution of marriages is indicated as follows:

Death	(Dt)
Desertion	(Ds)
Divorced	(Dv)

The history is therefore given as follows: M1Dt M2Dv M3

The same applies for the marital history of the woman.

5. COLUMN 6: MARITAL STATUS

In this column the marital status of all the members of the household is indicated. The following may apply here:

- Co-habiting
- Married
- Divorced
- Dead
- Unmarried

At current marital status the number of years of duration is given.

6. COLUMN 8: EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MAN AND OF WOMAN

This column is only filled in in respect of the man and the woman. The highest school standard as well as any post-school training is given.

7. OCCUPATION

Here the current occupation is given, but only for the man and the woman.