



GRASSROOTS GOVERNANCE? CHIEFS IN AFRICA AND THE AFRO-CARIBBEAN

Edited by Donald I. Ray and P.S. Reddy

ISBN 978-1-55238-565-4

THIS BOOK IS AN OPEN ACCESS E-BOOK. It is an electronic version of a book that can be purchased in physical form through any bookseller or on-line retailer, or from our distributors. Please support this open access publication by requesting that your university purchase a print copy of this book, or by purchasing a copy yourself. If you have any questions, please contact us at ucpress@ucalgary.ca

Cover Art: The artwork on the cover of this book is not open access and falls under traditional copyright provisions; it cannot be reproduced in any way without written permission of the artists and their agents. The cover can be displayed as a complete cover image for the purposes of publicizing this work, but the artwork cannot be extracted from the context of the cover of this specific work without breaching the artist's copyright.

COPYRIGHT NOTICE: This open-access work is published under a Creative Commons licence.

This means that you are free to copy, distribute, display or perform the work as long as you clearly attribute the work to its authors and publisher, that you do not use this work for any commercial gain in any form, and that you in no way alter, transform, or build on the work outside of its use in normal academic scholarship without our express permission. If you want to reuse or distribute the work, you must inform its new audience of the licence terms of this work. For more information, see details of the Creative Commons licence at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

UNDER THE CREATIVE COMMONS LICENCE YOU **MAY**:

- read and store this document free of charge;
- distribute it for personal use free of charge;
- print sections of the work for personal use;
- read or perform parts of the work in a context where no financial transactions take place.

UNDER THE CREATIVE COMMONS LICENCE YOU **MAY NOT**:

- gain financially from the work in any way;
- sell the work or seek monies in relation to the distribution of the work;
- use the work in any commercial activity of any kind;
- profit a third party indirectly via use or distribution of the work;
- distribute in or through a commercial body (with the exception of academic usage within educational institutions such as schools and universities);
- reproduce, distribute, or store the cover image outside of its function as a cover of this work;
- alter or build on the work outside of normal academic scholarship.

SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF TRADITIONAL LEADERS AND PUBLIC VIEWS ON THEIR POLITICAL ROLE

CHAPTER 3

CHARLES CROTHERS

CHARLES CROTHERS is an associate professor in sociology in the School of Social Sciences, Auckland University of Technology. Earlier positions have included lecturing stints at Victoria University of Wellington and the University of Auckland and five years as professor and head of sociology at the University of Natal–Durban. Charles’s academic work spans social research methods, social theory (especially the theory of social structure), history of the social sciences, social science-based policy, and the political economy and sociology of settler societies.

There is some descriptive literature on the institution of traditional leaders in South Africa, and rather more political debate about their role in society, particularly because of their critical perceived role in *delivering* the rural African vote. There is a particular link between the key role of traditional leaders in relation to the control of land and local authorities that are the level of government most concerned with land-use controls, and perhaps ownership. So it is particularly the role of traditional leaders in local government which is at issue. Indeed, much of the literature (see references) relates to the political role of traditional leaders. However, there is little information on what the social characteristics of traditional leaders are, or on how the public views them.

A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A crucial ideological point is where traditional leaders might seem to best fit in with a modernizing *new* South Africa. To modernizing purists, traditional leaders clearly appear anachronistic: an affront to democracy and, as public administrators, producing little or nothing of economic value. Worse, since traditional leaders are securely installed without mechanisms of accountability, let alone mechanisms to encourage good performance, traditional leaders are seen as entirely beyond the pale. Even worse, since they are not supervised by any other authority, traditional leaders are open to exploit those under their control, through the charging of fees or demanding of services beyond market value for services which should be performed at cost or even free. This is especially so given the extent to which, by virtue of governmental interference in successions and appointments, the claims to legitimacy flowing from ancestry or from popular support are contestable.

However, the purist position may need to be offset by a closer examination of the full range of costs and benefits involved. By appointing traditional leaders the costs of elections are reduced, and there may be other services towards the achievement of community unity that traditional leaders perform either without recompense, or more efficiently and effectively than alternative mechanisms. The proper role of any social

position cannot be determined by theoretical reflection alone, but deserves careful empirical study.

