

https://dspace.org/

Urban-industrialisation among the ‘Bantu’ in the Republic of South Africa

Alverson, Hoyt S.

1967
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/8408

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED SOCIAL RESEARCH

ADDITIONAL SEMINAR PAPER

TITLE: Urban-Industrialisation among the 'Bantu' in the Republic of South Africa.

BY: ALVERSON, H.S.

NO: A08

U R B A N = I N D U S T R I A L I Z A T I O N

A M O N G T H E "B A N T U" I N T H E

R E P U B L I C O F S O U T H A F R I C A

By

HOYT S. ALVERSON

Department of Anthropology,

Yale University

1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword

Introduction 1

Summary and Critique of Methods for Studying Transition 4

Demography 4

Economics 6

The Dimensions of rural-urban Transition 8

Network Anthropology 9

Commentary on Network Analysis 11

Structural Anthropology 12

Sociology 13

Social Psychology 16

Development Psychology 17

Formulating a General Theory of Rural-urban Transition 18

Urban-Industrialization in the Republic of South Africa 21

The Demographic Dimensions 21

The Economic Dimensions 25

Economic Variables as Stimuli to Population Movement ... 26

Economic Variables as Agents of Socialization 33

Sociological and Psychological Dimensions. 45

Political-Legal Aspects 63

Conclusions 64

Footnotes and References 66

Bibliography 70

F O R E W O R D

Dr Alverson was Research Fellow in the Department of Social Anthropology and African Government during 1966 and 1967. He came to South Africa in order to carry out fieldwork for his doctorate in anthropology at Yale University. He studied African workers in a number of factories, and made several important and interesting discoveries. These are incorporated in his doctoral thesis, and will be published in due course.

The present paper was originally presented in May 1965 in compliance with the requirements of Course 146b at Yale University, Problems in the Structural Analysis of African Societies.

I found it a useful, critical summary of much of the relevant literature, and considered that its thoughtful questions and interdisciplinary approach merited a wider audience. In particular, several of my students and colleagues were stimulated by Dr Alverson's approach, and we were impressed with the way in which he was able to follow through many of the methodological concepts of this paper in his field research. Dr Alverson has kindly allowed this revised version to appear as the first occasional paper of our African Studies Programme.

John Blacking

Chairman of the African
Studies Programme

INTRODUCTION

The study of population movements from rural agricultural sectors to urban centres has long concerned social scientists. This "study" has, however, never been a unified, coordinated effort on the part of social sciences to arrive at a "theory", in the strict sense of the word, of rural-urban transition. Rather, to date, this study has yielded a body of knowledge which amounts to a series of highly descriptive, schematic accounts of specific population movements with accompanying assertions as to what impelled the movement. In Western sociology, interest has been primarily in the plotting of population movements, determining the rates of mobility and ascertaining the subsequent effects of this mobility on the social organization or disorganization of urban centres.[1] In short, one finds demography, the description of population and its movements through space, concatenated to urban sociology.

This marriage of demography with urban sociology has, however, left a crucial area of inquiry untouched: namely, the process of and the reasons for population movement in the case of aggregates and in the cases of individuals. To be sure, there have always been reasons forwarded for movement from farm to city but nearly always these have been dogmatic assertions rather than tested hypotheses. These "reasons", more often than not, are variations on a single theme: people move from one location to another to improve their material welfare through the earning of a higher real income.[2]

In addition to the paucity of information which might explain population movements in North America, the way they come about, and why, there is even less information available on the dynamics of rural-urban transition on a cross-cultural basis. That is, most information of rural-urban movement collected to date has involved peoples who are members of the same sociocultural system. Seldom do we find rigorous investigation of the problem of "transition" where the cultures of the migrants radically differ from that of the larger urban society. Nor do we find any attempt to compare the dynamics of migration as it may be affected by cultural-societal differences of the peoples involved, all other things being equal.

While social scientists in the United States and Canada have a great deal of work to do to develop an adequate theory of rural-urban transition, the same is

true for social scientists interested in this transition wherever it occurs. My concern in this paper is with the problem of the transition of the Bantu-speaking peoples in the Republic of South Africa from rural to urban "life", how it is occuring, and why. Unfortunately, it is not possible to adapt some well thought out body of knowledge to an understanding of the specific problems of the "Bantu", since no such body of knowledge exists. Thus, I am forced not only to delimit the problem peculiar to South Africa, but also to develop a system of explanation, which will shed light specifically on transition.

During the last twenty years anthropologists have begun to extricate themselves from the compulsive pursuit of the "untouched" culture and to realize that there is just as much to learn about human behaviour from cultures in contact as there is from "isolated" cultures. The problem of urban in-migration is thus squarely in the sphere of interest of modern social anthropology.

South Africa affords a splendid and timely laboratory situation in which to make such a study, as will, hopefully, become clear during this paper.

To attack intelligently the problem of understanding "Bantu" rural-urban transition, it is necessary to outline the kinds of approaches that have been used to understand population movements of this type, thus establishing a reservoir of knowledge on which to draw and a basis for formulating more powerful ideas. Only by exploring the entire spectrum of knowledge in this field can one be sure that one is not leaving some fruitful notions untapped. I want to attempt a critique and synthesis of the efforts that have gone before. Then, I will turn to the research problem at hand. After exploring the demographic, economic, legal, psychological, and sociological variables and their multifarious parameters, I want to attempt to construct hypotheses which will possibly describe adequately and explain "Bantu" movement from reserve to city (and back) in terms of both individual behaviour and in terms of the behaviour of the migrants as a collectivity. The hypothesis will be based on the facts available on "Bantu" population movement. I will avoid making assertions which are manifestly ungrounded in fact - although, of course, further data could invalidate a given postulate. By doing so, the construction of a series of propositions which can be rigorously tested in the field will be best insured.

To begin the discussion of rural-urban transition, the problem should be delimited and the approaches to its understanding enunciated. "Urbanization" has been used in the literature to mean two distinct things. The first is the increase in the proportion of the total population in any given political unit residing in cities. The second usage means the reasons for such increase and the way such increase comes about through time. It is obvious that these two usages refer to "overlapping phenomena"; that is, this complex thing,

"urbanization", which we will not define precisely until later, is a many-faceted phenomenon. As mentioned, most studies have been concerned with some small aspect of this total complex. As urban anthropologists, our interest has a traditional bias in the direction of a holistic approach: holistic in the sense that we are interested both in the big picture and in the way the details comprise the big picture.

In this paper, I will be concerned with urbanization defined as follows: "Urbanization" is: 1) the movement of large numbers of individuals from rural, largely agricultural areas to large industrial, commercial towns and cities; 2) the reasons or causes of such movement in both the individual and the aggregate case; 3) the multifarious processes by which the movement or migration comes about; 4) the processes whereby the migrants are incorporated into the urban social system; and 5) the processes whereby concomitant behavioural and attitudinal changes accompanying adjustment to city life emerge. In short, urbanization includes at least four interrelated phenomena: 1) population movement and its character; 2) the causes of such movement; 3) the processes of linkage to the urban social system; and finally 4) the process of enculturation or socialization of the individual to city life or city culture, and his subsequent assimilation.

SUMMARY AND CRITIQUE OF METHODS FOR STUDYING TRANSITION

On the basis of my interpretation of "urbanization", it is likely that extant theories about and methods of studying this problem will be deficient in scope. However, a résumé of the major contributions to the study of rural-urban transition will be worthwhile, both as a guide to deciding what else must be done to develop theoretic and methodological tools and as a guide to further research.

Demography

The first component of the complex phenomenon of urbanization is: "the movement of large numbers of people from rural, agricultural areas to industrial, commercial areas". The documenting of such movement, ascertaining its occurrence, has been the province of population sociology. Some would include population movement in "demography", but in America demography is traditionally confined to the analysis of the population with regard to "characters", e.g. health, birth rate, death rate, age distribution, education, etc.

The method of documenting and measuring population movement is, in essence, simple counting or enumerating of people in given localities at different points in time and computing net gains or losses through time. The amount of net change in population in specific localities as a function of both time and total population is an estimate of population mobility, i.e. the rate of geographical movement. In some areas, population movement is not uni-directional; that is, the movement is not simply from rural to urban areas, for instance, but may be circular. Such cyclic movement, to be measured, requires a refining of methods. Obviously, a continuous circular movement could disguise mobility, by maintaining the population level at each point of migration constant. Moreover, cyclic migration may yield a net increase in some locale over time, but this increase may in no way be commensurate with the amount of movement taking place. "Stabilization" refers to the extent to which individuals cease to return to the point of origin of their migration. Stabilization is, thus, a statement of the change-over from the circulation of people between town and country to their permanent settlement in the towns.[4] Stabilization is a continuous variable that in the past has been treated as if it were a discrete one. Indices have often taken arbitrary data as a basis of measuring the phenomenon. In South Africa, as opposed to the United States, circulatory migration is taken to be the "natural" state of affairs; any net gains in the population at one point on the continuum is taken to be prima facie evidence of stabilization. Mitchell[5] takes the point of view that people who spend a greater portion

or their time in town than they do in the country are becoming "stabilized" to town life. An index which will reflect the amount and distribution of time spent in one place (town) as opposed to the country, is a "measure" of the process of "urbanization", assuming stabilization implies urbanization. Implicit in this assumption is the notion that the length of time one spends in a place is a measure of the degree to which one has become accustomed to and oriented towards the social system of that locale. This, however, may well be confounding several possible issues. The first is: to what extent length or residence in town is a result of an already or being acquired orientation to town life, instead of vice versa. The second is: the possibility that length of time spent in town is a mere sympton of becoming oriented to town live, having nothing to do with the causes or effects of town orientation.

In spite of these possible objections, stabilization as a concept of reduced mobility is a useful one. We simply have to be careful about asserting a priori what this mobility reduction means.

There are a number of ways to estimate stability. Two will be mentioned here: the first is: the ratio of males to females in the population. This, of course, is completely inferential and based on the assumption that a significant departure in the one to one ratio of men to women in a population implies that there is a considerable migration of members of one sex within that population. For example, males might outnumber females in town because of their selective migration for obtaining wage employment. As their women come into town it is assumed that the men wish to remain. This index is useful if one is interested in a rough estimate of stability for a total locality. It is, however, at best a nominal scaling device allowing no inferences as to how much more stable one population is than another. It ignores the individual and ignores possibly significant sub-sets of population which may be differentially mobile. Most important it makes many a priori assumptions about the significance of a disparity in the one to one sex ratio. A second measure is the length of time spent away from the reserve in the town; that is, the percentage of the population having spent 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, etc., years away from the reserve. This index is simple to compute and the data easy to collect, but it confounds several possible issues. (1) It confounds absolute age of individuals with length of residence in town. If number of years spent in town is a constant fraction of age lived, then group differences could be attributable solely to differences in age structure of the group and not to differences in amount of exposure to the urban milieu. (2) It does not account for or take account of the ages at which individuals leave the reserves: a person who leaves the reserve at the age of 40 and has remained in town 15 years is not likely to be as "stable" a resident as an individual who left the reserves at the age of 10 and has remained 15 years. (3) Most importantly for the interest in movement per se, it does not account for the way time in the country as opposed to

time in the city if distributed. One does not know whether of thirty years spent away from the reserve, this was thirty continuous years or thirty years spent in five year segments interspersed with five year periods in the country.

Another index designed to take account of some of these objections of stabilization offered by Mitchell[6] is:

$$\frac{\text{years in town since turned 15 years of age}}{\text{years lived since turned 15 years of age}} \times 100.$$

This index takes account of the age at which individuals typically leave the country; it takes account of total time spent in town as opposed to country. The index, however, has two shortcomings: (1) it does not account for the absolute age of the individual, thus confounding stabilization as follows: an individual in town since 16 years of age, who is 18 years at the time of ascertainment has a stabilization index of 66; an individual in town since 25 years of age and who is 45 at the time of ascertainment has an index of 66. To correct for this, I propose weighting Mitchell's index with the absolute age of the individuals; thus :

$$\frac{\text{Years in town since 15 years of age}}{\text{Years lived since 15 years of age}} \times \text{age} \times 100.$$

My index corrects for absolute age and hence for absolute time. However, my amendment does not correct the second deficiency of Mitchell's formula, it does not show the distribution of time spent in town and reserve, whether residence was continuous, interspersed, etc. To correct for this I am proposing a new measurement technique. (See Occasional Paper No.2).

Economy

The second aspect of the problem of "urbanization" is: "the reasons or causes for migration". Here our inquiry turns from description to explanation. We must now reckon with the illusive business of causal inference. Foremost on the list of explanations forwarded for rural to urban migration has been the notion of "economic man" attempting to better his material welfare through wage employment found in the city.

Implicit in the classical economic explanation is the assumption that man is a rational creature perpetually interested in the maximization of his material welfare. The labour force, then, can be viewed as production potential subject to the law of supply and demand. Where there are jobs whose remuneration consists of greater real income than that paid or received in jobs elsewhere, the labour will be drawn to those jobs until they are filled by those qualified to do so. Conversely, to fill new positions one need pay in real wages that amount which measurably exceeds the real wages of positions held by the segment of the labour force qualified to perform this work. Where labour is scarce; that is, where there are more jobs of all types than labourers of all types qualified to perform these jobs, the various segments of industry and commerce must raise wages high enough to draw labour from other segments of industry. The competion for labour, then increases real wages.

However, the situation though not altered in the case of rural work-seeking migrants, has special attributes. Generally, to attract labour to urban centres, one need pay in real wages that which exceeds the marginal productivity of the land held by farmers in the rural areas. In the case of a large number of impoverished farmers, real wages may be low enough to permit bare subsistence in the town at the current cost of living. The large, supposedly impoverished rural areas often form a nearly inexhaustible labour supply, an inelastic supply of workers. This situation enables the capitalist sector of the economy to hold wages at that level sufficient to attract the impoverished farm labour. In so far as training is a negligible component of qualifying for the job, there need be no increase of wages in one sector to attract labour from other sectors due to shortage in the first; labour is simply recruited from the farms. When the rural, agricultural sector is depleted of farmers competing in agriculture to the extent that the marginal productivity of farming exceeds that productivity of the jobs available in the urban labour market, labour will cease to be available from the farming community. That is, when the numbers employed in agriculture diminish to the extent that there are not enough workers to produce the food needed by the population at large, the rise in price of food will increase the real income derived from farming. The labour supply once again becomes elastic; to continue attraction of labour to the city, wages must be raised above the level of "income" derived from farming. Industry, then, must compete for the services of the labour force.

This classical economic exegesis, while containing many fundamental truths, ignores a number of very important intervening variables. For purposes of this paper, only those variables intervening in the case of South Africa will be considered. First, this explanation assumes that the individuals comprising the rural labour force are motivated by the same stimuli as the urban workers. While this may be doubtful in many cases it is manifestly not true in South Africa, as shall be demonstrated later. Second, the fact of vast cultural differences among the "rural" as opposed to "urban" peoples, means that there may be impediments to migration of a non-economic nature. Third, to assume that the rural areas are "impoverished" takes much for granted. The rural areas (especially where cultural differences obtain) may have far different criteria of poverty than those that obtain in the city. Fourth, in the case of South Africa especially, labour may be drawn from the rural areas as a result of two non-economic variables: (1) The rural farmers, in this case the "Bantu", are provided with so little land, such unproductive land, that it is necessary to seek work in the urban sector to support themselves. (2) Taxes may be levied which must be paid in money, which in turn can only be obtained through wage employment, hence forcing labour into the city for the length of time that is necessary to accumulate the wealth needed to pay the "head tax". As will be mentioned again below, both of these techniques which are "non-economic" in principle, have been used to force badly needed but reluctant African workers into industrial employment. In very few

Instances can urban migration be attributed solely to the attraction of the higher wages which can only be gotten in the city. In short, not all men live by bread alone, particularly when that bread is of the kind found in a strange White man's society.

The Dimensions of Rural-Urban Transition

One of the intriguing complexities of causation in social phenomena is that the 'causes' which initially bring about some effect may not be the same that maintain it. In other words, to assume that most "Bantu" came to the industrial centres of South Africa because they were "required" to earn the money, is probably not an inaccurate statement. But, since the time the "Bantu" first began to be involved in the Industrial economy circa 1870, many new emergent processes have evolved. Once individuals become a part of the urban social system, other individuals may migrate in for other than those initial economic reasons: the process of migration may change through time as a result in the changed distribution of individuals between town and country. Labour from the country may affect the town life and the way succeeding generations of countrymen may be introduced to the city. The pattern of employment may change as more and more individuals encounter the urban social system; ambitions, ideals, values may even begin to change as segments of the migrant population are introduced to urban culture. Reasons for coming to town may even change, as shall be shown below.

In short, identifying the initial stimulus to migration is not adequate as an explanation or description of contemporary migration, why it is occuring, and how it comes about. And, of course it says absolutely nothing about how these individuals become linked or accommodated in the larger urban society.

Rural-urban transition in South Africa is not, as has been emphasized, moving from the farm to the city. (I use the word transition in the sense of urbanization as I defined it.) To understand transition we must find the answers to at least the following questions.

1) What are the reasons that people are moving into the city today? Are they the same for all people, or are there isolatable sub-sets of the migrant population which move to the city for distinctively different reasons?

2) How do various individuals get to the cities? What kinds of contacts are made to obtain employment, housing, etc?

3) How long do various sub-sets of the population remain in the cities? What is the pattern of their residence: periodic, stable? What are the discoverable causes and correlates to the varying patterns of residence found?

4) What psychological, sociological, and economic characteristics are associated with migrants? How do these differ among individuals, are there any

significant clusters associated with various sub-sets of the migrant population? Inquiries into such variables as age, sex, education, pattern of up-bringing, personality, group memberships, position in the home society, "attitudes", values, "opinions", beliefs, ambitions, etc., are pertinent here.

