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ABSTRACT

An overview of literature was used to arrive at a broader understanding of the one-parent family in an as yet predominantly two-parent society and to provide some base for comparison to evaluate the findings of an exploratory, descriptive case study of 70 middle-class, white South African lone-parents, all members of two single-parent associations. Respondents included 14 non-custodial parents. All were interviewed by the researcher using a structured, open-ended questionnaire and anecdotal data sheets. Replies to the questionnaire were recorded on data processing coding sheets, tailored to the computer programme requirements of CROSTAB 2 of the Academic Computer Center of Wisconsin University. Information was recorded of material, psychological and social situations of the universe, and included an investigation of the respondents' marital aspirations, their opinions concerning existing social services and divorce legislation and their suggestions for reforms. Information about their children's attitude and school performance was according to the assessment of the parents.

The overview reveals an absolute and percentage-wise increase in one-parent families (particularly with young children), mainly the product of divorce (the specific divorce rate has more than trebled in South Africa within the last half century) rather than death.

There is a consensus that lone-parenthood is a transient state, with marriage as the goal, largely due to societal pressure, for the divorced, the widowed and the unwed mother. Remarriage creates an increase in the number of stepchildren and stepparents as well as a new extended family not consanguinely related. While this may be confusing as no norms exist to guide such interfamilial relationships, it engenders possibilities for new or additional affections and loyalties.

It is agreed that the optimal environment for the child's development is an untroubled strife-free two parent home, but there is a consensus in recent research that it is not maternal or paternal deprivation per se, which causes stress in the child, but the turbulence and instability associated with or preceding the one-parent situation. The child is resilient and negative effects are generally healed within a year or two. Changing and merging parental roles due to economic and social changes and revised perceptions challenging the indispensability of the mother's nurturing role and emphasizing the quality of the bonding relationship, has, when custody is being granted, halted the automatic presumption that decisions must be based on the same sex and tender years doctrines. Associated with this is the changing attitude to access of the non-custodial parent to the child, with free access particularly being recommended as being in the child's best interest. In the researcher's universe 90% of the respondents had some degree of ongoing relationship with the child (even when there was none with the ex-spouse), the majority
maintaining frequent and regular contact. Divorce severed only the marriage and not the parental bond.

All the widowed and the majority by far of the divorced considered the separation as having been a crisis in their lives. Particularly interesting was that with most of the non-custodial parents, notwithstanding their ongoing relationships, the parting with the children was more traumatic than the parting with the ex-spouse. There were feelings of guilt, loneliness and discrimination with most respondents. There appeared to be a positive correlation between crisis and discrimination and loneliness and guilt and a negative correlation between feelings of guilt and the wish to remarry.

Overall the economic position of the universe had deteriorated, particularly that of the women, in spite of most of them working. There were considerable changes of employment and moving of home, generally to inferior conditions, as well as changing of schools; all these attributed by respondents to their single-parent situations. The almost universal desire to remarry was expressed in club membership, an increased incidence of going out, largely with new friends, and more frequent dating. The more tolerant societal attitudes to sex made it possible for a fifth of the universe to maintain relationships other than marriage (with most as a step to remarriage) with a partner of the opposite sex, all but one drawn from the single-parent's organization. Almost all the children, irrespective of age and sex, reacted positively to their parent's opposite sex friend while hardly any saw in them a surrogate for the absent parent.

Most of the respondents expressed a dissatisfaction with, and a wish for, improvement of the social-psychological position of lone-parents. They proffered ideas for reforms. The researcher suggested the use of the school and the single-parent organization as operative bases for disseminating knowledge about and improving the social and psychological position of lone-parents and their children, through the active involvement of them all.

As the use of numerous different terms to describe the one-parent situation is so confusing, it is suggested that existing terms be used more restrictively, each to define one specific concept only.
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It is important to remember that exploratory studies merely lead to insights or hypotheses; they do not test or demonstrate them.... Social research is not a deductive process in which everything follows from some clearly defined premises, it is a continuous search for truth, in which tentative answers lead to a refinement of the questions to which they apply and of the procedures by which they were obtained. (Sellitz, Jahoda, Deutch and Cook 1959:64)
1.1 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The researcher seeks through an overview of the literature and her own research to examine and arrive at a broader understanding of the one-parent family in an as yet predominantly two-parent society. The overview of literature will also be used as a base for comparison with the findings from the writer's own research.

