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Preface

This study was begun in May, 1971, when I was appointed research professor at the University of Dar es Salaam, after having served one year as professor of Sociology. My task as research professor was to set up and conduct a study, which was to be relevant to the solution of some problem of national importance, and, at the same time, would give as many sociology students as possible an opportunity to gain experience in field work by participating in a field project, preferably in a rural area. It was understood that the study would result in a report which could be used in the teaching of future courses on Rural Sociology and Methodology, for which teaching material concerning Tanzania was, and, alas, still is not readily available. I was given a free hand to select both my problem and the area in which I wanted to work; and for this privilege I am deeply grateful to the University authorities.

During my field work I received encouragement and help from many quarters. Of crucial importance was the encouragement which I received from the Regional Commissioner of the Mbeya Region, the Rt.Hon. Peter Siyovelwa, without whose understanding and help in overcoming administrative difficulties I could not have completed my assignment. But his help would have been of little avail if I had not also met equal friendliness and understanding from other officials, of whom I wish to thank especially the district Coordinator of Agriculture for the Mbeya district, Mr Msuka; the secretary of the Ruiwa branch of TANU, Mr Eliah Mwamsiku; the Chairman of Motombo ujamaa village, Mr Edward Mogogo; the Bwana Shamba in Ruiwa, Mr T. Swila; the Head teacher of the Ruiwa Primary School, Mr A.S. Mhagama; Mzee Metichuma Merere and Mzee Jalalkhan Gwarram, both of Ruiwa; the Chairman of the Ward Development Council in Utengule, Mzee Ismail Kitambi; the secretary of the Utengule branch of TANU, Mr J.E. Mwakimbuja; and Mr Abibu Mwaluhili of Uhambule.

I am also greatly indebted to the officers of the Nordic Mbeya Project, but especially to Mr Claus Jespersen, Mr Ebbe Svensson, and Mr Onni Aalto- nen, for the generous help they gave me in the form of practical advice, the loan of camping equipment, and accommodation in Mbeya.

In addition to giving me this pleasant assignment, the University of Dar es Salaam also gave me the financial support needed to take ten students out in the field for four weeks. The Finnish Foreign Ministry’s Department for Development Aid supplemented this by paying me road allowance
and assuming the cost of transferring our interview data to punch cards. For this aid I am very grateful. I am greatly indebted to Mr Aulis Grön- 
dahl of the Åbo Akademi for the patience and care with which he ran my raw 
data through the computer and rearranged them into meaningful tables, and 
to Mr Timothy Stroup of the University College, Oxford, and Mrs Alice 
Stroup, Somerville College, for correcting my English. I am also much obliged to the Scandinavian Institute for African Studies in Uppsala, which kindly 
has accepted my manuscript for publication in its series of research reports.

But over and above everything else I am indebted to the people of Ruwe 
and Uhambule for the hospitality and friendship which they showed me and my 
students. Without this, and without the patience with which they submitted 
to our interviewing, all our endeavours would have been in vain. It is my 
sincere hope that this report, in spite of this many shortcomings, will 
help them to plan a better future for themselves.

Abo, Sept. 17th, 1975

Knut Pipping
Introduction

Until very recently, the Southern Highlands formed a very isolated corner of Tanzania. In pre-war colonial times an important trade route seemed to have passed through the area (Wright 1958,43; Shorter 1972,234), but with the cessation of the slave trade, traffic along it dwindled. Owing to the region's remoteness from the coast, only a few German planters settled here, in spite of the pleasant climate, the good prospects for agriculture, and the fact that the German administration built a road connecting it with Dar es Salaam (Tanzania in Maps, 106). When the British took over they did not do much, either, to develop the area until the discovery of the Lupa goldfields in the 1930's. This caused the administration to look for a new site for the headquarters of Iringa Province, which then included 1 of the Southern Highlands. Such a place was eventually found in the gap between the Mbeya Range and the Poroto Mountains, where a small trading center, the beginnings of Mbeya town, had begun to develop after the exploitation of the Lupa goldfields had commenced. In 1936 the headquarters of Iringa Province were moved to Mbeya, and the province was re-named Southern Highlands Province. In the goldfields, the Chunya settlement was made into a township in 1937, and the Chunya District was formed in 1942 (Tanzania in Maps, 108 f). The existing roads were improved to facilitate traffic, and some more roads were built, but, by and large, before independence little was either attempted or accomplished to develop the province.

It is probably no overstatement to say that the turning point in the history of the Southern Highlands came in 1965, when the Rhodesian minority declaration of independence caused the government of Tanzania to pay particular attention to communications with Zambia. This led to important changes in the first five-year plan and greatly influenced the selection of priorities in the second five-year plan. Of special importance was the decision to build a pipeline from Dar es Salaam to Lusaka, to rebuild and bitumenize the road between the two capitals, and to build a railway to connect the copperbelt in Zambia with the harbour in Dar es Salaam. An important side-effect of these decisions is that the isolation is about to be broken, and new possibilities will arise for the entire economy of the region. In order to speed up the integration of the Southern Highlands in the Tanzanian economy, special provisions for its development were made in the second five-year plan.

The overall high priority given to the Mbeya Region in the second five-year plan led to the assignment of various priorities at lower levels.
Among them were those with respect to research projects at the University of Dar es Salaam: All departments and research bureaux at the University were asked to use some of their research capacity in the study of problems concerning the Southern Highlands. Therefore it was in line with my duties as professor at the University to choose that region as my research site when charged with the task of setting up a research project within the Sociology Department.

But there was also another reason for this choice. As a part of the Government's development plans for the Mbeya Region, the Tanzanian Government intended to set up a Rural Training Center in Mbeya (2nd Five-year Plan I, 34,36), and had approached the Nordic countries - Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, - in an attempt to enlist their aid for this endeavour. The governments of these countries responded favourably to the request, and when an agreement had been reached between them and the Tanzanian Government in 1968, the management of the Nordic aid was entrusted to the Finnish Bureau of Development Aid. One of first steps taken was to launch a socio-economic survey, whose aim was to map the state of agriculture in the Southern Highlands. The findings of this survey were, in the first place, to serve as guide-lines when planning the curricula of the new center, and, in the second place, to be used as a benchmark for future measurements of the impact of the center on the region. The field work for the survey was conducted in 1969, and the main findings published in 1970 under the title Southern Highlands Socio-Economic Study.

Both because I am a Finn and because a general interest in the Southern Highlands prevailed at the University when I arrived in Dar es Salaam, I followed the progress of the Nordic Mbeya Project, and especially the survey from the beginning of my stay in Tanzania. When the survey findings were published, it appeared that also in this case, as in many similar cases, the deadline for the project had been set so narrowly that the research team had not been able to analyse in detail all its copious data. In order not to let valuable material lie unused, I volunteered to continue the analysis of certain problems which the research team had not had time to deal with. Permission to do this, and funds to pay for additional computer runs, were readily granted by the project administration in Dar es Salaam and Helsinki. And from February to May, 1971, I analysed some of the survey data and published my results as a stencil in June (Pipping 1971).

When I became research professor in May, 1971, it was obvious that the most profitable way in which I could spend my time was to set up a project which was fairly closely connected with the Nordic Mbeya Project. Of the many alternatives open to me, I opted for a study of land tenure, a topic which has interested me for a long time, and with which I had dealt in my
secondary analysis of the S.H.S.E.S. data. As this analysis had left many questions open, I was eager to pursue them further, both because they seemed to be scientifically rewarding and because they were politically important. (It should be kept in mind that when I began to plan this project, the drive to implement ujamaa vijijini was gaining momentum, and that the question of landownership was an important political issue just then.)

Moreover, the situation in one part of the Mbeya Region, the Usangu Plain, seemed to be particularly attractive for the kind of study which had in mind. The Usangu Plain was, by then, one of the major centers for rice growing in Tanzania (Tanzania in Maps, 58 ff), and the growing of rice there, as a cash crop, was given high priority in the second five-year plan (Vol. I, 43, 48, Vol. III, 166 ff). Now it is known that the advancement of cash-crop farming has tended to further the emergence of an entrepreneurial peasant stratum in many parts of the world; and this has led some theorists to hypothesize that rural development can be achieved only at the cost of increasing stratification and inequality (Middleton 1966, 14). This reasoning left its marks on the political debate which has been carried on in Tanzania since Uhuru, and which, to a great extent, has concerned the ways in which to overcome social and economic inequality in the rural areas. In this debate, reference has been made not only to observations made abroad, but also to empirical findings from various parts of Tanzania, which seem to support this hypothesis (cf. Cliffe, in Socialism in Tanzania II, 195 ff). But so far only some of Tanzania's cash crops have been studied from this sociological point of view: coffee in the Kilimanjaro area and Buhaya, cotton in Sukumaland, maize and tobacco in Ismani, and tea in Rungwe. As, in my mind, the kind of cash crop may be an important variable when trying to test Middleton's hypothesis, it seemed to me that a study of land holding and (in)equality in a rice growing area was called for.

Although accumulation of land in a few hands and subsequent differentiation with respect to landownership and social status frequently is a slow process, it may proceed rapidly, as e.g. Feldman's study of Ismani has shown (Feldman 1970). It seems, furthermore, reasonable to assume that the hances for rapid accumulation of land are better in a sparsely populated area, where there still is much unoccupied land available. Therefore, in order to find out whether, and to what extent, availability of vacant land could have played a part in the formation of the ownership structure of his particular cash-crop area, I wanted to study at least two rice-growing communities which differed with respect to the availability of land.
In the end of July, 1971, I went to Mbeya to discuss my plans with the local authorities and the researchers on the Nordic Mbeya Project. The outcome of these talks was that I selected two villages, Ruiwa and Uhambule, for closer study. I selected them as research sites because they seemed to represent different types of rice-growing communities in the Usangu Plain. In addition, both had been, and were still, studied from an agronomic point of view by the Nordic team. Therefore I felt that both the Nordic Project and I were likely to profit from pooling of our efforts. A secondary, but nevertheless important, reason for my choice was that both villages are fairly easily accessible, which was of some consequence because the ten students, who were scheduled to help with the field work, had to be brought there without too much effort.

From the beginning of August until the end of October I tried to gain some insight into the life of the two villages. After some preliminary visits, during which I was introduced to the village authorities by agricultural officers from the Regional Headquarters in Mbeya, I began to camp there from Tuesday mornings to Saturday nights; the weekends I spent in Mbeya to organize my notes, rest, bath and replenish my supplies of food and petrol. The main tasks which I wanted to complete during these months were to draft and test the questionnaire which I intended to use, to make a complete census and a rough map of each village, to facilitate and hasten the interviewing operations which were scheduled to be carried out by my student assistants during the Christmas vacation. Thanks to the willing cooperation given by the villagers, and especially by ten-cell leaders, and the efficient assistance of my interpreter and Swahili tutor, Mr Gabriel Samuel, the job proceeded smoothly; but owing to my insufficient knowledge of Swahili, and the limitations imposed by the use of an interpreter, my informal talks with the villagers were not as rewarding as I had hoped.

The students arrived in Uhambule on December 6th. By the 19th we had completed all interviews there and had moved to Ruiwa, where we worked until the 29th. Utilizing the ten-cell organization, it was possible to locate the interviewees and to do the interviewing without undue loss of time. In all, we completed 710 interviews, or, on the average, six interviews each a day (discounting holidays and days needed for packing, moving and organizing the work), which is a reasonable number considering the dispersed settlement pattern of the villages.

The balozis (ten-cell leaders) had obligingly agreed to summon the household heads in their ten-cells to be interviewed in the balozis' compound. This saved much time, but had some disadvantages which could not have been
overcome even if the interviewers had visited the interviewees in their own homes. When I tested our questionnaire I tried to stage my test interviews to take place without witnesses, but I soon found that it usually was difficult to make the appropriate arrangements, and that such secretiveness also aroused suspicion, both in the interviewees themselves and among those who witnessed the interview from a distance. Therefore I felt only a little apprehension in adopting the tactics which we eventually used, as they saved much time; and we probably would have gained nothing by seeking out the interviewees in their houses and interviewing them there.

As to the reliability of the interviews, I had noticed at the very beginning of my work that some of the respondents were reluctant to answer my questions. This observation was confirmed by all student interviewers, who again and again met interviewees who were disinclined to speak their minds freely. Some of the interviewers mentioned, in the reports which they wrote after the completion of the field work, that they noticed so much reluctance among the respondents that they seriously doubted that interviewing of this type could be relied upon in a setting like the one which was studied.

These doubts were reinforced by their informal interviewing and observation, in the course of which they were able to check the accuracy of some of the information which they had obtained through the formal interviews. Several of them reported that they sometimes found such great discrepancies between what they had been told during the formal session and what they afterwards had heard in informal conversations, that they began to wonder whether our method was at all reliable.

At the bottom of the interviewees' unwillingness to speak freely were general suspicion of our aims and widespread misconceptions of our task. At least in the beginning, many farmers took us for government agents sent to assess tax or to implement ujamaa, against which they held many prejudices (cf. below, Ch.6), but about whose basic principles they actually knew very little. As usual in any field research, these suspicions were most pronounced during the beginning of our stay, but receded when our pursuits became better known. In this way our interviewing tactics exerted a healthy influence. Very often those who had already been interviewed did not leave the balozi's compound, or the lembuka, where the interviews were conducted, but remained until all their ten-cell mates had been interviewed, after which time a general bareza commenced, with the roles on interviewer and interviewee reversed. Many times the student interviewers were hard put by inquisitive and dissatisfied farmers, who used this occasion to air
their complaints - which were many - and to ask for explanations concerning some incomprehensible acts of the authorities, e.g., concerning our activities in the village. During these sessions the interviewers could usually alleviate some of the current suspicions, by explaining our work in more detail; but they were probably not able to dispel them completely. It must therefore, be reckoned with that some of the responses given do not adequately express the respondents' real opinions, and that other answers contain distortions of fact. This, however, is something which anybody, using the interview method, will encounter anywhere in the world, not only in Usangu or in Tanzania.

As has been mentioned above, few, if any, interviews could be conducted in privacy; and it is likely that the presence of witnesses did influence some interviewees, as the following quotation from one of the interviewers' field reports shows:

"In some ten cell, when you start your interviews with the ten cell leaders, everybody listens to him very attentively and when you come to the others, you find the answers almost in the same line. For example, the questions of ujamaa villages. If you ask a person if he thinks that everybody in the village will join an ujamaa village, a most likely answer is either 'yes' och 'I can't tell'. So, if someone says 'I can't think what the others think about ujamaa villages' you may find those who follow after him falling into the same category.

The people were interested in giving us the idea that the villages (both Uhambule and Ruwa) were very poor so that they could get as much help from the government as possible. I noticed this because, while I was interviewing one person, another next to him intervened in vernacular and asked him not to be so truthful, because if you say that everything is good, then you won't have any help from the government. There were times when I had to silence some of these men, and ask them very politely to wait for their turn, because they were going to answer exactly the same questions."

The first source of bias mentioned in the quotation might have been eliminated if all interviews had been conducted in privacy, but probably not the second, as it obviously was in the villagers' interest to give us, and via us the authorities, the impression that they lived in great poverty and were in need of government help.

Because I wanted to map in detail all holdings according to size, and since the absolute number of large holdings presumably was small in both villages, I had decided not to rely on a sample but to make a complete enumeration of all farms. However, the question arises: To what extent did we succeed in finding and interviewing every farmer in Ruwa and Uhambule?

A tentative answer can be found in Appendix B1, where I have tabulated
he number of completed interviews by village and ten-cell. The grand
tals, 76% in Ruiwa and 80% in Uhambule, look fairly impressive at first
ight; but they ought, nevertheless, to have been some ten percentage
ints higher. In survey research of the usual type it is commonly regarded
s satisfactory if 90% or more of the selected respondents are interviewed,
nd survey results based on a lower return percentage are viewed with suspi-
ion.

It is, moreover, likely that the figures in Appendix B1 are slightly
issleading, due to our ignorance of the exact number of people in either
illage during the interviewing period. Because I did not expect any subst-
ial changes in the composition of the population during the three months
ich passed between my census-taking and our interviewing, we did not make
ew census in December; i.e., we did not explicitly ask the ten-cell
aders to list again all household heads then living in their ten-cells,
r to account for changes which had taken place in them. Thus we do not
ow the exact number of households in each ten-cell during the interviewing
iod. Those listed as immigrants in Appendix B1, col. 3, are only those
ew arrivals who actually turned up at the interviewing sessions; but we
ot check whether there were also other newcomers who did not come to
interviewed. Judging from the surprisingly large turnover during the
hree months that passed between the beginning of my census-taking and the
nterviewing period - as manifested by columns 2 and 5 in Appendix B1 - it
ems rather likely that there were such people, and that the percentages
n col. 7 thus are too high.

When the field work was completed, I returned to Dar es Salaam, where
he interview data were coded for transfer on punch cards. Most of the coding
as done by two hired assistants, but the answers to the open-ended questions
oded myself, and I also checked the work done by the coders. Upon my
urn to Abo in July, I immediately arranged for the cards to be punched
th run through the computer of the Abo Akademi. Due partly to a heavy teaching
ad and partly to prolonged illness, my analysis of the data and writing of
e report proceeded much more slowly than I had hoped for; and I am myself
irst to lament the long time which has passed between the completion
f my field work and the publication of the report.

As I have mentioned in the Preface, one part of my assignment was to
ite a report which could be used as teaching material at the University
Dar es Salaam. This mandate greatly influenced the form in which the
port was ultimately cast. While teaching a course on sociological methods
n the academic year 1970-71, I noticed that many of my students encountered
reat difficulties when required to read, interpret, or construct statistical
tables. Since, in my opinion, the mastery of standard statistical technique is an absolutely prerequisite for the study and practice of sociology, I have deliberately chosen to present my findings in a form which is calculated to exercise the reader in looking for statistical relationships between simple variables. Some readers may find the statistical documentation unnecessarily detailed, but I have preferred to err on this side rather than on the other for what I think are good pedagogical reasons.
1. The setting

The Usangu plain, or the Bohoro flats, which lies about 1,000 metres above sea level, has the shape of a triangle with its apex at Mbeya town and opening up toward the northeast. Its southern boundary, which runs almost due east, follows the Poroto Mountains, the Chimila Escarpment and the Kipengere Range for some 150 kilometers; its northern boundary, which runs north-northeast, follows the Chunya Escarpment in a similar fashion.

The plain is watered by many small streams flowing from the surrounding mountains, eventually uniting in the middle of the plain to form the Great Ruaha. In the western part of the plain, close to Mbeya, mean annual rainfall exceeds 1,000 mm., but it decreases gradually to 400 mm. as the plain widens toward the northeast. There is only one wet season, from December to April; and during the dry season there is no rain at all in July and August. Annual temperature variation is the largest in Tanzania, with well-marked hot and cool seasons.

As the name indicates, Usangu plain is the home of the Wasangu. We do not know when they established themselves there, but only that they ruled over it when recorded history begins, and were driven westward, beyond Mbeya, by the Wahehe in 1877 (Elton 1879, II 337 ff, Fülleborn 1909, 204 ff). Under their forceful paramount chief Merere Towelamahamba they tried for fifteen years to recapture their lost territory. Although Merere allied himself with the Germans in 1893, the Wasangu did not succeed in their efforts until the Germans, advancing from the east, had taken the Hehe capital Kalenga in 1894, the year after Merere's death, and had established themselves in Iringa. Tom von Prince, the German officer in charge of Iringa District, then set up Merere Mungadilwa, Merere Towelamahamba's successor, as chief of the western part of Iringa District, which included Usangu; and in consequence of a deal made with the Germans, the Wasangu, by then much reduced in numbers, moved back to their old homeland during the following years (Fülleborn 1906, 214, Wright 1968, 31 ff).

We know very little of the traditional economy of the Wasangu, as no study of their history or ethnography has yet been made, and I did not in full exploit the opportunity I had to collect information on their past. From their oral tradition and from occasional notes in the descriptions of early travellers, it is obvious that they were chiefly cattle breeders, but that they also cultivated some maize, red millet (máre), and tobacco (Livingstone 1874 I, 213, 218; Elton 1879 II, 349, 366). Fülleborn states
that they, like the Wahehe and Wabena, cultivated sorghum, eleusine, maize, and sweet potatoes, and to some extent also beans, peas, cucumbers, groundnuts, and tobacco; but he gives no particulars specifically about the Wasangu. Like earlier authors he, too, stresses the importance of cattle in their economy, and quotes various sources to show that great inequalities prevailed with respect to ownership of cattle (Fülleborn 1909, 250 ff). Heese does the same, supplementing Fülleborn by saying that the village held in common all grazing land, in contrast to gardens which were individually owned. Ownership of non-irrigated gardens was permanent, and such gardens were also inherited, while the irrigated gardens each year were re-distributed by the village chief among those who had participated in their construction. Unfortunately Heese does not say for what crops they were used. Rice was brought to the plain by the Arabs. (Livingstone 1874 I, 210, 216). Livingstone tells us that "Hamees [an Arab, connected with one of the most influential native mercantile houses in Zanzibar, whom Livingstone met at the southern end of Lake Tanganyika in 1867] left people to cultivate rice" around Utengule, Merere's capital, in order to facilitate the provisioning of the caravans which followed the trade route across the plain and passed through Utengule.

This happened only a few years before the Wasangu were driven away from the plain, and upon their return in the 1890's they do not seem to have grown any rice.

Instead, the practice was re-introduced by some Baluchi farmers who moved to Usangu around the turn of the century. Their descendants, who today number approximately 200 families, claim that they came to Usangu heeding advice given by Jemadari, a Baluchi non-commissioned officer who about 1876 had come to Merere's court with a small troop of Baluchi mercenaries to serve as his bodyguard (Wright 1968, 43; Jespersen 1973, 36). These Baluchi immigrants employed some hired Wahehe and Wabena on their shambas, who gradually began to cultivate rice on their own, but for local consumption only. The spread of this innovation must have been slow, for in the agricultural season 1963-64 only 348 tons of rice were bought by the Usangu African Farmers' Co-operative Society (Jespersen 1973, 36).