People are likely to vary in their views about the political role of traditional leaders. It is difficult to predict on theoretical grounds how respondents (and people in general) feel about the political role of traditional leaders. Presumably, as in many other areas of life, people's views are shaped by their interests and also by their ideologies. Traditional leaders are clearly barely salient for the vast range of South African citizens, except perhaps as traditional leaders impinge on people's views about how they see the new South Africa emerging.

But some variation in views will also clearly follow from the social position in which people are placed, especially in relation to traditional leaders. Those more closely linked to traditional leaders are certainly more likely to hold more intense views. Clearly, those occupying land in the dispensation of a traditional leader, and perhaps operating under the traditional leaders' surveillance, are presumably most intensely involved. If they have had bad experiences with traditional leaders or get on poorly with the present traditional leader incumbent, it is possible that they will generalize their concern into a broader negative attitude. However, it is also possible, whatever the exact content of the relationship between a particular follower and their traditional leader, that they will see their traditional leader as a representative of their broader interests as rural blacks.

Attitudes to the political role of traditional leaders may also be influenced by the class situation in which people live. If they see themselves as separated from the interests of their traditional leader, who instead represents the interests of traditional leaders in general, there will be more negative views. It is likely that many traditional leaders portray themselves as representing the interests of their constituents. It is likely, though, at least on some issues, that in practice they also (or instead) represent views which reflect their own particular interest as traditional leaders.

There is a methodological problem with the data collection. The views of most respondents may be influenced by the characteristics of interviewers, but some of those most closely tied in with traditional leaders might also feel that they are not entirely free to express their views in an interview situation, since any critical opinions might come to the notice of their traditional leader, and so they might have hedged their opinions accordingly. This point follows from the more general view that correctly tapping politically-orientated opinions in rural areas through interviews can be difficult.

With the information at hand it is not possible to adjudicate between these various considerations. However, the reader may find them useful in endeavouring to understand the broader patterns that are reported here.

THE SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF TRADITIONAL LEADERS

In the October Household Surveys (OHS) carried out annually by Statistics South Africa since 1993, some 30,000 households are visited annually. The occupations of respondents (and more generally those in responding households) are coded and in each survey some traditional leaders have been covered. Although the sample is small, I have only used results from the 1995 survey. (Further work pooling the results for several surveys would hopefully validate the findings given here.) The data allows the depiction of traditional leaders in terms of the socio-biological characteristics and also their household structures, dwelling characteristics, education, income etc. In this part of the study, I also make some general comparisons between traditional leaders and other black African households (see tables 1–3 at end of chapter).

Only thirty-two respondents who reported their occupation as a traditional leader were included in the 1995 OHS. The sample is inadequate for generalizing to the whole population of traditional leaders with any degree of accuracy, but should be of a sufficient size to indicate some of their main characteristics. Of these, two considered themselves self-employed and the remainder had their answers recorded as employees. Interestingly, there were two quite separate groupings in terms of industry. Just under one-third of respondents were involved in industry, specifically the mining industry. Others appeared to retain the more traditional involvement in agriculture. This is reflected in their locations: with the rural traditional leaders to be found in Eastern Cape, Northern Province, or KwaZulu-Natal, while the industrial traditional leaders are concentrated in Gauteng. One-sixth of traditional leaders are women: all rural. Two-thirds of the industrial traditional leaders were union members, but nearly half of the rural ones too (it is possible that the latter are involved with associations of traditional leaders). Educational qualifications were spread across a wide range, with a higher proportion of rural traditional leaders having higher qualifications. Industrial traditional leaders are slightly younger on average (forty-six compared to fifty for

rural traditional leaders). Rural traditional leaders reported better incomes: some 50 per cent higher overall than industrial traditional leaders. Also, rural traditional leaders report other income sources other than wages, which helps boost their overall remuneration.

Whereas rural traditional leaders are split between those living in formal dwellings and those living in traditional dwellings, industrial traditional leaders live in hostels. Not surprisingly, most rural traditional leaders own their dwelling, although there is clearly a minority in more complex situations. Rural traditional leaders feel safer than industrial traditional leaders, although there are some rural traditional leaders who do not feel so safe. They do not seem to have been much at risk in terms of crime. While all the industrial traditional leaders are unconcerned with air pollution, some rural traditional leaders clearly see difficulties. A large proportion of rural traditional leaders report that at times during the year they have insufficient income to adequately feed their children. On the whole, traditional leaders are moderately satisfied with their lives. Rural traditional leaders are evenly divided by those who feel that their living situation is better than a year before, whereas the industrial traditional leaders tend to be considerably more optimistic.