The study is exploratory and descriptive and is a case study of 70 lone-parents who are members of two single-parent organizations in a South African city.

A purpose of the study is to examine how these lone-parents fulfil some of their parental roles and to determine which factors arising out of the state of lone-parenthood, or associated with it, affect their roles as parents, their children, and themselves as persons.

From the research of lone-parenthood, the writer will draw attention to some of the social implications, make some recommendations for community action and will postulate some hypotheses.

It is hoped that the findings and insights from this limited study will, particularly in South Africa, stimulate further research on specific aspects of lone-parenthood and one-parent families and assist in their assessment and understanding by society, members of the legal profession, legislators, social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists, and all who influence, formulate, and implement social policy.

1.2 RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

The nuclear family is generally regarded as the most important unit responsible for the physical, cultural, and social perpetuation of man and society of which he is a member.

In our Western society, our accepted norm is still that family is marriage and marriage is family. (Puxon 1963; S. N. Harris 1967; Hahlo 1975) According to Gibbs and Martin, (1964:14):

Marriage is the only approved social institution allowing for a high degree of intimacy between two people who are not blood kinsmen; to be status integrated from the age of twenty-five to senility is to be married.

Nevertheless, while the two-parent structure resulting from marriage is still the norm, and the form generally aspired to, there has been growing societal acceptance, and increased incidence of divorce, the one-parent family, remarriage, and deviant arrangements such as cohabitation as alternatives to marriage.

These phenomena, and their related problems, have, particularly over the last thirty years, been of increasing interest and concern to researchers. In South Africa, however, comparatively little research
has been conducted on lone-parenthood, relative to its incidence in the
country.

Divorce, in South Africa, as in other Western countries, has
replaced death as the main cause of the one-parent family. The specific
divorce rate in this country has increased by 320% between 1935 and 1976,
from 3.5 to 11.2 per 1,000. The introduction of a new divorce act in
South Africa allowing for divorce on irretrievable breakdown may lead to
an increased number of divorces, resulting in still more one-parent
families. Further research on lone-parenthood and its social implica-
tions in South Africa is therefore all the more pertinent.

This exploratory study is of necessity limited and the researcher
has restricted herself to a small universe of a White population in a
South African city.

1.3 PATTERNS AND CONCEPTIONS

The title of this thesis:

"One-Parent Families: Some Social Implications
of Lone-Parenthood"
encompasses a wide field involving social, emotional, and economic factors.

Unless some framework is constructed for research in this field
which will contain all the facets and through which some order can be
imposed, there is a danger of a conglomeration of unrelated data resulting.
Either conceptual patterns must be sought from data collected, or data must
be disciplined within defined conceptual parameters.

Whichever approach is used there must be some self-imposed
discipline to avoid chaos.

The complexity of a study dealing with the family can be gauged
by enumerating several of the components having a bearing on the family:-

(i) population composition and distribution
(ii) freedom of selection of mate
(iii) sexual norms and behaviour
(iv) sexual equality and inequality
(v) primary and secondary socialization
(vi) generation roles
(vii) functions of extended kin
(viii) family disorganization  (Tavuchis 1970:13)

Some of the concepts within which or against which research can be
evaluated are stated in this introductory section. While citing some
theories and concepts as possible frameworks, the writer does not, at this
stage, accept them all as being necessarily valid. Some may provide
exploratory guidelines, with a reservation that they may be but points of
departure for the explanation of forces moving developments in the history
of the family. Existing conceptions must not blind a researcher in the
search for new patterns, systems or conceptions. This research may
strengthen some existing hypotheses or inspire the generation of others. As frameworks of reference it may accept some basic concepts such as Goode's (1964:2) statement:

The family is the fundamental foundation of the larger social structure, in that all other institutions depend on its continuation.