Likewise, we know very little of the size and permanence of the traditional Sangu villages, and of the Sangu system of land tenure. It seems, however, that many of the present-day settlements date back to the resettlements on the plain by the Wasangu in the 1890's. Utengule, one of the present centres of the plain, lies, in all likelihood, at the same place as Merere Towelamahamba's capital Utengule, which was destroyed by the Wahehe in 1877. Both Ruiwa and Uhambule may have been established at the same time, for according Fülleborn's very detailed map, he visited villages on roughly the
same sites as Ruiwa and Uhambule during his travels in the plain in 1899-1900. (Unfortunately, he gives no details about this journey). In 1901, Ruiwa obviously was regarded as a local center of some importance, for in that year the White Fathers set up a mission station there. However, owing to protest voiced by the Moravians in Rungwe, who regarded Usangu as their sphere of interest, the White Fathers were obliged by the German authorities to close it down very soon; but in 1905 the Benedictines were allowed to open a Catholic mission station there (Shorter 1972, 347 ff). I talked in both villages to men who claimed to be more than 70 years old and who said that they were born in their present home village.

Ruiwa is the more developed of the two communities. It lies 45 kilometers from Mbeya and is connected with the Tanzam highway by a ten-kilometer stretch of dirt road which is very difficult to negotiate during the rainy season. The houses of the village, which is situated on the banks of the small river Gwiri, are spread out over an area measuring about three square kilometers; but about one half of them form a fairly dense cluster around the soko, which serves less as a market place than as a collecting point for the local co-operative. In 1969 a water tank was built about one kilometer south of the village, and a pipe-line with water taps at every 200 metres was laid along the "main street". The piped water has caused many villagers, who lived some distance from the road, to abandon their old houses and build new ones along it; much building activity was going on while I lived in Ruiwa. Most houses are still mud huts with grass roofs, but many of those who build new houses make them of mud bricks and hope some day to provide them with roofs of corrugated iron. In the village there is a primary school (established in 1954 with four classes, but now being extended to six classes), a dispensary, a ward office building, several dukas and lembukas, one mosque, one Catholic and three Moravian churches, and a TANU office building, which was completed in December 1971. The school, ward office, and dispensary are of fired bricks, and not very far from the school and the dispensary is the only private fired-brick building with an iron roof, the home and storehouse of an immigrant farmer who settled in Ruiwa in 1929.

Although more than thirty ethnic groups are represented in the village, there is no clear ecological differentiation in the settlement pattern. (Tab.2.3 and Appendix B1-2). Many of the Wasangu do, however, prefer to live in the northern end of the "village center", and most of the outlying homesteads, to the north and east of the center, are owned by Wanyakyusa. The settlement pattern is not very compact: between the houses, even in the village center, are small shambas, where maize, beans and sweet potatoes are grown, and many households have small banana groves and a few mango,
papaya, and kapok trees.

In 1969 a small group of chiefly Nyakyusa villagers, led by the secretary of the local TANU branch, got together to establish an ujamaa village in Ruwa, but soon it became apparent that they could not win over the entire population to the idea. They did, however, succeed in recruiting about eighty families and were given land for a common shamba by the WDC in 1970. This village, which is called Motomoto, does not form a territorial unit within Ruwa; the members' houses and holdings are dispersed, chiefly in the southern end of the village, and separated by non-members' land.

In 1971, two other ujamaa enterprises were started in Ruwa: one, call Mpangala, by a fairly wealthy cattle-owner; another, for which no name has yet been found, by the head teacher of the village school. According to the acting chairman of Mpangala, it had recently been officially recognized but had yet got no land; but the teacher's village did not yet exist officially. Like Motomoto, neither of these villages will become separate territorial entities unless some arrangement to this effect can be agreed upon.

Uhambule lies 65 kilometers from Mbeya town and 7 kilometers from the Tanzam highway, within which it is connected by a dirt road which is more likely than the Ruwa road to remain passable during the wet season. The settlement pattern of Uhambule is much more dispersed than that of Ruwa; there is e.g., nothing which bears any resemblance to a village center.

Like Ruwa, Uhambule is situated along the banks of a small river, the Mambi. The settled area measures about 9 kilometers from north to south, and extends about 1 kilometer on each side of the river. The houses form small clusters around which most shambas are located; but between these clusters there is empty bush. The plain on the western bank of the Mambi seems to be reasonably well-watered, and parts of it are now being brought under cultivation, while the eastern bank is dry and is mainly used for grazing. As in Ruwa, over thirty ethnic groups are represented in Uhambule, and the ecological differentiation follows the same pattern as in Ruwa. In the eastern end of the village there are two Sangu clusters which, if I have understood the matter correctly, have been laid out according to the traditional Sangu pattern, and where the houses, cowsheds, and vihenge are built in the traditional Sangu style. In the westernmost end of the village there is a recent Ndali settlement.

Except for one of the dukas, which is built of fired bricks, plastered and whitewashed, all houses are of either mud or mud bricks, and few of them have sheet iron roofs.

Few services of any kind are available in Uhambule. There are only two small dukas, one small Moravian church, and a small Lutheran church to which is attached a small primary school. There is no TANU local, and the
attempts to introduce ujamaa vijijini have, so far, borne only very meagre fruit. The villagers themselves claim that there are the beginnings of six ujamaa villages in Uhambule, but so far as I was able to ascertain, only one, or maybe two, of these can be regarded as viable beginnings.
2. The villagers

Owing to the short duration of my visits to both Ruiwa and Uhambule, to the ethnic diversity of the populations of both villages, and to my limited knowledge of Swahili, I could not study the family structure in detail. Therefore I must use the terms 'family' and 'household' in a loose, conventional western sense. 'Family' will, thus, mean nuclear family, and in the case of all monogamous families, be equivalent to 'household'. With respect to polygynous families, I have, for the sake of convenience, counted as one household not only the set-ups where two or more wives, with or without their children, lived in the husband's compound, but also where several wives lived in separate compounds, irrespective of whether each of the wives managed her household separately. The reason for this is partly to make the statistical analysis easier, and partly that I simply could not afford the time needed for finding out what the local habits were in this respect. 1)

In Ruiwa I counted 264 male and 8 female household heads, in Uhambule 424 and 14, respectively. All the female household heads were widows. As Tab. 2.1 shows, not quite two thirds of the families were monogamous, and there were almost the same number of polygynous men as bachelors. In these respects, there were no significant differences between the villages.

Tab. 2.1 - Male household heads: Number of wives, by village, abs. numbers and per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of wives:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total polygynous</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 264 100.1 424 100.1

Chi square = 3.345; D.F.=4; P< .30

*) Here, and in the following, NI stands for "no information".

All interviewees were asked how old they and their spouses were. As it was to be expected that some respondents would not be able to answer the question, and that many of the answers given would not be reliable, the

1) In the following, sometimes the number of all household heads irrespective of their sex, and, sometimes the number of male household heads will be used as n. It should be kept in mind that the two groups are not identical, as the former contains a small number of women.
interviewers were instructed also to estimate the age of each respondent, and to record their own estimates if no information was given or if it seemed to be wrong. Therefore my data about the age distribution in the villages are not entirely reliable; but it would have been too laborious that it did not seem worthwhile to obtain better data by more detailed questioning, using some local relative chronology as aid.

The answers to our question about age are given in Tab. 2.2. As can be seen we succeeded much better in ascertaining the ages of the men than of the women. This is simply due to the fact that most interviewees were men, and the interviewers could estimate the ages of those who claimed not to know how old they were; but since they usually did not meet the wives, they could not make such estimates with respect to the women.

Tab. 2.2 - All male household heads and their spouses: Age distribution by sex and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th>All married men, Mbeya Region</th>
<th>First wives: Ruwa</th>
<th>First wives: Uhambule</th>
<th>All married women, Mbeya Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age ascertained</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age not ascertained</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ruiwa: Men-Women: t=3.33, p < .01  Uhambule: Men-Women: t=4.19, p < .01

Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th>All married men, Mbeya Region</th>
<th>First wives: Ruwa</th>
<th>First wives: Uhambule</th>
<th>All married women, Mbeya Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean age, years</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second wives  Third wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th>All married men, Mbeya Region</th>
<th>First wives: Ruwa</th>
<th>First wives: Uhambule</th>
<th>All married women, Mbeya Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age ascertained</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age not ascertained</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th>All married men, Mbeya Region</th>
<th>First wives: Ruwa</th>
<th>First wives: Uhambule</th>
<th>All married women, Mbeya Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean age, years</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi squares: Ruwa: husbands/first wives = 33.21, p < .001  Uhambule: - " - .99.36, p < .001

According to Tab. 2.2, the age distributions of Ruiwa and Uhambule do not differ much. In both villages the husbands claim to be eight to ten years older than their wives, irrespective of whether these are senior or junior wives. As the difference between men and women is far too great to be due to chance, we may ask if it is real, or if it only reflects a tendency among the men to understate the ages of their wives. As a check I have compared my figures with the corresponding Census figures for the Mbeya region and found no statistically significant differences between my data and the Census figures. Thus we may conclude that my two villages are not atypical with respect to the age distribution of the villagers, and that it seems to be a common pattern that men marry women who are considerably younger than they themselves.

Although both villages lie in what is traditionally Sangu country, both have today ethnically very mixed populations. As is shown by Tab. 2.3 and Appendix B2, almost forty different groups are represented in my sample.

Tab. 2.3. The major ethnic groups in Ruiwa and Uhambule, per cent. (For a more detailed breakdown, see Appendix B2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Ruiwa:</th>
<th>Uhambule:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safwa</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bena</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total         | 100.0  | 100.0     | 100.0  | 100.0  | 100.0     | 100.0  |

n             | 264    | 276       | 542    | 424    | 503       | 927    |

The diversity is greater in Ruiwa in so far as a larger number of ethnic groups is found there than in Uhambule; but Ruiwa is, on the other hand, more homogenous in that the largest ethnic group forms an absolute majority in it, which is not the case in Uhambule. In both villages, the largest group consists of Wanyakyusa, who in Ruiwa outnumber the second largest group, the Wasangu, by five to one, and in Uhambule by three to one. The Nyakyusa immigration to the plain began on a small scale in the 1920's, but increased gradually in the 1950's and 1960's, and shows no signs of abating. As I have no Census figures available, I cannot document this process in detail, but in the villages there was a feeling among the Wasangu that they were edged farther out on the plain by the Wanyakyusa. How well-founded this feeling is can be judged from the following tables, of which the first,
b. 2.4, shows that immigration must have played an important part in the development of both villages since before Uhuru, but especially in the first five years.

Tab. 2.4. All household heads: Year of arrival in present home village, absolute numbers, per cent and yearly averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of arrival:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>average,n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>average,n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>born in present home village</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955 or earlier</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-1961</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-1965</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1968</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>436</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 11.36, d.f. = 7, p < .20

Less than one-fifth of the farmers are native of their present home villages, while almost one-half of all household heads of Ruiwa and almost 60% of the farmers in Uhambule have settled there after 1966. In addition to the "real" settlers, a considerable number of more or less temporary immigrants must have lived in both Ruiwa and Uhambule during the last ten years. As my count of household heads in September and December showed, there was much moving in and out of both villages, amounting to as much as 8% in Ruiwa and 5% in Uhambule during the three months which passed between the two counts (cf. appendix E1). Discounting such temporary settlers, and taking into account the net gains, as in Tab. 2.4, the number of newcomers seems to have increased every year since 1956 (except, maybe, 1971). Such heavy traffic sti got the permanent residents a feeling that their country is being invaded, and it is small wonder that some of them view the immigrants with xenophobic feelings.

2.5. Male household heads, by year of arrival in present home village and ethnic group, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of arrival:</th>
<th>Sangu</th>
<th>Nyakyusa</th>
<th>Ndali</th>
<th>Safwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R U</td>
<td>R U</td>
<td>R U</td>
<td>R U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in R/U</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 or earlier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-1961</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-1965</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1968</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0 100.0 100.2
26  64  147  208  8  38  8  16
The majority of the Wasangu who live in either village was born there (Tab. 2.5) and most Wanyakyusa did arrive during the last few years. Closer study of the figures shows further that there are more immigrant Wasangu in Ruiwa than in Uhambule, and that the latter began to attract Nyakyusa immigrants later than did Ruiwa. The impression gained so far, that Uhambule has remained a "purer" Sangu village, is supported by Tab. 2.6, according to which more than three-quarters of the farmers born in Uhambule are Wasangu, in contrast to one-third of the farmers in Ruiwa.

Tab. 2.6. Male household heads: place of birth by ethnic origin, absolute numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Natives:</th>
<th>Immigrants:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruiwa</td>
<td>Uhambule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu</td>
<td>14 34.1</td>
<td>54 78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saf wa</td>
<td>4 9.6</td>
<td>5 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni</td>
<td>3 7.3</td>
<td>2 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 42.8</td>
<td>5 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>41 99.9</td>
<td>69 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table also shows that more Wanyakyusa have preferred Ruiwa to Uhambule, which instead has attracted a considerable group of Ndali immigrants.

The large proportion of Nyakyusa immigrants suggests that many of the immigrants have come from Rungwe. This is confirmed by Tab. 2.7, which shows that only a small fraction of the male immigrants, but about one-quarter of the married women, hails from outside the Mbeya District.

Tab. 2.7. All married men and their solo/senior wives: place of birth, by village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Husbands:</th>
<th>Senior wives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruiwa</td>
<td>Uhambule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present home village</td>
<td>48 18.2</td>
<td>71 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbeya town</td>
<td>6 2.3</td>
<td>9 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Mbeya district</td>
<td>29 11.0</td>
<td>39 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rungwe district</td>
<td>156 59.1</td>
<td>241 56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbozi</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chunya</td>
<td>2 0.8</td>
<td>3 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumbawanga</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbeya region</td>
<td>248 94.1</td>
<td>375 88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arusha region</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>2 0.8</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodoma</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iringa</td>
<td>7 2.7</td>
<td>40 9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtwarra</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruvuma</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinyanga</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabora</td>
<td>2 0.8</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanga</td>
<td>1 0.4</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanzibar</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tanzania</td>
<td>12 4.5</td>
<td>44 10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad</td>
<td>3 1.1</td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>1 0.4</td>
<td>4 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>264 100.1</td>
<td>424 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is generally asserted that the main body of the Nyakyusa immigrants consists of young people, for whom there is no land in their overpopulated villages. Owing to the inability of many respondents to state exactly their age and the year in which they arrived, the truth of this assertion cannot be proved in detail, but, as Tab. 2.8 indicates, there is some, though not statistically significant, co-variation between the two variables, the contingency coefficient $r$ being only +0.18. As the table shows, the youngest age groups are clearly overrepresented among the late settlers, and the older age groups among those who arrived early.

### 2.8 - Male household heads: year of arrival in present home village, by age and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and over</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R/U</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.1</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ i \text{ square} = 55.10 ; r = +0.18 \]

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R/U</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.1</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and over</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ i \text{ square} = 93.96 ; r = +0.16 \]

Only a minority of the immigrant settlers seems to consist of people who have landed on the plain after first having tried other alternatives. Those who have settled in Ruwa, 55%, and of those who have established themselves in Uhambule, 54% were people who had come straight from their home villages, while 15 and 22%, respectively, had lived, at least for some time, in another place than either their home village or my two villages. Only about ten per cent of all immigrants can be reckoned as migrant labourers, having lived in more than three different places.
Tab. 2.9 - Number of wives, by age of husband and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of wives:</th>
<th>under 20</th>
<th>20-28</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70+ or over</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total            | 100.0   | 73.7  | 100.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0       | 100.0| 264   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UHAMBULE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total            | 100.0   | 100.0 | 99.9  | 100.0 | 99.9  | 100.0 | 99.9        | 99.9| 100.1 |

As I mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, one man in five was (or had been) married to more than one wife. As can be expected, the number of wives a man had was positively correlated to his age, but the relationship is not linear, and less so in Ruiwa than in Uhambule (Tab.2.9). In the former village the men seem to have acquired additional wives until they reached the age of fifty, after which their desire for more wives appears to decrease, while the men in Uhambule seem to have continued to take new wives also at a more advanced age. But owing to the rather small number of cases involved, it is not possible to judge whether this difference between the villages is due to chance or not. For the same reason it is not possible, either, to judge whether the ethnic background of the husbands can explain the observed differences between the major ethnic groups.
### Tab. 2.10 - Ethnically homogamous married couples, by village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group of husband</th>
<th>Wives belonging to the same ethnic group as the husband:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first wives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safwa</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UHAMBULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group of husband</th>
<th>Wives belonging to the same ethnic group as the husband:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first wives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safwa</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bene</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most marriages were ethnically homogamous (Tab. 2.10). The fact that homogamous marriages were more common among the Wanyakyusa than among the other ethnic groups need not mean that this tendency is stronger among them than among the other groups. Due to their great superiority in number, Nyakyusa men have, on purely statistical grounds, better chances than men from less numerous ethnic groups, to find a suitable spouse of the same stock as themselves.

### Tab. 2.11 - Number of people in the households of Ruiwa and Uhambule, abs. Numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twelve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirteen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourteen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fifteen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sixteen or more</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>272</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Median: 3.85, 3.82
- Arithmetic Mean: 3.97, 3.80
- Standard deviation: 2.73, 2.65
On the average four persons lived in each household (Tab. 2.11), the households of Ruiwa being slightly (but not significantly) larger than those in Uhambule, as measured both by the arithmetic mean and the median. Four households out of five consisted of husband, wife, and their children, and insofar as there were lodgers, they were, almost without exception, relatives. As Tab. 2.12 and Fig. 2 A show, there is a curvilinear relationship between the age of the household head and the number of people in the household.

Tab. 2.12 - Average number of people in the households, by age of the husband and by village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of husband:</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>69</th>
<th>70 and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruiwa</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhambule</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form of the curves for both villages resembles so much the corresponding curves for the husband's age and the number of children (cf. below, Tab. 2.1 and Fig. 2 E, App. C) that there hardly can be any doubt that it is the number of children, and not of wives and other relatives, that influences the size of the households most.

All respondents were asked how many children their wives had borne, how many of them had survived, how many were still staying with their parents, and where the others lived. But owing to the short time at our disposal, and the time and care it takes to gather this kind of information accurately, the quality of my data about the children is not as high as it ought to be. This is partly due to the fact that I did not, in the beginning, point out to the interviewers the necessity of being careful and of making probes when the respondents gave inaccurate answers, and partly due to the students' lack of patience to ask all necessary questions or to fill out the questionnaire properly. The uneven quality of the recorded answers made the coding difficult; so, in addition to the mistakes made while gathering the data, the material seems to contain some coding errors.

Tab. 2.13 - First and second wives: Average number of children still alive, by number of children born.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children born:</th>
<th>Average number of children still alive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruiwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven or more</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main findings concerning the children are summarized in Tab. 2.13, from which we learn that the average number of children born and of children till alive was the same in both villages: out of four children born, three ad survived. This figure is more favourable than the totals for either, he Mbeya Region or all rural Tanzania, which, according to the 1967 Census, were two children surviving out of three (65 and 69 per cent respectively). As can be expected, the senior wives had borne more children than the junior ones (fourth and fifth wives are disregarded here, as their number is too mall to warrant inclusion), but nevertheless the former had as many surviving children as the latter, which may mean that the age differences between senior and junior wives is, in fact, quite small, and the age distribution of the wives (Tab.2.2) basically correct.

Figs. 2 B-D give a more comprehensive picture of the survival chances of the children. With due regard to the inaccuracies of my data, they evidence an almost linear relationship between the number of children born and the number still surviving (owing to the small number of second wives, the regression line for them is not as straight as for the first wives). As far as these villagers are concerned, this may be taken as disproof of the African belief that a large family is a safe form of old age insurance, for once a woman has given birth to four children, the chances are fairly good that at least three of them will survive.

Because the trial interviews had shown that many respondents did not know their own ages, we did not even attempt to ascertain how old their children were, and therefore I cannot construct age pyramids for my villages. But since the age distribution of the adults seems to be very similar in both villages, it is not unreasonable to assume that the children's age distributions are also the same in both Ruiwa and Uhambule.

Tab 2.14. - Number of children living with their parents, by village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total married couples: 210 100.1 358 100.1

Median: 2.34 1.91
Arithmetic mean: 2.35 1.91
Standard deviation: 2.22 3.12
Our data on the reproductive behaviour of the villagers have shown that the number of surviving children is large enough to cause the population of either village to grow rapidly if all surviving children remain in their home villages. If we compare Tab. 2.14 with Tab. 2.13 we find that in Ruiwa the mean number of children who still stay with their parents is almost the same as the mean number of surviving children, but that this is not the case in Uhambule, the poorer of the two villages. There the number of children leaving is so much greater that those remaining will not replace the present generation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab. 2.15 - Average number of children living with their parents, by age of husband and by village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of husband:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 20- 20- 30- 40- 50- 60- 70 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhambule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same conclusion is supported by Fig. 2 E, which shows the development of the family cycle in the two villages. The flatter shape of the curve for Uhambule probably reflects the fact that, relatively speaking, more Uhambule children leave home, and leave at an earlier age, than do the children in Ruiwa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab. 2.16 - Present place of residence of those children who have left their parental homes, by village, abs. numbers and per cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present place of residence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbeya Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbeya district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rungwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbozi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chunya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbeya region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arusha region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iringa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilimanjaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morogoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwanza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar es Salam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total away from home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total still with their parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This difference between the two villages is further evinced by the two last rows of Tab. 2.16 which show that in Uhambule one child in every three surviving has left, while in Ruiwa only one in four has done so. As is further shown by the same table, only a small fraction of those who have left their parental homes have succeeded in acquiring places of their own in their home village. Instead, many seem to have returned to the place from which either of their parents have come to Usangu, as indicated by the fairly high proportion of children who have gone to Rungwe. Many of them are children of Nyakyusa immigrants who have returned to where their parents have come from, either to stay with their relatives or in the hope of acquiring land of their own with the aid of their relatives. Unfortunately, the data about the emigrant childrens' occupations are so incomplete that there is no point in trying to analyse them.