5) What are the range of possible ways that migrants may become linked to the urban social system; what are the agencies of enculturation found in the city and how do they operate; what are the relationships between or means of linkage to the urban social system and kinds of enculturatiog influences which may accompany varying modes of incorporation into urban society

6) What changes in the migrant's attitudes, values, and ambitions, particularly with regard to industrial employment and life in urban centres can be expected to occur as a result of what kinds of experiences and connections in the urban society? How will these changes and experiences differ among migrants, and what correlations might one expect to find between the two?

7) What are the ultimate ranges of structural positions open to the "Bantu" in the urban social system? What are the variables affecting differential occupation of these positions: psychological, sociological, economic, and legal?

8) Finally, what is the extent of the interaction of the above variables, and how does their single and joint functioning influence the varying behaviour of individuals and aggregates of individuals?

Only by providing answers to all of these questions are we going to be able to describe and explain "Bantu" migration in 1967.

There are five broad theoretical perspectives that have been used to study the problem of "urbanization". A brief overview of these perspectives will, I think, make clear where we stand, in terms of having the necessary expertise to describe and explain this rural-urban transition.

Network Anthropology

Philip Mayer, Monica Wilson, and to a lesser extent J. Clyde Mitchell have been using a theoretical approach called "network anthropology" in an attempt to understand this problem. These anthropologists, as well as many others, see the need to distinguish "demographic urbanization" from sociological urbanization: the former is the movement to town; the latter is the orientation to town life. Particularly in South Africa, where Mayer alleges there is really very little orientation to town, a preference of town over rural life, the migration is cyclic. What makes people continue to circulate, and conversely, what prevents them from settling in the towns? The answer to this question for these anthropologists lies in the study of the migrant's group memberships and the affective interpersonal relations maintained between migrants and their "significant others" located in the towns and the rural reserves. Mayer sees this

continuing circulation as a result of the simultaneous "pull" of the country home and of the town, although the "content" of the pull is different in each case.[8] In short, the study of migration in South Africa requires the technique of "interpersonal network analysis". The differences between those who continue to migrate and those who have abandoned their rural ties can be best studied or understood through an analysis of the differing networks of interpersonal relations of the two categories of individuals. The migrants' willingness to stay in town depends on how he evaluates the new personal ties he has formed there in relation to the older ties of the reserve. If the new ties have greater "moral content" he will become rooted in the town; if the strong moral content remains with the rural ties, he will return. The shift in the moral weight from extra-town ties to within-town ties is the process of urbanization.[9] This viewpoint sees urbanization not as a process of internalizing cultural norms, although this may be a result, but rather as a shift in affective commitment to one way and location of life to another in terms of the interpersonal relations, which are the all important variables affecting one's orientation. The way in which particular people are related to migrants in town becomes the means for understanding why an individual will settle in the town or return to the farm.

The best diagnostic for determining whether one is a townsman or a tribesman is whether the people whom an individual regards as his "significant others" are oriented to and prefer life in the town or life in the country.[10] To understand urbanization as a process one must view the "network" from a slightly different point of view. One must not only ascertain the number and distribution of ties in the town as opposed to those in the country, but one must also ascertain the roles and relations of the individuals with whom the propositus has some affective tie. If they are oriented to country life as well as he, it is likely that the migrant will be "incapsulated" in a dense network of rural oriented individuals which will serve to reinforce rural values and orientations.[11] Mayer asserts that not all of an individual's contacts in the urban centre are important in terms of the network: only those individuals forming the migrant's primary group command moral commitment of the individual. These face-to-face primary relations form the migrant's "group" in the town. These are the people who eat, sleep, drink with him and help him in time of trouble, etc. The group forms a mechanism of social control and is an agency of constraint operating as a kind of outpost of the home culture. Mayer concludes that where an individual enters a town and becomes involved in a kind of network of personal relations in which all of the individuals know everyone else, this situation prevents or discourages the formation of strong associations with non-rural oriented individuals. Where ego is involved in an open network of affective interpersonal relations where not all or most of the individuals ego knows each other, there is a greater likelihood that ego will develop more contacts with differently oriented individuals. Such a situation can lead to change in the

orientation of the migrant due to the possibility of increasing identification with the values of town oriented individuals.

Having established in theory how the networks of individuals might operate either to encourage or discourage urbanization, the question becomes, what leads to the formation of the different kinds of networks? The disparity in the number of males to females (more males than females) in a given urban location, makes less likely the possibility of settling down; it maintains the belief that home is elsewhere.[12] The greater the distance of the rural home from the urban location, the more likely that man will gather together on a home-boy basis. Where commuting is possible, the less the need for vicarious contact with the people and things of the home life.[13] The belief or lack thereof in Christianity may determine the category of individuals one will associate with. Moreover, the association of paganism with loyalty to tribal tradition makes more likely the rural orientation of non-Christian "Bantu".[14]

Commentary on Network Analysis

Network analysis provides a means for describing the patterns of an individual's social relations. Yet beyond this, I think network anthropological statements about what maintains circular movement between country and town, and how one becomes "urbanized" leave something to be desired. To say that people move between town and country and do not settle in town because of the alternate push and pull of the two environments is a tautology. Moreover, to say that the reason for the push and pull is social relations and their patterning asserts the obvious. Why do people come to town? When individuals arrive in town, why do they form the social relationships that they do? Is the urbanization process one that begins when one enters town, or are there predisposing factors; that is does urbanization begin before one ever sees the city? If so, why? Why do individuals participate in the networks that they do? What determines the "moral content" of social relations? How do Christianity, paganism, distance from the reserve, disparity in number of males and females, the alleged reasons for the formation of differing kinds of networks, actually bring about network formation? And finally, is not the notion that there is a dichotomy in orientation among "Bantu", home-oriented vs. town-oriented, too simplistic? Could it be that there are a number of components to the perceptual and cognitive complex of town vs. reserve life? Is interest in industrial employment perhaps independent of interest in urban life?

The network approach does not seem to provide answers for such questions. Network analysis does, nonetheless, have descriptive value in that it enables us to put the individual's affective and jural interpersonal commitments into a scheme that will facilitate understanding and make comparison easy and meaningful. Moreover, it has heuristic value in that it may suggest

in the case of individuals' areas of investigation which might turn up some of the mechanisms important in influencing the individual's behaviour, orientations, and values. Coupled with other modes of explanation the causal nexus of interpersonal affective ties may become clearer.

Structural Anthropology

The next theoretical approach which has been used, largely by Africanists, to explain rural-urban transition has been the structural anthropological notion of differential participation in two social systems. This has been a component in the thinking of the Manchester School headed by Max Gluckman. Here the circular migration is seen as the result of individuals having structural (role/status) positions in two nearly autonomous social systems. One is able to perform some roles in one society, some in another, often different roles in each of the two societies. Upon entering the town, the native becomes a detribalized tribesman; upon entering the reserve he becomes a de-urbanized townsman. His behaviour is influenced by the expectations of the two systems: when he is in town, he forgets or suppresses reserve behaviour in so far as it is inappropriate in the city; and the converse is true when he returns to the reserve from town.[15] According to this viewpoint, "urbanization" is social change at the individual level. Culture contact opens up a number of new alternatives for individual activity, of which individuals may or may not take advantage. When a sub-set of individuals finds the new role/status possibilities more rewarding than the traditional ones, change in individual orientations mark the beginnings of social change.

While it is no doubt correct that "acculturation" may to a great extent be a differential systematic linkage of individuals in two social systems, this does not explain all that we are interested in knowing. For example, why do some individuals avail themselves of the opportunities afforded by the "contact" of two cultures in one way, while other individuals do so in another way, while some do so not at all, while others may abandon the traditional system entirely? The immense variation in individual, group, and "plural" reaction to the new and additional structural possibilities afforded by contact makes trivial the explanation for transition that these individuals are maximizing their social potential by taking the best of two worlds as they perceive it; for, while this is true, it tells us little about why people do it one way as opposed to the other. Why is there differential abandonment of the tribal system; why is there differential embracing of the Western system? What are the multifarious dimensions of systematic linkage; that is, what are the ranges of vocational, recreational, attitudinal, and orientational variables by means of which one may participate in a rural vs. urban social system? Are there many roads to detribalization and de-urbanization? Does vacillation between town and country as opposed to settlement in

one or the other mean the same thing to all who do one or the other? Is there a correlation between overt behaviour and belief or preference? These questions are not answered by stating that people in fact "alternate" between social systems. We might well utilize the notion of differential participation in two systems as a mode of approaching the more important problem of why and how.

Sociology

Another theoretical framework that has been used in the study of rural-urban transition is the sociological or "functional" method. Actually, this is hardly a method. It is an entire discipline. Sociologists have been by and large dubious about formulating a "theory" of urbanazation as by the social anthropologists cited above, because they feel not enough information has been obtained on what it is we are supposed to set up a theory to explain. A theory by definition is a series of axioms together with coordinated definitions for deriving theorems from the axioms, and, perhaps, a number of propositions based on theorems. The axioms are the minimal information derived from tested and proven hypotheses needed to explain or account for all of the empirical data of phenomenal reality believed to be a part of the physical universe falling within the explanatory purview of the theory. Sociologists feel that we have only scratched the surface in discovering the range of dimensions that "rural-urban" transition involves. We have not begun to understand their operation and interrelation.

One of the contributions of sociologists to the study of rural-urban transition has been their emphasis upon the empirical approach to understanding the issues involved. Functionalist sociology has, as mentioned, been reluctant to accept any grand a priori schemes purporting to explain "urbanization". Y. Glass and S. Biesheuvel, among others, have both made significant contributions to the study of rural-urban transition; their work is in the empirical tradition. One early and rather simple study, for example, established that there was no necessary correlation between orientation towards and absorption into life in the city, and preference for industrial employment. Another critique of sociologists has been that "acculturation" or transition has often been studied without regard to the character of the urban and rural context; these very often are taken as "givens". Sociologists have been instrumental in divorcing the study of "Bantu" migration and "urban sociology" from the traditional theories developed from the study of urban migration in North America and Europe. The cities of South Africa are different in many ways from those of Europe and North America. These differences are relevant to an understanding of the character of migration. For South African cities, in general, there is a paucity of information available on (1) the social and economic interrelations between the White areas and Black locations, (2) the social and economic effects of the

differential legislation governing the urban population (i.e. the "Bantu" and White), their separation, (3) the control of their mobility, spatial and social, and (4) the social ecology of the urban centres. Very little is known of the social organization of the urban townships in which "Bantu" live. Very little is known about the linkage between the black locations and the industrial sectors of which the former are a peripheral but intrinsic part.[17] Which exerts the greater influence on the migrant "Bantu", all other things being equal: the locations or the city itself? Is it possible to apportion the kind and degree of influence attributable to each? These and many other questions which have not been answered or even investigated must be answered before any intelligent appraisal can be made of what rural-urban transition is or how it comes about.

Sociology has contributed considerably to the answering of some of these questions through the use of various survey, questionnaire, interview, participation-observation, and case study techniques.

Sociologists[18], as mentioned, have generally challenged the notion that orientation to living (residing) in the city is prefectly correlated with commitment to industrial employment. Industrial employment is defined as occupation in which there are set hours for the performance of work where the burden for adhering to these hours lies with the worker. Contract labour such as found in the mines is not analogous to industrial employment as defined here. Workers on the mines are more or less wards of the companies, and as such would be expected to react differently on measures or "tests" of urban orientation and industrialization.

Development of criteria for measuring urban and/or industrial commitment have in many cases been formulated *a priori* without recourse to empirical research. Such measures as frequency and duration of contact with reserves while in the city, number of jobs held over given periods of time, the attitudes and values of an individual's "significant others", etc., have generally been accepted as indices of rural-urban commitment depending on the rating received in terms of the above criteria. These *a priori* formulations of how to measure industrial and/or urban orientation presuppose an adequate formulation of "industrialization" and "urbanization". An adquate exegesis or urbanization/industrialization must, then, delimit what it means to become urbanized/industrialized, as well as how this may come about. This, too, has been the concern of some sociologists.

In the context of South Africa, one dimension of industrialization and urbanization can be ignored: that is, the extent to which there is increasing urban population and increasing numbers of individuals seeking work in secondary industry. This would be a very important variable in areas where city life and industrial development are just emerging. The appearance of urban centres and industrial employment are

themselves very important in explaining the rural-urban transition. But, where these variables are "constant", i.e. are already given, their growth may well be stable enough such that historical development of urbanism (city life) and industrialism (work in factories) may be ignored.

Sociologists generally agree that urban industrialization includes a combination of psychological, economic, and social factors: (1) There is a complex of attitudes, the common factor of which seems to be preference for either living in the city (with all that this entails) or preference for industrial employment, or both; (2) Economic involvement in the urban area is far greater than in the rural area; e.g. property ownership, equity in improvement union, land ownership, corporate investments, etc. (3) Social relations which themselves are urban-based, e.g. friendship ties, membership of voluntary associations, etc. which are urban, rather than rural based, location of the family, particularly the wife and children, if in the city, may indicate urban involvement. Length of time in the urban centre together with the pattern of distribution of that time spent may be an indicator of orientation. (4) Finally, expressed preference for farm or city is an indicator of orientation in many cases.

It is certain that these criteria of urban-industrial commitment are correlated with one another. But, the prediction of transition is made more accurate the more variables one has as predictors, even if there is a partial correlation (but not perfect correlation) between them.

Industrial commitment is a complex of attitudes that is hypothesized to result from (1) the mode and degree of exposure to industrial employment together with (2) numerous personality and personal history variables. The task is to discover those individuals who have shown long continuous industrial employment and who prefer this to other types of work. The task is, then, the investigation of the variables which distinguish these individuals from those who to one degree or another depart from the norms established as measures of total industrial commitment.[19]

This completely empirical approach to the ascertainment of what industrial/urban commitment is, and from there an empirical approach to the ascertainment of how the commitment comes about, has numerous advantages over the more intuitive a priori speculations of the network and economic approaches. (The application of the functional method will be illustrated below when the data are discussed.) Some of the findings utilizing this method will reveal some fallacies in traditional thinking with regard to both the substance of rural urban transition and the processes whereby it comes about.

Social Psychology

A part of all of the above approaches to the study of rural-urban transition have been statements about individual psychology. The ultimate concerns of all these approaches seem to be to ascertain why individuals "feel" the way they do about rural-urban or agricultural-industrial employment. The perception of the situation is certainly the ultimate implication of the economics and sociology of transition. To become "urbanized and/or industrialized" implies a fortiori a personal preference for this way of life. Hence, the way individuals view their life-way and the ways in which social and economic variables affect personal opinion, attitude and value formation are indispensible data to have if "transition" is to be fully explained. Indeed, this is the way transition is in part defined.

The above does in no way imply that we can reduce the study of transition to psychology; it simply states that individual psychology gets at a most important component not only of what transition is, but how it comes about. People are not automata that react to the socio-economic programming with perfect fidelity. People's heads are crammed full of ideas, some shared, some idiosyncratic. These will not only partially determine the mode of transition but will also be a part of the causal nexus which brings about the transition.

Dr. S. Biesheuvel[20] and his associates at the National Institute for Personnel Research, have been concerned with the psychological study of rural-urban transition. These psychologists have tended to view rural-urban transition from the viewpoint of personality change and reintegration as a result of (1) the qualitatively different types of roles entered into as a result of industrial employment and life in the city and (2) the attendant perceptions of these roles on the part of the "Bantu" migrants.[21]

The taking of new roles, attitude and value change, and consequent changes in personality have long received the attention of social psychologists. Their knowledge of these topics is crucial to understanding transition. Urban life and industrial employment are, in fact, a complex of roles and statuses, which in turn partially define the gamut of social relationships one must or may enter into. These roles, and the expectations and demands that playing them entails, are acculturating (socializing) influences. Playing of roles of various kinds, together with the reinforcements and rewards for playing successfully, combine to produce a learning situation which may set up new complexes of reaction patterns and new means for the satisfaction of tissue, security, mastery, esteem and self actualization needs.[22]

It is clear that the manifold complexities of city life may act in various ways to induce new reaction patterns (personality patterns). The near infinite possibilities for participation in varying role-status positions are accompanied by numerous means for

reinforcing competent playing of such roles: economic, peer group, reference group, membership group, etc.

One of the possible results of successful role playing is an affective orientation or commitment to those roles. An overt disposition or set to react positively or negatively to any thing or situation is one of the indicators of commitment to some position, issue, etc. This would be expected to hold for the learning of city ways or the "ins and outs" of industrial employment.

All men have needs and wants. According to many psychologists these wants are hierarchical in nature, in that some require satisfaction before the pursuit of higher needs may be effectively attempted. It is assumed that migrants bring to industrial employment needs which in the city can be satisfied in ways which were not found in the rural area. Life in the city is likely to create not new needs, but new means for their satisfaction. In short, the needs may through acculturation require new goals for their reduction. Needs will be canalized into new goal directed behaviour. Pursuit of need-reducing goals is a stimulus for socialization.

Biesheuvel and his collegues have been concerned with the work situation (industrial employment) as an acculturating influence. Their empirical data are presented later. It seems to me, moreover, that the kind of psychological research being done by Biesheuvel et al. should be extended to all phases of activity that in-migrants as individuals, aggregates, or groups enter into; specifically, the areas of: (1) individual reaction to group (small group) norms and values, (2) acquisition of new attitudes and beliefs (attitude change), (3) cognition and perception of social phenomena including particular emphasis on the "frame of reference" as a determinate of perception, (4) modes of communication and interpersonal interaction, (5) public opinion and individual and aggregate reaction thereto, (6) psychological evaluation of roles, role playing, role evaluation, and role behaviour, (7) leadership, and (8) numerous other foci of inquiry traditionally within the purview of psychological investigation must be undertaken with regard to the migrant to complete the picture of the meaning and process of transition.