Another complementary and parallel conception is the universally practised and accepted raison d'etre of the family as enunciated by Green (1968:352):

The primary universal function of the family is the creation of new members of society in order to perpetuate it. All other purposes of the family are subservient to this end. The creation of new members is a fourfold task - reproduction, maintenance, status ascription and socialization.

The basis of a family is the institution of marriage, which is still the unchallenged relationship 'in which a man and a woman are socially permitted, without a loss of standing in the community, to have children.' (Johnson 1961). In the last century, with increasing social mobility - residential, occupational and other - there has emerged very strongly a pattern of 'purely personal choice of marriage partner...' (Parsons 1949). A chosen degree of involvement between familial members and wider kin largely replaces a hitherto relationship of constraint and dependence (Fletcher 1970).

It is uncertain to what extent conditions which were the basis of the earlier family and which forced its cohesion upon its perhaps reluctant members are, either still present, or as relevant. Perhaps there is substance in Fain's contention that today it is quite feasible for males and females to succeed in life as well when they are single as when they are married and often a single parent can readily afford to raise children. (Fain 1977:33)

It must be examined whether, how and to what extent, the 'restricted conjugal family' (Green 1968:361), when further reduced, as it is with the lone-parent family, continues the functions of the family. The largely transient nature of lone-parenthood, together with the theories put forward by Erikson (1950), Bowlby (1951, 1953, 1958, 1969) and Rutter (1972) provide the basis for the view that the one-parent family is not a final condition. Wilson et al. (1975:528) refers to 'an ongoing process in a context of societal change.' Jetse Sprey (1975:56, 57) expresses it as follows:

It is the conceptualization of single-parenthood as an ongoing process that provides a frame of reference within which family process and its subsequent transformation into a single-parent one can be logically integrated. It is clear that within this scheme the possible remarriage of the single-parent, and thus the restoration of the intact family unit, also can be handled.
Whether marriage and family relationships are by choice or necessity, for society to perpetuate itself, relationships must be ongoing.

The writer, in conclusion, wishes to stress that this is an exploratory study suggesting possible areas for further research.

1.4 METHODOLOGY

We were engaged in an exploratory study. We started with no well-defined hypotheses or interpretations and no ready-made methodology and field techniques. (Bott 1957:8)

1.4.1 Aim of the study

This research project was undertaken to exploratively study the one-parent family and some social implications of lone parenthood: this within the context of present day society where the societal norm is the two-parent so-called intact family within which both the mother and the father fulfill largely complementary parenting roles.

1.4.2 Methodological steps

Carrying out the study involved (not strictly in chronological order) the following steps:

i) Gathering background information.
ii) Exploring the feasibility of the study.
iii) Choosing the sample.
iv) Drawing up the questionnaire.
v) Interviewing respondents.
vii) Marshalling and collating the findings.
vii) Drawing conclusions.

1.4.3 Gathering background information

1.4.3.1 Review of the literature

An intensive literature study of books, reports, periodicals and papers was undertaken to equip the writer with the background material necessary for a framework of reference, decision-making and a method of approach to the study envisaged. Information was sought about:

(a) social research methodology, to find suitable survey tools to be employed;

(b) the effects of the dissolution of the family triangle on interfamilial relationships, and on its members—the parents themselves and the children;
(c) some of the legal aspects of lone-parenthood, particularly of divorce and provisions by society for solo-parents;

(d) the consequences of lone-parenthood in a prevalently two-parent society-- for its members, adults and children; more specifically for the functioning and social identity of its adult members and on the development, rearing and social identity of the children;

(e) other implications of single-parenthood.

Most of the literature for the study was obtained from the United States of America, Canada and England. South African literature consulted consisted mainly of several theses of other South African researchers, legal treatises, and statistical data, the latter restricted to the White section of the population. The bibliography contains details as to the source of the material referred to.