This short review of the main demographic characteristics of Ruiwa and Uhambule shows more similarities than differences between the villages. Both are ethnically quite mixed villages with a large proportion of recent immigrants, among whom the Wanyakyusa are the most conspicuous. Most immigrants were young when they came, and only a few seem to have been migrant labourers. The chances that the children born in these villages will survive are somewhat better than in many other parts of Tanzania.

Of all men in Ruiwa, 41%, and of all men in Uhambule, 42%, had gone to school for at least one year, but only 18% and 16%, respectively, had more than four years of formal schooling. As is shown by comparison with the figures for literacy in Tab. 2.17, more men than those who had been to school claimed to be literate. Of the sole or senior wives, three-quarters were illiterate, of the junior wives more than that. Comparison of the literacy figures in Tab. 2.17 with Tab. 2.18 shows that literate husbands tend to have literate wives more often than literate wives tend to have illiterate husbands.
Tab. 2.17 - All men and all married women: literacy, membership in TANU, and religion, by village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUIWA</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Wife 1</th>
<th>Wife 2</th>
<th>Wife 3</th>
<th>Wife 4-5</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined TANU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 1968</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 or later</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not member</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad.religion</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof R.C.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other Prot.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified Chr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Tab. 2.20, the ethnic groups seem to differ considerably with respect to literacy, but owing to the small number in most groups, the percentages in this table should be interpreted with caution.

Tab. 2.18 - Literacy of husband, by literacy of first and second wives and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literate husband with literate first/sole wife</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Literate husband with literate first/sole wife</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>literate second wife</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>literate second wife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab. 2.19 - Male household heads, by literacy, age and village, abs. numbers and per cent.

Per cent. literate husbands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of husbands:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 136 51.5 213 50.2

Tab. 2.20 - All household heads, by literacy, ethnic group and village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group of husband:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakysua</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safwa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 136 51.5 213 50.2

Both in Ruiwa and Uhambule the adherents of traditional religion form a majority (Tab. 2.17), followed by the Christians. In Ruiwa there is a substantial group of Muslim, significantly larger than in Uhambule. Because of the small size of most ethnic groups it is difficult to judge whether a given religion has received particular support within any of them (Tab. 2.25). Most first marriages are homogamous with respect to religion (Tab.2.26), the Muslims being least and the Christians most tolerant of mixed marriages.

Tab. 2.21 - All household heads, by literacy, membership in TANU, and village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joined TANU</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 1968</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 or later</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not member</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 136 51.5 213 50.2
Tab. 2.22 - All household heads, by literacy, religion, and village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion:</th>
<th>Ruwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All | 136 | 213 | 51.5 | 50.4

Tab. 2.23 - Male household heads: membership in TANU, by ethnic group and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group:</th>
<th>Joined TANU</th>
<th>before 1968</th>
<th>1968 or later</th>
<th>not member</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sañwa</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bena</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All | 42.4 | 20.1 | 37.5 | 100.0 | 264 |

| UHAMBULE |
| Nyakyusa | 35.8 | 43.9 | 20.3 | 100.0 | 212 |
| Sangu | 36.2 | 34.8 | 29.0 | 100.0 | 69 |
| Ndali | 42.1 | 47.4 | 10.5 | 100.0 | 38 |
| Sañwa | 50.0 | 22.2 | 27.8 | 100.0 | 18 |
| Kinga | 30.0 | 40.0 | 30.0 | 100.0 | 20 |
| Bena | 38.9 | 33.3 | 27.6 | 100.0 | 18 |
| Hehe | 33.3 | - | 66.7 | 100.0 | 9 |
| Other | 25.6 | 35.9 | 38.5 | 100.0 | 39 |

All | 35.9 | 39.5 | 24.6 | 100.0 | 423 |

Tab. 2.24 - Male household heads, by religion, membership in TANU, and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion of husband:</th>
<th>TANU</th>
<th>Trad.</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Trad.</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before 1968</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 or later</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not member</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All | 100.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.1 |

n | 115 | 65 | 83 | 235 | 31 | 155 |

*) In this, and some of the following tables, the male household heads will, for stylistic reasons, be called "husbands" although many of them are single.
### Tab. 2.25 - Male household heads: religion by ethnic group and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Traditional Muslim</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeFwa</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bena</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 105.18, d.f. = 14, p < .001

| UHAMBULE     |                    |          |        |     |
|--------------|                    |          |        |     |
| Nyakyusa     | 53.8               | 1.4      | 44.8   | 100.0 | 210 |
| Sangu        | 64.7               | 8.8      | 26.5   | 100.0 | 68  |
| Ndali        | 65.8               | 5.3      | 28.9   | 100.0 | 36  |
| SeFwa        | 61.1               | 11.1     | 27.8   | 100.0 | 15  |
| Kinga        | 70.0               | 20.0     | 10.0   | 100.0 | 20  |
| Hehe         | 11.1               | 66.7     | 22.2   | 100.0 | 9   |
| Bena         | 55.6               | 11.1     | 33.3   | 100.0 | 16  |
| Other        | 43.6               | 15.4     | 41.0   | 100.0 | 39  |
| **All**      | 56.0               | 7.4      | 36.7   | 100.1 | 420 |

Chi square = 79.92, d.f. = 14, p < .001

In all, only about ten per cent of all interviewees had held office of some kind (ten-cell leader, chairman, secretary, board member of TANU, etc.). Due to the small number of such cases, it cannot be decided if adherents of a given religion, or members of a given ethnic group have been over- or underrepresented among the incumbents of such offices.

### Tab. 2.26 - Number of wives, by religion of husband and, by village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of wives:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trad.rel.</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four or more</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total polygynous)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 53.25, d.f. = 10, p < .001

| All              | 100.0  | 100.0   | 100.0   | | 100.0     | 100.0 | 100.0   |
| n                | 115    | 85      | 83      | | 235       | 31    | 155     |
Tab. 2.27 - Religion of husband by religion of sole/senior wife, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion of husband:</th>
<th>Religion of sole/senior wife:</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UHAMBULE            |                               |             |        |           |       |
| Traditional         |                               | 92.3        | -      | 20.4      | 57.9  |
| Muslim              |                               | -           | 100.0  | 0.7       | 7.1   |
| Christian           |                               | 7.7         | -      | 78.9      | 35.0  |
| Total               |                               | 100.0       | 100.0  | 100.0     | 100.0 |
| n                   |                               | 162         | 23     | 132       | 337   |

As can be expected, more Sangu than Nyakyusa men in both Ruiwa and Uhambule had relatives in their home villages (Tab. 2.28). For the married women the tendency was the opposite, but the difference between the villages in this respect is not statistically significant. In Ruiwa, more Wanyakyusa than Wasangu claimed to have many friends, but this difference between the two major ethnic groups is not statistically significant.

Tab. 2.28 - Respondents of the two major ethnic groups who said that they have relatives and friends in their present home villages, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nyakyusa</th>
<th>Sangu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husbands with relatives in Ruiwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo/senior wives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot;</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands with many friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot;</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;some&quot;</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot;</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands with relatives in Uhambule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo/senior wives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot;</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands with many friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot;</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;some&quot;</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot;</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Land tenure

Except for a few interviewees who said that they had borrowed their fields, all those who cultivated said that they owned their shambas; i.e., they gave an affirmative answer to our question "Do you have private land here in R/U?" ("Una mashamba binafsi hapa R/U?). I was never able to ascertain what exact meaning the Swahili expression used in our question had to the respondents, but from what they said, both during the interviews and in other contexts, my students and I concluded that they saw themselves as owners of the land which they cultivated and not as tenants on land owned by the people of Tanzania, which they legally were. There was thus no difference among the respondents with respect to property rights, but, as we shall soon see, there were some differences with respect to how much land they actually owned.

As can be seen from the questionnaire (Appendix A), we asked all interviewees very detailed questions about their land and the crops they grew on it. Judging only from the answers which we got, both during the trial interviews which preceded the construction of our questionnaire, and during the survey proper, most of our respondents seemed not to mind answering our questions about the acreages of their shambas. As is shown by Tabs. 3.1-2, only three individuals in the entire population refused to say how many shambas they owned, and only fourteen interviewees declined to tell us the acreage of their shambas. The percentage of "no response" was thus remarkably low; but does the interviewees' overt compliance to our requests for information also mean that their answers were reliable?

Tab. 3.1 - Number of shambas owned by the farmers in Ruiwa and Uhambule, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of shambas</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>owned:</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 272 100.0 468 100.0
Total number of shambas 426 667
Average per owner 1.56 1.52
No definite answer can be given to this question, for it was beyond our resources to check the farmers' statements by measuring even a small sample of their fields, as the S.H.S.E.S. team did in 1969. But we may assume that our respondents reacted to our interviews in the same fashion as those interviewed by the S.H.S.E.S. team reacted to their questions, and generalize from their findings to our own.

Tab. 3.2 - All shambas in Ruiwa and Uhambule, by acreage, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1.0 acres</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.9 acres</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.9 &quot;</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9 &quot;</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9 &quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0-5.9 &quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0-6.9 &quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 or more acres</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main outcomes of the S.H.S.E.S. reliability check were: (1) that the accuracy of the farmers' answers was fairly low; (2) that their estimates of the acreage of their cash-crop shambas were better than their estimates of the acreage of their other fields; (3) that they more often over- than understated the acreage of their fields (in the Mbeya district by 25%); and (4) those who had but little land tended to overstate their acreage more than those who had much.

It is not at all surprising that the estimates were inaccurate, for almost fifty per cent of the interviewees were illiterate, and thus presumably had vague ideas of how large an area one acre actually is. Nor is it surprising that the respondents gave better estimates of the acreage of their cash-crop than of their subsistence-crop shambas, as the former provide a cash output of definable amount, and their acreage is related to
ash or semi-cash inputs which vary strictly with area, e.g. seed, fertilizer, 
fertilizer for oxen or machinery, or hired labour. The interviewees' tendency to 
xaggerate the size of their holdings, and especially those used for subsis-
substance crops, can be explained by reference to the fact that these shambas 
quently are under several interplanted crops, which were planted, weeded, 
not harvested at different times. Therefore the owners of such fields spend 
uch time on them at different seasons, and this easily makes them believe 
hat the field is larger than it actually is (S.H.S.E.S., 204 ff). Thus, 
hen we now proceed to discuss what our respondents told me and my students, 
e ought to keep in mind that the acreage estimates which they gave probably 
er were too high, but that many of them obviously forgot, or refused to mention, 
eir small subsistence-crop shambas, on which they grew millet, beans, or 
ananas. Such shambas were much in evidence, esp. in Ruiwa, but for some 
ason they were only rarely mentioned during the interviews, in spite of 
ome probing by the interviewers.

Tab. 3.3.- Number of farmers owning shambas elsewhere than in R/U, abs. 
numbers, per cent. and average acreages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shambas elsewhere:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both husband and wife have</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husband has, wife has not</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife has, husband has not</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither husband nor wife has</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

|                  | 271   | 100.1| 436      | 99.9|

Ruiwa: Own shamba 1 in Ruiwa            | 2.38  | 1.48 | 233      |
|                                        | 1.76  | 1.23 | 174      |
|                                        | 1.86  | 0.77 | 11       |
| wife's shamba                          | 1.75  | 1.54 | 20       |
| own shamba 1 outside Ruiwa             | 2.15  | 2.05 | 26       |
|                                        | 2.33  | 2.41 | 6        |

Uhambule: Own shamba 1 in Uhambule       | 2.53  | 1.55 | 384      |
|                                        | 1.84  | 1.27 | 247      |
|                                        | 1.88  | 1.58 | 24       |
| wife's shamba                          | 1.87  | 1.22 | 30       |
| own shamba 1 outside Uhambule          | 2.07  | 1.85 | 56       |
|                                        | 2.19  | 1.26 | 13       |

According to Appendix B 3 and Tabs. 3.1-3.5, about one farmer in eight 
ad no land whatsoever except, in some cases, a small garden which was often 
elsewhere than in Ruiwa or Uhambule. Exactly the same proportion had more 
han six acres, and the wealthiest 25% of all farmers owned among them one-
alf of all cultivated land. Thus, at least three-fourths of all farmers in
both villages must be classified as smallholders, and there was no one who owned a really big farm.

Most farmers owned two separate shambas, the average acreage of which was slightly more than two acres. The average household had a little over three acres at its disposal; and if we disregard those who for some reason did not farm during the last season, we find that the average grower had cultivated not quite four acres in 1971. There were no significant differences between the villages, but my estimates exceed the S.H.S.E.S. estimates for the Ruiwa and Utengule wards by one acre, which is statistically significant at the .001 level (Tab. 3.11).

Tab. 3.4 - All households in Ruiwa and Utambule, by type of farmer, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>Abs. numbers:</th>
<th>Per cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruiwa</td>
<td>Utambule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landless</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the distribution shown in Appendix B3 is very inconvenient for analytical purposes, I have grouped all farmers into five categories (Tab. 3. since my observations gave me no cues as to how many "classes" or "strata" there "really" were and how the class boundaries ought to have been drawn in order to be sociologically relevant, I have done my grouping on purely statistical grounds, i.e., in order to obtain categories of roughly the same size. To what extent the five categories which I have thus formed are meaningful from a sociological point of view remains to be seen; and to indicate that, for the time being, I regard them as statistical categories and not as social strata, I have labelled them landless 1), one-acre, three-acre, five-acre and nine-acre farmers, instead of e.g. poor, affluent and wealthy peasants.

1) The term "landless" is somewhat misleading as some of the farmers in this category had some land, i.e. less than 0.5 acres in R/U or a shamba elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab. 3.5 - Type of farmer, by number of shambas and village, per cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RUWA:</strong> Type of farmer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of shambas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>================================================================</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UHAMBULE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>================================================================</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab. 3.6 - Farmers and their wives owning shambas outside their home villages, abs. numbers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of farmer:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers with one shambas outside present home village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives with two shambas outside present home village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RUWA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>================================================================----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UHAMBULE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>================================================================----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Farmers and/or wives having shambas outside R/U who**

- have no rice shamba in Ruiwa
  - "" maize
    - 18
- have no rice shamba in Uhambule
  - "" maize
    - 33
- have no rice shamba in Ruiwa
  - "" maize
    - 19
- have no rice shamba in Uhambule
  - "" maize
    - 49
Cross-tabulating the farmers' acreages with the number of shambas which they owned (Tab. 3.5) we find, as can be expected from scrutiny of Tab. 3.1 that the majority of the better situated farmers had most of their land laid out in two blocks only, in the same way as their poorer neighbours. There is a slight tendency to co-variation between the number of shambas and the number of wives that the farmer has (Tab. 3.7), and this tendency would probably show up more clearly if fewer farmers had "forgot" to mention their small subsistence-crop gardens.

Tab. 3.7 - Number of shambas, by number of wives and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of wives:</th>
<th>Number of shambas:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHAMBULE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discounting the few nine-acre farmers who owned more than two shambas, the normal layout of a farm in either village is thus to have one rice and one maize shamba, and, in many cases, a small banana grove or garden. The acreage of the farmer is, on the average, some fifty per cent larger than that of the latter (Tab. 3.9). Because maize can be grown on less fertile and drier soil than rice, the better land is reserved for this crop. This land in both Ruiwa and Uhambule is situated outside the village proper, while most of the maize shambas are in the vicinity of the farmers' homes (cf. also S.H.S.E.S., p. 198). So are also the millet fields and the banana groves, of which there were (esp. in Ruiwa) more than is shown by Tab. 3.8.
Tab. 3.8 - All shambas in Ruiwa and Uhambule, by crops grown in 1971, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop grown:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maize</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bananas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other crops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 426 100.0 567 99.9

Tab. 3.9 - Rice and maize shambas, by acreage and village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rice</td>
<td>maize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1.0 acres</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.9 acres</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.9 &quot;</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9 &quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9 &quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0-5.9 &quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0-6.9 &quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0-7.9 &quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 and over acres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 212 99.8 190 99.9 357 100.1 260 99.9

Total acreage 536 acres 333 acres 996.5 acres 457 acres

Arithm. mean 2.54 " 1.75 " 2.79 " 1.76 "

Standard deviation 1.57 " 1.22 " 1.60 " 1.47 "

As indicated by Tab. 3.8-9 and shown in greater detail by Tab.3.10, in both villages the rice shambas are both larger and more numerous than the maize shambas, but the pattern is not the same in both villages. In Ruiwa the total acreage under rice was 1.6 times larger than that under maize, but the product-moment correlation between the two acreages was nevertheless +.80, and only 18% of all cultivators said that they had grown no maize at all in 1971. In Uhambule the corresponding figures were 2.2, +30, and 33%. This may, but need not, mean that the farmers in Uhambule specialise more in rice, the major cash crop, while their neighbours in Ruiwa try to achieve a more even balance between producing cash and subsistence crops.
### Tab. 3.10 - Total acreage under rice by acreage under maize, by village, abs. numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rice</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>under 1.0</th>
<th>1.0-</th>
<th>2.0-</th>
<th>3.0-</th>
<th>4.0-</th>
<th>5.0-</th>
<th>6.0-</th>
<th>7.0-</th>
<th>8.0 and</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 1.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0-5.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0-6.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UHAMBULE  |      |           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |         |       |
| none      | 54   | 6         | 13   | 5    | 3    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 81    |
| under 1.0 | 8    | 7         | 1    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 16    |
| 1.0-1.9   | 57   | 27        | 49   | 6    | 2    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 141   |
| 2.0-2.9   | 24   | 13        | 33   | 7    | 3    | 1    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 61    |
| 3.0-3.9   | 10   | 7         | 15   | 17   | 4    | 2    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 55    |
| 4.0-4.9   | 10   | 2         | 5    | 6    | 1    | 2    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 26    |
| 5.0-5.9   | 6    | -         | 2    | 2    | 2    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 14    |
| 6.0-6.9   | 4    | -         | 2    | 1    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 7     |
| 7.0-7.9   | 1    | -         | -    | 1    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 2     |
| 8.0 and   | 4    | -         | 4    | 1    | 2    | 1    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 12    |
| over      | -    | -         | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |         |       |
| Total     | 178  | 62        | 122  | 46   | 19   | 8    | -    | -    | -    | -       | 435   |

### Tab. 3.11 - Estimates of average acreage under rice and maize, by village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rice:</th>
<th>Maize:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.H.S.E.S. 1969:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main survey, Zone 3 (all Usangu), p.111 and 200</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliability check (p.203), Utengule ward: farmers' answers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jespersen 1973 (measurements):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all Usangu, pre-survey (p.51 f)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all Usangu, main survey (p.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruia ward, pre-survey  &quot;-&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utengule ward, pre-survey  &quot;-&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipping 1971:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruia</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhambule</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do these figures tally with acreage estimates found in other sources? As can be seen from Tab. 3.11, my figures do not differ much from those obtained in the S.H.S.E.S. reliability check, but exceed their other estimates by about one acre, which, in the cases where the standard deviation is published, is statistically significant at the .001 level. As far as the rice shambas are concerned, I therefore think that my assertion on p. 33, that my respondents did overestimate their acreages, is basically correct.

Tab. 3.12 - Male household heads, by type of farmer, age, and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>under</th>
<th>20-</th>
<th>30-</th>
<th>40-</th>
<th>50-</th>
<th>60-</th>
<th>70 and</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landless</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 77.26; T = +0.25

HAMBULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>under</th>
<th>20-</th>
<th>30-</th>
<th>40-</th>
<th>50-</th>
<th>60-</th>
<th>70 and</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>landless</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 42.94; T = +0.15

So far, my analysis has shown that, in both villages, there is a group of landless people, and some variation in the size of the farms. The landless are mainly young immigrants (Tab. 3.12) who have arrived during the last few years (Tab. 3.13), and there is a clear positive relationship between the advancing age of the farmers and the amount of land which they own (cf. esp. the first and last rows of Tab. 3.12). Chronological age and length of residence seem, in the first place, to determine how much land a man has been able to acquire. Judging from the values of the contingency coefficients T, time of arrival in R/U seems to be the more influential of the two variables.
Tab. 3.13 - Year of arrival in present home village, by type of farmer and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>Settled in R/U since</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>birth</td>
<td>1961 or earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landless</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.0 100.0 100.0 99.9 100.1
n 47 56 85 68 256

Chi square = 75.21 ; T = +0.29

LUHAMBULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>Settled in R/U since</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landless</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.1 99.9 100.1 100.1 99.9
n 71 63 143 143 420

Chi square = 106.82 ; T = +0.27

This finding can be interpreted in two ways. It may mean that those who arrived early have successively enlarged their holdings, or it may mean that there formerly was more land available than is now the case, and that the early immigrants soon after their arrival acquired larger holdings than could those who arrived later. Which of the two explanations is correct cannot be decided before we have correlated holding size with some variable which in their turn, are correlated with chronological age and time of arrival in R/U.