There are several interesting points in this portrait:

- not all traditional leaders are rural/agricultural
- not all are elderly, in fact they are only slightly older than most occupational groupings
- while their pay levels are quite high compared to other black Africans, a substantial proportion receive low incomes and (at least in terms of the hunger measure) live in poverty.

PUBLIC ATTITUDES:

In the Idasa post-election survey carried out in 1995, respondents were asked their views about several aspects of the local political role of traditional leaders (see tables 4–6 at end of chapter). The six questions cover:

- the political role of traditional leaders
- whether there is a perceived conflict between tradition and democratic authority
- whether traditional leaders should be in local government
- whether traditional leaders should be awarded a seat or be required to be elected

- whether traditional leaders should be aligned to party views or not
- whether traditional leaders should take public stances or not.

The survey from which this data is garnered is of high quality (for example, its measurement of voting distribution mirrors that of the general election). The questions on traditional leaders are asked within the broad context of many questions of a political complexion. There is quite a large proportion of “don’t knows” on several of the questions, which is an indication that some respondents are not familiar with the topic.

Over the whole sample, the majority (just under three-fourths) saw traditional leaders as playing a political role and one-fifth saw them as playing an important role. On whether there is a conflict between traditional and democratic authority, the sample was fairly evenly spread amongst the five response categories; except that there is a distinct bias towards emphasizing conflict, with over one-quarter perceiving serious conflict and just under 10 per cent perceiving that the two types of authority can easily go together. Some 60 per cent of the sample were supportive of traditional leaders being in local government, with similar proportions arguing that traditional leaders should run for election, and that they should not take public stances. A somewhat higher proportion (75 per cent) opposed the political alignment of traditional leaders. The broad consensus is, on the one hand, to accord traditional leaders a role in public life including in local government, but on the other hand to prescribe that role to “non-political politics” and requiring them to be elected. On the other hand, a substantial minority are prepared to accord traditional leaders a more active politically political role, and to allow them *de jure* political status.

In order to examine the pattern of views within the set of attitude items, a factor analysis was carried out. Two factors were extracted and rotated: The first four items are moderately correlated, and the last pair is strongly correlated. What do the two factors mean? The first factor contrasts those who see traditional leaders as having an important role which does not conflict with democratic authority, i.e., who should be in local government and who would be awarded a seat with those who do not see traditional leaders as having an important role; who see conflicts between traditional and democratic authorities; and who think that either traditional leaders should keep out of local government or should be made to run for their seat. The second factor tends not to be correlated with the first. It, unsurprisingly, links political alignment and taking a stance.

However, the overall public of South Africa is likely comprised of a multitude of more specific viewpoints. Presumably, it is black Africans living in rural areas for whom the issue is most salient. But before examining the views of these respondents let us compare them to those of other groupings. Respondents from each of the racegroups do not differ greatly in terms of their support of the role of traditional leaders. Black respondents are slightly more supportive and Indian respondents somewhat less supportive (coloured respondents have the highest proportion suggesting no role at all.) Rural compared to urban respondents are not dissimilar. Similarly there are few differences in views on the conflict (or lack of conflict) between the two forms of political authority, although rural dwellers are a less inclined to see a difficulty. Blacks are much more supportive of a representation of traditional leaders in local government, while coloureds and Indians are less supportive. Rural dwellers give a slight edge of approval to traditional leaders. There is a major difference in terms of the electing of traditional leaders: whereas blacks are split half-and-half on this question, the other race groups are overwhelmingly in support of requiring the traditional leaders to run for office. Rural dwellers are more inclined to support awarding of seats, although over half want to see elections being required. Black Africans are least supportive of traditional leaders being aligned or taking public stances, whereas other race groups and especially whites are more relaxed about this aspect. Similarly, it is rural dwellers rather than urban dwellers who are more keen to see the wings of traditional leaders clipped. In terms of the two broad factors then, blacks (and also rural dwellers) are more supportive of the political involvement of traditional leaders, although they do not particularly stress the importance of this role or see it as less conflictual. Both blacks and rural dwellers are slightly more concerned that traditional leaders play their political role in a “non-party” political way.