Much of the current American literature deals with separation and divorce. There has been an upsurge of interest, particularly on these two topics in the United States, as the Raschke computerized ongoing research compilations on divorce-connected subjects, show. Much of the literature on divorce centres around a specific aspect and the effects of divorce on that aspect, as for example the possible effects of divorce on the children of different ages, effects of custody and visitation arrangements, the effects of divorce on the self-concept of adults, adolescents, and children. British literature in the last decade largely deals with lone-parenthood and economic deprivation. South African studies point to a growing awareness of the problems of marital dissolution. S. N. Harris studied the socio-legal aspects of divorce in South Africa (1960) and compared its system with that of England and Holland (1967); La Grange (1970) studied the adaptation of women to the situation of divorce. Rosen (1977) studied the effects of custody and access arrangements on children of divorce.

Examining questionnaires used by others: Tapp (1963), the Canadian Council of Social Development (1971), Arsenau et al. (1971), proved essential and invaluable in finalizing decisions on the nature and structure of the questionnaire.

One of the difficulties of the study was the confusing terminology. The terms used in literature to describe the one-parent situation vary; One-parent, lone-parent, single-parent, solo-parent, and parent-without-partner, are used interchangeably. There is not one particular word defining one particular marital status in one-parent situations.

According to Goode and Hatt (1952:364) 'the writer should not attempt to develop his own terminology, peculiar to himself, but should utilize existing terms if they are clear enough.' Nevertheless, the writer has made some suggestions in her conclusions for a codified use of terms for the various categories of single-parents (see conclusions in
1.4.3.2 Correspondence

Correspondence was conducted with

(a) the secretary of the South African Law Commission in Pretoria to obtain the recommendations on the proposed law of divorce and matters incidental thereto;

(b) the South African legal aid bureau in Pretoria, to obtain a national report on its services;

(c) Famsa - the South African National Council for Marriage and Family Life (S.A.), Pretoria;

(d) Ann Parks, the public relations officer of Parents Without Partners, Inc. Washington D.C. United States to obtain the organization's constitution, to learn about its strength, purpose, history, membership, turnover, and about its affiliated youth and other clubs, and to obtain sources of current research and literature available in America (particularly) and elsewhere on lone-parenthood;

(e) secretaries and chairmen of other single-parent groups, and child centered groups in England and Scotland: Gingerbread and the National Council for One Parent Families, the Council for Children's Welfare, the National Children's Bureau and the Scottish Council for Single Parents;

(f) library of the University of Toronto;

(g) the Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work, and

(h) the Canadian Council on Social Development for lists of further recommended reading and photocopies and micro-fiche of studies;

(i) Dr. Helen J. Raschke, Assistant Professor, Norfolk State College, Virginia, from whom the researcher obtained computerized information on most of the planned, in-progress, or completed but unpublished divorce-related research going on in academic and private institutions (1976, 1977, 1978) which made it possible to write for information and request copies of dissertations from some 60 American University and other researchers;

(j) local consular representatives and overseas government population offices for demographic data required for the study.

1.4.3.3 Meetings with the experts

To learn first-hand from experts in the field about various aspects of the study, is as important as conducting library studies and interviews with the men and women constituting the survey population.

Discussions were thus held with:

(i) Members of the legal profession, particularly in connection with the proposed new South African Law of Divorce, which had been tabled in Parliament, to replace the existing laws and has since been enacted and is known as the Divorce Act, 1979;
(ii) senior voluntary committee members of the Widows' Information service and the National Council of Women about the financial, emotional, social difficulties of mothers who are lone-parents, particularly the widowed, in South Africa;

(iii) a secretary of the Legal Aid Bureau concerning free legal advice and services in South Africa;

(iv) directors and senior social workers of social welfare agencies and psychiatric services;

(v) directors and social workers of homes for the unmarried mother;

(vi) directors and social workers of places of care for committed children;*

(vii) the senior social worker of a branch of the Marriage Guidance Council;

(viii) social workers and senior employees at the Department of Social Welfare, about their services to one-parent families, welfare grants and pensions;

(ix) senior employees at the Department of Labour about unemployment insurance benefits to widows and invalid widowers;