Chronological age correlates positively with a number of other variables which must be assumed to be more relevant than age alone for explaining the variations in landownership. Both the number of children and the number of wives a man has are likely to increase with increasing age, and so may the number of people in his household. If either of these increases, then this and his family's needs for more land, for more subsistence produce, and for more cash, tend to increase. The obvious next step is thus to see whether there is any co-variation between these variables.
### Tab. 3.14 - Type of farmer, by number of wives and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of wives:</th>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>landless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UHAMBULE         |          |        |        |        |        |
|                  |          |        |        |        |        |
| none             | 34.0     | 25.2   | 11.3   | 10.8   | 2.0    |
| one              | 63.6     | 68.9   | 66.9   | 53.8   | 64.7   |
| two              | 2.1      | 5.8    | 18.3   | 27.7   | 19.6   |
| three            | -        | -      | 3.5    | 3.1    | 3.9    |
| four             | -        | -      | -      | 1.5    | 7.8    |
| five             | -        | -      | -      | 1.5    | 2.0    |
| **Total**        | 99.9     | 99.9   | 100.0  | 98.4   | 100.0  |
| **n**            | 47       | 103    | 142    | 65     | 51     |

### Tab. 3.15 - Type of farmer, by number of children living with their parents and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children still with their parents:</th>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>landless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight or more</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children/farmer</strong></td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UHAMBULE                                     |          |        |        |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------|          |        |        |        |        |
| none                                         | 59.6     | 48.7   | 36.2   | 25.0   | 23.1   |
| one                                          | 17.3     | 29.1   | 22.8   | 16.2   | 21.2   |
| two                                          | 7.7      | 12.8   | 17.4   | 17.6   | 17.3   |
| three                                        | 11.5     | 3.4    | 10.7   | 17.6   | 19.2   |
| four                                         | 3.8      | 4.3    | 3.4    | 10.3   | 3.8    |
| five                                         | -        | -      | 4.7    | 5.9    | 1.9    |
| six                                          | -        | 0.9    | 2.7    | 2.9    | 3.6    |
| seven                                        | -        | -      | 0.7    | -      | 3.8    |
| eight or more                                | -        | 0.9    | 1.3    | 4.4    | 5.8    |
| **Total**                                    | 99.9     | 100.1  | 99.9   | 99.9   | 99.9   |
| **n**                                        | 52       | 117    | 149    | 68     | 52     |
| **Children/farmer**                          | 0.82     | 0.97   | 1.64   | 2.45   | 2.58   |
Tab. 3.16 - Type of farmer, by number of persons in the interviewee's household and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of persons in the interviewee's household:</th>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>1- acre</th>
<th>3- acre</th>
<th>5- acre</th>
<th>9- acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six to ten</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven or more</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons/household</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHAMBOLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six to ten</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven or more</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons/household</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 3.14-16 and Fig. 3. A show that there are clear positive relationships between holding size on the one hand and, on the other, the number of wives, children, and persons in the household. It is entirely in accordance with commonsense expectations that all three independent variables correlate positively with holding size, because they themselves are usually positively correlated with one another. This observation can also be interpreted as a check on the reliability of my data and, what is more important, as a clear indication that the farmers in both Ruiwa and Uhambule have succeeded in acquiring more land as their families grew. Thus, the hypothesis seems to be warranted that the age of the husband (and the corresponding increase of his family), rather than the year of his arrival in R/U, is the factor which most strongly determines how much land a man possesses.
ab. 3.17 - First and second shambas, by time of acquisition and village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne shamba</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>econd shamba</td>
<td>acquired</td>
<td>&quot;long ago&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>before 1956</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956-61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>966-68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969-70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>econd shamba</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ne shamba</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>econd shamba</td>
<td>acquired</td>
<td>&quot;long ago&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>before 1956</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956-61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962-65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>966-68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969-70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>econd shamba</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At first glance this hypothesis seem to be contradicted by Tab. 3.17, which shows that most of those who owned two shambas had acquired both at the same time. This fact may support the contrary hypothesis, i.e., that the early settlers, as is shown by Tab. 3.13, were able to acquire larger holdings than the latecomers. But if we consider that chronological age and length of residence are positively correlated (cf. p.19 and Tab. 2.8), the fact that most farmers acquired both shambas simultaneously need not contradict the fact that they were able to enlarge their holdings as they grew older and their families increased. Taken together these findings probably mean that there has been no dearth of space in either village, so that those who are now better endowed with land have been able gradually to extend the areas of the shambas which they acquired when they first settled in Usangu.
Had there been less space available, so that gradual extension of the original shambas would not have been physically possible, the holdings of the wealthier farmers would probably have been more fragmented than actually is the case, and their several shambas would also, in all likelihood, have been acquired at different times.

Tab. 3.18 - Quality of soil, by year of arrival in present home village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the soil:</th>
<th>Settled in R/U since</th>
<th>1961 or 1962</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUWIA</td>
<td>birth</td>
<td>earlier</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all good</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some good, some average</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some good, some bad</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some good, some average, some bad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all average</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some average, some bad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all bad</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the soil:</th>
<th>Settled in R/U since</th>
<th>1961 or 1962</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UHAMBULE</td>
<td>birth</td>
<td>earlier</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all good</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some good, some average</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some good, some bad</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some good, some average, some bad</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all average</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some average, some bad</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all bad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 3.19 - Water supply, by year of arrival in present home village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water supply to the shambas:</th>
<th>Settled in R/U since</th>
<th>1961 or 1962</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUWIA</td>
<td>birth</td>
<td>earlier</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient on all fields</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient on some fields</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insufficient on all fields</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water supply to the shambas:</th>
<th>Settled in R/U since</th>
<th>1961 or 1962</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UHAMBULE</td>
<td>birth</td>
<td>earlier</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient on all fields</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient on some fields</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insufficient on all fields</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab. 3.20 - Location of the interviewees' shambas, by year of arrival in present home village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>shambas are</th>
<th>Settled in R/U since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>birth 1961 or 1962-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all nearby</td>
<td>51.1 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some nearby, some far away</td>
<td>19.1 37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all far away</td>
<td>23.4 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>6.4 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>47 56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UHAMBULE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all nearby</td>
<td>78.9 71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some nearby, some far away</td>
<td>11.3 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all far away</td>
<td>7.0 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>2.6 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>71 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This conclusion is supported by Tabs. 3.18-20 which show that the shambas of the latecomers are not worse with respect to the quality of the soil, water supply, or location than those of the natives or early immigrants. As there has been no lack of space, the recent immigrants have settled at the outskirts of the villages, at places where the soil is good and the water supply adequate, in order to live near their fields. Obviously, they deemed this to be more important than living near the village center, and this has led to the dispersed settlement pattern described in chapter 1.

Tab. 3.21 - Acres per person in households of different sizes, by village and crop, averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people in household:</th>
<th>Ruiwa Acres per person:</th>
<th>Uhambule Acres per person:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rice maize</td>
<td>all crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>2.14 1.14</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>1.09 0.77</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>0.51 0.46</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>0.53 0.40</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>0.60 0.40</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six to ten</td>
<td>0.46 0.31</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than ten</td>
<td>0.42 0.25</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having now established that the farmers of both villages by and large have been able to augment their holdings as their households grew, our next task is to find out whether the increase has been in proportion to growth of their families. As is clearly shown by Tab. 3.21 and Fig. 3.8, the additional acreage which they have been able to secure has not at all
been proportional to the increase of the number of people in their households. This holds equally for rice and maize shambas; and the pattern is almost identical in both villages. How this has affected their economic situation I shall discuss in chapters 4 and 5; but before turning to that subject, I should discuss the means by which our interviewees acquired their holdings.

The question by which we tried to find out how the villagers had got their land was open-ended ("Kwa namna gani ulilipata?" - "By which means did you get it?"). The reasons for putting it this way, instead of using a question with pre-coded answer categories, were twofold. Firstly it would give the interviewees a better chance to use the answer categories which they themselves used when thinking and speaking about acquisition of land; and, secondly, it would give the interviewers greater freedom to probe further when they encountered evasive or incomplete answers.

The outcome was less satisfactory than I had hoped for, because the question yielded only laconic and stereotyped answers. One reason for this may have been that Swahili, in which the interviews were conducted, was not the mother tongue, but the second or third language of most interviewees. But it may also simply reflect the fact that the interviewees really do think of the means by which land can be acquired in these categories; and it may also mean that I had not coached my interviewers well enough (or did not supervise them closely enough) to make them probe deeper when they got certain types of answers. Here I am chiefly thinking about the answers "wenyeiji waliniwa,"nilipewa na wenyeji" ("the natives gave it to me", "I got it from the natives"), which turned out to be the second largest answer category.

Tab. 3.22 - Means used by the interviewees to acquire their present holdings, by ethnic group and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means used:</th>
<th>First shamba:</th>
<th>Second shamba:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nyakyusa</td>
<td>Sangu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocated by WDC/jumbe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot; natives</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot; relative</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot; neighbour</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>led</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UHAMBULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means used:</th>
<th>First shamba:</th>
<th>Second shamba:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nyakyusa</td>
<td>Sangu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocated by WDC/jumbe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot; natives</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot; relative</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot; neighbour</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>led</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this answer really meant, or in what respect it means something else in the most frequently given answers ("Nilipewa na kumi-kumi/balozi" and umbe alinipa" ("I got it from the ten-cell leader/judge") I can only guess; on the fact that the answer "wenyeji walinipa" was more often given by our Igwe interviewees and the answer "kumi-kumi/jumbe/balozi alinipa" by the skyusa respondents (Tab. 3.22), we may infer that the former answer meant it the respondent had acquired his land through some informal, traditional means and not, in the official way, via the Ward Development Committee. For its interpretation also bespeaks the fact that the largest group which gave former answer was found among those who settled in R/U before Uhuru (Tab. 3), i.e., before the present system of land allocation was introduced.

Tab. 3.23 - Means used by the interviewees to acquire their present shambas, by time of arrival in present home village, per cent.

Means used: RUIWA

First or only shamba:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means used</th>
<th>birth</th>
<th>1961 or 1962-</th>
<th>1969 or later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>allocated by WDC/jumbe/balozi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natives</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second shamba:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means used</th>
<th>birth</th>
<th>1961 or 1962-</th>
<th>1969 or later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>allocated by WDC/jumbe/balozi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natives</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UHAMBULE

First or only shamba:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means used</th>
<th>birth</th>
<th>1961 or 1962-</th>
<th>1969 or later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>allocated by WDC/jumbe/balozi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natives</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second shamba:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means used</th>
<th>birth</th>
<th>1961 or 1962-</th>
<th>1969 or later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>allocated by WDC/jumbe/balozi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natives</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab. 3.23 also shows that, quite according to expectations, the largest proportion of farmers who had inherited their land, or received it as a gift from their father or grandfather, was found among those who had spent their whole lives in Ruiwa or Uhambule. But it also shows that, contrary to expectations, there was, in both villages, a group of immigrants - even recent immigrants - who said that they had got their land from their fathers. Some of these were natives of R/U who had been away in search of work elsewhere, and had then returned; but most of them must have been children of immigrants who came to Usangu with their families when their children were still small.

Tab. 3.24 - First and second shambas, by the means used to acquire them, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUIWA</th>
<th>Means used to acquire the first shamba:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allocated by gift from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WDC natives father rel. neighb. loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One shamba only:</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alloc. by WDC</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second shamba</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alloc. by WDC</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second shamba</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have already mentioned that most of the farmers owned two shambas, and had acquired both at the same time. To find out whether they also had used the same means to get them, I have compiled Tab. 3.24, which shows that this actually is the case. This seems to hold also when we compare the small-holder with the better-off farmers (Tab. 3.25). When we compare Tab. 3.24 with Tab. 3.17, we find that the variation is somewhat greater with respect to the than with respect to mode of acquisition.
Tab. 3.25 - Means used by the interviewees to acquire their present shambas by type of farmer and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means used:</th>
<th>1-acre</th>
<th>3-acre</th>
<th>5-acre</th>
<th>9-acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUWIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First or only shamba:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocated by WDC/jumba/balozi</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; natives</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; relative</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; neighbour</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second shamba:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocated by WDC/jumba/balozi</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; natives</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; relative</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; neighbour</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHAMBULE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First or only shamba:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocated by WDC/jumba/balozi</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; natives</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; relative</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; neighbour</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second shamba:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocated by WDC/jumba/balozi</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; natives</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gift from father</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; relative</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot; neighbour</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most spectacular fact shown by Tabs. 3.22-25 is that practically peaking nobody in either village has purchased or leased his land. I see no reason to question the reliability of this finding, which to my mind is very clear evidence that there still is no dearth of cultivable land in Isangu and, as a consequence of this, it is unlikely that competition for land or hoarding of land will occur in the near future.

Before summing up our findings about landownership, it is appropriate to cross-tabulate the five types of farmers which I have used with the most
important background variables. As is seen from Tab. 3.26, the acreage which a farmer cultivates is not influenced by his ethnic background, and this also holds if we cross-tabulate acreage under rice or maize separately with ethnic background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group (numbers of villages)</th>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>landless</td>
<td>1-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa (152)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu (30)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali (8)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safwa (10)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga (6)</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe (6)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bena (5)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (40)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (257)</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GAMBWE                             |                |        |        |        |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|-------|
| Nyakyusa (212)                    | 15.1           | 25.0   | 33.5   | 14.2   | 12.3   | 100.1 |
| Sangu (69)                        | 8.7            | 23.2   | 33.3   | 23.2   | 11.6   | 100.0 |
| Ndali (38)                        | 15.8           | 39.5   | 21.1   | 13.2   | 10.5   | 100.1 |
| Safwa (16)                        | -              | 16.7   | 27.8   | 22.2   | 33.3   | 100.0 |
| Kinga (20)                        | 10.0           | 10.0   | 60.0   | 10.0   | 10.0   | 100.0 |
| Hehe (9)                          | -              | 33.3   | 22.2   | 22.2   | 22.2   | 99.9  |
| Bena (16)                         | 5.6            | 22.2   | 55.6   | 11.1   | 5.6    | 100.1 |
| Other (31)                        | 9.7            | 41.9   | 29.0   | 9.7    | 9.7    | 100.0 |
| **Total (415)**                   | **12.0**       | **26.3** | **33.7** | **15.4** | **12.5** | **99.9** |

As is shown by Tab. 3.27, total acreage varies in both villages with literacy and membership in TANU, but only to some extent with religion. Contrary to what could be expected, total acreage varies neither negatively with belief in traditional religion nor positively with adherence to Christianity, but varies instead positively with belief in Islam. This may mean that Islam is the high-status religion, and that those who begin to prosper tend to adopt this faith.
Tabl 3.27 - Type of farmer, by literacy, membership in TANU, and religion per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUTWA</th>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>landless</td>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>9-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literate</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Joined TANU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>before 1968</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968 or later</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not member</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N!</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Religion:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traditional religion</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N!</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | n | 39 | 77 | 81 | 36 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UHAMBULE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>literate</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Joined TANU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>before 1968</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968 or later</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not member</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N!</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Religion:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traditional religion</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N!</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | n | 52 | 117 | 149 | 68 |

Summing up we may conclude that the majority of the farmers have acquired their shambas by applying to, either the WDC or "the natives", i.e., by asking the local community for land. Only a minority has got its land from Womeren, and commercial dealings in land have been extremely rare. Leases are completely unknown in both villages, and only one shamba has ever been purchased. This certainly means that anybody who wants to establish himself as a farmer in this part of Usangu still can get some land to cultivate.

At a first glance this does not seem to tally with the fact that there was quite a number of landless household heads in both villages, though
it does not necessarily contradict my conclusion that there still is enough unoccupied cultivable land in Usangu. It will be recalled that the great majority of the landless settlers were young (Tab. 3.12) or had settled in R/U during the last two years (Tab. 3.13), or both. Therefore their present status may be due to the slow working of the land allocation procedure rather than to shortage of cultivable land.
4. Harvests

In the beginning of the last chapter I mentioned that the interviewees did not mind telling us how much land they owned, and they seem to have overstated rather than understated the acreage of their fields. But when they were asked how much they had harvested of different crops, they became more reserved. Surprisingly many said that they simply did not know, and of those who responded with an estimate, many, if not all, gave figures which, as we shall presently see, were far too low to have been the true ones. To what extent this not entirely unexpected behaviour was due to ignorance, and to what extent it stemmed from suspicions about our undertaking and the use we might make of their answers, we shall never know; but an analysis of the responses which we got may nevertheless give us some idea of the distribution of wealth in the two villages.

As such an analysis might be of more methodological interest for future studies of this kind, and as it is necessary for judging the overall reliability of the data, I will begin with a discussion of the reliability of the harvest estimates which we got, and compare them with corresponding figures given in other sources.

The main question to be dealt with in this analysis is whether the farmers of Usangu were really ignorant about their harvest results, or whether they deliberately tried to deceive us. Giving them the benefit of doubt, let us begin with marshalling such facts as seem to support what we may call "the ignorance hypothesis", i.e. that the interviewees really did not know how much they had harvested.

Tab. 4.1 - Number of farmers accounting for their harvests, by village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowners, n</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- who gave harvest estimates, n per cent. of all rice growers</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- who said how much rice they had sold, n per cent. of all who gave harvest estimates</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize growers, n</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- who gave harvest estimates, n per cent. of all maize growers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- who said how much maize they had sold, n per cent. of all who gave harvest estimates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then we notice, firstly, that about twice as many interviewees gave estimates of their rice harvests as of their maize harvests (Tab.4.1). Since most farmers cultivated both rice and maize, this can be taken to mean that they really did know how much rice they had harvested. This hypothesis, in turn, is supported by the fact that most of them who grew rice said that they sold at least a part of their rice harvest, while only a few of those who grew maize said that they had sold any maize. Now, since the rice that is sold has to be put into bags, which are then weighed at the co-op's collecting point, and paid for by the weight, those who have sold rice must have a better idea about how much rice they have harvested than of how much maize they have got, because they usually sell no maize and thus have no reason to measure the harvested maize before storing it in their vihenge.

Tab. 4.2.- Rice harvests in the years 1969-71, by village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total area under rice, acres</td>
<td>1884.0</td>
<td>2219.5</td>
<td>1948.5</td>
<td>2990.5</td>
<td>3884.5</td>
<td>4150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of bags harvested</td>
<td>1065.0</td>
<td>1293.5</td>
<td>1163.0</td>
<td>1919.0</td>
<td>2473.5</td>
<td>2729.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sold</td>
<td>538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bags harvested per acre</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion sold, per cent.</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion growers who sold, per cent.</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bags/grower: harvested</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>14.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sold</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- kept</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bags/seller: harvested</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sold</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- kept</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, the number of interviewees who gave harvest estimates (of both rice and maize) correlated positively with time (Tab.4.1-2 and Fig.4 A-B; which is what we may expect if the "ignorance hypothesis" is true: namely that recent events are better remembered than distant ones. Other effects of time's influence on their views are shown in Tabs. 4.3-4 and Fig. 4.A-B. According to the former table, the proportion of interviewees who did not answer the question "How was your harvest this year - last year - the year before last?" correlates negatively with time, which is in accordance with the "ignorance hypothesis". Similarly, the latter table shows that some of the interviewees who answered the question may have embellished the past, which is in accordance with current theories of learning and forgetting, and this yields additional, though weak, support to the "ignorance hypothesis".
Tab. 4.3 - Percentage of farmers giving judgements about their harvest yields 1969-71, by crop and village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruwe</th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rice</td>
<td>maize</td>
<td>rice</td>
<td>maize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 harvest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 harvest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 harvest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of growers</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 4.4 - The interviewees' judgements about their harvests in 1969-71, by number of bags actually harvested, crops and village

Average number of bags actually harvested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruwe</th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rice</td>
<td>maize</td>
<td>rice</td>
<td>maize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1969 harvest was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1970 harvest was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1971 harvest was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most differences exceeding 5 bags are statistically significant at the 0.5 level.

Thirdly, there is a clear positive correlation between holding size and the proportion of farmers who gave us information both about how much rice and maize they had harvested and how much they had sold. (Tab. 4.5). (The number of farmers specifying what quantities of maize they had sold is too small to allow tabulation of their answers.) As it is reasonable to assume that the owners of large holdings produced a larger surplus than the smallholders and thus had more grain to sell, they ought to have been better informed about how much they had harvested; and, in accordance with that I said above, they ought also to have been in a better position than the smallholders to supply such information. This reasoning is corroborated by
Tab. 4.2 and Fig. 4.6 which, among other things, show that those who sold rice also had harvested more than those who did not sell. Also, if we cross tabulate the acreage under rice and maize, respectively, with the number of farmers who gave harvest estimates, we find a similar positive relationship between the variables in question.

Tab. 4.5 - Proportion farmers giving information about their harvests 1969-71, by type of farmer, village and crop, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village, crop, year:</th>
<th>Type of farmer specifying harvested quantity:</th>
<th>1-acre</th>
<th>3-acre</th>
<th>5-acre</th>
<th>9-acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruiwa, rice 1971</td>
<td>landless</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maize 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhambule, rice 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maize 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of farmer specifying sold quantity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village, crop, year:</th>
<th>Type of farmer specifying sold quantity:</th>
<th>1-acre</th>
<th>3-acre</th>
<th>5-acre</th>
<th>9-acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruiwa, rice 1971</td>
<td>landless</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhambule, rice 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of farmers specifying sold quantity of maize is too small to warrant tabulation.

The arguments presented so far can be taken as positive support for the "ignorance hypothesis". Furthermore there is another set of data which, in my opinion, show that the opposite hypothesis, the "deception hypothesis" may not be true.

To begin with, according to Tab. 4.4 and Fig. 4.6, there is a very clear positive association between the average number of bags harvested and the interviewees' answers to questions 306 - 309: Those who said that their harvests had been good during the last three years also had harvested more rice and more maize than those who said that it had been normal or bad. Next those who said that they had harvested enough for their families' needs also had gathered better harvests than those who denied having done so (Tab. 4.6)
Tab. 4.6 - Answers to the question "Did you harvest enough for your family’s needs?" by average number of bags harvested in 1969-71

"Did you harvest enough for your family's needs?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although many of the differences between the averages in Tabs. 4.4 and 4.6 are not statistically significant, they all point in the same direction, which probably would not have been the case if the interviewees had tried to deceive us.