In the next section I examine internal differentiation in the views of black Africans living in rural areas. There clearly are some important age differences. The youngest age-group (under twenty-five) is least supportive of an important role for traditional leaders, whereas the oldest age-group (seventy plus) is substantially more supportive. There is a slight tilt, as respondents are older, towards seeing the relationship as non-conflictual. Similarly, support for representation, for awarding rather than requiring an election, allowing alignment, and taking public stances all increase with age (although the pattern is not sharp on several of these).

It might be expected that the age-pattern of views are considerably reflected in terms of education. While this is true, with less educated people more supportive of traditional leaders whereas more educated respondents are less responsive, the

differences are often not especially marked. Where more educated respondents differ most is in their emphasis on democratic criteria (running for elections) and in taking stances.

The housing and employment situations of respondents may be particularly crucial in shaping people's views. Especially in relation to housing, rural black African households may particularly be under the fairly direct control of traditional leaders.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

There is a considerable level of support for the political role of traditional leaders. This support is highest amongst sectors of the population that are clearly most likely to be more generally traditional, older, rural uneducated respondents. But even amongst these core constituencies, respondents are careful. Almost one half suggest that traditional leaders should be elected not awarded a seat, and overwhelming majorities oppose political alignment and the taking of public stances.

Table 1: Personal Characteristics of Traditional Leaders

| Industry in which Employed | Traditional | Manufacturing/ Mining |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| | Col % | Col % |
| Province | | |
| Eastern Cape | 52.7% | |
| KwaZulu-Natal | 16.2% | |
| Gauteng | | 92.3% |
| Mpumalanga | 4.0% | |
| Northern Province | 27.0% | 7.7% |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 83.6% | 100.0% |
| Female | 16.4% | |
| Highest Level of Education | | |
| None | 8.0% | 27.6% |
| Std 2 | 3.3% | |
| Std 3 | 8.0% | |
| Std 4 | 8.0% | |
| Std 5 | 4.3% | 42.4% |
| Std 6 | 16.6% | |
| Std 7 | 16.1% | 30.0% |
| Std 8 / NTC I | 4.0% | |
| Std 10 / NTC III | 28.0% | |
| Std 10 and Certificate or Diploma | 3.6% | |
| Member of Trade Union | | |
| Yes | 40.0% | 62.3% |
| No | 60.0% | 37.7% |

Table 2: Age and Incomes

| Industry in which Employed | Traditional | Manufacturing/Mining |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| | Mean | Mean |
| Age | 50.4 | 46.5 |
| Total Monthly Salary (Rand) | 1,879 | 1,307 |
| Monthly Income of Employee (Rand) | 1,670 | 1,307 |

Table 3: Household/Dwelling Characteristics

| Industry in which Employed | Traditional | Manufacturing/Mining |
|---|-------------|----------------------|
| | Col% | Col% |
| Main Type of Dwelling | | |
| Formal dwelling/separate house | 44.3% | 7.7% |
| Traditional dwelling/hut | 45.6% | |
| Formal dwelling in backyard of another house | 10.1% | |
| Room in hostel or compound | | 92.3% |
| Ownership | | |
| Single dwelling owned by household/fully paid | 83.8% | 7.7% |
| Single dwelling owned by household /partly paid | 2.6% | |
| Dwelling owned by household/fully paid | 9.5% | |
| Free (co benefit) | | 92.3% |
| Free (other) | 4.1% | |
| Physical Safety in Neighbourhood | | |
| Very safe | 41.8% | 7.7% |
| Rather safe | 42.4% | 92.3% |
| Rather unsafe | 8.4% | |
| Very unsafe | 7.4% | |
| Victim of Crime | | |
| Yes | 3.3% | |
| No | 96.7% | 100.0% |
| Smoke and Pollution | | |
| Very difficult | 5.3% | |
| Difficult | 15.7% | |
| Slightly difficult | 15.1% | |
| Not difficult | 63.9% | 100.0% |
| Money to Feed the Children | | |
| Yes | 42.7% | |
| No | 57.3% | 100.0% |
| Satisfied with Life These Days | | |
| Very satisfied | 8.3% | |
| Satisfied | 38.9% | 42.4% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 20.3% | 57.6% |
| Dissatisfied | 19.5% | |
| Very dissatisfied | 13.0% | |
| Compared to One Year Ago | | |
| Things better | 15.6% | 42.4% |
| Things about same | 68.0% | 57.6% |
| Things worse | 16.3% | |