(x) senior officials at the Department of Statistics for explanations of statistics on populations, family-breakdown, housing conditions, geographic distribution and income of the white South African population, particularly one-parent populations;

(xi) magazine editors about their views on lone-parenthood and to obtain information about articles which appeared in their publications on the subject;

(xii) members of the clergy to learn about the different prevailing religious attitudes to death, divorce, separation, and unmarried motherhood;

(xiii) senior housing officials;

(xiv) principals and owners of creches, nursery school and school principals;

(xv) the owner of an experimental boarding house for divorcees and widows;

(xvi) the head of the computer division of the University of Cape Town (see Computerization, 1.4.6.4).

(xvii) senior lecturers in the Faculty and fellow students also busy with research projects.

1.4.4 Exploring the feasibility of the study

Although the overview of the literature showed that researchers had succeeded in gathering information by personal interviews and

*Children committed to a place of safety, in terms of the Children's Act of 1960, (South Africa).
questionnaires, there was stress on the delicacy of such investigation and the painful associations they may evoke. George and Wilding (1972:13) discussing their own methodology, pointed out:

> The issues to be explored are delicate and seem likely to be painful. Many respondents will be unwilling to be reminded of experiences which they have tried to forget.

South African lone-parents might be equally reticent in revealing their intimate histories to a stranger. The feasibility of the study depended on the co-operation of the units of the universe.

To establish whether single-parents would agree to be interviewed and would co-operate freely and candidly, the writer chose at random a divorcée* from a list of divorced mothers supplied to her by a school principal, and a widow from a list given to her by a widows' information service. It was also of interest to hear their views on the needs and possibilities of conducting a research project on one-parent families in a South African city. Both the women approached agreed to being interviewed, expressing the opinion that a study of such a nature is highly overdue in South Africa. Each interview lasted almost three hours, and both mothers talked at length, openly and in detail concerning deep personal feelings, experiences and problems. Most of the information was volunteered and it appeared, as Goode (1956) found in some of his interviews, that the interview had served as a cathartic experience affording the respondents an opportunity for emotional release and to discuss intimate matters which they would not broach even with relatives and close friends. The researcher felt more assured of the feasibility of the investigation.

1.4.5 Choosing the 'sample'

The writer decided to draw her material for her study from a population of lone-parents.

1.4.5.1 The ideal sample

From the overview of the literature the researcher realized that, in order to cover all the aspects of the study, the ideal sample would need to include:

---

*To differentiate between masculine and feminine, the Concise Oxford Dictionary's (1976:303) explanation of the French terms divorcé (masc.) and divorcée (fem.) are used by the researcher throughout this study.
(i) the divorced, separated, widowed and unmarried lone-parents;
(ii) male and female lone-parents; including complementary custodians and non-custodians;
(iii) lone-parents who are self-supporting as well as those who were receiving social assistance;
(iv) those who had been lone-parents for some time and those who had become heads of one-parent families within the past year;
(v) lone-parents with adolescent children, those with latency age children and those with pre-school children.

1.4.5.2 The search for a sample

The search for a sample for the study commenced with an approach to principals of two large schools, between them catering for a representative cross-section of social class. These schools being White, the sample would already have been a sectional one. Both principals claimed an awareness of problems in school performance and behaviour amongst children of one-parent families. Neither principal had lists of children from 'broken homes' and both were uncertain whether it would be permissible for them to extract and provide such lists. The approach to a welfare agency also met with a negative response, although its chief social worker was sympathetic. Here again, had agreement been obtained, the sample would not have been a balanced one, by virtue of the economic position of many of the case-load and that more women than men were likely to be in receipt of assistance (see 3.1.2). Being limited in time and resources, sifting through public records for a random sample was ruled out by the researcher.

Marsden (1969:5) explained that his sample was a biased one. It was a sample of women without any direct information having been drawn from the other parent. He wrote:

One important dimension is missing. Because only the mothers were interviewed, this is a picture of fatherlessness without the fathers' viewpoint.