Developmental Psychology

A final complex of variables that have begun to be investigated are those which psychiatrists of the Washington School call the development of "prototaxic, parataxic, and syntaxic response" patterns in infancy and childhood. Psychiatrists and psychoanalytically oriented social scientists have made it quite apparent that much of the "personality" is developed or learned during the first few years of life. The reaction norms learned early in life influence both the form and content of behaviour and cognition throughout life, and

are not generally radically modified by later learning experience. In short, much of what we do, much of the way we perceive the world, is a result of the way we are initially taught to do things and perceive things. Certain components of personality (temperament) are learned earliest and pervade all other aspects of personality. Other aspects, so-called character traits, are learned later and are modified sometimes with less difficulty. Finally, some aspects of personality are relatively more conscious and amenable to change, such as attitude, values, and beliefs. While there is not time or need to review theories of personality development, suffice it to say, MUCH OF THE WAY IN WHICH PEOPLE WILL REACT TO URBAN LIFE OR INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT AND WHETHER INDIVIDUALS WILL BECOME ORIENTED TO URBAN LIFE OR INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT, OR BOTH, MAY BE ADEQUATELY ACCOUNTED FOR IN PART IN TERMS OF THE PERSONALITY SET THAT MIGRANTS BRING TO THE CITY AND/OR INDUSTRY. Personality is largely a function of child rearing and early learning experience. A study of child rearing is, then, indispensible to an understanding of not only how transition may come about, but also to an understanding of the variety of ways in which transition occurs from individual to individual and aggregate to aggregate.

Dr K. Danziger[23] has done some exploratory work in South Africa with regard to the role of child rearing in influencing reactions to urbanization and industrialization (his data and findings are discussed later).

FORMULATING A GENERAL THEORY OF RURAL-URBAN TRANSITION

On the basis of this discussion of the diverse viewpoints and approaches to the study of rural-urban transition, I will now attempt a synthesis which will, hopefully, take advantage of the best of all worlds, and which will outline a more adequate means not only for investigating but also for explaining transition.

While the data, to be discussed below, indicates that industrial orientation is not necessarily correlated with urban orientation, there is some indication that this is a result of lack of time perspective, in that the two eventually become correlated in an attitudinal complex as the individual continually participates in secondary employment in the city. Making this tentative assumption the following may be posited.

Urban-industrialization is defined as the complex of multi-dimensional processual phenomena whereby individuals, aggregates, and groups are enculturated or socialized into a social sub-system, characterized by an economic base of commerce and/or secondary industry, and a socio-ecological organization typified by (1) high population density, (2) high geographic

and often social mobility, (3) heterogeneity of population with regard to origins, education, interests, values, religion, occupation, wealth, membership and reference groups, personality, etc. Enculturation is defined as internalization of the norms of and participation in the role-status system of a given social system or sub-system. Rural-urban transition, then, can be viewed as a sub-class of the phenomenon of socialization-enculturation. The complex of phenomena which are the causes and/or the modalities for this enculturation are:

1. Inducements to leave rural reserve OR inducements to enter the city.
   a) economic
   a)$_1$ demographic
   b) psychological
   c) sociological
   d) combinations of the above

2. Influences against internalization of urban-industrial life OR inducements to maintain rural reserve contact.
   a)$_1$ economic
   a) demographic
   b) psychological
   c) social psychological
   d) social
   e) cultural

3. Influences facilitating internalization of urban-industrial life OR inducements to abandonment of the rural reserve life.
   a)$_1$ economic
   a) demographic
   b) psychological
   c) social psychological
   d) social
   e) cultural

An"equilibrium" or "perceived equilibrium" between (1) and (2) would be expected to lead to continuing circulation, i.e. migration between reserve and city, with ultimate stabilization resulting from the dominance of (1) or the onset of some aspect of (3). The operation of (3) to the exclusion of or to a greater degree than (2) will be expected to lead to stabilization in the urban-industrial way of life.

It is clear that the three classes of variables can be viewed either from the perspective of the city or the reserve or both. Thus in (1), for example, economic incentives to leave the reserve might be the:

a) dire poverty of the reserve irrespective of perceived opportunity in the city.
b) perceived opportunity for earning far greater income in the city whether or not rural real income is sufficient for subsistence or not.
c) combinations of the above: e.g.,dire poverty of the reserve and opportunity for greatly increased wages in the city.

In (2), social (sociological) reasons for not internalizing some or many urban-industrial norms might be:

a) many emotionally and economically satisfying group ties in the rural reserve, with few such ties in the city.

b) constant rejection and repulsion from group memberships in the city, irrespective of the kinds of affective and rural ties extant in the reserve.

c) combinations of the above.

The above is an exploratory hypothesis only. Based on the skimpy data available, it would seem that the ascertainment of the information demanded by the hypothesis might well give us an explanatory statement of migration as it is occurring in the Republic of South Africa. Testing of this hypothesis must be done in three distinct phases. First, the mere existence of the hypothesized variables must be ascertained; second, that they operate to influence enculturation as stated must be tested; third, that the knowledge of these variables and their functioning allows description, explanation, and prediction of human behaviour must be tested. Only when all three of these sub-hypotheses can be accepted as true with a stipulated degree of confidence can the hypothesis be said to have been proven. Once the exploratory hypothesis has been established, with the entire spectrum of causal and correlated variables hypothesized to add some increment of variance to the process of urban-industrialism, stated systematic data-gathering can begin.

It is unlikely that all or many individuals or aggregates would be influenced by all of the variables which are operative at some time among some individuals. It is rather likely that classes of individuals could be isolated, who have undergone urban-industrialization in much the same fashion. Nonetheless, to determine which variables are operative what percent of the time, and to what degree they may "cause" the transition, one must have data on all the possible variables. It is quite likely that sub-sets of the migrant population are motivated and influenced to take up urban-industrial life in quite different ways and for quite different reasons. Hence, all suspected variables must be checked out on an adequate and random sample of migrants.

Finally, it is probable that a complete explanation of transition will not be as useful information for some purposes as would be some less labyrinthine, partial explanation for prediction and description. For example, in the prediction of population growth, gross migration, differential transition among sub-strata of a population, etc., one may not be interested in an all-encompassing theory. Therefore, it will be fruitful to tease out from the body of explanatory and descriptive material, information which will yield maximum information with a minimum of theoretical complexity. The single most reliable predictors of urban-industrialization, for example, might be of use in assessing characteristics of given populations for census, tax, or welfare purposes. Hence, during the course of this inquiry attention will be paid to the discovery of "

description and prediction of urban-industrialization.

URBAN-INDUSTRIALIZATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

The Demographic Dimensions of Rural-Urban Transition

From 1904 to 1961 the estimated population of the Union of South Africa tripled, increasing from 5,175,824 to 15,841,128.[24] During this period the relative proportion of White and "Bantu" remained fairly constant: Africans, 69%, Whites, 21%, with the remainder represented by Coloured and Asians. There have been during this time radical shifts in the geographic distribution of the population, with the movement being of differential magnitude for European and "Bantu". In 1865 there were less than 20 towns in all of Southern Africa with a population of 1,200,000= 23% of the total population. By 1936 the total urban population (those residing in towns of more than 2,500) was 3,101,000 = 31% of the total population. By 1951 the total urban population was 5,321,182 = 42% of a total population of 12,641,000. According to the 1960 general census the urban population of the Union was 7,481,689 = 46.7% of the total population of 16,002,797.

The relative urban population increase has taken place at differential rates for Whites and Africans.[24]

For Whites: % Urban =	For Africans: % Urban =
1904 = 53%	< 15%*
1936 = 65%	18%
1951 = 76%	27%
1960 = 80%	32%

It is difficult to assess the variance in population increase found in both racial groups attributable to natural increase as opposed to that attributable to population movement (in-migration). It is, however, quite certain that the increase in the proportion of urban population to rural is not due solely to natural increase, for 1) no such rates of natural increase would be likely in such a situation and 2) more importantly, the decrease in the proportion of rural population strongly suggests a movement of population out and into the city.

In and of themselves these statistics are rather trivial; their significance lies in the fact that they are reflections of radical social, political, and economic changes taking place in the larger South African Society.

The Africans have been to some degree or another under the influence of Western culture since the 17th Century; systematic attempts by Europeans to control large segments of the "Bantu" population for their own interests have been made since the beginnings of the 19th Century.

---

* African, Asian and Coloured; no data available on Africans alone for this year.

The immediate concern of the British Administration throughout the 19th Century, once military control was established over the "Bantu" populations, was the maintenance of law and order, and meeting through taxation the costs of the necessary governmental machinery and allied projects.[25]

Fairly early during the First quarter of the 19th Century, many "Bantu" became accustomed to working for Europeans, particularly on farms. The first big impetus to labour migration came with the discovery of diamonds in 1869 at Kimberley, followed by prolific railway construction. Another stimulus to migration occurred in the 1880's with the discovery of gold on the Witwatersrand. Native labour was used in the working of these mines. The labour was of the "contract" variety, with the labourers' needs being met, at least in theory, by the concerns running the mines.

While the mines must have attracted numbers of workers, few of them became "professional" miners, so to speak. That is, the workers would leave the reserves for many reasons, work on the mines for a few years and return to the reserves, never again to seek wage employment. During the period 1886 - 1914, there was comparatively little significant growth of a permanent "Bantu" population in the mining towns on the Rand. The labour was migratory in the true sense of the word.

During the First World War and after, there was a rapid development of secondary industry in South Africa. Businesses concerned with the manufacture of not only producer capital and materials but also finished consumer goods sprung up in great profusion throughout the major trade centres in the Rand, the South East Coast, and the Eastern and Western Cape. It is in response to this development of industry that the rate of migration of "Bantu" into true urban centres increased. It is not within the scope of this paper to give a historical account of the development of the "reasons" for the inception of labour migration. Rather this will be an "assumption" from which I will depart.

Total employment in secondary industry grew from 86,000 in 1904 to 180,000 in 1920. (This reflects the war time industrial boom). By 1939 the total number employed in industry was 353,000. By 1960 the figure had risen to over 1.2 million in secondary industry alone. The "Bantu" in 1904 constituted less than one half of the labour force in secondary industry. By 1960 they constituted in different industries between 75% and 90% of the industrial work force. When these percentages are weighted by the increase in actual numbers of workers, the absolute increase of "Bantu" in secondary Industry is over 1200% since 1904.

Participation in secondary industry means radical changes in indigenous social organization and "culture". This is axiomatic. The changes are far greater than those brought about by contract labour on the mines. Employment in industry means living in large urban centres, an entirely new ecological dimension for the "Bantu".

Today 31.8% of the "Bantu" of South Africa live in the fifteen largest cities of South Africa = 3,471,233 individuals. But what is going to be more important is the fact that an increasing percentage of the "Bantu", who at any point in time reside in urban centres, are going to be permanent residents of these centres and not simply migrants who in some short time will return to the reserves.

Much labour in South Africa has been and still is of a "migratory" variety. In other words, many individuals journey to the city in search of work, work for some period, say one to three or five years, and then return to the rural reserve. Individual patterns of migration vary greatly, but one overall trend may be noted here: while circulation is prevalent in the African labour forces, there is an increasing proportion of individuals who "drop out" of the migratory scheme and become permanent residents of the city. While little quantitative data are available on migration patterns of various aggregates(such data as could be analyzed by methods outlined above), van der Horst has noted[26] in a survey conducted in 1956 that the variation in total time spent in Cape Town since age of first employment, number of visits to rural reserves, total amount of time spent on these visits is considerable among individuals and between aggregates based on occupation. Her data suggest that there are certain jobs, at a given wage level which are more likely to be filled by newcomers to town and by individuals more prone to long return visits to the reserves, than are other jobs. (This topic will be pursued in detail below in the section on the occupational structure). Wilson and Mafeje note[27], for example, that certain specific factories or "job-types" may be represented by individuals from specific rural sectors. That is, factories and occupational positions may show a rural-based specificity.

Unfortunately, nobody has undertaken to explain the significance of these associations between degree of stabilization (migration stabilization), and occupational choice, and between rural home and occupational choice. Some speculations may be hazarded.

(1) Some jobs by their very nature are more suited to the needs and capabilities of transient labourers (e.g. there is little training required, the jobs may be gotten readily, etc.)

(2) the fortuitous association of some men from a given tribal group with a given type of work, may through cultural and communication media become positions other men from the same group will tend to favour simply because of the weight given to the choice of the fellow members of membership and reference groups.

These and other hypotheses should be investigated. Knowledge of the role that members of communication networks and quasi-groupings play in introducing migrants to urban centres would be valuable in accounting for aspects of the overall set of problems subsumed under the category "urban-industrialization".

(3) There is a possibility that stabilization may carry with it certain "self-perpetuating tendencies". That is

to what extent does the fact that some individuals are settling permanently in the cities serve as a stimulus or inducement for other less-stabilized individuals to do the same thing? To what extent is stabilization a model and intrinsically rewarding goal? If for some individuals stabilization (the demographic phenomenon alone) is a model of, modality for, and reward for, similiar behaviour, then for these individuals the description of the process of demographic stabilization may well constitute a major part of an explanatory model of stabilization and perhaps urbanization.

An area of demographic inquiry that has been suggested by Mitchell is what I shall call the demographic contingencies to "urban-industrial" transition. While demographic variables have often been used as criteria for measuring urbanization or even tacitly as its causes, both of which are sophomoric efforts, some demographic variables may be requisite contingent conditions if other causal factors, necessary and/or sufficient, are to be operative. For example, length of uninterrupted residence in town, may itself cause no urban or industrial orientation, but it may be a contingent condition for the occurrence or operation of other variables which are more directly linked (in a mechanistic sense) to attitude change. The delineation of the function of migration pattern as a body of contingent conditions may be a fruitful pursuit:- a pursuit requiring, however, an adequate methodology in demography as well as a knowledge of other disciplines, economics, sociology, psychology, etc. Heretofore, demographic data such as length of continuous residence in town has been heaped together with other factors which in concert have a fair to middling capacity to predict urban-industrial orientation. No efforts have been made to ascertain whether these "predictors" are in any way contributory and/or contingent conditions, and if so, the means whereby they become partial causes of urban-industrialism. For example, is the presence of permanently resident "Bantu" in urban centres a social fact giving acceptability and propriety to a new way to pursue a living which otherwise might be rejected by rural "Bantu as unthinkable? That is, to what extent is the presence of urban "Bantu" a cultural model for following suit without fear of rejection or ridicule?

In summary, there is a paucity of demographic data on the "Bantu". To date the circulation of labour between rural reserve and industrial centres has been taken as an undifferentiated fact. One is either a "raw type" or a "sophisticated type": that is, the migration is assumed to be a unitary holistic phenomenon, the variation and complexities of which are ignored or unappreciated. Attention has centred around the explanation of the fact of circular migration; yet, it seems that explanation would be assisted if objective quantitative information were available on the patterns of migration themselves. Mayer,[28] Wilson,[29] and van der Horst,[30] have each attempted to deal with the problem of migration but none has attempted a rigorous analysis of the circular mobility itself. The major deficiency in the demographic work to date has been the tendency for researchers to approach the stu

a priori categories of what shall constitute migrant, what constitutes semi-stabilized, and what constitutes stabilized. From here those who "fit" the categories are rounded up, and other characteristics are then determined. Such notions as x numbers of years in town, presence of wife, land rights on the reserve, etc, are often correlated with the psychological, i.e. attitudinal preference for town life, but they often are not.[31] Defining "urbanization" or completed transition on the basis of variables which yield mere actuarial prediction is hardly satisfactory. One reason for the deficiencies of the predictive characteristic approach in describing or explaining transition may in part lie in the over-simplicity of these diagnostic features. As mentioned earlier, to explain or describe migration by using demographic data requires accurate, complete demographic data, gathered by some rigorous and robust procedure. Concocting demographic criteria which predict "urbanization is bound to be misleading and inaccurate at best and, perhaps, wholly fallacious at worst.

THE ECONOMIC DIMENSIONS OF RURAL-URBAN TRANSITION

As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, economic variables are often regarded, a priori, as the prime movers of "migration"; indeed, some regard "economics" as the prime movers of society itself. While the situation in South Africa will militate against both these notions, it will confirm the great importance of economic variables in explaining migration and in explaining why and how individuals become urbanized and/or industrialized.

While there are numerous economic factors which have been influences to migration, they can, I think, be divided non-arbitrarily into two mutually exclusive categories: "positive" and "negative". In the positive category are found any economic stimuli which in and of themselves can be shown to have been instrumental in attracting "Bantu" labour into industrial centres. In the negative category are all economic factors, usually pertaining to the reserve and the society found there, which have impelled "Bantu" to leave the reserve, generally to seek some other means for making a living.

We have stated that one of the easily discerned patterns of movement among some workers in South Africa is circulatory migration. It may well be that economic factors which lead individuals to return to the reserves after a "stint" in the city may also be divided into the two categories mentioned above: positive and negative. Positive factors are those which centre about the reserve and its people living there and which are stimuli to return to the reserve; conversely, negative factors are those which are associated with the city and are influential in forcing or encouraging, to speak somewhat teleologically, the worker to return "home".

A third way of considering economic factors in rural-urban transition is economic variables as "agents of socialization". Unlike with the previous two

categories, the interest here is in economics as a stimulus to change in behaviour, values, beliefs, ideals, orientations, etc. It is to be expected that this category will overlap the previous two in many respects; but for purposes of analysis it might be fruitful to recognize nonetheless two classes of economic variables:

1. a) Economics as inducement to leave reserves and enter industry.
   b) Economics as inducement to leave city and return to the reserve.
2. Economics as an agent of socialization.