Tab. 4.7 - Answers to the question "Do you want more land?" by average number of bags of rice and maize harvested in 1969-71

"Do you want more land?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>17.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>17.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>15.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 4.8 - Attempts to get more land, by average number of bags of rice harvested in 1969-71

"Have you tried to get more land? With what result?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wants more land, has tried with success</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wants more land, has tried without success</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has not tried</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not want more land</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>18.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this evidence against the "deception hypothesis" is clear, it is not very strong; and would have been much strengthened if the pattern of response to the questions 322 and 323 (Tab. 4.7-8) had been as consistent as in the two preceding tables. As they now stand, these two tables show that only in Ruiwa is there co-variation between the interviewees' reported actual harvest results on the one hand and, on the other, their desire for and attempts to get more land.

In the preceding discussion of the interviewees' answers concerning their acreages and harvest yields, I have - perhaps wrongly-assumed that the literate farmers may be better able to give exact information than the illiterate ones. Working by the same hypothesis I have, as a final test of the two hypotheses, tabulated the harvest estimates keeping literacy constant,
(Tab. 4.9), but have obtained support for neither. In both villages, the percentage of literate farmers who gave harvest estimates was almost the same as the percentage of illiterate farmers who did so; but in both villages the literate farmers reported having harvested between two and five bags more than their illiterate neighbours. These differences are, however, too small to be statistically significant. Thus, literacy does seem to affect neither the respondents' willingness nor their ability to report how much they had harvested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimates concerning the rice harvests in</th>
<th>Percentage of farmers who gave harvest estimates:</th>
<th>Average number of bags of rice harvested:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruiwa literate Ruiwa illiterate Uhambule literate Uhambule illiterate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>46.3 46.1</td>
<td>15.98 13.54 16.61 14.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>52.2 56.2</td>
<td>16.57 13.72 16.90 13.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>57.3 60.7</td>
<td>12.31 11.32 16.41 11.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, we cannot entirely discard the "deception hypothesis", although we have no data which directly support it. Our preliminary conclusion must therefore be that some respondents may have tried to deceive us, but what bias there is in our data is mainly due to the respondents' ignorance of how much they had actually harvested during the last three years.

Having, for the time being, settled this question we may now proceed to examine how realistic the interviewees' harvest estimates were. Let us begin by computing the number of bags per capita which the interviewees said that they had harvested. As is seen from Tab. 4.10, their estimates of their rice harvests tally fairly well with the estimates which can be computed from the data given on pp. 179 and 33 in the S.H.S.E.S. Final report (Unfortunately there are no corresponding figures for maize.) As Tab. 4.10 and Figs. 40-E show, there is a strong negative J-shaped relationship between on the one hand, the per capita harvests of both rice and maize, and the number of household members, on the other. Although the form of the relationship between the variables is not surprising, especially if we keep in mind that we found a similar relationship between acres per capita and household size, the slope of the curve, especially for rice, is so steep that it must be regarded as suspect. These suspicions are confirmed by Tab. 4.11 and Fig. 4F, according to which the average number of bags harvested per acre is not only negatively correlated with acreage under rice, but also far too low to be true. According to Jespersen, who obtained some of his data through
measurements of both fields and yields, the average figure for all of sangu in the years 1969-72 varied between 13.33 and 14.24 bags of rice per acre, with 95% confidence limits between 0.75 and 2.20 bags per acre (Jespersen 1973, 45).

Tab. 4.10 - Average number of bags of rice and maize harvested per capita, by household size and village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of persons in the household:</th>
<th>Average number of bags of rice harvested in</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six to ten</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven or more</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.H.S.E.S.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 4.11 - Average number of bags of rice harvested in 1969-71, by acreage, under rice and village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage under rice:</th>
<th>Average number of bags</th>
<th>Bags per acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 1.0 acres</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.9 acres</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.9 &quot;</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9 &quot;</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>19.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9 &quot;</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>23.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0-5.9 &quot;</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>21.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0-6.9 &quot;</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>22.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 and over</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UHAMBULE             |               |               |               |               |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| under 1.0 acres     | 4.50 | 5.31 | 5.50 | 9.00 | 10.62 | 11.00 |
| 1.0-1.9 acres       | 11.58 | 11.05 | 9.85 | 7.72 | 7.37 | 6.57 |
| 2.0-2.9 "          | 14.83 | 16.41 | 16.08 | 5.97 | 6.56 | 6.43 |
| 3.0-3.9 "          | 16.34 | 17.11 | 16.48 | 5.24 | 4.89 | 4.71 |
| 4.0-4.9 "          | 16.67 | 21.00 | 19.86 | 4.14 | 4.67 | 4.41 |
| 5.0-5.9 "          | 25.11 | 22.41 | 23.19 | 4.56 | 4.07 | 4.22 |
| 6.0-6.9 "          | 15.80 | 20.80 | 18.50 | 2.43 | 3.20 | 2.84 |
| 7.0-7.9 "          | 22.75 | 22.75 | 12.50 | 3.03 | 3.03 | 1.67 |
| 8.0 and over        | 25.00 | 23.8 | 21.9 | 2.94 | 2.80 | 2.58 |
The discrepancy between my interview data and his measurements is so great that my data must be deemed entirely worthless for forming a picture of the standard of living in the two villages. This is, of course, very disappointing; but though my data are wrong in absolute terms, they may be usable as relative measurements of the interviewees' economic status with respect to one another.

It would, however, be naïve to assume that all farmers understated their yields by the same proportion, for it is not unlikely that the wealthier landowners tended to understate their harvest yields more than the smallholders. Like well-to-do farmers elsewhere in the world, our better-off interviewees in Usangu may have felt that they had more to lose than to gain if we, or the authorities, knew the true state of affairs in the villages, and wanted to change status quo.

The farmers' reluctance to disclose information about their harvest yields did not surprise me, for from the literature and earlier experiences of similar field work among Finnish smallholders I knew what to prepare myself for; but nevertheless I hoped - maybe somewhat naively - that I should meet with good luck and find more co-operation than eventually proved to be the case. In order to show that the Usangu farmers are much like their counterparts in, for instance, West Africa, it seems appropriate to quote an accomplished field worker about her difficulties in Ghana:

"When making field enquiries in the Dagomba and Wa areas, I found that nearly all cattle-owners are very unwilling to discuss, even in general terms, the matter of sale of cattle - even if they were not downright misleading (insisting that they 'never sold'), they were always very evasive. I know that several investigators have been seriously misled by informants whose statements they took literally. I think it ought to be better realized that West African farmers usually have a very strong aversion to answering questions relating to monetary transactions and that even when, like cocoa-farmers, they readily do this, they are never able to relate their receipts to any standard time-period. In a Hausa village in 1967 I found a very great reluctance on the part of all those selling grain of their own production to admit to this - and as the farmers were frank and eager on most topics, I think this is connected with a traditional fear of being accused of neglecting their wives and children. (In fact, of course, nearly everyone in the village knew who sold grain.) But in the case of cattle-selling, informants' embarrassment should not, I think, be equated with any traditional reluctance to sell stock (many of the cattle-owners are, in any case, first-generation reapers), but rather with a deep-seated objection to answering questions relating to such large-scale monetary transactions. There is also the question of the annual cattle tax levied by the authorities in the North, which are everywhere inclined to raise more and more revenue from this source. There were naturally fears that a stranger's enquiries about sales might be related to the size of the herd for tax purposes. Rearers might also associate such enquiries with the prohibition on the movement of female and young stock." (Hill 1970, p. 87 f.)
### Table 4.12 - Possession of various commodities, by type of farmer and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>Landless</th>
<th>1-acre</th>
<th>3-acre</th>
<th>5-acre</th>
<th>9-acre</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk lantern</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mus stove</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st watch</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harvesting machine</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ctor</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se of wood, grass roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se of mud, grass roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se of mud brick, grass roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se of fired brick, iron roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Module

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mus stove</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st watch</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harvesting machine</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ctor</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se of wood, grass roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se of mud, grass roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se of mud brick, grass roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se of fired brick, grass roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This means that we must qualify and reformulate our "deception hypothesis", taking into account the size of the respondents' holdings. Such a reformulated hypothesis receives support from Tab. 4.12, in which I have summarized the measurements by a socio-economic scale which I constructed in order to find out if there were differences in standard of living, as measured by ownership of various commodities. In Uhambule there is a very clear positive correlation between holding size on the one hand and, on the other, ownership of superior houses, cattle, and various household goods. In Ruiwa, the same
tendency is noticeable, but not so clearly as in Uhambule. This must mean that the farmers with larger holdings have produced not only larger harvests, but also larger surpluses and that, in turn, their harvests per acre must have been about normal, i.e., considerably greater than disclosed to us.

Thus I cannot check how close a co-variation existed between the cash-crop acreage and the incomes of our respondents, which actually was one of the aims of this study. For the same reason I cannot construct an index taking into account both the interviewees' capital and their income, but must remain content with using only their acreage as a measure of their economic status.
5. Desire for more land

It is often assumed that the most usual spontaneous reaction of farmers who cannot produce enough to provide for their families is to dream of more or better land to cultivate. Owing to local conditions, their chances to realize this dream vary, which fact, in turn, affects the course of action which they take to reach the goal of their dreams.

In the S.H.S.E.S. Final Report all interviewees were asked if they wanted more land. Of all respondents in the Mbye region, 50.2% said "yes", and of these 53.2% said that they wanted it to grow more food crops for their families, while 23.1% wanted it for growing more cash crops (Final Report, 52).

A secondary analysis of these answers showed no meaningful pattern of co-variation between the answers to these questions and a number of other variables (Pipping 1971). From this negative outcome I concluded that further robes were necessary if I wanted to obtain reliable answers about the farmers' real wishes. Therefore I tried in this study to check up on the interviewees' answers by asking them also if they had harvested enough for their families' needs; if they had done anything to get more land; and what steps they had taken, and how successful they had been in their endeavours. As will presently be shown, these additional questions helped to clarify some of the details, but did not yield any coherent picture of the nature and extent of and hunger among the farmers of Ruiwa and Uhambule.

In the preceding pages it has been shown that the great majority of our interviewees were smallholders, and that in both villages there was a clear negative correlation between household size, on the one hand, and both creage and quantities of grain harvested per capita, on the other (pp. 46 and 57), although the true strength of these relationships could not be ascertained due to the inaccuracy and low reliability of the respondents' harvest yield estimates. Therefore it seems reasonable to assume a similar negative association between household size and the percentage of interviewees who answered "yes" to our question: "Did you harvest enough for your family's needs?". But contrary to our expectations, no clear relationship appears when we cross-tabulate these two variables (Tab. 5.1.A).
Tab. 5.1 - Answers to the question "Did you harvest enough for your family's needs?", by size of household, type of farmer, attempts to get more land, and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Number of persons in the household:</th>
<th>Ruise</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six to ten</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven or more</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Type of farmer:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>landless</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Desire for and attempts to get more land:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wants more land and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- has asked for more</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- has not asked for more</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total wanting more land</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total not wanting more land</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, when cross-tabulating the same question with holding size (Tab. 5.1.B), significant differences in the expected direction appear. Taking these percentages at their face value, we may conclude that on the average, one-fourth of the villagers thought that they could not support their families adequately on the land which they cultivated and thus needed more land, and that even some of the largest landowners felt that their fields did not yield enough. Knowing that those who said that they had harvested enough also had gathered larger harvests than those denying that

---

1) The attentive reader who is surprised by the percentage of landless farmers answering "yes" to the question should be reminded of the fact that some of them had land outside R/U (cf. Tab. 3.3., p. 33)
by had done so (Tab. 4.6), these figures look reasonable, and therefore it comes as a surprise when we find that two-thirds of those who said that they had harvested enough said that they nevertheless wanted more land (ab. 5.1.3). This makes me suspect that the question through which I tried to measure the extent of land hunger ("Una maana kuwa unahitaji mashamba idi?") may have been a leading one, i.e., that the way in which it was put to the respondents induced them to answer "yes" rather than "no". On common-sense grounds we can fairly safely maintain that any farmer who has grown in the mainly capitalistic system which prevailed in Tanzania before the Usaha declaration (a system which had not yet disappeared when we conducted our interviews), is more likely to answer "yes" than "no" when asked if he wanted more land without "really" meaning what he said. If this is the case, the quoted figure is certainly too high, and land hunger in the Usangu plain is widespread than Tab. 5.1.3 indicates.

If, however, it is assumed that the possession of much land is so highly valued that most farmers are more likely to answer "yes" than "no", why is only 67%, and not, say, 85 or 95%, answer this question in the affirmative? Similar commonsense grounds we can argue that if the question was really worded, then close to 100% of the respondents should have answered "yes" instead of a mere 67%, and there should be no statistically significant difference (such as the one shown by the last rows in Tab. 5.1.3) between those who had harvested enough and those who had not.

As it is, we do not know if, and in what way, the question was loaded, and we do not know what the respondents actually meant when they answered as it was. We can only guess that some interpreted it in terms of their actual objective needs, while others understood and answered it with an eye to the idea of increase in wealth and prestige, and others, again, in terms of their conceptions of social justice. It must be assumed that each of these interpretations affected the respondents' answers differently, but in a way known to us.
Tab. 5.2 - Attempts to get more land, by crops and acreage, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>Wants more land and</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for more</td>
<td>asked</td>
<td>has not asked</td>
<td>Total wanting</td>
<td>Does not want</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landless</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rice acreage: | | | | | | |
| none | 60 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 21.7 | 11.6 |
| less than 1.0 acres | 21 | 26.8 | 42.9 | 71.5 | 23.8 | 4.7 |
| 1.0-1.9 acres | 75 | 16.7 | 55.7 | 77.4 | 17.3 | 5.3 |
| 2.0-2.9 " | 58 | 15.5 | 53.4 | 68.9 | 25.9 | 5.2 |
| 3.0-3.9 " | 20 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 55.0 | 45.0 | - |
| 4.0-4.9 " | 25 | - | 36.0 | 35.7 | 64.0 | - |
| 5.0-5.9 " | 5 | - | 60.0 | 60.0 | 40.0 | - |
| 6.0-6.9 " | 4 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | - |
| 8.0 or more | 4 | - | 75.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | - |
| Total | 272 | 20.2 | 46.3 | 66.5 | 27.9 | 5.6 |

| Maize acreage: | | | | | | |
| none | 82 | 19.6 | 47.6 | 67.2 | 20.7 | 12.1 |
| less than 1.0 acres | 51 | 29.4 | 46.6 | 74.5 | 23.5 | 2.0 |
| 1.0-1.9 acres | 78 | 16.6 | 51.3 | 67.9 | 28.2 | 3.9 |
| 2.0-2.9 " | 41 | 30.0 | 45.4 | 58.5 | 39.0 | 2.5 |
| 3.0-3.9 " | 10 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 60.0 | 40.0 | - |
| 4.0-4.9 " | 7 | 40.0 | 42.9 | 57.2 | 42.9 | - |
| 6.0-6.9 " | 2 | - | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | - |
| 8.0 or more | 1 | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |
| Total | 272 | 20.2 | 46.3 | 66.5 | 27.9 | 5.6 |

| UHAMBULE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Type of farmer: | | | | | |
| landless | 52 | 51.9 | 15.4 | 67.3 | 28.8 | 3.9 |
| 1-acre | 117 | 23.1 | 41.0 | 64.1 | 34.2 | 1.7 |
| 3-acre | 149 | 25.6 | 45.6 | 71.2 | 27.5 | 1.3 |
| 5-acre | 68 | 6.8 | 61.8 | 70.6 | 26.5 | 2.9 |
| 9-acre | 52 | 23.1 | 40.4 | 63.5 | 34.6 | 1.9 |
| Total | 438 | 25.2 | 42.7 | 67.9 | 30.1 | 2.0 |

| Rice acreage: | | | | | |
| none | 81 | 42.0 | 19.8 | 61.8 | 21.0 | 17.2 |
| less than 1.0 acres | 16 | 16.8 | 43.8 | 82.6 | 37.5 | - |
| 1.0-1.9 acres | 141 | 24.9 | 44.7 | 69.6 | 22.7 | 7.7 |
| 2.0-2.9 " | 81 | 24.7 | 50.6 | 75.3 | 21.0 | 3.7 |
| 3.0-3.9 " | 55 | 20.0 | 50.9 | 70.9 | 25.5 | 3.6 |
| 4.0-4.9 " | 26 | 3.9 | 50.0 | 53.6 | 46.2 | - |
| 5.0-5.9 " | 14 | 14.2 | 78.6 | 92.8 | 7.7 | 0.1 |
| 6.0-6.9 " | 7 | - | 88.6 | 85.7 | 14.3 | - |
| 7.0-7.9 " | 2 | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |
| 8.0 or more | 15 | 26.6 | 33.3 | 59.9 | 26.7 | 13.4 |
| Total | 438 | 25.2 | 43.4 | 68.6 | 24.2 | 7.2 |

| Maize acreage: | | | | | |
| none | 178 | 29.1 | 42.7 | 70.8 | 16.3 | 12.9 |
| less than 1.0 acres | 62 | 25.8 | 43.5 | 69.3 | 30.6 | 0.1 |
| 1.0-1.9 acres | 122 | 24.9 | 41.0 | 63.9 | 32.0 | 4.1 |
| 2.0-2.9 " | 46 | 29.5 | 52.2 | 71.7 | 23.9 | 4.4 |
| 3.0-3.9 " | 19 | 21.1 | 42.1 | 63.2 | 31.6 | 5.2 |
| 4.0-4.9 " | 8 | 37.5 | 50.0 | 87.5 | 12.5 | - |
| 8.0 or more | 3 | - | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 | - |
| Total | 438 | 25.2 | 43.4 | 68.6 | 24.2 | 7.2 |
In order to check the reliability of the answers to the question "Do you want more land?", we asked all interviewees if they had done anything in order to get more land. As is seen from Tabs. 5.1 C and 5.2, only about one third of those who said that they wanted more land replied that they had asked for it. In Ruiwa there was no difference in this respect between those who said they had harvested enough for their families and those who said that they had not, but in Uhambule significantly more of the latter told us that they had applied for more land. When we cross-tabulate the answers to these questions with the three sets of acreage figures which we have analysed in chapter 3, we find that in Ruiwa, but not in Uhambule, there was a weak negative association between acreage, on the one hand, and desire for and attempts to get more land, on the other. The latter observation is in accordance with facts which were pointed out on p. 56 and in Tabs. 4.6-7, namely that Uhambule both those who said that they wanted more land and those who usually had got more had gathered larger harvests than those who had made no attempts or had failed in their attempts to get more land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUIWA</th>
<th>&quot;Do you want more land?&quot;</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>was good</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UHAMBULE | | | |
| good | 32.2 | 35.3 | 17.1 | 37.5 | 27.8 | 20.0 |
| normal | 42.0 | 46.5 | 44.2 | 47.7 | 57.8 | 40.0 |
| bad | 25.9 | 18.1 | 38.6 | 14.8 | 14.4 | 40.0 |
| Total | 100.1 | 99.9 | 99.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUIWA</th>
<th>Has asked for more land and has got more</th>
<th>Has not tried to get more land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UHAMBULE | | | |
| good | 31.3 | 39.0 | 23.4 | 35.9 | 36.6 | 16.5 |
| normal | 50.0 | 46.3 | 46.8 | 39.3 | 46.2 | 46.5 |
| bad | 18.0 | 14.6 | 28.8 | 24.8 | 17.2 | 37.1 |
| Total | 100.1 | 99.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.1 |
Tab. 5.3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Did you harvest enough for your family's needs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RUIWA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The harvest in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UHAMBULE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the harvest estimates were so unreliable I have tried to determine whether there is any co-variation between our various measures of land hunger and other data on the harvest yields. The results are presented in Tab. 5.3 which, however, shows no systematic co-variation between the variables.

Tab. 5.4 - Desire for and attempts to get more land, by number of people in the respondents’ households, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people in the household:</th>
<th>Ruiwa has asked for more land</th>
<th>Ruiwa has not asked for more land</th>
<th>Total wanting</th>
<th>Uhambule has asked for more land</th>
<th>Uhambule has not asked for more land</th>
<th>Total wanting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six to ten</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven or more</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we then cross-tabulate the interviewees' attempts to get more land with the number of people in their households, we find (Tab. 5.4) that in Uhambule, but not in Ruiwa, the heads of large households tend both to be more eager to get additional land and to exert themselves more to obtain it.
Tab. 5.5 - Desire for and attempts to get more land, by year of arrival in present home village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Settled in R/U since</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>birth</td>
<td>1961 or</td>
<td>1962-</td>
<td>1969 or</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>earlier</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has asked for more</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land but has not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tried to get more</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total wanting more</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMBULE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has asked for more</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land but has not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tried to get more</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total wanting more</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In chapter 3 it was shown that there was a moderate positive association between a farmer's total acreage and the length of his residence in Usangu. Therefore it is justified to expect a considerably stronger desire for more land, and more attempts to get additional land, among the newcomers than among the early immigrants or the natives of R/U. That this expectation is fulfilled - though not completely - is shown by Tab. 5.5.

In addition to the hypotheses discussed above I have studied the co-variation of land hunger with a great number of other variables but, alas, without finding any such relationships. Thus, my attempts to find a reason for the interviewees' land hunger have been disappointing insofar as the only explanation which has been supported by my data is the rather trivial one that desire for (more) land is stronger among the recent immigrants who have but little land than among the established settlers. This does not mean, however, that the latter are content with their present living conditions; but to me it seems as if their expressions of discontent with the prevailing distribution of land are to some extent of a symbolic nature and rooted in a vague feeling that their present plight would improve by itself if they only had more land.