Hart (1976:232) found that

...to obtain a research sample of 100 divorced and separated men and women...it would be necessary to draw a general random sample of 3,000 households and to enumerate the marital status of more than 5,000 people.

This in itself, Hart pointed out, would demand the combined efforts of a panel of researchers. Furthermore, a sample drawn from population statistics could not include the separated.
The official statistical definition of marital breakdown coincides with the legal termination of the marital bond... Thus the sociologist, out of methodological necessity rather than theoretical choice, may be forced to confine his researches within certain limited categories. (Hart 1976: 232).

Arsenau et al. (1971:27) had unsuccessfally tried, through the Census Bureau, to locate the total population of female-headed one-parent families in Halifax, Dartmouth, Canada.

1.4.5.3 Selection of universe

It was clear that the same considerations would apply to this study, and that the sample would have to be more limited in size than originally envisaged and could not be unbiased, and representative of the total population of single-parent families in South Africa. The research would be a case-study.

The writer had already learnt from other studies (Grills et al. 1963; Weiss 1975; Hart 1976; Parks 1977) that it is possible to draw a sample of lone-parents from the membership of organizations for parents without partners.

The existence of Parents' Associated provided a conveniently organized group of people who were single-parents due to divorce, separation or the death of the marital partner. (Grills et al. 1963:36)

Significantly, the unmarried mother was not represented in his sample.

The writer interviewed four committee members of a single-parent association to find out

(a) whether they too thought a study on single-parent families was possible and, in their opinion, necessary;

(b) whether club secretaries would provide lists of members from which the population of a study could be drawn;

(c) whether club lone-parents would co-operate with the researcher in such a study.

Their affirmative answers to all the above were encouraging and a second club was similarly approached. Here again, the replies were positive. It was decided to draw the universe from the two clubs.

Membership of these associations was restricted to Whites and consisted, as asserted by the committees, of middle-class single-parents. Some of the occupations, educational levels and housing conditions, do not quite bear out this classification. (See Tables 6, 5, 11).

Paid-up membership lists as at July, 1977, were provided. No member who joined after that date would be included in the research. All the members on these lists were to be personally approached for partici-
pation by the researcher herself, who would explain the purpose of the study to each one. The population would therefore be a self-selected group and the findings only pertinent to, and characteristic of, the population interviewed.

Club membership was not dependent on custody, but on parent-hood. One of the principles enumerated in the preamble to the constitution of most lone-parent clubs, including the two selected for this study, is that

*From the International Constitution and Byelaws of Parents Without Partners, Inc. Washington, D.C. (as ratified by the Chapters, effective June 1, 1976).
subculture of one-parent clubs. Overfamiliarization with members may have created a bias, both in the researcher and prospective respondents. Moreover, the writer's non-involvement in club activities would reduce discussion amongst the members and the confidentiality as to whom the researcher interviewed, was more likely to be reserved. As pointed out, originally all the members were to be approached.

The one club referred to as 'A' chosen for the study had, at the time of the study, 85 paid-up members and the other club (referred to as club 'B') 44. Sixty-one of the 85 of club 'A' members were included in the population. Table M2 explains the reasons for the non-participation of the other 24. Club 'B' changed its purpose, composition and membership. Its function was no longer helping parents without partners with their children. This association now catered for 'singles,' bachelors and spinsters, the widowed, separated, divorced with no children and for lone-parents. The club's purpose now social, parenthood was not a necessary membership criterion. The writer discovered this in her attempts to make telephone appointments from a revised membership list. She was told by many that they were not parents.

It was therefore decided not to continue with club 'B'. The researcher had completed nine interviews with single-parent members of this club, these nine having included fortuitously, five widowed, who gave a more balanced representation to this category, as there were seven widowed respondents in club 'A'. The total universe had reached 70 and approximated in size populations used by other researchers: Tapp (Canada, 1963) used 74 and Hart (England, 1976) 63 men and women in their studies. (Hart's was a case-study of members of a club for the divorced.) The final population is shown in Table M1, broken-down by marital status and sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL UNIVERSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the case of Hart (1976), the researcher's population had to be restricted in size. Also, as with the universe of Arsenau et al.
(1971), the researcher's population was not scientifically controlled for the distribution of respondents into widowed, divorced, separated and unmarried categories.