ECONOMIC VARIABLES AS STIMULI TO POPULATION MOVEMENT

As is true for most social phenomenon, the reasons for the beginnings of rural to urban movement are different from those that today maintain the movement. It is difficult if not impossible to assert with certainty what the course of social change among the "Bantu" would have been apart from the systematic attempts of the Administration to encourage labour migration. Before the discovery of diamond and gold in South Africa, there was no reason for the British and Dutch to be interested in the "Bantu" as a source of cheap labour. The economy was largely one of "frontier agriculture", with only a modicum of plantation and other commercial agriculture. However, in the latter half of the 19th and the first quarter of the 20th century the demands for labour grew enormously as a result of the development of the mining and secondary industry.[32]

This growth in industry and the resultant demands for labour was greatest on the Witwatersrand and the Reef but was nonetheless dramatic in the Western Cape as well.* In 1900 Cape Town was the largest city in Southern Africa, yet had a population of only 175,000. Within 25 years its population had doubled = 350,000.[33] Between 1924 and 1953 (data are not available for earlier years) the proportion of Africans to other peoples employed in industry in the Western Cape alone, an area with very few Africans to begin with, increased from 14% to 27%, and in South Africa as a whole, increased from 44% to 55%.[34]

A partial cause of increased employment of the Bantu in secondary industry lies in the abject poverty of the reserves. "It has become clear that the agricultural potential of the Reserves cannot support more than one third to one half of the existing population (resident there) at a low level of subsistence, and that large numbers must be displaced if those remaining are to farm effectively and earn a living from the land."[35] According to the Tomlinson Report[36], "at least 300,000 must now find alternative employment".[37] Houghton has

---

*Since the bulk of data available for the analysis of the above problems is concerned with Cape Town and environs, the Rand and Reef material will be more or less ignored.

concluded that reserve poverty is the major reason for migrating to the city; men must go to town or their families on the reserves will starve.[38] Van der Horst has noted that in the sample of workers used in her Economic Survey of Labour in Cape Town, 100% claimed to be sending money back to the reserve.[39] I have been unable to locate any quantitative data on the percentage of individuals who leave the reserves, who are motivated solely by the poverty of the rural home, or who are largely motivated thereby.

There is no question that rural poverty is a major stimulus to seek work in the city. Schapera[40] has noted that in Swaziland, for example, the foodstuffs grown by natives meet only about 1/5 of their food requirements. While things have improved since 1933 when this observation was made, it is my estimate that most families on the reserves are unable to produce enough food to support themselves, and must earn some money to buy the remainder. Moreover, additional wants and needs can certainly be satisfied only by earning wages to pay for them. Wilson[41] has noted that in the Keiskammahoek District a good season yields only about three months' supply of maize, the maize for the other nine months having to be bought from merchants.

A question arises as to how many migrants in the city today are there because they and their families cannot support themselves on the reserves alone. There is no data available on this point, but I suspect that the rural poverty served as a stimulus to migration after the formation of the reserves (1870-1910) and before 1958. It was only after the 5,000,000 "Bantu" were herded into areas where the carrying capacity of land was insufficient to support the population, that they had to migrate for reasons of poverty. Since 1958, more intensive efforts have been made to develop the reserves such that they could sustain the population resident on them; this effort by the Government is likely to have reduced some of the dependence of rural families on outside earned cash wages. The development of the reserves is now entailing commercial and industrial components which are supposed to be run and managed by Africans. If these enterprises pay off, this should reduce the need to travel to the city for earning necessary supplementary wages.

Before the inauguration of the reserve system as it exists today, there was little or no voluntary migration either to the cities or to the mines.[42] Although there was some demand for "Bantu" labour prior to 1870, few left their rural homes. After 1870 the need for labour in the mines and in the growing industries became severe; to compel the "Bantu" to contribute their labour, the Administrations resorted to levying head and hut taxes, which could be paid only in cash. While these taxes were generally nominal, men had to sign a one-to three-year contract to work for wages which would provide the tax money.[43] This measure was quite effective in getting the "Bantu" into the labour market. (There was of course the police power of the State behind the enforcement of tax payment.) Compul-

participation in the industrial community may be an important initial stimulus to leave the reserves. It was, however, the forcing of 5,000,000 Bantu during the 50-year interval 1870-1920 onto 1/5 of the land area that they had originally occupied, that produced the poverty which was the most important stimulus, of the first category, to leave the reserve and seek work in the city.

While there will be little disputing the causal connection in some cases between rural poverty and migration to urban centres, it is coubtful that this is now the sole reason for migration; it is however a major reason. As has been stated, migration in South Africa is not a unitary phenomenon. As will be discussed below, the patterns of migration vary considerably from individual to individual; the categories of people who migrate are quite diverse. The causes of the variation in migratory patterns may reflect the operation of different causal variables. It may with certainty be inferred that from the beginnings of White settlement in South Africa, some "Bantu" have been attracted to employment with Whites for cash wages independent of their wealth or poverty in their rural homes. While this attraction for the city, the mine, or the plantation cannot be explained solely in economic terms, there exists the possibility that numbers of "Bantu" have sough employmentin industry and mines for the wages that such employment brings. That is, industrial employment may be an "adient" goal, holding its own attractions of an economic nature. Of course, a man's relative wealth before seeking industrial employment is probably always a factor in how he perceives the merits of wage labour. But it may be true that some individuals perceive wage employment as a preferable situation to a given rural economic status, while others perceive it as a necessary evil resulting from that same rural economic status.

The positive attraction of "economic opportunity" in urban industrial centres can only be understood in terms of the social and psychological changes which bring about changes in orientation and values. That is to understand the impact of economic opportunity in urban centres one has to understand the means whereby those economic factors of urban-industrialism came to be perceived by Africans as "opportunities" or as something to strive for, and not something one is compelled to do. However, in keeping with the format of this paper, I will delimit the economic factors of the urban-industrial centres which might be stimuli to migration, and postpone the explanation of how they become goals in the "Bantu" culture to the sections dealing with sociological and psychological processes.

The data to be cited below, while systematically gathered, cannot be taken as coming from a random sample of African workers, i.e. cannot be taken as representative of the population of African workers. Nonetheless, it is useful and has sufficient heuristic value, to make its presentation here worthwhile.*

In van der Horst's sample of Africans in seven Cape Town firms - the sample being random with regard to the population of workers in the seven firms, but not for Africans in Cape Town industry at large - almost all workers came from the eastern part of the Cape Province; only 10 of 631 workers investigated had been born in Cape Town. One-half of the workers had begun their careers as wage earners on the Witwatersrand gold mines. 23% of workers had their first gainful employment in Cape Town. The remaining 23% began work in industrial towns of the Eastern Province and the Transkei. There was a marked tendency away from gold mining as the number of jobs held by individuals increased. (That is, individuals as a collectivity tend to show preference for non-mining work more strongly, the more non-mining work they have had.) The mean number of jobs held prior to the one held at the time of interview was seven; (unfortunately, van der Horst gives no data on the total length of time in gainful employment, which may be used to determine rate of job turnover for individuals and aggregates.) I suspect, however, that there is a high correlation between total time in employment and the number of jobs held. We will be able to get these data from another source below.

In all firms studied, from 67% to 87% of individuals, depending on the firm, had first come to Cape Town more than five years beforehand. Significant, however, is that the mean time since first arrival varies greatly from one type of firm to another. Generally, those firms offering jobs paying the lowest wages tend to have younger employees filling the positions; the younger employees are also generally more recent arrivals in Cape Town.

On the average, workers had spent two-thirds of their working lives in Cape Town (generally one comes of working age at 15), yet the mean age at time of first arrival was 23-25 years. The average time spent since arrival was 8 to 13 years. Most workers (90% +) had visited the rural reserves periodically. Among those workers who had migrated to Cape Town since the time they were legally employable, the number of trips made back to the rural reserve varied between 3.2 and 5.9 trips. The number of visits to the reserve as well as the length of the time since last visiting the reserve varies significantly between types of firms. The Dairy, which generally attracted the youngest workers,

---

*To avoid the cumbersomeness and redundancy of sustained footnoting, let me state here that all the data to be cited in this section is taken from van der Horst, AFRICAN WORKERS IN TOWN: A STUDY OF LABOUR IN CAPE TOWN.

and the most recent arrivals, and had the highest rate of turnover had employees who also made the greatest number of trips to the rural home and who had visited the rural home most recently, at the time of the interview. It is interesting to speculate whether certain jobs because of ease with which they can be found or because of the kind of work, attract people with a proclivity for home orientation. It is difficult to say why new arrivals from the reserves go to certain firms more than others, although I should think this would be very revealing data to have. Two possibilities come to mind: 1) the kind of job it is - easy to get, little red-tape, easy to leave, etc., this might attract people who have no intentions of wanting to commit themselves, economically speaking, to town employment; 2) could it be that the tendency for new arrivals to seek jobs in certain firms is a function of the fact that other new arrivals (i.e. acquaintainces of new arrivals) are fortuitously working in a single firm, and they attract later comers? Information on the socio-economics of job selection is sorely needed.

Wages vary considerably from firm to firm largely as a function of the type of work in which the firms specialize. The classifications unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled cross cut the wage structure (i.e. they are only poorly correlated with wage differentials). Unskilled building workers earn considerably more than semi-skilled factory workers in most cases studied. In fact, holding level of skill constant (admittedly an intuitive sort of thing to do) , weekly wages varied (in 1956) from £2-6s-9d in the dairy to £4-5s-0d for unskilled work; and for semi-skilled work they varied from £2-12s-0d to £4-10s-0d per week. The great overlap is readily apparent.

The number of workers stating that they send money home to the families in the reserves varied from firm to firm. With the exception of two of the firms, however, only 50% of the workers reported sending money home regularly. Of those sending remittances, the amount varied from £1 to £23 per quarter, with the average amount varying from £4 to £7 in the different firms. While there is little data anywhere available on the sociological correlates to sending home cash, such data would be extremely useful. It seems probable that the amount of money sent and the regularity of its being sent would correlate with numbers of other factors indicating greater or lesser industrial-urbanization of workers.

The Tomlinson Commission has reported[44] that practically the entire cash income of rural families is derived from money sent by member wage earners from urban centres. The mean income derived therefrom amounts to £18-9s- per family, per annum.

These data (what employees report sending home and the amounts rural families derive from remittances sent from the cities) are testimony to the role played by economic necessity for forcing work in the urban areas. However, that 50% do <u>not</u> send money home regularly, and that we may legitimately

employees who claim to send home so much, often actually do so, is testimony both to the worker's desire to amass money capital for his own use, and to the probability that many workers have few if any important rural ties. That is, wage earning is a positive value or goal, not just a necessary evil. It would be interesting to know the correlations between the stated reasons for working in the urban centres and the ways in which wages so earned are disposed of.

It is appropriate to add here a very depressing but crucial emendation to the discussion of the positive economic valences of wage employment in the city. The presentation so far gives the impression that many "Bantu" go to the city "to make their fortune" as it were. There are degrees of poverty, however, and as such the city offers some relief from the dire poverty of the reserve. The lack of any real opportunity for significant economic betterment in the city may be one of the body of factors which tends to promote ultimate return to the reserve, or frequent return to the reserve, or less than complete satisfaction with industrial work. We stressed that circulation typifies much of the migration in South Africa. Part of the cause of this circulation must lie in the vacillating perception of Africans as to where they can maximize their wants and desires. The city, as will be shown, may draw them because they perceive it as an avenue of betterment and because the reserve offers little economic hope. Yet the city is quick to disillusionment. Wages, housing, the anomie, the vissicitudes of contact with an arrogant and unsympathetic White population (a non-economic variable, nonetheless important) soon take the glitter out of the gold. Simultaneously the economic advantages of the reserve may begin to loom large in the mind of Africans. (A common phenomenon: See L. Festinger, Cognitive Dissonance) Land holding rights, a place to live that one really owns, often a place where there is at least fresh air, are positive economic features of the reserve which may encourage return.

Let me briefly substantiate the above rather subjectively formulated ideas. In 1950 there was a 250,000 housing unit shortfall for "Bantu" living in urban centres. Overcrowding in slum yards which lacked even the minimum of ammenities was common. The urban locations of the Witwatersrand were appalling hives of degradation with regard to housing. During the last 15 years, however, City Councils have done a remarkable job of urban renewal. On the Rand, the slums have been virtually removed and adequate housing is now available for most "Bantu" who are allowed, at all, to enter the urban areas. The present (1966) housing shortfall over the entire Republic is less than 45,000 units (compare 250,000 in 1950).

The structure of wages in the urban centres offers even more telling and concrete evidence for the poverty of urban Africans. In 1951, 5.8% of skilled positions, 34.2% of semi-skilled positions, and 80.8% of unskilled positions, were filled by Africans. In 1948 unskilled African wages were 17% of unskilled European wages:

(compare 50% in Great Britain and 79% in Germany for the same time period for analogous groups.) In 1954 it was estimated that the mean shortfall of real income for a family of 5 Bantu in Johannesburg per month was over £7.[45] Ten years earlier the mean shortfall per month per family was £3. During the ten years (1944-1954) though income rose xonsiderably, the cost of living rose even more. Thus:

	Poverty Datum	Mean Monthly Income	Income Deficit
1944	£12 18s 6d	£ 9 18s 1d	£3 0s 5d
1954	£23 10s 4d	£15 18s 11d	£7 11s 5d

Between 1950 and 1956 the percentage of urban Bantu families whose income fell short of the minimum required for a "decent living" increased from 73% to 87%.

Fortunately, between 1959 to 1964 there has been, for numerous reasons that cannot be considered here, a rapid and unprecedented increase in urban African real income, as well as improvement of welfare in general. One source[46] estimates that by 1963 almost no urban African families had incomes below the "dire poverty" datum, and that 88% of the families had income above the poverty datum plane of R46 (£23) per month per family.

One of the lessons to be learned from the above overview is that the assessment of the causes of migration either in or out of the city must take cognizance of a rapidly changing wage structure in the urban areas. Prior to 1959, urban poverty may have been considered with considerable certainty to have been a major force for out-migration (in addition to numerous other such forces of a social, political, and legal nature); today, urban poverty, being far less extensive, may well be acting as a stimulus to further in-migration and reduction of out-migration. The economy of the reserve is a corpus of variables influencing of person's return to the reserve after a "stint" in the city; it has been shown on a number of occasions[47] that holding of land on the reserve correlates highly with ultimate return to the reserve. Van der Horst found in her sample that 67% of Africans expressing the desire to return to the reserve held land rights on the reserve.[48] It is impossible to go from an association like this to a statement of cause and effect; but it is probable that holding of land is a partial cause in many cases of the desire to return to the reserve. It should be pointed out, however, that many people who hold land on the reserves express the desire to remain in town; and conversely, many people who hold no reserve land rights desire to return to the reserve.

After 1958, when Dr H.F. Verwoerd became Prime Minister, there was inaugurated a crash programme to develop the economies of the reserves. Land is supposed to have been added; irrigation, afforestation, exploitation of mineral resources, etc., are supposed to be moving ahead far more rapidly than ever before. Information as to whether such positive improvement of the reserves will enhance the attract

in the perceptions of individuals is sorely needed. Furthermore, it would be interesting to ascertain whether the simultaneous improvement of both city and reserves will act as a stimulus to a person making a decision to spend his entire life in one or the other of the two places, or whether these improved termini of migration will simply generate more circulatory migration than has existed before. It is, for example, clearly the intent of the many individuals within and without Government to encourage migration of labour, as this keeps up the appearances of White and Black apartheid with regard to permanent residence, and keeps the cost of labour rather lower than would be if the labour force were a permanent, more stable population.

Evaluation of the role of economic factors in the perpetuation or stimulation of migration demands a sensitivity to the rapidly changing economic organization of South African society as a whole. Cognizance of current events, something that anthropologists have rather compulsively eschewed on too many occasions, is absolutely mandatory in achieving an understanding of migration in South Africa today.

ECONOMIC VARIABLES AS AGENTS OF SOCIALIZATION

The second general perspective in which economic variables will be viewed is that of "socialization". Implicit in the discussion of economics so far has been the assumption that those features of the economy which seem to influence behaviour do so because individuals have LEARNED to take cognizance of them and have internalized them as values or goals. The concern with this next section will be the delimitation of what changes in values, goals, or orientation in general are attributable to the economic organization of urban industrial society. I will postpone to the section on psychological and sociological considerations, the explanation of attitude change itself. Here I want simply to point up some of the "economic parameters" which might well be models for or modalities of socialization. How these economic behaviours become internalized is a problem for the next section, but an outlining of their significant features can be done most appropriately now.

The subject area most revealing in the context of socialization is that of the occupational structure and the description of the "job" itself. While the total economic behaviour of the individual migrant extends way beyond the sphere of his wage employment, it is nevertheless his job experience that is a most salient factor of attitude and value change.

As a summary statement, it can safely be asserted that the significant trends in the employment histories of Africans are: (1) tendency to progress from jobs requiring little or no training to those requiring more and more; (2) tendency to hold jobs longer and longer as time passes; (3) tendency to the improvement of wages and one's financial situation in general; (4)

itself, and not in terms of an interlude to the more pleasant business of tribal life on the reserve.[49]

As mentioned, 50% of workers in van der Horst's sample began work on the mines: mining is the kind of work that requires the fewest conceptual and attitudinal changes in the worker, simply because the company "does everything" for the employee. The miner's job is to move repetitively a shovel in a certain way, or drive a "donkey" in a certain way, otherwise he must do little else, and his needs are met by the firm running the mine. This is not true for industrial employment. It is very important to draw attention to the vast, qualitatively different demands and requirements of industrial work as opposed to mining. In most firms studied, van der Horst found that 80% of workers had worked less than two years at their prior job, with 50% having worked less than a year. It is significant that the mean lengths of times jobs are held correlates with the type of work that is done. Generally, the most menial tasks are held for the shortest periods with the most skill-demanding jobs being vacated least, frequently.[50]* Generally, however, the core of stable workers, workers holding a single job for four or so years or more, is small, as has been discovered in several studies. Thus, less than 5% of the population could be classed as "stable" urban-industrial workers.[51]

One of the correlates to the holding of jobs paying higher wages was the increase in amount of education obtained by workers.[52] Certainly, preparation for the holding of jobs in industrial firms is a factor in transition. Whether those individuals who bother to stay in school a longer period are disposed to take on industrial work would be an interesting question to answer. Perhaps those who come to the city and obtain the better positions have long been on the road to urbanization via their reserve education.