The normal procedure for a villager to obtain additional land is the same as for a settler who moves into a village, namely to submit an application to the Ward Development Committee, which then decides whether the applicant lives in such circumstances that he really needs more land to support himself and his family. As is shown by Tab. 5.6, the largest group of those who said that they had tried to get more land reported having used the official channel, and the next largest group consisted of those who said that they had "asked the natives". Comparison with Tab. 3.22-23 shows that the ways in which needy farmers tried to obtain additional land were basically the same as the ones by which the villagers in general had got their land, and that considerably fewer in the former group had got additional land.
from their relatives. It thus seems as if established villagers who think that they need more land are less likely than newcomers to get assistance from their kin.

Tab. 5.6 - Means used by the interviewees to get more land, by village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked WDC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asked natives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asked relative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asked friend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asked neighbour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 5.7 - Answers to the question "Did you harvest enough for your family's needs?" by means used to get more land and village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means used to get more land:</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruiwa</td>
<td>Uhambule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asked WDC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot; natives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot; relative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot; friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot; neighbour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 5.8 - Those who succeeded in getting more land: means of acquisition, by village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated free land</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lease</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most striking piece of information contained in both Tab. 3.22-23 and 5.6-8 is that there obviously is no commercial dealing in land in Usambara. Purchase is virtually unknown, and so is lease. Instead, to borrow land ("kuazima") is not unusual, especially among newcomers: 77% of those who had borrowed land in Ruiwa had settled there after 1969, while the corresponding figure for Uhambule was 62%. What "borrowing land" actually meant - e.g., what obligations it carried for those borrowing land - I never ascertained.
due to an oversight on my part; but I got the impression that this was a temporary arrangement entered into between an established settler and a newcomer who either had come to see what living in the Usangu plain was like, or one who had applied for more land but had not yet got any in his own name.
6. Co-operation

As I mentioned in the Introduction, the drive for ujamaa vijijini was gaining momentum when this study was done, and like much other research which was begun at that time, my project was planned to gain information which would be useful for the implementation of ujamaa (in my case, in Usangu).

As far as I knew from my friends on the S.H.S.E.S. team and the officials in Mbeya with whom I discussed my plans, neither knowledge of nor interest in this new idea was widespread in the Southern Highlands but, as they warned me, this was only an impression which they had got from casual observation and informal talks with farmers, their wives, and local officials.

Since a positive attitude to co-operation in general is a prerequisite for successful implementation of ujamaa, I wanted to find out how much spontaneous co-operation there was, and therefore included in the questionnaire a set of specific questions concerning help given and help received in all important farming activities. As can be seen from Tabs. 6.1-2, the interviewees said that they did not help each other much, and more farmers claimed to have given than to have received help. From the standpoint of equality, the most conspicuous detail in the tables is the negligible percentage of farmers who said that they had employed hired labour.

Tab. 6.1 - Help received in various farming activities, by relationship to the helper, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Ruwia Help received from</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighbours</td>
<td>relatives</td>
<td>hired</td>
<td>friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoeing</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planting</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weeding</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harvesting</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threshing</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winnowing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 6.2 - Help given in various farming activities, by relationship to the helped, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Ruwia Help given to</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>neighbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoeing</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planting</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weeding</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harvesting</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threshing</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winnowing</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ly figures, which are lower than those given on p. 180 f in the S.H.S.E.S. inal Report, may not be true, because at the time of my study there was much tered talk everywhere in Tanzania about the evils of exploitation, and some farmers who actually had employed hired labour may have wished to avoid eing looked upon as exploiters by the interviewers, and therefore "forgot" o tell the interviewers that they had used hired hands. On the other hand, ort farms in both villages were so small that few farmers needed to employ ied labour unless their wives and children were ill or otherwise incapable f working in the fields at some crucial period of the agricultural season.

Another detail in the tables which may be significant (in the sociologi- cal, not the statistical sense) is that there were many more farmers who xchanged help with their neighbours than with their relatives or friends.

Tab. 6.3 - Presence of relatives and friends in present home village, by husband's ethnic group and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruwiwa:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhmbe:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangu Nyakyusa</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Sangu Nyakyusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband has relatives</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife has relatives</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husband has many friends</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is very evident also when we cross-tabulate help given with help received for hoeing and planting separately, the only farming activities where there are enough cases to make such breakdowns. This may mean that obligations toward neighbours were felt to be more binding than obligations toward kins- en - but it may just as well be a consequence of the trivial fact that all farmers had neighbours, but only some of them had relatives in their home village (Tab. 6.3).

Tab. 6.4 - Proportion of farmers who received help with hoeing and planting, by type of farmer and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>own family</th>
<th>relatives</th>
<th>neighbours</th>
<th>hired hands</th>
<th>nobody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruwiwa Hoeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|             |            |           |             |             |        |
| Planting:   |            |           |             |             |        |
| Landless    | 15.7       | 20.0      | -           | -           | 8.8    |
| 1-acre      | 16.7       | 40.0      | 33.3        | 100.0       | 29.6   |
| 3-acre      | 50.0       | 20.0      | 16.7        | -           | 33.6   |
| 5-acre      | -          | -         | 25.0        | -           | 13.9   |
| 9-acre      | 16.7       | 20.0      | 25.0        | -           | 13.9   |
| Total       | 100.1      | 100.0     | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0  |
| n           | 6          | 5         | 24          | 1           | 216    |
Tab. 6.4 - Continued

Type of farmer: own family relatives neighbours hired hands nobody

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>landless</th>
<th>1-acre</th>
<th>3-acre</th>
<th>5-acre</th>
<th>9-acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hosing</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>landless</th>
<th>1-acre</th>
<th>3-acre</th>
<th>5-acre</th>
<th>9-acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we break down the answers about help received with hosing and planting by type of farmer (Tab. 6.4), no clear-cut picture emerges, and the answers certainly do not indicate any co-variation between total acreage and use of hired labour.

Tab. 6.5 - Payment given for help received in various farming activities, by village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Ruwia:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>food</td>
<td>pombe</td>
<td>food &amp; pombe</td>
<td>cash</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>pombe</td>
<td>food &amp; pombe</td>
<td>cash</td>
<td>food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hosing</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planting</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weeding</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harvesting</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threshing</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winnowing</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 6.6 - Payment received for help given in various farming activities, by village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Ruwia:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>food</td>
<td>pombe</td>
<td>food &amp; pombe</td>
<td>cash</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>pombe</td>
<td>food &amp; pombe</td>
<td>cash</td>
<td>food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hosing</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planting</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weeding</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harvesting</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threshing</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winnowing</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we then examine the payments given and received for services rendered (Tab. 6.5-6), we find that nobody had mentioned work exchange. This need not mean that the interviewees did not exchange work, for work exchange may imply that the one who receives help and incurs an obligation to assist his helper.
t a later date, also is obliged to give his helper(s) food and pombe, and
pects to be treated in the same manner when it is his turn to help. To many
ntervieweew the fact that they got food and pombe as remuneration may have
vershadowed the fact that they also exchanged labour.

Another conspicuous detail is that only four of our interviewees mentioned
aving received cash as compensation for help given. This may be true, but
it may also mean either that our interviewees did not want to admit that they
ad worked as hired hands on their neighbours' shambas, or that the (small?)
umber of hired hands that had been employed in Ruiwa and in Uhambule were
igratory workers or young men from the village who still lived with their
rents and therefore were not included in our population of household heads.

As was mentioned in the beginning of this report, there were groups of
ople in both Ruiwa and Uhambule who tried to transform their village, or
part of it, to an ujamaa village. In Ruiwa the plans had advanced farther
an in Uhambule, for in Ruiwa one ujamaa village, Motomoto, was already
orking, and the planning and recruitment of members for two other villages
as under way. In Uhambule, the plans for one village were fairly well advan-
ed, and endeavours were made to recruit members for five other villages.

his difference between Ruiwa and Uhambule is clearly visible from the per-
tages shown in Tab. 6.7, and it becomes even more marked if we form one
egory, "ujamaa supporters", of those who already are members and those
o specified which of the several ujamaa enterprises they intended to join,
nd compare the percentage of supporters in Ruiwa with the corresponding
centage in Uhambule: the difference is statistically significant at the
5 level.

Tab. 6.7 - Plans to join ujamaa, by ethnic group and village, eper cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Nyakyusa</th>
<th>Sangu</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Nyakyusa</th>
<th>Sangu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already member</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intends to join</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified village</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified village</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No plans to join</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab. 6.8 - Male household heads: Membership in ujamaa, by ethnic group and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>member</td>
<td>not member</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>member</td>
<td>not member</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sango</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safwa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bena</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n: 72 192 264 99 324 423

From what I saw of the activities of those engaged in promoting ujamaa vijijini, I got the impression that, as a group, the Wanyakyusa were more enthusiastic in organising ujamaa villages than the other ethnic groups; and especially in Ruiwa, Motomoto was frequently referred to as a Nyakyusa enterprise. Therefore I have compared the two major ethnic groups on this score (Tab. 6.8) and found that in Ruiwa the Wanyakyusa were significantly (*P < .01*) more enthusiastic than the Wasangau, while the latter were (not significant) more active in Uhambule.

In the following tables I have tried to find out whether there are any characteristics common to those who have already joined and those who said that they had no intention to join. Beginning with Tab. 6.9 we find, somewhat contrary to expectation, that the better-of farmers have been more likely to join than the landless. Similarly, in Ruiwa there were more farmers among the joiners who said that their harvest in 1969-71 had been good than among those who refused to join (Tab. 6.10), although the joiners (according to their unreliable responses) actually had harvested less than the non-joiners (Tab. 6.11).

Tab. 6.9 - Plans to join some ujamaa village, by type of farmer, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUIWA</th>
<th></th>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>already member of some ujamaa village</td>
<td>landless</td>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>9-acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plans to join specified village</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plans to join unspecified village</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no plans to join</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n: 192 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UHAMBULE</th>
<th></th>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>already member of some ujamaa village</td>
<td>landless</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>3 acre</td>
<td>5 acre</td>
<td>9 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plans to join specified village</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plans to join unspecified village</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no plans to join</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n: 192 36

Total: 192 36
Tab. 6.10 - Membership in ujamaa, by judgements of the harvest yields in 1969-71, by village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans to join ujamaa:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>already member</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans to join specified village</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans to join unspecified village</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no plans to join</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 6.11 - Plans to join ujamaa by average number of bags of rice harvested in 1969-71, by village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans to join ujamaa:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>already member</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans to join specified village</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans to join unspecified village</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no plans to join</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because total acreage correlates with time of arrival in R/U, we are titled to expect that there would be more joiners than non-joiners among those who had settled early in R/U. According to Tab.6.12, there is a tendency in the expected direction, but the differences are too small to be convincing.

Tab. 6.12 - Plans to join some ujamaa village, by year of arrival in R/U, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUIWA</th>
<th>1961 or earlier</th>
<th>1962-1968</th>
<th>1969 or later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already member</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans to join specified village</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans to join unspecified village</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no plans to join</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UHAMBULE</th>
<th>1961 or earlier</th>
<th>1962-1968</th>
<th>1969 or later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already member</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans to join specified village</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans to join unspecified village</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no plans to join</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.1</th>
<th>100.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Tab. 6.13 I have quoted a number of percentages which may help to form an over-all picture of the joiners and the non-joiners. Contrary to my hopes, it gives no coherent picture of either group, and in several instances a weak trend which we find in one village is contradicted by an opposite trend in the other. Moreover, almost all differences are too small to be statistically significant. For these reasons, and because the table is self-explanatory, I shall comment no more upon it, but leave it to the reader to interpret it.

Tab. 6.13 - Plans to join ujamaa, by various background variables, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Already member</th>
<th>Plans to join ujamaa:</th>
<th>No plans to join ujamaa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans to join specified village</td>
<td>Plans to join unspecified village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvested enough for family</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants more land</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has tried to get more land</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband: years in school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one to four years</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five years or more</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband literate</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband member of TANU</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband’s religion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All soil good</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient water on all fields</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All shambas nearby</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two or more</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband’s age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab. 6.13 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UHAMBULE</th>
<th>already member</th>
<th>plans to join specified village</th>
<th>plans to join unspecified village</th>
<th>no plans to join ujamaa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvested enough for family</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants more land</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has tried to get more land</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband: years in school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one to four years</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five or more years</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband literate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband member of TANU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's religion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All soil good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient water on all fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All shambas nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two or more</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 20</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All those who had joined were asked why they had done so. This question was open-ended because the trial interviews had shown that the joiners' motives were quite varied, and I wanted to get an overview of their motives that was as complete as possible. But, as is often the case in situations like this, a substantial proportion of the answers turned out to be stereotyped, rather laconic, phrases. This does not, of course, mean that the interviewees were not aware of their motives, or that their answers were not sincere, but simply that they could not describe their motives in words other than the slogans used to promote interest in ujamaa vijijini.
Tab. 6.14 - Members in ujamaa villages: reasons for joining, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason given</th>
<th>Ruiwa n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Uhambule n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal gain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingroup pressure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;unity is strength&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;to aid progress&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response to exhortations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reasons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

================================================================================
Total giving reasons          67  99.7 | 64  100.0
No reason given               5   5  | 35
================================================================================
Total members                  72  99

The coding of these answers was therefore fairly easy. They could be grouped in the categories shown by Tab. 6.14, from which we see, firstly, that the respondents in Uhambule were significantly less able to verbalize their motives than those in Ruiwa; and, secondly, that in Ruiwa in-group pressure to join seems to have been stronger than in Uhambule. The latter observation is not unexpected because the implementation of ujamaa had progressed further in Ruiwa, and there were some individuals who tried very hard to enlighten and convince ignorant and sceptical farmers of the advantages of life in an ujamaa village. Similarly, the fact that more people in Uhambule gave sociability as the chief reason can be due to feelings of isolation and deprivation caused by the greater dispersion (e.g. "It is easier to be friendly with others when you are together" or "I like to work with other people") of the homesteads there. Feelings of the same kind may lie behind the greater frequency of answers indicating that hopes for personal gain were more widespread in Uhambule than in Ruiwa.

In an attempt to discover the villagers' basic attitude toward ujamaa vijijini, all interviewees were asked if they thought that all land should be held in common, or if private ownership should also be permitted. As is seen from Tab. 6.15, more than one-third of the non-members, but only one-fifth of the members in both villages, refused to answer the question (the differences are statistically significant at the .01 level). Some of these refusals were, in all likelihood, due to genuine ignorance (cf. below, p. 81), but some were certainly caused by a feeling that it was inopportune to voice disapproval of the official policy. If we add the proportion of those who refused to answer the question to those who felt that there should be only private land, we find that they formed the largest group among the non-members and that they were more numerous than those who wanted private ownership to continue even if common ownership was introduced.
Tab. 6.15 - Opinions concerning ownership of land, by membership in ujamaa and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion concerning ownership of land:</th>
<th>Ruwa member</th>
<th>Ruwa not member</th>
<th>Uhembule member</th>
<th>Uhembule not member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all land should be held in common</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there should be both common and private land</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there should be only private holdings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ong the members, those who felt the same way formed a majority in both lages, and only a minority felt that private ownership should be comple-
y abolished.

Tab. 6.16 - Answers to the question "Should R/U be made into one or several ujamaa villages?", by membership in ujamaa and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R/U should be made into</th>
<th>Ruwa members</th>
<th>Ruwa non-members</th>
<th>Uhembule members</th>
<th>Uhembule non-members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one village only</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>several villages</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it does not matter which</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there should be no ujamaa at all</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 6.17 - Answers to the question: "Should R/U be made into one or several ujamaa villages", by ethnic group of husband and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>One village</th>
<th>Several villages</th>
<th>Does not matter</th>
<th>No ujamaa at all</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUTWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa (152)</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu (30)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali (8)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safwa (10)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kionga (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bena (5)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe (6)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (47)</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (264)</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UHAMBULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>One village</th>
<th>Several villages</th>
<th>Does not matter</th>
<th>No ujamaa at all</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa (212)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu (69)</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali (38)</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safwa (18)</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kionga (20)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bena (18)</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe (3)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (39)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (203)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interviewees' opinions about how ujamaa vijijini should be implemented in their villages were divided in a similar fashion (Tab. 6.16). Among those who had already joined one of the existing ujamaa enterprises, the largest group consisted of people who supported the present set-up, but they did not form a majority. For in both Ruiwa and Uhambule there were substantial groups of people who either had not yet made up their minds or who preferred to have the village in which they lived organised as only one ujamaa village. Among the non-members, the pattern was, by and large, the same, save that the proportion of "don't-know" answers was significantly greater than among the members. In neither of the villages were the opinions divided according to the respondents' ethnic background (Tab. 6.17).

Tab. 6.18 - Answers to the question "Should R/U be made into one or several ujamaa villages?" by opinions concerning ownership of land and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R/U should be made into:</th>
<th>Only common land</th>
<th>Both private and common land</th>
<th>Only private land</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RUIWA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one village</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>several villages</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not matter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no ujamaa at all</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UHAMBULE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one village</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>several villages</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not matter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no ujamaa at all</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we then cross-tabulate the answers to the question about landownership with the answers to the question about how many ujamaa villages there should be (Tab. 6.18), we find that it was mainly the same people who refused to answer both questions. This may mean that the majority of those who refused to answer the first question did so because they actually did not know what to say, and not because they were afraid to stick their necks out by telling us what they really felt. Consequently, my guess (on p.79 above) of the strength of the opposition to common ownership was probably exaggerated.

The same table shows further that the group which was by far the largest in each village consisted of people who accepted common ownership of land, if private ownership of some land was also permitted, and who wanted the futu
maaa villages to be fairly small units, i.e., smaller than the ones in which they now lived. In Tab. 6.19 A-H I have cross-tabulated the respondents' attitudes to common ownership of land with a number of variables which may affect them.

6.19 - Opinions concerning ownership of land, by rice and maize acreages, type of farmer, harvest yields, attempts to get more land, husband's membership in TANU, ethnic group, and religion, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA:</th>
<th>Only common land</th>
<th>Both private and common land</th>
<th>Only private land</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Did you harvest enough for your family's needs?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes (184)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no (58)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has tried to get more land (55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has not tried to get more land (75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of farmer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landless (39)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre (75)</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre (60)</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre (36)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre (29)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice acreage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none (59)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1.0 acres (20)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.9 acres (75)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.9 &quot;-&quot; (57)</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9 &quot;-&quot; (20)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9 &quot;-&quot; (25)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0-5.9 &quot;-&quot; (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 or more acres (8)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize acreage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none (81)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1.0 acres (50)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.9 acres (77)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-2.9 &quot;-&quot; (41)</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9 &quot;-&quot; (10)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9 &quot;-&quot; (7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 or more acres (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband joined TANU before 1956 (111)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 of later (52)</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not member (106)</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's religion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional (113)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim (65)</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian (82)</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group of husband:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa (149)</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu (30)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab. 6.19 Continued</td>
<td>Only common land</td>
<td>Both private and common land</td>
<td>Only private land</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UHAMBULE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Did you harvest enough for your family's needs?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes (305)</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no (92)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has tried to get more land (110)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has not tried to get more land (106)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of farmer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landless (52)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre (117)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre (143)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre (68)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre (52)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice acreage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none (81)</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1.0 acres (16)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.9 acres (141)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.9 -&quot;- (81)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9 -&quot;- (55)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9 -&quot;- (26)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0-5.9 -&quot;- (14)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0-6.9 -&quot;- (7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 or more acres (17)</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize acreage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none (176)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1.0 acres (62)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.9 acres (122)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.9 -&quot;- (46)</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9 -&quot;- (19)</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9 -&quot;- (8)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 or more acres (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband joined TANU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 1966 (152)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 or later (167)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not member (119)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's religion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional (235)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim (31)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian (155)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group of husband:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa (201)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu (69)</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But as can be seen, they reveal no easily interpreted systematic differences. The most striking detail is that in both villages there are statistically significantly more people who want all land to be held in common among those who said that they had harvested enough for their families' needs, while there are more spokesmen for private ownership among those who did not harvest enough. Judged in the light of the fact that there are quite a few
Opponents of common ownership among those who own much land (both rice and size fields), and a substantial proportion of people who want private ownership only among the landless and the less well endowed, this observation indicates that many of the poorest farmers do not regard collective farming as a remedy, but instead think that re-distribution of privately held land will help them to improve their lot. This conclusion is to some extent supported also by the observation that in Ruwiwa (but not in Uhambule) there are more people wanting all land to be held in common among those who have tried to get more land than among those who have not tried. Because collectivisation of land is one of the most important tenets of TANU's political program, we are entitled to expect that most members of TANU should speak up for collective ownership, but, strange as it may sound, this is not the case. Instead, there are more people wanting all land to be private among the TANU members than among the non-members but, on the other hand, significantly more members than non-members have answered the question. This I judge to be an important fact, as it probably indicates that the members are more aware of the land question than the non-members. But the not insubstantial proportion of "don't-know" answers given by the TANU members may mean that there are still more proponents of private ownership among the members than is shown in col. 3 of the table, as the members probably are more reluctant than the non-members to voice their preference for private ownership.

In an attempt to check how firm the interviewees' attitudes toward ujamaa iójinini were, we also asked a semi-projective question:"Do you think that everybody in R/U will join an ujamaa village?". In Tab. 6.20 the answers to it are broken down by the respondents' attitudes toward private vs. common ownership of land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is everybody going to join me ujamaa village?</th>
<th>Only common land</th>
<th>Both private and common land</th>
<th>Only private land</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified yes</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtful yes</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified don't know</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified don't know</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBULE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified yes</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtful yes</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified don't know</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified don't know</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen, there is weak positive association between preference for
common ownership and belief in the villagers' willingness to join ujamaa,
which association is more marked in Ruiwa than in Uhambule.