Table 4: Questions About the Political Role of Traditional Leaders.

| | Count | Col % |
|---|-------|-------|
| Q74: Role of Traditional Leaders | | |
| No role | 590 | 28.5% |
| Some role | 1064 | 51.3% |
| Important role | 419 | 20.2% |
| Q75: Conflict Between Traditional and Democratic Authority | | |
| A serious conflict | 559 | 27.3% |
| A minor conflict | 427 | 20.8% |
| Unsure | 414 | 20.2% |
| Can go together | 463 | 22.6% |
| Can easily go together | 189 | 9.2% |
| Q76: Preferred Role of Traditional Leaders in Local Government | | |
| Should be in local government | 1207 | 61.1% |
| Should not be in local government | 768 | 38.9% |
| Q77: Should Traditional Leaders be Elected? | | |
| Awarded a seat | 716 | 38.5% |
| Run for election | 1145 | 61.5% |
| Q78: Should Traditional Leaders be Aligned? | | |
| Yes, should be aligned | 507 | 26.4% |
| No, shouldn't be aligned | 1413 | 73.6% |
| Q79: Traditional Leaders take Public Stances? | | |
| Yes, should take stances | 766 | 39.7% |
| No, should not take stances | 1161 | 60.3% |

Table 5: Factor Analysis**Analysis number 1****Pairwise deletion of cases with missing values**

| | Mean | Std Dev | Cases | Label |
|----------|---------|---------|-------|--|
| VAR 1540 | 1.91720 | .69299 | 2073 | Q74 Role of Traditional Leaders |
| VAR 1550 | 2.65687 | 1.33256 | 2052 | Q75: Conflict Between Traditional and Democratic Authority |
| VAR 1560 | 1.38864 | .48757 | 1975 | Q76: Preferred of Traditional Leaders in Local Government |
| VAR 1570 | 1.61519 | .48668 | 1861 | Q77: Should Traditional Leaders be Elected? |
| VAR 1580 | 1.73576 | .44104 | 1920 | Q78: Should Traditional Leaders be Aligned? |
| VAR 1590 | 1.60265 | .48948 | 1927 | Q79: Should Traditional Leaders take Public Stances? |

Correlation Matrix

| | VAR 1540 | VAR 1550 | VAR 1560 | VAR 1570 | VAR 1580 | VAR 1590 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| VAR 1540 | 1.00000 | | | | | |
| VAR 1550 | .32030 | 1.00000 | | | | |
| VAR 1560 | -.46645 | -.31284 | 1.00000 | | | |
| VAR 1570 | -.32061 | -.19503 | .37482 | 1.00000 | | |
| VAR 1580 | -.04613 | -.11446 | .20594 | .01759 | 1.00000 | |
| VAR 1590 | -.19567 | -.09527 | .29836 | .02572 | .55867 | 1.00000 |

Initial Statistics

| Variable | Communality | Factor | Eigenvalue | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
|----------|-------------|--------|------------|---------------|--------------|
| VAR 1540 | 1.00000 | 1 | 2.22621 | 37.1 | 37.1 |
| VAR 1550 | 1.00000 | 2 | 1.39485 | 23.2 | 60.4 |
| VAR 1560 | 1.00000 | 3 | .80654 | 13.4 | 73.8 |
| VAR 1570 | 1.00000 | 4 | .67066 | 11.2 | 85.0 |
| VAR 1580 | 1.00000 | 5 | .49800 | 8.3 | 93.3 |
| VAR 1590 | 1.00000 | 6 | .40374 | 6.7 | 100.0 |

Factor Matrix

| | Factor 1 | Factor 2 |
|----------|----------|----------|
| VAR 1560 | .78341 | -.14962 |
| VAR 1540 | -.68922 | .33815 |
| VAR 1550 | -.55262 | .24823 |
| VAR 1570 | .52641 | -.46313 |
| VAR 1580 | .47725 | .73317 |
| VAR 1590 | .57201 | .66669 |