The turnover rates, and the reasons for turnover are revealing data for the appreciation of some of the "problems" of transition. The analysis of labour turnover in three firms studied by van der Horst revealed the following:

In Firm 1

During the period July 1954 to July 1955, of a total work force of 243 (reduced to 199 by end of year), 342 Africans left the service of the firm and 298 were hired. Of these leaving 159 (46.5%) were dismissed and 183 (53.5%) resigned. 58% of those dismissed were dismissed because of staff reductions accompanying the seasonal fluctuation of production; the remaining 42% were dismissed because of unsatisfactory work or conduct: 18 for unsatisfactory work, 9 for disregarding instructions, 7 for drunkenness or smoking dagga on duty, 6 for

---

*For example, an average of 72% skilled workers had been with the firms at least one year, whereas only 35% of unskilled workers had.

other reasons. Of those who resigned, almost half stated that they were returning to the reserves. However, of those returning to the reserves, 1/4 had had less than three months' service with the firm while another 1/4 had had over a year's services. Van der Horst speculates that for the employees with less than three months' service who were returning to the reserves, the job was probably a "time filler" until such time as their presence was required on the reserve as during ploughing season; while for the latter, she offers no reasons that might have motivated their return, although periodic return to the reserves is a common thing. It is also quite possible that the workers reporting that they were returning to the reserves may have been deceiving the interviewers.

In Firm 2

During the year 1955 there was a turnover rate among Africans in Firm 2 of 166%: 27% were dismissed; 73% resigned; of those resigning 51% gave as the reason that they were returning to the reserves. As in firm 1 those resigning had had shorter periods of service with the firm than those staying on.

Labour turnover analysis reveals that the high rate of turnover is caused by a core of highly mobile workers. Gross aggregate statistics of the rates of turnover disguises some rather significant sub-strata of variation with greater variance between classes than within any class. For example, the average total period worked by Africans between 1956 - 1963 is 10.3 years; the average time spent between jobs is 4.9 years, with an average working life of 15 years;[53] these data while interesting disguise the fact that various sub-populations of this single aggregates called "Africans" have very different employment histories. Unfortunately, van der Horst has not collected employment history data for different sub-classes of the population, such sub-classes being defined according to such criteria as education, time of first migration, place of birth, marital status, etc. These breakdowns would be extremely valuable to have.

It is my speculation that employment history data as presented here can be most useful as an indicator of acceptance of wage employment as a way of life; the employment nistory of individuals could be used along with other independently ascertained criteria as a means for viewing how attitude change affects work patterns or how work patterns affect attitudes. Conformity to the demands of the work situation is a prerequisite to successful employment. To the extent that "playing a role" may lead to genuine role playing ability with the accompanying commitment that this usually entails, job experience certainly delineates a number of ways in which behaviour must be altered if one is to become an accepted "townee". Jobs do not necessarily cause an orientation to the city in and of themselves; but they are certainly depots where the learning of appropriate role behaviour is made possible if one is so motivated.

The role of work in traditional "Bantu" culture and its role in the Western culture are as different as two role structures can be. Biesheuvel has noted[54] that in traditional "Bantu" culture the biological and psychological needs of the individual were met by vastly different social activities. Work (i.e. the economic activity on which the tribe is based) was concerned with subsistence and little else; needs for deference, conformity, prestige, mastery, security, and self-actualization were met by quite different activities: artistic activity, dare-devilry, warfare, singing, religious experience, etc. By contrast, the subsistence role in our society (vocation) and the aspects of life directly associated with it (including many activities centred in an urban setting) have taken on a pervasive character not found in any primitive society;[55] I can think of no pre-contact society where one "job" or task occupied a man's attention 8 to 10 hours per day, 12 months of the year. Nor can I think of a society in which "vocation" has been the crux of the entire social, political, and economic organization. A multiplicity of need satisfaction funtions are associated with work in our society. Further, work is often the only means for the satisfaction of numerous basic and derived needs. Learning to see work as a mode of multiple need satisfaction is one of the major problems in urban-socialization which faces the "Bantu" worker. Of course, many never come to view work in this light; they remain "Bantu"; others do undergo a remarkable personality change which in effect we might call rural to urban transition. They become townsmen. Work, economic production, is a focus for this transition.

Some general observations can be made here, although no rigorous substantiation of the following points can be made as yet.

(1) African migrant workers may not change their fundamental attitude towards their own traditional objectives; they nevertheless, acquire new habits, attitudes, and insights. They begin to discover the concept of individuality particularly, as regards individual responsibility for action. They may on their jobs develop new wants, and perhaps change the goals which are the means of need reduction. Although these individuals may hold two sets of reaction norms simultaneously, one set for the urban and one set for the rural roles, the process of compartmentalization and, indeed, the process whereby the multiple personality emerges is poorly understood.[56]

(2) Those who, for reasons not yet presented, break away from the traditional environment must gradually accustom themselves to a way of life in which "work" or vocation is the essential condition of their new existence.[57] To make the most of one's industrial employment, to acquire the skills necessary to hold the job, to advance in the job, requires "commitment" to the industrial employment, to one's job. (As will be seen in a later section, commitment to one's job may coexist with an equally strong commitment to the reserve and the rural way of life.)

(3) There is a resultant change in some aspects of the total personality structure. One becomes more subject to the external pressures as guidelines to behaviour (other directional). In the money economy, new wants emerge and older needs find new goals. Amassing of wealth is one of the most universal goals that people acquire as a result of participation in a money economy; material wants take on a greater diversity. Economic goods become more important than before. Entirely new roles are played, roles based on entirely new dimensions of interpersonal relations, many of which are part and parcel of the work situation.[58]

(4) The work situation exposes Africans to entirely new modes of sanction of social behaviour: dismissal, on the negative side; incentives or bonuses on the positive side. "Overtime" work is a possibility that the traditional culture seldom affords as a means of accruing extra wealth. (One can only plant maize so often or in such great quantity before diminishing returns set in). In the money economy earning too much is an impossibility.

(5) Finally, it is largely on the job that "Bantu" and White meet. Whatever the forces of socialization are, certainly the behaviour of Whites vis à vis one another and vis à vis the "Bantu" exerts some constraints on the attitudes, behaviour, and cognition of the migrant. He may learn to manipulate that world; all of which implies mastery. Often mastery is a selective advantage, a thing that can turn the new, strange, unpredictable and awesome, into the familiar, the appreciated, and the exciting.

It is not appropriate here to go into the psychology of attitude change. Suffice it to suggest that the analysis of the job, the structure of work in the urban centre will take us a long way towards understanding what values the migrant may or may not acquire, and what forces are operating to reward or punish the migrant's often bumbling attempts to "cope" with this new urban-industrial world.

There is some empirical evidence for the assertions just posited. This evidence is usually in the form of attitude studies, attitudes of the migrants towards their work. This approach to the assessment of transition brings the individual more into the picture. It also complements the knowledge gained from the study of industrial roles as structural phenomenon only.

Homans has given us a "law" which descrives one aspect of the socialization process of job learning, and specifically job advancement. "The higher the rank of a person within a group, the more nearly his activities conform to the norms of the group...."[59] All other things being equal, one would expect to find that as individual "Bantu" advance in job status within a firm, the more nearly their outlook, values, etc., would conform to the normative expectations of the group (the organization). Indeed, we do find that "Bantu" who hold "middle" class jobs in South Africa hold very Western middle class norms of behaviour.

However, in South Africa upward job mobility is minimal. The number of "Bantu" that are working at any point in time in jobs above the level of petty clerk, is almost nil in White-owned firms. As a result both of purposefully withheld education and job reservation, few "Bantu" ever aspire to high positions in industry or commerce. Whichever the causal relation in Homan's law, be it conformity brings about elevation or elevation brings about conformity, or both, the occurrence of the elevation does notoccur at all.[60] Hence, we cannot assert what the socializing influence of a good prospect of upward mobility would be, since the phenomenon does not widely occur. In short, the economic rewards for attitudinal and behavioural identification with and mimicking of "White" behaviour have been quite effectively removed for large numbers of commercial/ industrial workers. The reinforcement schedule for socialization is geared to reward of only minimal changes in "rural-reserve customs".

Another dimension of the occupational structure which has many important implications for the process of socialization is the pattern of <u>horizontal job mobility</u>. There are within any class of jobs, (classes being defined according to level of "skill" and consequent salary), jobs which require varying amounts of sophistication in "Western ways". Unskilled labour involving considerable contact with Europeans and European technology would seem to place more constraints on the number of African "reaction norms" than would a job involving little or no direct confrontation with the same. For example, a hod carrier or ditch digger, who simply has to move objects from one place to another, need learn fewer "Western" values, attitudes, skills, etc., than an individual working as a domestic servant, messenger, or railroad porter.

There are unfortunately no data available giving case histories of numerous individuals or even gross aggregate statistics available showing how "kind-of-work-done" changes as a function of the ordinal position of the jobs held (1st, 2nd, etc.).

Van der Horst[61] has foundin her sample that there is a tendency among those employees who have in fact remained in gainful urban employment, to progress from mining, to building, to factory work. The between-class-(of work) variance in jobs along the dimension of "socialization intensity" is significantly greater than the within-class-variance. This seems to indicate that individuals do progress from jobs requiring marginal socialization to those requiring more. It could be argued that the pay is greater in the second classes, but this is not the case,. In fact, building pays better in many cases than factory work.

Another aspect of occupational history which would seem to be either conducive to socialization or indicative of socialization, or both, is the tendency to become more and more <u>stable</u> as a worker. An individual whose jobs held become held for longer and longer periods coupled with shorter and shorter periods of unemployment between jobs would be exposed to the

numerous influences of continuous employment, more so than would be the case for an individual with only sporadic contact with the labour market. It seems to me that investigation of the possible reflexive causal relation of continuous employment and socialization would be worthwhile.

Finally, the most important indicator of the effectiveness of work as an agent of socialization lies in the expressed and unexpressed attitudes of the workers. Socialization implies by definition an on-going process of norm internalization. Certainly then, how workers feel about their work, is an indication of how "socialized" they have become, to what degree they have begun or have come to identify with the norms and values of the heretofore alien culture.

One of the difficulties in utilizing worker attitudes towards their job as an indicator of the degree to which they have accepted Western norms and goals, is the confounding effect brought about by some aspects of the job which colour the assessment of other aspects of the job. Among the "Bantu" of South Africa, for example, low wages are a cancer that quite likely prevents many from otherwise identifying quite strongly with the work, the work situation, and the Weltanschauung this identification entails. Keeping these provisos in mind we may assess van der Horst's findings more critically.

Between 60% and 70% of the men in the different firms studied stated that they "liked their jobs".[62] The reasons cited and their frequency are: (a) knew the job well, 31%; (b) job was light and easy, 18%; (c) could give no reasons, 31%; other reasons, 20%. An attempt was made to have workers evaluate wages apart from other conditions of their work. Van der Horst found very widespread dissatisfaction with wages; in the different firms, however, the amount of dissatisfaction varied. (Better, the number expressing some dissatisfaction varied). Van der Horst attempted no scale measurement of "dissatisfaction", something I would have considered quite interesting. In any case, the percentage of workers dissatisfied with wages varied from 13% to 94%, with a median frequency of 80%. The percentage expressing dissatisfaction correlated highlywith absolute wages paid. Some interesting side observations are: first, workers were very well informed about the structure of wages in their firms and in the labour market in general; second, however, between 56% and 97% of employees in the different firms expected to remain with their present job, although from 8% to 50% would have preferred to work elsewhere.[63] Van der Horst gives aggregate statistics comparing the percentage of employees in different firms (a) liking job, (b) expecting to remain, (c) preferring to work elsewhere. Unfortunately the meaningfulness of these data is vitiated because we have no way of knowing the correlation, if any, between these categories, i.e. the percentage of one class that are the second, that are the third, etc.

Interestingly, those who aspire to work elsewhere, aspire to jobs which they had never held nor about which they know very little.

Another means of ascertaining attitude towards the job is via study of attitudes towards foremen. The majority of all men in the different firms (from 50% to 94%) stated that they "liked" their foremen. Further, in all the firms between 28% and 70% preferred European foremen; there was no specific data on why Europeans in particular were preferred over Africans or Coloured. It was determined that the qualities workers liked best in foremen were (a) consideration, (b) did not interfere with the job, (c) did not shout and swear at workers. The inference is, I suppose, that Europeans more often have these qualities than do African or Coloured, which is logical given our present understanding of social distance and interpersonal behaviour in such structured situations.

Just as revealing data on socialization as that noted above is found in workers' expressed aspirations for their children's life work. What a parent wants for his child is often a reine Subjektiv - a pure projection. (Often it is not, however) In any case, of 299 men who had sons, over half had definite ideas about what they wanted their sons to do for a living. 33 wanted their sons to be teachers; 15 wanted them to be doctors; and 7 wanted them to be lawyers. Significantly, 20 wanted their sons to be farmers; 19 wanted them to be carpenters; and 15 wanted them to be clerks. Van der Horst notes that the workers were aware of the limitations: legal, personal, etc., that circumscribed their own potentialities, they hoped, generally, that their sons would not be similiarly confined.[64]

Unfortunately, we do not have data that would allow comparison of aspirations, as discussed above, with other features of the employees' work and employment history. The aspirations, however, are, I think, rather neat indicators of identification with Western urban-industrial economic structure.

Another study, one of the few others, which has probed rather deeply into attitudes of Bantu workers towards their jobs and industrial employment, has been carried out by L.E. Cortis.[65] His study was conducted in a large metal products manufacturing firm in Durban, a firm employing "Bantu", Asians, and Europeans. By far the largest group in the firm are the "Bantu", who do primarily unskilled and semi-skilled work, e.g. materials handling and machine tending are typical of the two categories respectively.

The following are the major features of the tasks performed by the "Bantu":

(a) the jobs are all highly repetitive
(b) all jobs require less than a minute per unit (work unit); the shortest equals 10 centi-seconds, the longest equals 70.
(c) all units are manufactured by means of

chain assembly lines. Each unit is processed in some way by a worker and then passed by conveyor to the next worker.

(d) since gravity conveyors are used, a worker may set his own speed in performing a job, but two factors militate against any slowing down: 1) charge hands encourage rapid work, 2) machine time units at the end of the assembly being much shorter than those at the beginning act as a "suction" to maintain rapid-as-possible output.

(e) work varies in the degree of physical exertion required.

(f) the skill involved in most jobs is slight, extended training not being required.

In attempting to measure worker attitudes, a 36 item questionnaire was prepared, with 8 open-ended and 28 closed-end items; the closed-end items fixed responses were constructed as Lickert scales, with encouraged, but not insisted upon, open-ended explanation of response given. The open-ended items were used primarily for establishing rapport and in directing the thinking of the subjects to the rather broad issues the researchers were interested in.[66]

The following topics were covered in the schedule:

(a) satisfaction with the job the individual holds
(b) degree of identification of worker with the firm
(c) his view of (attitude towards) management and supervisory personnel.
(d) his view of fellow employees.
(e) his views on the training he has received.

Included in the questionnaire were items which would yield the subjects' rank in importance of the items:

a) big salary
b) job security
c) opportunity for advancement
d) happy working conditions
e) considerate management

The result of the experiment showed the following:

(1) Happy working conditions is ranked as the primary requisite for a job by Europeans and categorically last by the "Bantu".
(2) A big salary is ranked last by Europeans and second in importance by "Bantu".
(3) Opportunity for advancement is ranked high by both "Bantu" and Europeans (however, there is some evidence that the "Bantu" associate opportunity for advancement with opportunity to earn more money, while Europeans interpret this to be a component of job security.)
(4) Both groups seem indifferent to considerate management.

The majority of comments made by the "Bantu" referred to the dissatisfaction with the disciplinary policies of the firm, or else to issues impinging on the security of the workers. 75% of "Bantu" said they would not recommend the factory to friends, primarily

because of the job insecurity, workers being periodically retrenched as a result of the seasonal fluctuations in the demand for the materials produced. However, when asked what they disliked most about their jobs, over 90% referred to the low wages paid.

In addition to there appearing many differences in responses of the "Bantu" and the Europeans to the items in the interview as groups, significantly different responses were found to exist between various sub-sets of the population of "Bantu" workers. The major variance existed between the classes of skilled vs. unskilled workers, and between sets or classes of workers on bonus (incentive schedules) and those not.[67]

The main reasons found for the variance in sub-group response were:

(1) The introduction of incentive schemes and the enhanced pressure to work at optimum rates created strong feelings of insecurity. Workers fear that if they cannot keep up they will be replaced by younger workers.
(2) Skilled workers have developed status consciousness, because of the skills they have acquired; they are proud of their work and confident in their ability to learn any other mechanical skill; they feel as a group that they should receive differential treatment from management when disciplinary measures have to be enforced.
(3) Semi-skilled workers are less willing to accept transfers to associated factories because a) they fear loss of their status as semi-skilled workers and b) because of family ties.
(4) The introduction of the incentive schemes tends to make "Bantu" more aware of the ad hoc, and often very poor, training that they have received.

In the discussion Cortis makes the following overall observations. "Bantu", as opposed to Europeans and Indians were most concerned about the security aspects of their jobs. This even outweighed the concern for wages. Workers showed preference, for example, to taking a modes cut in salary in order to work where the incentive schemes were notin operation. This insecurity resulted in strongly expressed projected antagonism against the firm as a whole, although no hostility was directed against any specific personnel. (I do not know whether bhis is a result of the generalized Rorscharch nature of the projected antagonisms or whether the "Bantu" just did not want any specific bosses finding out they had been railing against them. Among the "Bantu", trust of the White Man or the White Man's schemes is minimal and with good reason: they could have merely been keeping themselves covered.)