Tab. 6.21 - Answers to the question "Is everybody here in R/U going to join
some ujamaa village", by membership in TANU and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruiwa before 1968</th>
<th>1968 later</th>
<th>Husband joined TANU before 1968</th>
<th>1968 later</th>
<th>not member before 1968</th>
<th>1968 later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unqualified yes</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doubtful yes</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualified don't know</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unqualified don't know</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.1 100.0 100.1 99.9 99.9 100.0

n 107 52 92 144 150 109

Chi square = 13.23, d.f. = 8, p < .01

Chi square = 9.99, d.f. = 8, p < .01

Cross-tabulating the same question with membership in TANU (Tab. 6.21) we
find, in both villages, a statistically significant co-variation between the
variables: the TANU members voiced a stronger belief in the villagers'
willingness to join than did the non-members.

The interviewees were also asked to give reasons for why they prefer
one type of ownership to the other, but only 64% of the villagers in Ruiwa
and 59% of the interviewees in Uhambule responded to our request.

Tab. 6.22 - Opinions concerning ownership of land, by type of reasons given
and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of reasons given:</th>
<th>Only common land</th>
<th>Both private and common land</th>
<th>Only private land</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td>RUIWA</td>
<td>UHAMBULE</td>
<td>UHAMBULE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for common ownership</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasons for both common and private ownership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasons for private ownership</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evasive answers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

n 39 118 12 6

UHAMBULE

Reasons for common ownership | 95.0 | 3.4 | 6.1 | - |
| reasons for both common and private ownership | 5.0 | 25.8 | 15.2 | 25.0 |
| reasons for private ownership | - | 66.3 | 72.7 | 25.0 |
| evasive answers | - | 4.5 | 6.1 | 50.0 |

Total 100.0 100.0 100.1 100.0

n 40 178 33 8
As can be seen from a comparison between Tab. 6.15 or 6.16 with Tab. 6.22, many of those who had said that they preferred one type of ownership nevertheless gave reasons for what they felt concerning both. Unlike the reasons which the villagers gave concerning joining an ujamaa village, the reasons which they stated as motivating their preference of one type of land ownership were quite varied and rather difficult to code. Answers given by at least ten persons are tabulated in Tab. 6.23. As can be seen, the tabulated answers about reasons for preferring mixed ownership, i.e., both common land and private holdings, are in fact clearly in favour of private ownership, and this attitude appears more strongly still from the complete list of answers.

Tab. 6.23 - Reasons given for different types of landownership, by village, abs. numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for common ownership:</th>
<th>Ruwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- That 'is the way the government/party wants it</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Because the government/authorities are pushing/forcing/telling us to join</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for both common and private ownership:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Some like ujamaa, some don't</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Private holdings provide you with food, common holdings with cash</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many people will regret/resist giving up their private shambas. Therefore both kinds should be allowed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for private ownership:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- If the harvest is bad/the rains fail it is easier to manage if you have your own shamba</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- You are better off when you cultivate your own crops/land</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Because only few people are in favour of ujamaa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is easier for you to help your relatives/friends/guests with food if you have your own shamba</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- When you have your own shamba, you can decide yourself what to cultivate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Because you cannot rely on ujamaa, you need your own shamba</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To have a private farm/shamba is to help/to feed your children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- You need not ask permission to use your own crop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evasive answers:
- I think it's better | 5 | 8 |

The general picture which emerges from these answers is that the majority of respondents are not particularly enthusiastic about collective farming, but accept ujamaa because it is the country's accepted policy, and they are not unwilling to join ujamaa if they are allowed to keep at least a part of their privately owned shambas. Some answers (e.g. "We are not yet ready for ujamaa", "Because people do not understand ujamaa") show that the doubts which the villagers have about ujamaa may be due more to lack of information about the idea than to doubts of its viability.
Tab. 6.24 - Proportion respondents giving reasons for how many ujamaa villages there should be in R/U, by opinions concerning landownership and village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for one village</th>
<th>Common land only</th>
<th>Both common and private land</th>
<th>Private land only</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a similar fashion the question about how many ujamaa villages there should be in their home villages was followed by a question in which the respondents were asked to state their reasons for preferring one or several ujamaa villages. As is shown by Tab. 6.24, in both villages there were significantly more people who wanted one village among those who preferred common ownership of land, while those who also wanted to maintain private ownership preferred to have several villages. Like the answers to this question about reasons for private vs. common ownership, the answers to this question were quite varied and difficult to code. In Tab. 6.25 the answers given by more than ten people are tabulated.

Tab. 6.25 - Reasons given for how many ujamaa villages there should be in R/U, by village, abs. numbers.

Reasons for one village only:

- Unity is strength/it is good to work together
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 16
  - 8
- One village makes it easier for people to see the advantages of ujamaa vijiini
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 7
  - 7
- It is easier to get one village going properly
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 11
  - 8
- One village will reduce the risk of misunderstandings
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 4
  - 8
- Because so far only a few people have joined
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 3
  - 8
- Because the authorities/TANU have told us that they will allow only one village here
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 2
  - 7

Reasons for several villages:

- It will be easier for people to join if they have several villages among which they can choose
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 14
  - 8
- If we have many villages, there will be competition among them and that will aid progress
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 7
  - 5
- Because we are so mixed with respect to tribe/religion/customs/temperament that there will be much disagreement if we have only one village
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 3
  - 8
- Because it is so much easier for people in a small village to agree
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 15
  - 30
- Because administration will be easier
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 3
  - 9
- Because we cannot all be together
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - -
  - 11
- Because we are many people here
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 1
  - 10

Evasive answers:

- Because I think that is best
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 7
  - 8
- We do not want any ujamaa at all
  - Ruwaa
  - Uhambule
  - 7
  - 5
The main argument for one village only was variations on the theme "It is difficult to organise several villages because there are not enough trained organizers, and the common people have no experience and cannot run such an enterprise". The main arguments in favour of several villages were, firstly, that administration will be easier and more efficient in small units and, secondly, that the diversity of the people makes co-operation within large units impossible.

ab. 6.26 - Proportion respondents giving reasons for how many ujamaa villages there should be in R/U, by husband's membership in TANU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruiwa Husband joined TANU</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>before 1968</td>
<td>1968 or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasons for one village</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasons for several villages</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive answers</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the answers to this question are broken down by the respondent's membership in TANU (Tab. 6.26), literacy, and religion, no significant differences appear, although it seems reasonable to expect the TANU members to be more in favour of one village and the non-members of several.

Let us then return to the questions about help received with hoeing and plowing and see if those who had received help - whom we may regard as the more co-operative farmers - held more favourable attitudes to ujamaa vijijini than those who had received no help. According to Tab. 2.27, the only noteworthy differences are found in Ruiwa, where there are more members of an ujamaa village among those who had received help than among those who claimed to have received no help. Similarly, those in Ruiwa who had received help were more confident that all villagers would some day join an ujamaa village than were their neighbours who had received no help. No such differences were found in Uhambule.
Tab. 6.27 - Proportion farmers who said that they had received help with hoeing and/or planting, by various attitudes to collective farming, by village, per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hoeing help</th>
<th>Hoeing no help</th>
<th>Planting help</th>
<th>Planting no help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RUIWA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Ujamaa-member</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. “Is everybody going to join some ujamaa village?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unqualified yes</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doubtless yes</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualified don't know</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unqualified don't know</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Opinion about ownership of land:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only common ownership</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both common and private ownership</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only private ownership</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. “Should there be one or several ujamaa villages in R/U?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>several</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no ujamaa at all</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |             |                |               |                  |
| **UHAMBULE**     |             |                |               |                  |
| A. Ujamaa member | 16.3        | 19.3           | 26.5          | 25.4             |
|                  | 83.7        | 80.7           | 73.5          | 74.6             |
| B. “Is everybody going to join some ujamaa village?” |             |                |               |                  |
| unqualified yes  | 21.2        | 20.5           | 17.1          | 17.5             |
| doubtless yes    | 18.6        | 17.9           | 15.2          | 15.6             |
| qualified don't know | 25.2  | 29.5           | 23.7          | 23.2             |
| qualified don't know | 24.7 | 21.6           | 33.1          | 35.8             |
| no               | 7.0         | 10.2           | 10.9          | 9.9              |
| C. Opinion about ownership of land: |             |                |               |                  |
| only common ownership | 7.6   | 8.4            | 13.6          | 13.2             |
| both common and private ownership | 60.9 | 66.3           | 41.6          | 40.4             |
| only private ownership | 6.5   | 6.0            | 10.4          | 10.5             |
| NI               | 25.0        | 19.3           | 34.4          | 35.9             |
| D. “Should there be one or several ujamaa villages here in R/U?” |             |                |               |                  |
| one              | 17.8        | 16.9           | 21.5          | 21.3             |
| several         | 53.3        | 60.2           | 36.2          | 34.5             |
| no ujamaa at all | -           | -              | 2.5           | 2.4              |
| NI               | 28.9        | 22.9           | 39.8          | 41.8             |
7. The office holders

All interviewees were asked if they, during their life-times, had held office of some kind. The answers, which are tabulated in Tab. 7.1, show that none household head out of ten had held some kind of office, mostly that of en-cell leader. Since some ten-cell leaders are also members of the Ward (formerly Village) Development Committee (Ingle 1972, 146 f), these people are simultaneously party officials and municipal councillors of a sort. As one of the duties of the WDC is to control the allocation of land, the en-cell leaders may be instrumental in shaping the land-holding pattern of their communities.

Tab. 7.1 - All household heads: offices held, by village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office held</th>
<th>Ruifu</th>
<th></th>
<th>Umhbulu</th>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten-cell leader</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member of VDC or WDC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer in TANU local</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer in co-operative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;mzee wa kijiji&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jumbe zamani&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total who have held office</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have held no office</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TANU ten-house cell system was formally adopted by the Party National Conference of 1965. Its aim is to

"provide a framework 'whereby the people will have a better opportunity to participate in the running of the day-to-day affairs of the nation' (Klerrruu 1966). They would facilitate two-way communication of people's views and opinions to TANU and its Government, and of the nation's policies to the people. By extending leadership to the village level, leaders would be more accessible to ordinary people, and would have easy access to 'all sorts of information regarding social and economic development' (Klerrruu 1966). The cells would provide the organisation for mobilising people to carry out the many development programmes which were now Tanzania's main concern. They would provide an accurate assessment of the Party's strength, since cell leaders would be required to keep membership records and collect Party dues. Finally, the cell system would help to enforce law and order - specified originally in Dar es Salaam as helping the City Council in its campaign against 'hooliganism, idleness, lawlessness and delinquency' (Klerrruu 1966)" (Levine 1972, 329).

In their studies of how the ten-cell system works, Proctor (1971) and Levine (1972) have shown that there have been great local variations in the election of ten-cell leaders. In many communities, the leaders were elected among the traditional local influentials; but in some places these traditional leaders "have not stood for election, considering the position beneath their 'ignity or not rewarding enough" (Levine 1972, 332). According to Tab. 7.2,
both Ruiwa and Uhambule seem to have followed the former pattern, the wealthier landowners being clearly over-represented among the ten-cell leaders.

Tab. 7.2 - All household heads: proportion which has held administrative or party office, by type of farmer and village, abs. numbers and per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of farmer:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-acre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-acre</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-acre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-acre</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The heavy over-representation, among the office holders, of farmers with holdings in the uppermost quintile led me to investigate systematically whether they differed, in other respects as well, from those who had held no office. The results are summarized in Tab. 7.3, which shows that the office holders were better off than the common people on almost all counts, and that most of the observed differences are statistically highly significant. It can therefore be safely maintained that the formal leaders of both communities were established men of some substance.
**ab. 7.3 - Comparison between those who have held office and those who have not, with respect to selected variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Has held office</th>
<th>Has held no office</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent giving estimates of their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice harvests in 1969</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maize harvests in 1969</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent stating that they sold a part of their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice harvest in 1969</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent of growers who sold a part of their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice harvest in 1969</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice bags/grower harvested in 1969</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice bags/grower sold in 1969</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize bags/grower harvested in 1969</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people in the respondent's household:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six to ten</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven or more</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square 10.95; d.f. = 6; p &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bags of rice harvested per capita 1971</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bags of maize harvested per capita 1971</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent owning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrist watch</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plow</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxen</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cows</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house of wood, grass roof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot;- mud, &quot;-&quot;</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot;- mud bricks, grass roof</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot;- mud, iron roof</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot;- mud bricks, iron roof</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&quot;-</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab. 7.3 Continued

B1. Husband, year of arrival in R/U

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born in present home village</th>
<th>24.7</th>
<th>16.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955 or earlier</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-1961</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-1965</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1968</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 100.0  100.0

Chi square = 33.25; d.f. = 6; p < .01

B2. Husband, age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 20 years</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>3.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 100.0  100.0

Chi square = 33.65; d.f. = 6; p < .01

B3. Respondent wants more land and has tried to get more land, with success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-&quot;&quot; without success</th>
<th>11.3</th>
<th>12.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total wanting more land: 68.9  70.0

Not wanting more land: 27.5  24.4

NI: 3.8  5.7

Grand total: 100.0  100.0

Chi square = 2.39; d.f. = 4; p < .10

B4. Ethnic group of husband:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nyakyusa</th>
<th>46.3</th>
<th>53.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sangu</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndali</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safwa</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bena</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahe</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 100.0  99.9

Chi square = 17.73; d.f. = 7; p < .01

B5. Husband joined TANU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before 1968</th>
<th>57.5</th>
<th>34.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968 or later</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not member</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 100.1  99.9

Chi square = 21.45; d.f. = 2; p < .01
6. Religion of husband:
   traditional 48.8  51.1
   Muslim    22.5  13.0
   Christian 28.8  35.9

Total 100.1 100.0

Chi square = 5.56; d.f. = 2;  p < .05

7. Husband literate 67.5  46.5
   Senior or sole wife literate 20.0  13.9
   Second wife literate   6.3   1.6

11. Number of wives:
    none 1.3  20.0
    one  54.5  64.8
    two  28.6  12.3
    three 3.9  2.4
   four or more 11.7  0.5

Total 100.0 100.0

Chi square = 74.17; d.f. = 4;  p < .01

12. Average number of children
   born to senior or sole wife 4.76  3.13
      still alive    3.67  2.66
   born to second wife 3.39  2.20
      still alive   2.58  2.14

13. Senior or sole wife joined TANU
    before 1966 22.5  8.4
    1966 or later 25.0  14.3
    not member 52.5  77.3

Total 100.0 100.0

Chi square = 25.08; d.f. = 2;  p < .01

14. Second wife joined TANU
    before 1966 6.3  1.3
    1966 or later 10.0  2.3
    not member 83.8  96.4

Total 100.1 100.0

Chi square = 23.92; d.f. = 2;  p < .01

15. Husband has relatives in R/U 63.8  59.9
    Wife has relatives in R/U 32.5  23.7

16. Husband has many friends in R/U
    - " - some   - " -
    - " - no    - " -
    - " - none  - " -
    NI 2.5  3.1

Total 100.1 100.0

Chi square = 2.83; d.f. = 3;  p < .10
Tab. 7.3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C7.</th>
<th>Respondent received help with hoeing</th>
<th>37.2</th>
<th>22.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;-&quot;- &quot;-&quot;- &quot;-&quot;- planting</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1.</th>
<th>Husband is ujamaa member</th>
<th>36.3</th>
<th>20.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;-&quot;- intends to join specified ujamaa village</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;-&quot;- &quot;-&quot;- unspecified &quot;-&quot;- &quot;-&quot;- has no plans to join</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                    100.1 | 100.1

Chi square = 12.10; d.f. = 3; p < .01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D2.</th>
<th>&quot;Is everybody going to join some ujamaa village?&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unqualified yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>doubtful yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qualified don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unqualified don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                    99.9 | 99.9

Chi square = 14.74; d.f. = 4; p < .01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D3.</th>
<th>Opinions concerning ownership of land:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all land should be held in common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>there should be both common and private land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>there should be only private land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                    100.1 | 100.0

Chi square = 12.88; d.f. = 3; p < .01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D4.</th>
<th>R/U should be made into:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one ujamaa village only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>several ujamaa villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>does not matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>there should be no ujamaa at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                    100.1 | 100.0

Chi square = 10.95; d.f. = 3; p < .01

With $n_1 = 80$ and $n_2 = 817$, all differences of 10 percentage points or more are statistically significant beyond the .10 level.
8. Conclusions

One purpose of this study was to map the system of landholding in the Usangu Plain; and another, more important aim was to find out whether the recent increase in cash crop farming had led to the emergence of an entrepreneurial class of landowners. A third objective was to investigate whether factors could be discerned that seemed to aid progress in Usangu, factors which could be isolated through comparisons of two communities representing different stages of progress. Although all three problems are important, the land is certainly of greatest political significance, as such an entrepreneurial class is deemed to be a major obstacle to the transformation of Tanzania into a socialist state (cf. Nyerere 1968, Shivji 1972).

Insofar as my data are reliable (for a discussion of their reliability, see pp. 5 ff), there can be little doubt that land is fairly equally distributed among the farmers of Usangu. One farmer out of six had more than six and a half acres; the same proportion had no land at all in R/U; and there was a certain tendency to co-variation between household size and acreage. Thus, two-thirds of the villagers were smallholders and, with one or two exceptions, farms in R/U were family enterprises. As far as I was able to ascertain, there were no absentee landowners, and most of those few who claimed to own land outside R/U either cultivated these shambas themselves or let their wives or children do it.

According to the interviewees, there were only a few instances in which land was leased, and purchase of land was virtually unknown. It can thus be fairly maintained that land has no commercial value in Usangu. This conclusion is supported by the observation that none of those who said that they wanted more land, and told us that they had made attempts to acquire additional land, even hinted that they had tried to buy land.

Because my data on the harvest yields are far from reliable, it has not been possible to judge to what extent individual farmers relied on subsistence farming for their livelihood, and to what extent they were dependent on cash cropping. However, at least two-thirds of all farmers were engaged to some extent in the cash-crop economy; but for the majority, subsistence farming nevertheless seems to have been more important than cash cropping.

Although the differences with respect to holding size were small in absolute terms, they seem not to have been entirely without significance. There is no doubt that those who held positions of formal authority more often than not came from the wealthiest stratum, so that wealth and local political power were held in the same hands. I cannot, however, tell to what extent this means that the wealthier farmers actively have tried to
monopolize influence, and to what extent it reflects a propensity among the villagers to accord formal authority to those who have proved themselves capable in other pursuits. In my opinion, the latter interpretation is more likely to be true, for the following reason: Most of those whom I have classified as office holders were, or had been, ten-cell leaders. The ten-cell system is so new that there has yet been little turn-over in the cadre of ten-cell leaders. Thus, only a few people have, so far, had a chance to serve as ten-cell leaders; and it is much more probable that those who were elected to this office when the system was first introduced were drawn from the group of elderly, long established farmers than from that of young, recent immigrants. Moreover, such an outcome seems to me to be especially probable in a situation like the one in Ruiwa and Uhambule, where a considerable part of the population is migratory and therefore lacks opportunities both to know each other well enough to find out who would make a good ten-cell leader, and to develop the degree of cohesiveness which is needed to challenge the authority of the established settlers.

An authority pattern like the one described above is often deemed to be conservative; and it has been maintained that much of the opposition to the ujamaa policy in Tanzania comes from the wealthier landowners (cf. Shivji 1972). Neither assertion seems, however, to be valid with respect to Ruiwa and Uhambule; for, as Tab. 7.3 shows, the office holders were clearly more in favour of the official policy than those who had held no office.

This finding, like the ones summarized in Tabs. 6.9-13, should not uncritically be taken at its face value, for it is quite possible that many of the interviewees were not sincere when answering our question about ujamaa. After all, we, the interviewers, came from the University and were there on Government and Party business. This may easily have led many respondents to feel inhibited about voicing their doubts about the official policy and to prefer to pay lip service to it. Moreover, all my students reported that they encountered much suspicion and many misconceptions about ujamaa during the barazas which usually followed an interview session with the members of a ten-cell (cf. above, p.5 f); and some of them expressed deep concern, in the reports which they wrote about their field experiences, about the ignorance and criticism of ujamaa which they encountered at these barazas. I do not doubt the basic accuracy of these reports, but what they wrote need not mean that the opposition came mainly from the wealthier farmers or the office holders. On the contrary, it seems as if those least in favour of ujamaa were those with little land (see pp. 75 and 84 above). If these people were the most vocal ones at the "after-interview barazas", it is not
surprising if the interviewers got an one-sided and somewhat exaggerated picture of the villagers’ opposition to collectivization. Therefore I am inclined to accept as valid the finding that the better-off, the older, and the more literate farmers, as well as the office holders, were more in sympathy with the Party’s policy than were the poorer, the younger, and the illiterate farmers.

With the scant data I have at my disposal, it is idle to speculate about what may have caused this distribution of attitudes; but I cannot suppress the suspicion that some of the better-off and the literate farmers who declared themselves in favour of ujamaa did so in the hope and belief that they would be able to manipulate the new system in a way which would be advantageous to them, like some of the “proto-cadres” and “proto-kulaks” described by von Freyhold (1972:1, 10 ff). Obviously such a situation would not be particularly desirable, either on political or on moral grounds. It is certainly in conflict with socialist ethics. But if one takes the hard, pragmatic view that a rapid change from individual to collective farming is an overriding goal, then there is little reason to deplore such a state of affairs. It might be politically wise to let those who are influential in the community live under this illusion, if their support of the implementation of ujamaa could be gained thereby, and, if, at the same time, their self-seeking activities could be held in check so that no injustice should ensue.