Final Statistics

| Variable | Communality | Factor | Eigen value | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
|----------|-------------|--------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| VAR 1540 | .58938 | 1 | 2.22621 | 37.1 | 37.1 |
| VAR 1550 | .36701 | 2 | 1.39485 | 23.2 | 60.4 |
| VAR 1560 | .63611 | | | | |
| VAR 1570 | .49160 | | | | |
| VAR 1580 | .76530 | | | | |
| VAR 1590 | .77166 | | | | |

Rotated Factor Matrix

| | Factor 1 | Factor 2 |
|----------|----------|----------|
| VAR 1540 | -.76377 | -.07766 |
| VAR 1550 | .74396 | .28747 |
| VAR 1560 | .69172 | -.11453 |
| VAR 1570 | -.60028 | -.08170 |
| VAR 1580 | .01713 | .87465 |
| VAR 1590 | .13272 | .86836 |

Factor Transformation Matrix

| | Factor 1 | Factor 2 |
|----------|----------|----------|
| Factor 1 | .84861 | .52903 |
| Factor 2 | -.52903 | .84861 |

Table 6: Political Role by Population – Group/Settlement Type**Q74 Role of Traditional Leaders**

| | | No Role | Some Role | Important Role |
|-----------------|----------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| | | Row % | Row % | Row % |
| Q96 Race | | | | |
| Asian | VAR1840A | | | |
| | Urban | 35.6% | 55.4% | 9.0% |
| | Rural | | 100.0% | |
| Black | VAR1840A | | | |
| | Urban | 33.7% | 45.3% | 21.0% |
| | Rural | 23.2% | 55.0% | 21.8% |
| Coloured | VAR1840A | | | |
| | Urban | 33.5% | 50.2% | 16.4% |
| | Rural | 47.2% | 38.5% | 14.3% |
| White | VAR1840A | | | |
| | Urban | 25.4% | 54.3% | 20.3% |
| | Rural | 38.6% | 47.5% | 13.9% |

Q75 Conflict Between Traditional and Democratic Authority

| | | A Serious Conflict | Minor | Unsure | Can Go Together | Can Easily Go Together |
|-----------------|----------|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | Row % | Row % | Row % | Row % | Row % |
| Q96Race | | | | | | |
| Asian | VAR1840A | | | | | |
| | Urban | 13.9% | 28.7% | 38.1% | 16.8% | 2.4% |
| | Rural | 100.0% | | | | |
| Black | VAR1840A | | | | | |
| | Urban | 28.3% | 21.8% | 20.3% | 22.0% | 7.6% |
| | Rural | 24.0% | 19.0% | 18.1% | 26.4% | 12.4% |
| Coloured | VAR1840A | | | | | |
| | Urban | 37.5% | 18.4% | 17.3% | 9.9% | 16.9% |
| | Rural | 29.8% | 23.1% | 24.3% | 9.7% | 13.2% |
| White | VAR1840A | | | | | |
| | Urban | 28.0% | 21.7% | 23.9% | 22.5% | 3.9% |
| | Rural | 44.2% | 25.0% | 15.9% | 13.5% | 1.5% |

Q76 Preferred Role of Traditional Leaders in Local Government

| | | Should be in Local Government | Should not be in Local Government |
|-----------------|----------|--|--|
| | | Row % | Row % |
| Q96 Race | | | |
| Asian | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 50.0% | 50.0% |
| | Rural | 100.0% | |
| Black | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 59.1% | 40.9% |
| | Rural | 67.0% | 33.0% |
| Coloured | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 54.6% | 45.4% |
| | Rural | 36.5% | 63.5% |
| White | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 61.8% | 38.2% |
| | Rural | 42.3% | 57.7% |

Q77 Should Traditional Leaders be Elected?

| | | Awarded a Seat | Run for Election |
|-----------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| | | Row % | Row % |
| Q96 Race | | | |
| Asian | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 2.7% | 97.3% |
| | Rural | 100.0% | |
| Black | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 44.7% | 55.3% |
| | Rural | 51.4% | 48.6% |
| Coloured | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 19.5% | 80.5% |
| | Rural | 8.7% | 91.3% |
| White | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 15.9% | 84.1% |
| | Rural | 12.6% | 87.4% |

Q78 Should Traditional Leaders be Aligned?