A final observation: the "Bantu" as a group tended to relate themselves to the firm in very egocentric fashion. Their jobs and job dissatisfactions were all enunciated in terms of the individuals. Among the Europeans, criticisms tended to be firm-oriented: job dissatisfactions were explained in terms of the operation of the firms and in terms of employees in general or in terms of the occupational structure.[68]

There are, I think, a number of data in this study which have direct bearing on the concern with the jobs as an agent of socialization. First, the disparity between the responses of "Bantu" and European on the interviews is prima facie evidence that the groups are significantly different. If we assume that the European responses are the ones normative for "Westerners", then, to the extent that there is disparity, is possibly the extent to which "Bantu" do not share Western culture or social position. It is easy to see that the "Bantu" in terms of the jobs done, the wages paid, and their attitudes toward the White are in a position that no White Man has ever held in South Africa.

More important than this overall picture are the significant variations among "Bantu" as measured by the interview schedule. Insecurity is readily perceived by the "Bantu"; even such a readily accepted industrial procedure as piece-work (incentive scheme) excites feelings of insecurity. It seems that this could be due to anyone or combination of variables: (a) generalization from the very insecure position the "Bantu" hold vis a vis the White Society in general; (b) lack of understanding (cultural) of what an incentive scheme is: at no time has a Calvinist work ethic been a part of "Bantu" culture; (c) recognized or perceived inferiority to White, Indian and Coloured with regard to competence to perform the jobs assigned. This could be an explanation for the often expressed complaint about poor training received. The "Bantu" workers may be aware of the disadvantages of inadequate preparation. This realization in itself is, I think, a very telling indicator of acceptance of, or at least cognizance of, the Western achievement criteria. That the "Bantu" can perceive the hierarchical structure of jobs is testimony to their change in orientation to job advancement and their readiness to take on the West on its own terms, as it were. That the "Bantu" recognize the same criteria for status differentiation within a firm as the White do, is an indication of acceptance (internalization) of still other achievement - status dimensions of Western society.

Cortis notes that the "Bantu" relate themselves egocentrically to the firm as opposed to the firm-centric orientation of the European employees. It is difficult to attribute this difference to imperfect socialization of the "Bantu" to Western work orientation (i.e. one becomes a company man). Studies by Roethlisbereger and Dickson[69] have shown that attitudes towards firms vary among workers according to the kind of position held. Those who perform trivial routine work fail to view or identify with the firm as a total structural entity. Rather;, those whose work does not subsume under it significant portions of the structure and functioning of the firm, tend towards the formation of primary friendship groups which more or less are divorced from the firm as a whole and concentrate on the establishment of work norms for the jobs held only by those members of the primary groups. Further the typical unskilled and semi-skilled worker is in the firm to get out of it the means to satisfy his tissue and other lower derived needs. Those needs such as

belonging, status, mastery, and actualization can only be achieved by means other than that of the firm. Only those in a position to use the firm as a means for satisfaction of the higher social needs could do so: management, technical advisors, etc. There are no means for lower grade workers to derive satisfaction of higher needs within the framework of the company, simply because their position within it is marginal to begin with. In short, the assembly-line worker plays far fewer roles within the firm than do higher level employees; the more totalistic the relationship with the firm the more likely one is to see the firm as an entity existing apart from one's self. I believe the egocentric perception of the "Bantu" of their factory is an indication of their having acquired perceptual rubrics similiar to those found among White workers in similiar positions.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF RURAL-URBAN TRANSITION

One of the more pernicious diseases infecting much of social science today is the provincial attitude towards "inter-disciplinary" inquiry. Specifically, social anthropology has tended in the past to view the empirical world as sliced more or less analogously to the way its conceptual world is sliced, i.e. the way social anthropology defines its boundaries. To my mind this hyper-rigidity in explaining social behaviour according to the dicta of the establishment (in social anthropology, particularly the British school) has produced some rather bizarre if not ludicrous attempts to account for human behaviour. I do not think that human behaviour can be explained in terms of the conceptual tools of any one social science. I doubt, further, if even any one aspect of human behaviour can be explained by recourse to the mode of explanation utilized in the analysis of one conceptual "level" of behaviour. Physiological activity is a variable affecting macro-social behaviour, albeit indirectly; conversely, social behaviours, cultural norms of behaviour affect physiological activity.

This rather pompous preamble is an attempt to say that I personally cannot approach the explanation of a complex phenomenon like urban socialization according to the road maps made available by any one discipline of the traditional social sciences. This phenomenon too often cross-cuts too many disciplinary boundaries in too many ways to permit its study from any other than any "inter-disciplinary" viewpoint. In fact, explanation or description of urban transition solely within the framework of either economics or sociology or psychology will probably result in nothing more than a shallow, disjointed, ad hoc, incomplete, tedious, spurious, oversimplified listing of seductively phrased half-truths. Hopefully, this paper will avoid at least these particular pitfalls, if it avoids no others.

The discussion of urban-industrial transition up to now may give the impression that economic considerations are the alpha and omega of this transition. Indeed, there can be no doubt that migration and urban-enculturation or socialization do centre to a great degree around economic variables. However, and hopefully this will be made clear below, we have at this point scratched the surface in describing and explaining both the transition and the ways in which it comes about. Work (gainful employment) is but a part of "life". It is but a part of the social system into which the "Bantu" must enter in his search for work, new experience, freedom from nagging relatives, the holy grail, or whatever. The total complex of means or ways whereby the individual is "linked" to the urban industrial social system is the irreducible minimum which must be investigated if an intelligent and adequate exegesis of transition is to be formulated.

The conceptual framework of sociology and psychology is quite different from that of economics and

demography. Psychology and sociology are interested in more dimensions of human behaviour than is economics. As such, these overlap economics in many important ways, not just topically. Psychology and sociology are not areas of inquiry whose boundaries may be set by a listing of classes of human behaviour. Being multi-dimensional, such a phenomenological description would be a half-truth at best.

I think that it is within the fields of inquiry of these two disciplines in concert that the most revealing data on PROCESS can be gathered. Economics' organization theory, and demography have given us adequate data on the phenomena of migration and stabilization, together with some of the possible causes. Economics has been useful, too, in delimiting some of the more important features of the urban social system which will place constraints on the behaviour of migrants and which may act as reinforcement schedules in the conditioning of certain behaviour patterns while tending to eliminate others.

Just as important, however, is the task of demonstrating or showing why and how these economic and organizational factors are causative in impelling migration and stabilization; important, also, is the task of explaining why many other changes in attitudes, values, goals, traditional habits occur apart from those directly linked to the search for and participation in wage labour. Also important is the delimitation of the non-economic dimensions of socialization into urban life. It will be seen below that the major influences on Africans to change their traditional orientation may be completely non-economic. That is, there is strong evidence that wage employment and job experience are contingent or at most contributory conditions to transition, and that they may or may not be either necessary and/or sufficient conditions for socialization to urban life. Finally, it is likely that different individuals become linked and thence socialized into the urban social system in quite different ways. The transition may, inother words, have a rather different etiology from individual to individual.

To explore some of the ideas framed rather intuitively above, requires exploration of all aspects of "Bantu" existence. This obviously cannot be done here except in exploratory or programmatic fashion.

Using as a guide the summary of approaches to the study of urbanization given in the first part of this paper, I will set up some of the most important aspects of sociological, social-psychological and psychological research which will be most fruitful in explaining this complex behaviour.

Rural-urban transition is a special case of the much wider issue of "socialization", as I have pointed out above. Socialization in turn implies all those processes by which an individual comes to be a participating member of a given society. Generally, one thinks of socialization in the framework of child

development. While this will be a concern here, too, socialization is best thought of in the context here as learning to be an accepted member of a new society by learning the appropriate roles, habits, and values. An account of urban socialization requires then a knowledge of (1) the social and psychological background of the rural migrant and (2) a knowledge of the social system of the city and how it is effective in re-socializing the individual.

Since the data on this topic is meagre at best, I will outline that which should be covered, but which for lack of data cannot be. Then I will develop the theory ideally, noting the empirical research and the gaps in such research.

There are at least eight aspects of rural-urban transition which must be investigated before a complete understanding of the phenomenon can be hoped for:

A. We must have knowledge of the psychological and cultural "sets" of the individual migrants coming into the urban centres. A knowledge of their motivations for coming, the ambivalences in their perception of the new experience of city life; equally important, a knowledge of the various defences that migrants use in resolving conflict, cognitive dissonance, etc., resulting from their anticipated participation in a new, strange, and often hostile social system, is necessary.

B. Cognitive processes, i.e. perceiving and learning, are all important aspects of the process of socialization. Knowledge of the ways in which the urban milieu in all its complexity is perceived, what social and cultural factors, both rural and urban, cause selectivity in perception and remembering the rural background will to some degree cause different individuals to attend to different aspects of the urban environment more or less intensely. Further, personality factors: temperament, traits, attitudes, achievement, knowledge, intelligence etc,, will affect the way the new environment is perceived and the way people will react to these "definitions of the situation".

Other information in this category which must be obtained is data on the kinds and diversity of conformity-inducing stimuli and reinforcement existing as a part of the urban environment. How does, or better why does, the migrant learn the "sequence" in urban social processes? What is the reinforcement schedule? Finally, what habits are formed as a result of the canalization of urban behaviour? Why are different habits formed in different individuals? What are the causes of variation in habit formation?

C. A knowledge of the structure and functioning of urban social groups and aggregates is mandatory. This knowledge must include both groups based on the norms of the Western culture and those based on traditional "Bantu" culture. Important groups for analysis are:

1. Peer groups
2. Family (if any)
3. Residential groups
4. Community
5. School
6. Church
7. Work groups
8. Ethnic status groups (aggregates)
9. "Interest Clubs".

Each of these groups should be studied from the viewpoint:

1. of their formation and structure
   a. their raison d'être (manifest functions)
   b. their latent functions
   c. means whereby they emerged
   d. the role-structure of the group
2. of significant dimensions of the groups
   a. size
   b. time-space dimensions
   c. cohesiveness
   d. conformity
   e. consensus - (unanimity of aims among members)
   f. effectiveness in goal achievement: "effectiveness"
   g. autonomy - structural-functional separation from other groups, institutions, etc.
   h. control: (degree to which behaviour is regulated by the group and the means for such regulation)
   i. formality - informality both of behavioural expectations and structure.
   j. "hedonic tone": the affective orientation of members to the group (pleasant, unpleasant, etc.)
   k. intimacy of members (the degree to which members are related through a multiplicity of interlocking role relationships)
   l. permeability: the ease with which new members are admitted; and the criteria for admission.
   m. stability (degree to which group persists over time and the reasons for such persistence).

Certainly appropriate as methods for ascertaining such information are techniques embodied in such procedures as sociometry, group dynamics, Bales's interaction analysis, network analysis, structure function analysis of the roles and statuses.

D. All important for getting at the process of socialization is ascertainment of relationships between the individual and the group. Among some of the most important relationships are:

1. Process of linkage of members to group: (this problem of "linkage" is only poorly understood.)
2. The constraints exerted on individuals by the group, both those dealing with maintenance of approved behaviour and those

dealing with the changing of "inappropriate behaviour."

3. How the group acts to preserve or change values not directly related to the manifest functioms of the group.

E. Analysis of the urban social roles in which migrants may or must participate is necessary to an understanding of how the individual is socialized and what the socialization results in. Some of the important data needed are:

1. Kinds and varieties of roles available to "Bantu", their breadth, specificity, extensiveness, and structure, i.e. their relations with each other and the behavioural expectations of each role.

2. The functions of urban roles: manifest and latent; their functions in terms of the operation of the urban social system as a whole and in terms of the individuals participation in it.

3. The disparities that exist between the behaviour expectations associated with roles and the ways in which actual role behaviour departs from expectation norms and why.

4. The ways in which migrants perceive the various roles they play as opposed to the ways in which "townees" perceive such roles. Any disparities should be noted.

5. Analysis of roles will reveal many possible role conflicts and role incompatibilities; these should be noted and their effects on the players ascertained.

6. The means whereby the various role behaviours are reinforced should be ascertained. The sanctions associated with different kinds of roles, together with their effectiveness, are crucial to an understanding of the incentives for playing roles appropriately.

7. Finally, a systematic comparison of the roles found in the urban social system should be compared to those of the traditional rural society system. In such a comparison, particular attention should be paid to finding those roles which are possibly "analogs" in the two social systems and which might as a consequence thereof be sources of ambivalence, confusion, or conflict in the participation in urban life.

F. In the ideational sphere, knowledge of the social values, norms, beliefs, and attitudes both in the urban system and in the traditional "Bantu" culture are necessary to an understanding of socialization. Many researchers have even assigned primacy to the acquisition of these aspects of urban culture, as they represent an affective-cognitive commitment in addition to the "playing" of the appropriate roles. Some

of the topics for investigation here are:

1. The formation and structure of new (urban) attitudes
2. The process of attitude change
3. Processes of acquisition of new models of behaviour
   a. the role of values in socialization (new means)
   b. the role of new goals in socialization
   c. new models for decision making
4. Value conflict (means-end conflict, both in terms of the new urban system and as between new and old value systems)

G. Social phenomena often not directly linked to the group, role or status structure of society are very important also in changing behaviour norms. Public opinion, propaganda and collective behaviour are often potent agents of attitude and behaviour change. Investigation of the following is essential:

1. Ascertainment of those shared ideas which tend to bring about conformity to or rejection of Western ideas, values, opinions, etc.
2. Ascertainment of the ways in which and degrees to which opinion can effect different "Bantu" immigrants; how is public opinion received; does opinion differ in different sub-sets of the population, White and "Bantu"?
3. Is there conflict in public opinion/opinion held by those not socialized into urban society as opposed to those who have become members of the urban society? How these interact should be determined.

Propaganda is likely to be in some cases an instrument of attitude or opinion change; vested interest groups and their propaganda must be located and their effects on migrants measured. Finally, mass behaviour (particularly, in the context of South Africa) may have much to do with influencing behaviour and opinion in the migrant. Fashion, fads, crazes, rumour, crowd and mob activity, "critical social situations" are likely to leave indellible impressions on some individuals caught up in them. The presence of these collective behaviours must be ascertained and the contexts in which they may influence behaviour or opinion must be determined. These must then, in turn, be related to the other operative instruments of socialization.

H. Though no one to my knowledge has investigated the function or role of social movements as agents of socialization in any context whatsoever, it seems that in South Africa, especially, it may well be that social movements concerned with "Bantu" self-improvement, "Bantu" assertion in a White dominated society, or conversely, nativistic movements, all might have an effect on the ultimate acceptance or rejection of or compromise with urban life. There is good evidence that numerous separatist churches, "Bantu" improvement societies, etc., play quite an important role as instruments of conformity within the

ideology that these movements or organizations espouse. Such movements should be documented, their memberships obtained, and their relative contribution to socialization measured.

Only by researching all of these topics systematically and in detail such that their joint interactive functioning as agents of socialization can be determined, can the necessary data for the formulation of an adequate, valid, robust theory of rural-urban transition be obtained.

I am sad to report that in all the research on urbanization that has been carried out most of the areas of inquiry outlined above, integrally bound up as they are with the processes of urban transition, have not been studied. In fact, intelligent hypotheses as to roles and their relationships for these social phenomena in influencing urbanization have not even been forwarded. It seems that many would-be researchers in the field of urbanization are not even aware of their possible extreme importance and relevance in an understanding of rural-urban transition.

As a result, there is very little literature on many of these topics as they might figure in the understanding of urbanization. Nonetheless, there has been some work done. Most of it is exploratory; some of it is good, some of it is utterly trivial. Since the literature is so spotty on these topics, the best means for handling the work already done will be to cover it more or less by study, then outline the areas that have yet to be rigorously investigated and/or have yet to be researched at all.

One of the approaches to the study of "urbanization", which has been frequently employed, has been that of network anthropology. Monica Wilson and Philip Mayer[70], in particular, have attempted the study of rural-urban transition from the frame of reference of the social group and/or the social network. Essentially, their point of view is that whether one will become "town oriented" or not is solely a function of the orientations and social roles of an individual's significant others and of his membership groups.

Monica Wilson in her study of Langa location in Cape Town,[71] a study carried out par excellence in the "structuralist tradition", was concerned primarily with the "coherence of groups", namely, voluntary associations in Langa. Yet she had some things to say about transition as well. It is her thesis that urban orientation comes about if one becomes a member of a group centered around or "based" on some urban function or urban membership criterion. One will remain rural-oriented if one becomes a member of corporate entity which as a group emphasizes orientation toward the rural reserve and conversely, avoidance of "city ways". Wilson notes that "lines of cleavage" in social groups are often found along lines we might call urban vs. rural orientation.[72] However, the emergence of groups based on a common rural background, seems contingent upon the presence of common

landholding rights, common linguistic and/or village background, etc. "When one develops interests other than those found among the home boys, the individual is drawn out of the group and begins to be absorbed as a townsman."[73]

In short, there are numerous "reasons for being" for voluntary associations in urban centres whose membership constitutes individuals with common aims, goals, and interests in the non-urban life. The institutionalization of individual interests certainly acts to retard the otherwise "urbanizing" influence of the city. As Mayer has said, voluntary groups having a "rural base" "incapsulate" the migrant and compel him to maintain his loyalties for and interests in the "home."[74]

Mayer approaches the problem of transition from the viewpoint of the social relations of the individual rather than the dynamics of group formation, maintenance, and "fission". His point of view complements Wilson's in that he feels commitment and interest to be a function of the commitments and interests of those individuals with whom any one person has affective and/or rural ties carrying "moral weight".[75] Mayer defines "urbanization" as that psychological state when the individual no longer feels the "pull" of the country home.[76] Whether one will or will not continue to feel the pull of the country home is a function of the degree to which this "pull" is made concrete in the form of "significant" social bonds (ties) in the urban area. The analysis of the kinds of ties that an individual has will give information on the likelihood of the rural-orientation being preserved, or of its being gradually eroded through the establishment of relationships with individuals with different orientations. Mayer holds up the work "pull" rather as a fetish, but nonetheless insists that it is the alpha and omega of urbanization, with the network of social relations being the cause of the maintenance or change in the pull.