When my study was still in the planning stage I thought that it might be possible to isolate some factors aiding progress by using a quasi-experimental design. Therefore I decided to select as research sites two villages which represented different stages on the road to progress. Relying in part on information and advice supplied by local experts, in part on my own (admittedly superficial) impressions, I eventually selected Ruiwa to represent the more, and Uhambule the less, developed villages of Usangu. My choice was mainly intuitive, because before I had to make it, I had neither the time nor the resources to collect the basic information necessary for really measuring the degree of development of the two villages. My main criteria for classifying Ruiwa as a more developed community than Uhambule were: the more closed settlement pattern; the seemingly better average quality of housing; access to piped water; the existence of a working ujamaa project and the greater progress made in planning additional ujamaa enterprises; the greater number of dukes and craftsmen; the presence in the village of a complete primary school, a dispensary, and several well-built houses of worship; and, in addition my entirely subjective impression that the people of Ruiwa were more “modern” than the people of Uhambule.

The checking of my assumption that Ruiwa was more developed than Uhambule
had to be left until the data had been collected and coded; and, as the reader has noticed from my consistent comparisons of Rulwe and Uhambule, the analysis was planned and executed with this in mind. However, the most conspicuous outcome of these comparisons is that there are very few and very minor differences between the two villages, with respect to either the variables which I had intended to use as independent variables or those that I had regarded as dependent. Therefore, although I still do think that Rulwe is, in some respects, a bit more modern than Uhambule, I cannot prove that it really is so, as no statistically significant differences have turned up with respect to those variables which usually are regarded as indicators of development. This may simply be due to the fact that my operationalizations of the variables which I intended to use in this capacity (literacy, possession of various commodities, farming practices) were not valid, i.e., that my measuring instrument was bad.

But it is, of course, also possible that my original assumption was wrong, i.e., that Rulwe is not more modern or more developed than Uhambule. The facts in favour of their being basically similar are that the two villages did not differ significantly with respect to any other variables either, and that whatever co-variation existed between diverse variables was of the same direction and magnitude in both villages.

This lack of co-variation clearly shows that I did not succeed in the third task which I had set for myself, i.e., to isolate factors which have aided progress in Usangu - be it because I had used wrong or badly operationalized variables, or because I had chosen my research sites unwisely.

Being myself trained in the positivistic tradition, which holds the formulation and testing of hypotheses to be the safest way to acquire valid knowledge about causal relationships, I was at first somewhat disappointed when no statistically significant differences turned up, and I asked myself "Is it worthwhile to publish such results?". However, as Carlsson (1958) and Sterling (1959) have pointed out, the heavy emphasis on hypothesis testing (and the frequently asserted corollary, that only conclusions validated by the outcomes of statistical significance tests are worth publishing) has some disadvantages, the chief ones being thus spelled out by Carlsson: "[An] important argument against the procedure in question...[is] its tendency to make sociologists neglect problems of description and estimation, the possibility that it leads to biased reporting in that some types of results are more seldom reported than other types; and the circumstance that it does not appear to be the method best adapted to convergence in sociological theory and research" (1958, 18). Dealing with the same problem on a more technical level, Sterling concludes, like Carlsson, that some types of results will rarely be published if this strategy is followed, and that, in addition, the
sk increases that Type I errors (i.e., that the null hypothesis will not rejected although it is false) will be published and never detected, cause results backed by significance tests rarely are checked by repli-
tion studies. Therefore, accepting Carlsson's and Sterling's arguments, I w feel no reluctance to publish my statistically non-significant comparisons tween Ruiwa and Uhambule, but regard them, instead, as positive contri-
tions to our knowledge of Usangu, as these findings of mine may save some ture student of the same area from looking for differences that do not ist.

Having thus seen that Ruiwa and Uhambule are very much alike, it would have been justified to pool the data from both villages and to subject the pooled data to a more penetrating multivariate analysis. However, the work one so far did not seem to warrant continuation of the analysis; and the replacement of the computer of the Abo Akademi by a new one, (which is occurring I write these lines) would have delayed the completion and publication of the report by several months. Therefore, refraining from further analysis, I ve decided to publish what I have found in the hope that my observations by be of some use to those who work for the development of Usangu.
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## APPENDIX A

**CHUO KIKUU CHA DAR ES SALAAM**

**IDARA YA ELIMU YA JAMII**

S.L.P. 35043, Dar es Salaam

**Tarehe**

**Jina**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Umi</th>
<th>Kabila</th>
<th>Mahali ulipozaliwa</th>
<th>Jumla ya watoto waliozaliwa</th>
<th>walio hai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mke 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mke 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mke 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mke 4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mke 5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46 Jumla ya watoto wanacishi na wazazi katika R/U:

### Watoto wengine: Mahali waishipo kwa wakati huu Kazi:

| Mtoto 1 | 48   | 50 |
| Mtoto 2 | 51   | 53 |
| Mtoto 3 | 54   | 56 |
| Mtoto 4 | 57   | 59 |
| Mtoto 5 | 60   | 62 |
| Mtoto 6 | 63   | 65 |

66 Umeleka R/U mwaka gani?

Kabla ya kufika hapa ulikuwa unaishi wapi?

Sehemu gani uliokuwa unaishi? | Mwaka gani? | Kazi gani uliokuwa ukiifanya kul

| 67 | 69 | 70 |
| 71 | 73 | 74 |
| 75 | 77 | 78 |
| 79 | 5  | 6  |
| 7  | 9  | 10 |

(11 Total number of places where lived:____)
Una mashamba binafsi hapa R/U? Ndiyo____ Hapana____
KAMA NDIYO: Mashamba mangapi unayoyalima kwa wakati huu?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mazao uliyopanda</th>
<th>Shamba 1</th>
<th>Shamba 2</th>
<th>Shamba 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 ____________</td>
<td>17 ______</td>
<td>21 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ekari</th>
<th>Shamba 4</th>
<th>Shamba 5</th>
<th>Shamba 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 ____________</td>
<td>18 ______</td>
<td>22 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mwaka wakupata shamba</th>
<th>Shamba 7</th>
<th>Shamba 8</th>
<th>Shamba 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 ____________</td>
<td>19 ______</td>
<td>23 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kwa namna gani ulilipata?</th>
<th>Shamba 10</th>
<th>Shamba 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 ____________</td>
<td>20 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shamba 12</th>
<th>Shamba 13</th>
<th>Shamba 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 ____________</td>
<td>29 ______</td>
<td>33 ______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ekari</th>
<th>Shamba 15</th>
<th>Shamba 16</th>
<th>Shamba 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 ____________</td>
<td>30 ______</td>
<td>34 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mwaka wakupata shamba</th>
<th>Shamba 18</th>
<th>Shamba 19</th>
<th>Shamba 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 ____________</td>
<td>31 ______</td>
<td>35 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kwa namna gani ulilipata?</th>
<th>Shamba 21</th>
<th>Shamba 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 ____________</td>
<td>32 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 Unalima mashamba yo yote mahali pengine? Ndiyo____ Hapana____
KAMA NDIYO: Shamba 1 Shamba 2 Shamba 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahali</th>
<th>Shamba 23</th>
<th>Shamba 24</th>
<th>Shamba 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 ____________</td>
<td>44 ______</td>
<td>50 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mazao uliyopanda</th>
<th>Shamba 26</th>
<th>Shamba 27</th>
<th>Shamba 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 ____________</td>
<td>46 ______</td>
<td>52 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ekari</th>
<th>Shamba 29</th>
<th>Shamba 30</th>
<th>Shamba 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 ____________</td>
<td>47 ______</td>
<td>53 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mwaka wakupata shamba</th>
<th>Shamba 32</th>
<th>Shamba 33</th>
<th>Shamba 34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 ____________</td>
<td>48 ______</td>
<td>54 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kwa namna gani ulilipata?</th>
<th>Shamba 35</th>
<th>Shamba 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 ____________</td>
<td>49 ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KAMA NDIYO: 56 Unalima mwenyewe____ au kuna mtu anakulimia____?
KAMA ANALIMA MWENYE: 57 Unakwenda mara ngapi kwa mwaka kuyalima?
KAMA MTU KWINGINE ANALIMA: 58 Nani anakulimia?

59 Unampa nini?
37 Mke wake ana mashamba yo yote hapa R/U au kokote? Ndiyo___ Hapana___

KAMA NDIYO:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shamba 1</th>
<th>Shamba 2</th>
<th>Shamba 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahali</td>
<td>60_______</td>
<td>66_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazao aliyopanda</td>
<td>62_______</td>
<td>68_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekari</td>
<td>63_______</td>
<td>69_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwaka ali-pata shamba</td>
<td>64_______</td>
<td>70_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwa namna gani alilipata?</td>
<td>65_______</td>
<td>71_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KAMA KOKOTE: 78 Analima mwenyewe___ au kuna mtu anamlimia___?

KAMA ANALIMA MWENYEWE: 79 Anakwenda mara ngapi kwa mwaka kuyalima?

KAMA MTU MWINGINE ANAMLIMIA: 80 Nani humlimia?

5 Anama nini?

6 Mwaka huu
7 Mwaka jana
8 Mwaka juzi

Umepeata magunia mangapi ya  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mpunga</th>
<th>Mahindi</th>
<th>Ulezi</th>
<th>Vitunguu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mwaka huu</td>
<td>9_______</td>
<td>12______</td>
<td>15_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwaka jana</td>
<td>10_______</td>
<td>13______</td>
<td>16_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwaka juzi</td>
<td>11_______</td>
<td>14______</td>
<td>17______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Ulivuna chakula cha kutosha kwa ajili yako na mahitaji ya jamaa yako?

Ndiyo___ Hapana___

22 Una maama kuwa unahitaji mashamba zaidi? Ndiyo___ Hapana___

23 Umewahi kupata mashamba zaidi kwa ajili ya kulima? Ndiyo___ Hapana___

KAMA NDIYO: 24-25 Kwa namna gani?

25 Ulifanikwa___ au hukufanikwa___?

Uliusa sehemu yo yote ya mavuno uliyopata? Ndiyo___ Hapana___

KAMA NDIYO: Uliusa magunia mangapi ya  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mpunga</th>
<th>Mahindi</th>
<th>Ulezi</th>
<th>Vitunguu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mwaka huu</td>
<td>26_______</td>
<td>29______</td>
<td>32_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwaka jana</td>
<td>27_______</td>
<td>30______</td>
<td>33_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwaka juzi</td>
<td>28_______</td>
<td>31______</td>
<td>34_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38 Udongo wa mashamba yako ukoje?
   1. Mazuri wote
   2. Mwingine mzuri, mwingine mzuri wa kawaida
   3. Mwingine mzuri, mwingine mbaya
   4. Mwingine mzuri, mwingine mzuri wa kawaida, mwingine mbaya
   5. Mzuri wa kawaida wote
   6. Mwingine mzuri wa kawaida, mwingine mbaya
   7. Mbaya wote

39 Unapata maji ya kutosha kwa mashamba yako yote ya mpunga?
   1. Ya kutosha kwa yote
   2. Ya kutosha kwa mengine, machache sana kwa mengine
   3. Machache sana kwa yote

40 Mashamba yako yako karibu?
   1. Yote yako karibu
   2. Mengine yako karibu, mengine yako mbali
   3. Yote yako mbali

Kuna ndugu yako aliyekusaidia katika shamba lako mwaka huu kwa:
jirani? mtu yeyote?
   41 Kulima? Nani? ___________________________ 42 Ulimpa nini? ___________________________
   43 Kupanda? ________________________________ 44 " ________________________________
   45 Kupalia? ________________________________ 46 " ________________________________
   47 Kuvuna? ________________________________ 48 " ________________________________
   49 Kutwanga? ______________________________ 50 " ________________________________
   51 Kupepeta? _______________________________ 52 " ________________________________

Je, wewe mwenyewe au mke wako alimsaidia ndugu katika mashamba yao mwaka huu kwa:
jirani? rafiki? mtu yeyote?
   55 Kupanda? ________________________________ 56 " ________________________________
   57 Kupalia? ________________________________ 58 " ________________________________
   59 Kuvuna? ________________________________ 60 " ________________________________
   61 Kutwanga? ______________________________ 62 " ________________________________
   63 Kupepeta? _______________________________ 64 " ________________________________

Jina

Undugu


Umwanachama katika kijiji cha ujamaa?

70 Ndiyo, wa________

Hapana, lakini nilikuwa wa________

KAMA HAPANA: Unafikiria kujiunga na kijiji cha ujamaa? Ndiyo________ Hapana________

KAMA NDIYO: 71 Kijiji kipi?

KAMA ULIKUWA MMOJAWAPO WA KIJIJI CHA UJAMAA:

72 Lini uliijuunga? Mwezi?________ Mwaka?________

Lini uliacha? Mwezi?________ Mwaka?________

73 Kwa nini uliijuunga?

74________

Kwa nini uliacha?

75 Ulifanya kazi sana katika shamba la ujamaa?

76 Kazi gani?
APPENDIX A

77 Wanachama wa kijiji cha ujamaa, wanafanya sehemu ya kazi yao vema?

78 Je, unafikiri kwamba kila mmoja katika R/U atajiunga na kijiji cha ujamaa?


5 Kwa nini unafikiri hivyo?

6

7

8

9 Unajua kwamba kuna vijiji vitatu/sita. Unafikiri kwamba itakuwa vizuri kuwa na vijiji vingi au itakuwa vizuri kuwa viungane kuwa kimoja tu?

1.Kimoja tu___ 2.Vingi___

10 Kwa nini unafikiri hivyo?

11

12

13

Umewahi kwenda shuleni? Kwa muda wa miaka mingapi? Unaweza kusoma? Kuandika?
Mke wako aliwahi kwenda shuleni? Kwa muda wa miaka mingapi? Anaweza kusoma? Kuandika?
Wewe ni mwanachama wa TANU? Mke wako pia ni mwanachama wa TANU? Lini mlijiunga?
 Una dini gani? Mke wako ana dini gani?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miaka</th>
<th>Anaweza</th>
<th>Mwanachama</th>
<th>Lini ali-</th>
<th>Mune</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shuleni</td>
<td>kusoma</td>
<td>kwandika</td>
<td>wa TANU</td>
<td>jiunga</td>
<td>Dini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mke 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mke 2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mke 3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mke 4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mke 5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 Je, un. katika au ulikuwamo katika halmashauri - kumi-kumi, VDC, n.k.?
Unao 39 taa? Ngapi? 
40 stovu " 
41 redio " 
42 baisikeli " 
43 saa za mkono " 
44 cherehani, mashine ya kushona " 
45 jembe ulaya " 
46 mbuzi " 
47 kondoo " 
48 punda " 
49 ng’ombe wa kulima (kambaku) " 
50 " wa maziwa " 
51 trekta " 

Unaso nyumba ngapi? Nyumba ya miti 52 ____

Nyumba ya udongo: ya nyasi 53 ____ ya bati 54 ____
" matofali mabichi: ya nyasi 55 ____ ya bati 56 ____
" " ya kochomwa: ya nyasi 57 ____ ya bati 58 ____

59 Je, baada ya mke/wanawake wako na watoto wako, kuna watu wengine ambaa wanakaa katika nyumba yako/zako? Nani?

(60-61 Total number of people in household ____)
(62-63 Number of ten-cell ____)
(64-65 Serial number within ten-cell ____)
(66-67 Number of interviewer ____)

= = =
<p>| Ten- | Observed | Moved | Observed | Inter- | Number | Largest | Dominant |
| cell | in Sept. | in Dec. | viewed | ethnic | % of eth- | ethnic group | |
| number | census | in | | n | n | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| RUIWA | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 9 | - | 9 | 9 | 100 | 1 | 100 | Sangu |
| 2 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 10 | 77 | 1 | 100 | Sangu |
| 3 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 69 | 6 | 33 | Sangu |
| 4 | 10 | - | 1 | 9 | 78 | 6 | 33 | Sangu |
| 5 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 100 | 6 | 29 | Sangu |
| 6 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 7 | 70 | 5 | 25 | Sangu, Nyika |
| 7 | 30 | 3 | 33 | 23 | 70 | 4 | 88 | Nyakyusa |
| 8 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 2 | 80 | Nyakyusa |
| 9 | 16 | - | 1 | 15 | 11 | 73 | 3 | 82 | Nyakyusa |
| 10 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 12 | 92 | 2 | 75 | Nyakyusa |
| 11 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 12 | 80 | 5 | 42 | Nyakyusa |
| 12 | 30 | 2 | 4 | 28 | 19 | 68 | 4 | 79 | Nyakyusa |
| 13 | 27 | 6 | 6 | 33 | 19 | 58 | 4 | 83 | Nyakyusa |
| 14 | 15 | 2 | 17 | 14 | 82 | 2 | 93 | Nyakyusa |
| 15 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 11 | 85 | 2 | 91 | Nyakyusa |
| 16 | 15 | - | 1 | 14 | 11 | 79 | 4 | 73 | Nyakyusa |
| 17 | 12 | - | 12 | 6 | 50 | 2 | 67 | Nyakyusa |
| 18 | 16 | 3 | 2 | 17 | 13 | 77 | 6 | 39 | Sangu |
| 19 | 17 | 6 | 6 | 23 | 16 | 70 | 4 | 81 | Nyakyusa |
| 20 | 15 | 4 | 19 | 13 | 68 | 4 | 54 | Nyakyusa |
| 21 | 20 | 2 | 2 | 20 | 19 | 95 | 12 | 32 | Sangu |
| 22 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 13 | 87 | 2 | 85 | Nyakyusa |
| UHAMBULE | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 15 | 3 | - | 18 | 15 | 83 | 3 | 67 | Nyakyusa |
| 2 | 14 | 3 | - | 16 | 16 | 100 | 4 | 63 | Nyakyusa |
| 3 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 99 | 69 | 3 | 56 | Nyakyusa |
| 4 | 13 | - | 13 | 11 | 85 | 6 | 46 | Hehe |
| 5 | 20 | 6 | 1 | 27 | 21 | 78 | 4 | 86 | Nyakyusa |
| 6 | 18 | - | 14 | 14 | 100 | 3 | 79 | Nyakyusa |
| 7 | 16 | 1 | 16 | 16 | 100 | 7 | 3 | 69 | Nyakyusa |
| 8 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 30 | 24 | 80 | 6 | 48 | Nyakyusa |
| 9 | 13 | 1 | 13 | 9 | 69 | 4 | 56 | Nyakyusa |
| 10 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 80 | 2 | 88 | Sangu |
| 11 | 24 | 5 | 3 | 26 | 18 | 69 | 6 | 67 | Nyakyusa |
| 12 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 19 | 19 | 100 | 5 | 53 | Nyakyusa |
| 13 | 12 | - | 12 | 11 | 92 | 3 | 82 | Nyakyusa |
| 14 | 11 | 2 | - | 13 | 12 | 92 | 4 | 58 | Nyakyusa |
| 15 | 14 | 2 | - | 16 | 11 | 69 | 6 | 46 | Nyakyusa |
| 16 | 16 | 5 | 4 | 17 | 13 | 76 | 4 | 46 | Nyakyusa |
| 17 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 14 | 93 | 5 | 64 | Nyakyusa |
| 18 | 14 | - | - | 15 | 14 | 93 | 5 | 57 | Nyakyusa |
| 19 | 11 | - | - | 10 | 8 | 80 | 1 | 100 | Nyakyusa |
| 20 | 13 | 2 | - | 15 | 13 | 87 | 3 | 77 | Sangu |
| 21 | 16 | 4 | 2 | 16 | 18 | 100 | 8 | 28 | Sangu, Ndali |
| 22 | 12 | - | - | 12 | 7 | 58 | 4 | 43 | Sangu |
| 23 | 12 | - | - | 12 | 9 | 75 | 3 | 78 | Sangu |
| 24 | 26 | 3 | 1 | 26 | 20 | 71 | 7 | 65 | Nyakyusa |
| 25 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 8 | 57 | 3 | 63 | Ndali |
| 26 | 14 | 2 | - | 16 | 12 | 75 | 1 | 100 | Ndali |
| 27 | 17 | 1 | - | 18 | 12 | 67 | 4 | 67 | Nyakyusa |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group:</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th></th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beluchi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bemba</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bena</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fipa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gogo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorowa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guluwa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hehe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimbu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luguru</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malila</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manyema</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndaii</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngindo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngoni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakyusa</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyamwanga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyamwasi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyatura</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyika</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangwa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safwa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandawe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukuma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukwa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simbwa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanji</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaramo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Per cent, Landless</th>
<th>Ruiwa</th>
<th>Uhambule</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 272  | 436   | 710 | 99.9 | 100.0 | 99.8 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Fig. 2 A - Number of persons/household, by age of husband and village, abs. numbers.

Fig. 2 B - Number of children born and still alive, by village, abs. numbers.

Fig. 2 C - Number of children born by number still alive, Ruiwa, abs. numbers.
Fig. 2 D - Number of children born by number still alive, Uhambule, abs. numbers.

Fig. 2 E - Number of children living with their parents, by age of husband and village, abs. numbers.

Fig. 3 A - Persons/household and children living with their parents, by type of farmer, abs. numbers.
Fig 3 B - Acres per person, by number of persons in the household, crop and village.
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Fig. 4 A - Proportion respondents expressing opinions about their rice harvests, per cent.
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Fig. 4 B - Proportion respondents expressing opinions about their maize harvests per cent.
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Fig. 4 C - Bags of rice harvested 1969-71, by village.
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Fig. 4 D - Bags of rice harvested per capita 1969-71, by number of persons in the household and village.
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Fig. 4 E - Bags of maize harvested per capita 1969-71, by number of persons in the household and village.
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Fig. 4 F - Bags of rice harvested per acre 1969-71, by acreage under rice and village.
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