| | | Yes, Should be Aligned | No, Should not be Aligned |
|-----------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | Row% | Row% |
| Q96 Race | | | |
| Asian | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 25.6% | 74.4% |
| | Rural | | 100.0% |
| Black | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 24.6% | 75.4% |
| | Rural | 23.2% | 76.8% |
| Coloured | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 37.4% | 62.6% |
| | Rural | 26.5% | 73.5% |
| White | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 37.9% | 62.1% |
| | Rural | 27.7% | 72.3% |

Q79 Traditional Leaders Take Public Stances?

| | | Yes, Should Take Stances | No, Should not Take Stances |
|-----------------|----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | Row % | Row % |
| Q96 Race | | | |
| Asian | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 35.7% | 64.3% |
| | Rural | 100.0% | |
| Black | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 35.9% | 64.1% |
| | Rural | 33.0% | 67.0% |
| Coloured | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 50.5% | 49.5% |
| | Rural | 40.8% | 59.2% |
| White | VAR1840A | | |
| | Urban | 61.3% | 38.7% |
| | Rural | 51.6% | 48.4% |

REFERENCES

- Balatseng, D.; Du Plessis, W. 1996. "Succession of Chieftaincy: Hereditary, by Appointment or by Common Consent?" *Tydskrif vir hedendaagse Romeins-Hollandse reg.* 59, no. 2: 349–55.
- Barnes, J.R.; Morris, M. 1997. "KwaZulu-Natal's Rural Institutional Environment: Its Impact on Local Service Delivery." *Development Southern Africa* 14, no. 2: 185–209.
- Butler, M. 1998. "Participative Democracy and Rural Local Government in KwaZulu-Natal." *Indicator South Africa* 15, no. 3: 74–77.
- Cross, C. 1997. "Rural Land Tenure Reform: Surrounded by Hungry Allocators." *Indicator South Africa* 14, no. 2: 72–78.
- Dzingirai, V. 1994. "Politics and Ideology in Human Settlement: Getting Settled in the Sikomena Area of Chief Dobola." *Zambezia* 21, no. 2: 167–76.
- Galvin, M. 1996. "Rural Local Government in KwaZulu Natal: Development Dilemma or Disaster?" *Indicator South Africa* 13, no. 4: 44–48.
- Keulder, Christian. 1998. *Traditional Leaders and Local Government in Africa: Lessons for South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC. Includes bibliographies.
- Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. 1994. The role of traditional leaders in local government. Johannesburg: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. Seminar report.
- Kunene, P. 1995. "Exploring Traditional Leadership." *Agenda* 26: 35–41.
- Malan, J.S. 1994. "Debat oor etnisiteit, tradisionele leierskap en grondregte in Namibie." *South African Journal of Ethnology* 17, no. 3: 91–97.
- Maritz, C.J. 1994. "KODESA en die tradisionele leiers: 'n oorsig." *South African Journal of Ethnology* 17, no. 1: 1–7.
- McIntosh, A. 1996. "Traditional Authorities and Land Reform in South Africa: Lessons from KwaZulu Natal." *Development Southern Africa* 13, no. 3: 339–57.
- Mtimkulu, P. 1996. "Traditional Leaders and the Constitution." *Politeia* 15, no. 2: 88–91.
- Munro, W.; Barnes, J. 1997. "Dilemmas of Rural Local Government in KwaZulu-Natal." *Indicator South Africa* 14, no. 3: 75–80.
- Pillay, N.; Prinsloo, C. 1995. "Tradition in Transition?: Exploring the Role of Traditional Authorities." *Information Update* 5, no. 3: 7–14.
- Rakate, P.K. 1997. "The Status of Traditional Courts under the Final Constitution." *Comparative and International Law Journal of Southern Africa* 30, no. 2: 175–89.
- South Africa. Laws, statutes, etc.. Council of Traditional Leaders Act.
- Vijfhuizen, C. 1997. "Rain-making, Political Conflicts and Gender Images: A Case from Mutema Chieftaincy in Zimbabwe." *Zambezia* 24, no. 1: 31–49.
- Vink, N. 1997. "Taxing Farm Land: Local Authority Options." *Indicator South Africa* 14, no. 2: 79–83.
- Vorster, L.P. 1996. "Tradisionele leierskap in Suid-Afrika." *South African Journal of Ethnology* 19, no. 2: 76–82.