The theories forwarded by Wilson and Mayer make many fruitful contributions; but as alleged explanation of urbanization or industrial orientation they seem, to me, to fall apart. Both beg the question entirely. They shove that which is to be explained "back" one step. For example: what causes individuals to join one social group as opposed to another? Empirically speaking, why do some individuals "feel pull" of the country home yet eagerly seek industrial employment, while others do not? These are just basic questions which neither Mayer nor Wilson attempts to answer. I think there can be no doubt that there are <u>many</u> significant constraints placed on the behaviour, perceptions, and choices that characterize an individual. However, <u>these</u> are not all or even most of the constraints. And more importantly, why do people "choose" to ally themselves with one "body of opinion" (one type of person) more than another to begin with? Why do some readily enter the web of home based social relations while others eschew such ties <u>abinitio</u>. Network analysis and small group

research, if they are to make valid contributions, will have to throw off the a priori notions that these modes of explanation are in any way ultimate, necessary, and sufficient to an understanding of urban-industrialization.

Urban network analysis, I feel, gives us many valuable data on some of the contingent conditions accompanying urban transition as well as migrant "encapsulation". Group research will, I think, also enable us to see some of the vectors stimulating attitudinal and behavioural change and/or maintenance. Finally, even the refinements such as those proposed by Mayer[77], where an attempt is made to quantify and qualify the many dimensions of interpersonal ties and the different bases of these ties, still does not take us to any fundamental causes.

As has been repeated several times, urban-industrialization entails both attitudinal/affective orientation as well as conscious, overt choice behaviour for industrial employment and the "urban style" of life. That people may enter into the town and selectively participate in many varied aspects of it (be they different varieties of voluntary associations and/or different friendship networks) indicates that these people come to the city with a complex, multi-dimensional psychological set, a set which may predispose the migrant to certain choices or decisions rather than others. This set may even affect the "network" as posited by Mayer, or even group membership as posited by Wilson.

This notion of set I would interpret in a broad way so as to be nearly coterminous with personality, but would include other dimensions of the individual such as social status (rural), education, achievement, intelligence, interests, values, etc. It seems to me that this data would greatly enhance our knowledge of particularly the diversity of means whereby new urban orientations may be instilled. Indeed, both Mayer and Wilson allude in a casual way to this complex of variables but really fail to explore it carefully or in depth, and to bring it into their theories. (Mayer does mention, for example, that being a Christian may dispose the individual to be less concerned with maintaining tribal-based ties than would be the case with a pagan, this also, however, is at best a tautology.)

There is, unfortunately, no systematic work being done to determine the differences in behaviour, interpersonal contacts, group memberships, interests, etc., of migrants as functions of differences in rural background: amount of education, temperament, occupation, religion, intelligence, etc. This data is mandatory. Wilson notes almost in passing that those individuals who migrate from the reserves, who have been in the professions (teaching, ministry, physician,) or who have been to secondary school, often are readily accepted in urban-based, voluntary associations composed of professional colleagues. For these people, there is no "middle ground" typified by

trial and error search for work, friends, security, etc. They have a bias or set that enables almost immediate absorption into significant aspects of urban industrial life. As such, it might be asserted that, in essence, these people have been "urbanized" before even experiencing the city. Their experiences have predisposed them to favour urban social and economic life in the satisfaction of their wants, needs, and interests, before actually experiencing this urban environment. The process of urbanization for these people would be quite different from that for (let us say) the uneducated or semi-educated migrant.

The above is, of course, a flat-footed, naive dichotomy based simply on education. There are probably 50 or 100 different perhaps interrelated features of the rural, socio-cultural system that could be found to contribute significantly to the variation in the ways whereby urban-modern orientation comes about. Knowledge of their single, conjoint, and interactive roles (qualitative and quantitative) in bringing about attitude change would greatly enhance our ability not only to determine what some of the "forces" to urbanization are but also how they function.

The only studies designed to get at some of the "pre-urban components of urbanization have been those by Glass and Biesheuvel.[78] Their work, though it has been highly exploratory has been extremely enriching, particularly since it has thrown the empirical monkey wrench into some of the most tenaciously held dogmas of anthropology regarding rural-urban transition. Glass has maintained that the panoply of criteria that have been forwarded to indicate the process of urbanization is <u>prima facie</u> evidence of either (1) an ill-defined conceptualization of what urbanization is or (2) an immensely complex situation.[79] For Glass, urbanization and industrialization connote a preference for city life and industrial employment respectively. These are essential dimensions of attitudinal orientation or commitment.

The task is, then, one of determining the entire gamut of variables that might influence one's commitment toward the city, the reserve, or both. Without going into the details of their findings,[80] Glass and Biesheuvel have posited that there are a number of components to urban and rural life. There are numerous variables which jointly or individually would affect an individual's attitude to the city or the reserve. These were arrived at non-empirically, but seemed to have empirical validity (if the results of the experimental work is itself valid). The variables investigated were: lengths of continuous exposure to the urban environment, location of residence of wife and children, and land ownership. These combine to produce a seven-point scale ranging from completely urban through uncommitted to completely rural. Using these factors to categorize the population, they were then able to study intensively the sub-populations for other significant characteristics, (or better, to ascertain the existence of other distinc-
istics.)

Glass and Biesheuvel's research has raised the issue that I mentioned above: namely, that there seem to be significant differences in the rural backgrounds of those individuals who differ on the urban - rural index. The question of urbanization perhaps having its most significant processual components in rural background is an important one to ask. Occupational achievement, skill, education, family ties, interpersonal relations are some of the sources or modes of variation which Glass found to distinguish the classificatory rural from the classificatory urban. Their research unfortunately did not probe the issue of measurement of these differences (a logical second step it seems to me), but nonetheless these must be researched.

In another part of their work, Glass and Biesheuvel have found that there is only a very slight correlation between what they define as 'urbanization' and what is commonly called "industrial commitment".[61] Using another attitude measurement technique, they were able to rank individual attitudinal orientations to industrial work along a seven-point scale: ranging in content from "stable, committed industrial workers", through "uncommitted workers" to "completely instable, non-industrial workers". Actually, this scale was not of the Guttmann variety in that it confounded several dimensions which are only imperfectly correlated. The scale was a composit of (1) duration of employment in secondary industry, (2) one's preference for industrial work, (as over against mining or farming, etc.), and (3) and the continuity of employment history - how long the individual works at a given job. Only in the two categories (the extremes of the ranking): 'stable, committed industrial workers', and 'completely unstable, non-industrial workers' was there a positive correlation with rural vs. urban orientation. In the other categories the relationships were non-regressive (showed no correlation). This means, for example, workers were found who preferred industrial work to farming, who had had long exposure to city life, and yet who preferred rural to city 'life'. Conversely, there were workers found who had had only intermittant industrial employment who preferred non-industrial work (even farming) and yet who preferred to live in the city. Further, these individuals occurred in the sample nearly as frequently as individuals among whom industrial employment and urban orientation were found associated.

This study points up in a revealing way a few of the complexities of the problem of transition and more important the lack of 'unity' to the process of transition. Many components of this complex process are somewhat autonomous, i.e. may be operative in one instance and not in another. I would want to add that there are probably many more uncorrelated intermittently present components of transition other than those of 'orientation and industrial commitment'. In fact, I believe (although I cannot prove this point) that the city and industrial employment are IN THE VIEW OF THE MIGRANT AND POTENTIAL MIGRANT THEMSELVES COMPLEX, HIGHLY DIFFERENTIATED PHENOMENA ABOUT WHICH THERE MAY NOT EXIST ANY ORGANIZED SINGLE ATTITUDE. I SUSPECT

THAT THERE ARE VARIOUS PARTS TO EACH OF THESE ABOUT WHICH INDIVIDUALS MAY HOLD MEASURABLE ATTITUDES WHICH IN TURN MAY BE NON-CONGRUOUS WITH ONE ANOTHER. THE PERCEPTION OF THE CITY AND INDUSTRIAL WORK MAY BE AMBIVALENT.

This seemingly rather fundamental notion that urban-industrialization may be not one thing but many, and further, may be different things for different people, has seldom been enunciated in the literature.

While Glass and Biesheuvel have done a great deal in their study, there are, nevertheless, constructive criticisms that can be made. First, it seems to me that their study would have had more value if they had researched the many questions which their work has brought to light. This, of course, can be done in the future. Second, in their research they neglected entirely a rich avenue of inquiry by their failure to exploit the case histories of some of the workers they interviewed. It seems to me that one of the most revealing independent checks and heuristic devices for giving direction and additional meaning to much of their data would have been independently gathered case history data. Such data could easily be used, for example, for interpreting the significance of the associations and correlations they found for understanding the ways in which these associations came to exist.

As interested in "process" as all researchers seem to be, I should think that longitudinal studies would serve at least to give time perspective and just as likely would serve to delimit empirically how the plethora of variables influencing transition operate interactively in the individual. From here the statistical picture could be interpreted more accurately and more meaningfully.

Finally, attributes characterizing individuals whom we classify according to still other criteria, may be completely spurious associations in terms of some hypothesis we have about the individuals or their behaviour; these associations may be conditions which by means of some as yet unknown mechanisms bring about the classificatory variables, or the associations may themselves be direct causes of the classificatory variables. In other words, denoting characteristics of rural, non-industrial migrants on the one hand, then noting characteristics of urban-industrial migrants on the other, still leaves the more important task of showing how - by what means - these associations play a causative role in bringing about the empirically determined difference in orientation and behaviour. It may be that some of these distinguishing features are purely indexical - that is, are invariably associated with one or the other "type" but for no reason having relevance in the explanation of transition, or how these associations may play a role in the transition process.

Why for example do individuals who hold land on the reserves tend to prefer [illegible]

sound like an asinine question. Often, I believe, researchers have assumed that the meaning of the associations is self-obvious, that is, their role in stimulating transition needs no elucidation. This is not the case. Do people who own farm land tend to prefer rural life because they have an economic stake in the reserve; because people who buy farm land do so, because they are oriented to rural life to begin with; because the ownership of the farm land is a partial cause of their learning to prefer rural life; or are ownership of farm land and rural orientation both a product of some third causal variable(s)? The same questions can be asked about all other associations. Glass has seen fit to 'reason out' why the associations would be crucial in determining orientation.[82] This is not sufficient. It is fine for setting up hypotheses, but not for proving other hypotheses.

The task of ascertaining why given interpersonal social relationships, economic commitment, patterns of mobility, group memberships, religious beliefs, work histories, skills, education, residence of wife, etc, affect urban-rural orientation requires inter alia that we research how these social phenomena are viewed by individuals. More important, we must ascertain the diversity in the ways they, and countless other items that have been considered in this paper, come to figure in people's motivations, perceptions, actions, interests, etc. In short, how the person is related to the perceivable and perceived influences around him is relevant to an understanding of urbanization.

It seems intuitively obvious that a phenomenon like urban-industrial transition, involving as it does such a preponderance of perceptual and cognitive changes, must be understood in part at least psychologically. It is not enough to assert that X, Y and Z invariably will produce an urbanite. The individual became an urbanite partially because he came to perceive certain social phenomena in certain ways. A person's attitude and opinions about the stimuli to transition are as important as the stimuli. It is sheer folly to try to explain perception solely in terms of society. It is true that society figures very prominently in what will be perceived in certain ways because of something operating other than the percept itself. People are not automata programmed by "the social network", or their occupation or their economic investments, or their child rearing. They are programmed by all these and an infinite number of other experiential phenomena. Change in how one perceives the social universe implies there has been some change in the reinforcement of past perceptions and cognition. The reinforcement schedule has been altered. How does the reinforcement schedule become altered? This is as yet only vaguely understood, but it is an all important problem.

We have been speaking of "agents of socialization" throughout this paper. The tacit assumption in the sociological studies that have been cited is that the things that have been found to be associated with one or more kinds of people within the process of transition

are reinforcements to change, reversion, ambivalence, etc. This is probably true. However, thousands of individuals may be found who differ in none of the diagnostics of, say, 'urban orientation', yet who have radically different opinions about the city, and who have radically different plans for the future. Assuming our diagnostics are exhaustive, the difference must lie in what these diagnostics mean to the different individuals. For one individual, holding a given job may, because of some other set of variables, be a potent agent of socialization. This individual wants to learn the "white man's" ways, and get ahead in terms of his (white man's) social system. For another individual in the same job, his work may be a necessary evil that must be put up with until such time as he can return to the reserve. This latter fellow will view the job in an entirely different way from the former individual. Perceptions being different, reactions to the work situation will be different. This is merely an example of the notion that it is not enough to know on a statistical basis what correlations in attitude and social status-role, etc., exist. It is these correlations in terms of the ways in which they are perceived and in terms of the ways that they figure in the lives of individuals that is truly meaningful, if we are interested in explaining process.

This is not to imply that there are no "regularities" apart from individuals: we need not put every migrant on the couch in order to assess what the process of urbanization is. It simply means that we must include in our study of the social variables the ways in which the individuals and significant sub-sets of individuals are related to the social matrix in which they are living. A given social fact may mean many different things depending on the perceiver and the social facts that occur with it.

Of all the aspects of urban-industrial orientation that have been mentioned in this paper, the cognitive aspect has received the least attention. There are studies dealing with the perception and individual assessment of perceived social phenomena[83], but very few systematic psychological and social psychological inquiries have been made, which have been designed to illuminate the data collected by sociologists and anthropologists on the perception of social variables involved in transition.

There are three pilot studies (carried out from a psychological standpoint) which will be enlightening here. The first, done by Biesheuvel and his associates at NIPR, attempts to assess the psychological (personality) aspects of socialization in industrial employment. His study, while not giving data that is useful to present here, does point up some of the issues that I have just raised, namely: knowledge of the motivational (needs, wants, etc.) perceptual, and personality framework is an integral part of understanding how given individuals react in the ways they do to the social fields in which they function.

Biesheuvel bases much of his research on Maslow's theory of the hierarchy of needs.[84] Briefly

individual has a number of definite drives or tensions requiring satisfaction. These drives may be classed according to the kinds of goal-objects which may lead to the reduction of tension (drive reduction/need satisfaction). The drives or needs are hierarchic in the sense that (1) they occur in the individual simultaneously and (2) certain of the drives must be satisfied before the organism is capable of integrative (or even adjustive) behaviour designed to satisfy the "higher" needs or drives. The basic drives are biological: hunger, thirst, elimination, sex, etc. The other drives are derived in the sense that they are to a great extent learned, although they are culturally universal. The most fundamental of the derived (social) drives is security, one step higher are the needs to be loved, thence comes the need for esteem, then mastery, and finally, "self-actualization".

It is instructive to view migrant behaviour from the "inside out". It is one thing to specify the societal constraints on behaviour; it is another thing to understand what needs, operative for what reasons, lead the individual to the choices and decisions they do within the range of choice permitted by the social system. This latter is Biesheuvel's concern. When the migrant enters the city, he comes with a complex set of innate and acquired motivations and perceptions. These have been met in traditional ways in "Bantu" culture, and with the change in the environment are going to have to be met in presumably new ways. While Biesheuvel has been most concerned with the work situation, the principles apply to all social behaviour.

A number of investigations carried out by NIPR show that not only do individuals meet needs in new ways, but that in certain circumstances new needs are derived from new kinds of social experiences. In short, in the tribal society certain needs deemphasized or were met in more direct stereotyped GOAL DIRECTED BEHAVIOUR. "Needs" affect the migrant's urban behaviour. To give but one example: there is evidence[85] that individuals who through any number of means exhibit more salient dependency (security) needs tend to work in the mines and in primary industry where work, performance, even daily life are regulated and taken care of by the firm. Such individuals are not often found in secondary industry. Similarly, as was illustrated above, some industrial workers are terrified at the thought of piece work, others are not. Perhaps, the differential here is attributable to the differential saliency of one type of need; namely, dependency - security.

A second group of studies illustrating the personality determinants of behaviour[86] shows that different workers, who otherwise have very similiar work histories, stress very different aspects of work as being "most important to them". Tests reveal that often these differentially salient aspects of the job for various individuals relate to different kinds of tensions for which often there is little opportunity for reduction. Individuals who stress security as opposed to pleasant relations as the most important parts of the job often have their other drives [illegible]

other activities; the former might have his "sociability" needs met by having his family present, while the latter satisfies his security needs by being a member of a labour union. In short, the social relations, the group memberships, etc.,may be reflective of needs and drives as well as of "custom" or other non-personal variables. What kinds of needs may be best satisfied in what ways for which individuals is indispensible information which must be collected.

Biesheuvel feels that work becomes an agent of socialization when a significant number of individuals' primary and derived needs can be satisfied only in the work situation. In other words, the individual comes to identify with his job.[87]

It is transparently obvious from this lengthy discussion that social, economic and psychological variables are seemingly inextricably enmeshed in one another; that concern for one set of variables inevitably leads us to an investigation of other. This is as things should be. When one develops a closed system of explanation within one discipline for such a process as rural-urban transition, one is bound to be procrustean. While Biesheuvel's work does not involve other activities, such as membership in voluntary associations, perceptual rubrics, mass media, ambitions for family children and future, etc., his ideas regarding the needs of the individual are eminently important in these areas as well. (Encapsulating home-based groups encapsulate partially because the individual wants to be encapsulated, not solely because the individual "preserves" his rural outlook.) The case study and small group experimentation are the primary research tools in the area of motivation. As such it makes somewhat more difficult the problem of relating personality data to other data of a statistical variety. Yet the job must be done.

Another study - one that points up some of the possibilities of an extension of Biesheuvel's work in measuring socialization in terms of social distance evaluation and reference (orientation group) preference ? is well worth citing here. Social distance is well known to be an overt manifestation of both personality and social-value variables.

Van der Berghe[88] has carried out a social distance study among College students: Bantu, Afrikaner,, English, Asiatic and Coloured, in the classic Bogardus tradition. Although not all of his study is relevant to our interests here, the parts of it which tell how different individuals in different racial groups rank other out-groups defined according to racial, occupational, territorial, and political criteria along a favourable, unfavourable continuum, may have interesting implications for determining to what extent individuals identify with what kinds of groups - to what extent an individual shares the social distance norms of significant groupings in the population.

Van den Berghe's study did not select for study populations of "Bantu" according to any number of criteria which might allow

according to hypothesized variance along an urban - non-urban, industrial - non-industrial set of continua. However, it was very revealing to see that urban "Bantu" rank rural "Bantu" at a greater social distance than they rank either English or Asiatics or Coloured. Only the Afrikaners were considered more socially "distant" than the "bush-Kaffirs". This positive rejection of the peoples associated with a cultural heritage that one or at least one's parents probably were part of is an interesting way of getting at the degree of acceptance of the Western socio-cultural system. This "cultural shame", as it is often called, may be a measurable phenomenon. If so, it may be possible to determine whether urban socialization is a process of either acceptance of the new culture, rejection of the old culture, or a unique or perhaps general interaction of both processes. An instructive approach, then, might well be to assume that urban orientation may or may not involve a rejection of the rural reserve. In other words, it may be that the placing of individuals on a continuum of urban-orientation may or may not simultaneously rank them analogously according to degrees of rejection of the rural culture. Van den Berghe's sample consisted of "Bantu" college students alone. Naturally their rejection of the rural reserve might well have both quantitative and qualitative differences from that of other sub-sets of the "Bantu" population.

Another point that might bear investigation: many attitude surveys, as mentioned above, have shown that people often "object differentiate"; that is, they have differing attitudes towards different parts or aspects of some social issue. Ascertainment of the significant features of the rural culture which may often be found to be SELECTIVELY rejected by different people, might give us clues as to another source of diversity in the processes of urban-industrial transition.

A final but very important psychological perspective that must be considered, one that is actually inseparable from the issues raised in the last section on personality, is that of personality development and infant and child rearing. As mentioned earlier, Danziger is one of the few psychologists who has attempted to bring to bear the method and theory of child psychiatry to the problems of rural-urban transition.[89] The discussion in the last few pages has been replete with statements about personality, present set, predisposition, etc. Different needs, wants, perceptions, and reaction norms may lead individuals, quite similar in terms of the "overt" criteria for urbanization, to react differently to and interpret differently the urban-industrial social system. These personality variables are, in turn, a function of early social experiences of the individual.

We have established that personality differences probably make a difference in the mode of linkage to the urban system. By definition this implies that differences in child rearing will be a part of the field of inquiry for determining how personality differences affect urbanization.

Perhaps even more important than child rearing and attendant personality differences as a predisposing complex of variables effecting potential for urban-industrialization, are these variables as they form a part of the culture which one generation of migrants adapts as a part of their acceptance of the urban culture generally, and which in turn are means for socializing the second generation ab initio into urban society. In other words, child rearing may be part of the complex of factors which seals the "urban fate", as it were, of the second generation. If one learns only the city, the rural reserve may hold little for the individual.

Danziger's work does not deal with the "Bantu", rather with Indonesian society. However, it is his insight that social change, whether it be defined in terms of individual reorientation or societal change, affects the ways in which parents bring up their children. He amasses considerable data to show how traditions of child rearing become altered in ways commensurate with the kind and degree of social change occurring in the social milieu.

An interesting study from the perspective of "Bantu" rural-urban transition might be a comparison of child rearing practices found in the reserves today and in time past, those found in the cities among differing sub-sets of the "Bantu" population, and in the cities those found among Whites. It would seem intuitively that as the "Bantu" become more and more enculturated into urban life, their child rearing practices would more and more approach those of some sub-sets of the White population. It would also be interesting to ascertain whether differences in child rearing among "Bantu" are found to follow class, tribal, or educational lines as they often do among the White population, and whether these differences in the two racial groups are analogous to one another: e.g. does middle class "Bantu" = middle class White, etc.

It is apparent that the empirical research that I have cited here - although it has been somewhat exhaustive in terms of the topics that have been researched90 - comes nowhere near supplying the information called for on my outline of desiderata for development of a theory of urban-industrialization. Numerous topics have been left untouched in the literature, as the reader can see for himself.

This synthesis has, I hope, nevertheless, done three things: (1) pointed out where the earth has yet to be broken, and as such points out how little we know about the problem; and (2) pointed out how much more COMPLEX THE PROBLEM IS THAN has been conceived in many quarters, and (3) how the synthesis of the findings of many approaches to the study of society and culture are required if any sense at all is to be made out of this as yet staggeringly complex process. Above all, the purpose of this last section has been to point out that the individual must be slipped back into the picture. One of the most important aspects of human behaviour is individual human beings.

The empirical work, scanty as it is, that has been done so far in the area of the social and social psychological aspects of urbanization has indicated clearly that these modes of inquiry can tap a large reservoir of information on the causes of urban socialization. My tentative outline of some of the more important aspects of the urban social system which probably play an important role in socialization stands now only as a speculation; however, that work which I have been able to cite, indicates that probably these variables will be very effective singly and in combination in bringing about cognitive and affective reorientation of the individual. The studies cited illustrate that urbanization is many, many things; it is a social phenomenon typified by diversity, complexity, and lack of consistent functioning from individual to individual. The city is a complex phenomenon.. INDIVIDUALS DO NOT REACT TO A CITY AS A GESTALT. It is probable that there is significant variation in the ways different individuals experience a city both in terms of the parts of it to which they are exposed and how these percepts are related to the "meaning" or "symbol" system of the individual. In short, we need to develop a social science of the South African City even to begin an intelligent attack on how the different migrants react and respond to it.[91]

THE POLITICAL-LEGAL ASPECTS OF "BANTU" URBAN-INDUSTRIALIZATION

This last section could legitimately be included as a subtopic within the preceding section. It is, however, an area that has been far more intensively and carefully studied than have other social phenomena comprising the urban centre. In fact, because the literature is so rich, I shall attempt here only a summary statement of the place of legal and political study within the larger study of socialization.

It is perhaps in the sphere of political-legal control of the "Bantu" vis à vis their participation in the urban socio-cultural system that the need of a study of the South African city as a unique urban phenomenon becomes most clear. To recite the legal and not-so-legal repressive measures employed by the State to control almost every conceivable aspect of town life for the "Bantu" would be simply a recitation of the already painfully familiar. For a comprehensive overview of the legal measures affecting the economics and sociology of the "Bantu" in the urban centres, see the various issues of the Survey of Race Relations.[92]

Every aspect of "Bantu" migration and socialization or enculturation into the urban social system will be affected to some degree by the labyrinthian complex of legal enactments regulating "Bantu" behaviour. Some of the major categories of law that are fundamental to understanding migration and urbanization are:

1. Measures controlling influx or entry into urban areas.
   A. Pass Laws
   B. Eviction laws
   C. Rights to Entry
2. Measures controlling place of residence and housing facilitiess.
3. Job reservations: measures limiting type of work that may be engaged in.
4. Wage ceilings: limits (legal and extra-legal) restricting wages that may be paid.
5. Segregation laws (particularly as regards use of urban amenities and places of business and social gatherings.)
6. Curfew laws: laws limiting times during which the individual may be found in various "protected" or "group" areas.
7. Education and Curriculum laws.
8. Welfare laws
9. Regulation of voluntary organizations

The above is a mere skeletal outline of some of the kinds of laws that must be reckoned as part of the urban social system.

The second major topical concern is the problem of race relations between "Bantu" and White. Certainly the experiences of Negroes in the United States and of the "Bantu" in South Africa testify to the psychic and often physical trauma which result from constant deprivation, degradation, and exploitation, be it formal and explicit or informal and subtle. For the "Bantu" one of the big factors associated with city life is the uncertainty of being within the grasp of the tyrannical masters. Fear, I believe, is a concommitant to urban life for many or most "Bantu". This variable must be assessed and its role in the lives of all "Bantu" determined. Often we evaluate group reaction to racial discrimination on the basis of the protestations of the articulate and organized few. NO ONE, TO MY KNOWLEDGE, HAS ATTEMPTED TO DETERMINE THE MULTIFARIOUS POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION OF THE URBAN "BANTU" IN TERMS OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF THIS STATE OF DEPRIVATION, BY INDIVIDUAL "BANTU" THEMSELVES. A knowledge of how different sub-sets of the urban "Bantu" population perceive their marginal social positions, might be very revealing in discovering the defences that are required to come to identify with the city in spite of the many probable deterrents to such identification.

CONCLUSION

This paper has been both a survey of past work, a synthesis of current findings, and an attempt to outline a programme of research and theory construction which will ultimately yield a comprehensive and adequate explanation for the staggeringly complex problem of population movement of urban centres and the process of socialization into the social system of the urban terminus of that migration. Looking back, it may seem

that the course has been rather plodding and tedious. I think, however, that when one tackles the problem of ordering what is, in essence, chaos, much tedium is required.

The preoccupation in some quarters of anthropology with the maintenance of disciplinary boundaries and ideological commitment has retarded, I believe, the intelligent pursuit of the solution to many complex social problems. Migration is no exception. I had no precedents, no guidelines to follow in trying to order and integrate the empirical research of often very different disciplines working with often seemingly very different problems. Explanation requires this integration. My synthesis lacks the formal elegance of a paper dealing with less diverse kinds of data. Hopefully, it has been, however, instructive in inspiring some new thinking; hopefully, some provocative questions have been asked and some new issues raised. Finally, I hope that this paper might provide a rough framework within which it will be possible to relate the research that may be carried on from many and diverse points of view, such that a coherent, robust, and adequate theory of rural-urban transition may some day be formulated.

FOOTNOTES

1. Paul H. Landis and Paul K. Pratt. Population Problems;
T. Lynn Smith. Population Analysis;
Dennis H. Wrong. Population; also see other standard texts in demography and sociology.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. J. Clyde Mitchell. "Urbanization, Detribalization,..." pg. 697 in UNESCO Industrialization and Urbanization in Africa South of the Sahara.

5. Ibid., pg. 697 - 698

6. Ibid., pg. 705

7. See: J.F.Holleman, et. al. (eds.) Problems of Transition; and
P. Mayer. Townsmen or Tribesmen, passim.

8. Phillip Mayer. "Labour Migrancy and the Social Network" IN
J.F.Holleman, et al. (eds.) Problems of Transition pg. 22, and passim.

9. Ibid., pg. 24

10. Ibid., pg. 27 - 28

11. Ibid., pg. 28

12. Ibid., pg. 32

13. Ibid., pg. 33

14. Ibid.

15. Max Gluckman, quoted by Mayer, loc. cit.pg.25

16. Y. Glass. "Industrialization and Urbanization in South Africa", in J.F. Holleman, op. cit., pg.53

17. Ibid., pg. 54 - 55

18. Ibid., pg. 56

19. Ibid., pg. 57 - 66, passim

20. S. Biesheuvel. "Work and Its Effects on Personality Development in Africans" IN J.F. Holleman, op. cit., pg. 81 - 93

21. Ibid., pg. 81 - 93

22. Ibid., pg. 84 - 86

23. K. Danziger. "Social Change and Child Training in Underdeveloped Areas", IN E. Holleman, op. cit., pg. 103 - 115

24. Union Year Book; see appropriate years.

25. I. Schapera. "Cultural Changes in Tribal Life", IN I. Schapera (ed.) The Bantu Speaking Tribes of South Africa, pg. 359

26. Sheila van der Horst. African Workers in Town, pg. 46

27. Monica Wilson. Langa, pg. 50 - 57

28. See: Mayer. Townsmen or Tribesmen

29. Wilson, op. cit., passim

30. Van der Horst, op. cit., passim

31. See: Van der Horst, op. cit., pg. 7; also: Y. Glass. The Black Worker; Ellen Hellmann. Sellgoods; and J.C. Mitchell, loc. cit.

32. See: inter alia, C. de Kiewiet. History of South Africa: Social and Economic.

33. van der Horst. op. cit., pg. 19 - 20

34. Ibid., pg. 22

35. quoted from Institute of Race Relations, Survey of Race Relations, 1962, pg. 76

36. F.R. Tomlinson, et al. Report Submitted by the Commission on the Socio-Economic Development of the Bantu Areas.

37. Institute of Race Relations. op. cit. pg. 76

38. D. Hobart Houghton and F.M. Wallin. The Economy of a Native Reserve. passim.

39. van der Horst. op. cit., pg. 109

40. I. Schapera. loc. cit., pg. 366

41. G. Wilson, quoted by editor in E. Holleman, op. cit., pg. 44

42. G.E. Gent. "Migrancy and Urbanization in the Union of South Africa" IN Africa 8: 161-183

43. Ibid.

44. F.R. Tomlinson, op. cit.

45. data compiled by me from appropriate issues of the Survey of Race Relations, 1948 - 1964.

46. H. Goldberg, quoted in the Survey of Race Relations, 1963, pg, 201

47. M. Wilson. Langa, passim; van der Horst, op cit passim; and Mayer, loc. cit., passim.

48. van der Horst. op. cit., pg. 45

49. Ibid., passim; also: Biesheuvel. loc. cit.; and Cortis, L. "A Comparative Study in the Attitudes of Bantu and European Workers" IN Psychologia Africana

50. van der Horst. op. cit. pg. 73, 74, 75, 76

51. Ibid., pg. 73 -74

52. Ibid., pg. 76

53. Ibid., pg. 79

54. Biesheuvel. loc. cit., pg. 81 - 82

55. Ibid., pg. 82

56. Ibid.

57. Ibid., pg. 83

58 Ibid., pg. 83 - 84

59. Homans, G.C. The Human Group

60. See: Survey of Race Relations (appropriate years); Union Year Book (appropriate years); and Pierre van den Berghe. South Africa: A Study in Conflict.

61. van der Horst. op. cit., pg. 70

62. Ibid., pg. 89

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid., pg. 92

65. L. Cortis. loc. cit., pg. 148 - 167

66. Ibid., pg. 151 - 152

67. Ibid., pg. 155 - 158

68. Ibid., pg. 158 - 165

69. F.J. Roethlisberger and W.J. Dickson. Management and the Worker

70. Wilson, M. and Mafeje, Archie. Langa. P. Mayer. Townsmen or Tribesmen. passim.

71. Wilson, M. Langa, passim.

72. M. Wilson, loc., cit., pg. 6

73. Ibid., pg. 10

74. P. Mayer, op. cit., passim

75. P. Mayer, loc. cit., pg. 24 - 30, passim

76. Ibid., pg. 21 - 22, passim.

77. Ibid., pg. 32-34

78. Y. Glass, loc. cit., pg. 52

79. Ibid., pg. 57

80. the research was carried out among factory workers in various urban centres throughout the Republic.

81. Ibid., pg. 67 - 70

82. Ibid., pg. 60 - 67

83. L.W. Doob. Becoming More Civilized

84. Maslow, A. Motivation and Personality

85. quoted by Biesheuvel in Biesheuvel, loc, cit.,pg 89

86. Sherwood, R. quoted by Biesheuvel in Biesheuvel, loc. cit., pg. 90 Cortis, L. quoted by Biesheuvel, in Ibid, pg. 90

87. Biesheuvel, Ibid., pg. 88 - 92

88. van den Berghe. "Race Attitudes in Durban South Africa", pg. 54 - 73

89. K. Danziger, loc. cit., pg. 103 - 115

90. See: M. Wilson, Langa, Mayer, op. cit., etc.

91. Y. Glass, loc. cit., pg. 52 - 57

92. See annual issues of the Survey of Race Relations, 1948 - 1964

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Biesheuvel, S. 'Some of the Characteristics of the African Worker' IN Journal of the South African Institute of Personnel Management, 15:5 1962.

Biesheuvel, S. 'Work and Its Effect on Personality Development in Africans' IN Holleman, J.F., et al. (eds.) Problems of Transition.

Cortis, L.E. 'A Comparative Study in the Attitudes of Bantu and European Workers' IN Psychologia Africana, 9: 148 - 167.

Danziger, K. 'Social Change and Child Training in Underdeveloped Areas' IN Holleman, J.F., et al., (eds.) Problems of Transition.

deKiewiet, C. History of South Africa: Social and Economic. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

deKock, Michiel Hendrik. The Economic Development of South Africa. London P.S. King and Sons, 1930.

Doob, Leonard W. Becoming More Civilized. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Glass, Y. The Black Industrial Worker: A Social-Psychological Study. Report submitted to the Inter-African Labour Conference, CCTA/CSA, Abidjan, 1961.

Glass, Y. 'Industrialization and Urbanization in South Africa' IN Holleman, J.F., et al., (eds.) Problems of Transition.

Gent, G.E. 'Migrancy and Urbanization in the Union of South Africa' IN Africa, 8: 161 - 183

Hellmann, Ellen. Rooiyard: A Sociological Survey of an Urban Slum Yard. Cape Town: Rhodes-Livingstone Paper No. 13, 1948.

Hellmann, Ellen. Sellgoods: A Sociological Survey of an African Labour Force. Johannesburg, South African Institute of Race Relations, 1953.

Holleman, J.F. Knox, Joan, Mann, J.W., and Heard, K.A. (eds.) Problems of Transition. Pietermaritzburg: Natal University Press, 1962.

Homans, G.C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, 1950.

Horrell, Muriel. (ed.) A Survey of Race Relations. (appears annually). Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1948 - 1964.

Houghton, D. Hobart. and Walter, Edith. The Economy of a Native Reserve. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter, 1953.

Landis, Paul H. and Hatt, Paul K. Population Problems. (2nd edition). New York City: American Book Co. 1954

van den Berghe, Pierre. Caneville: The Social Structure of a South African Town. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1964.

van den Berghe, Pierre. South Africa: A Study in Conflic Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1965.

Wilson, Monica. "The Coherence of Groups" IN Holleman, J.F., et al., (eds.) Problems of Transition.

Wilson, Monica and Mafeje, Archie, Langa: A Study of Social Groups in an African Township. Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Wrong, D. Population. New York City: Random House, 1956