Particularly disproportionate was the presence of only one separated in the population although from the overview of literature it appears that, in England, for instance, the number of separated probably equals the number of divorced (Finer Report, Vol. 1: 1974).

There were not many widowed club members. In club 'A' there were ten and, before the club changed its composition, 18 in club 'B'. Writing of the widows in his sample, Marsden (1969:230) concluded

...there were few widows so that little new can be said about their situation; but they provided a valuable reference group throughout the study against which the standards of living of others could be compared.

The writer's sample included eight widows and four widowers, 17.1% of the total sample. Comparisons have been made in the study between the widowed and divorced.

The never-married mother in the one club did not agree to be interviewed.

A table reflecting non-participation and the reasons for such non-participation is presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE M2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

NON-PARTICIPATION
REASONS FOR NON-PARTICIPATION BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Untraceable</th>
<th>Refusal</th>
<th>Engaged and refused</th>
<th>Does not qualify as remarried</th>
<th>Does not qualify as no children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These four include two who had initially consented but failed to keep appointments

In the course of obtaining the nine qualifying members from club 'B,' there were no refusals. The universe for this study therefore consisted of 70 men and women, all paid-up members of two single-parent clubs. All were parents, whether custodial or non-custodial (see figures 3 and 4, chapter 6).
Ideally the population should also have included (in the cases of the separated and divorced) the lone-parent's ex-partner. This posed difficulties as

(i) in some cases it would have necessitated locating men or women living geographically very far away from the spouse being interviewed (even overseas);

(ii) in two cases the respondents had no precise knowledge of the ex-partner's whereabouts;

(iii) not all respondents were prepared to give the researcher the ex-spouses' address for fear of retaliation regarding maintenance.

The universe of this study did not exclude any non-custodial parent by design.

1.4.6 The interview schedule

The nature of this study being exploratory, it was necessary to use a research instrument sufficiently flexible to enable the area to be studied to be fully explored. Like Arsenau et al. (1971:31), the writer decided that the research instrument to be used would be a personally administered structured open-ended questionnaire schedule, allowing for follow-up of areas of importance.

1.4.6.1 Drafting the questionnaire

From the initial preliminary interviews conducted with a randomly chosen widow and divorcée (see 1.4.4) and with the four committee members (two divorcées, one divorcé and one widower; see 1.4.5.3) of the lone-parent association from which most of the respondents for the study were subsequently drawn, information was obtained about single-parenting and its problems. These interviewees all had spoken at length about their situation and its difficulties, about the discrimination and stigma associated with the divorced and separated and the unmarried mother in particular, the isolation of the widowed and about society's general indifference to the custodial and the non-custodial parent. They all felt the need for a lone-parents' club to help such families in their social re-adaptation.

From two meetings with two local school principals, the researcher learned that the school performance of a proportion of children from one-parent families deteriorated - where death was the cause of single-parenthood - for varying periods after the bereavement. From the preliminary interviews, and particularly the talks with the school principals, it was also learnt that in some cases of children of divorce, separation and bereavement, school performance apparently suffered and attainment level dropped during the critical breakdown months, sometimes
continuing afterwards. In other cases the children settled down again after the final break and some improved in scholastic achievements and general participation in school activities.

As children are the perpetuators of our social heritage and as this study is concerned with single-parent families - a significant, integral (yet of necessity limited) part of the study must concern itself with children from divorced, separated and widowed homes. Sections of the questionnaire were devoted to effects on the children in one-parent families.

From all the information obtained from the overview of the literature, meetings with experts in the field, and the preliminary investigations conducted, a lengthy draft questionnaire providing possibilities of yielding exploratory data on many aspects of one-parent families and lone-parenthood was drawn up, covering fields assumed pertinent to the one-parent situation. Index cards were used for transcribing the preliminary interview records into the various subjects of enquiry, then reviewed and arranged to decide on the sectional headings to the questionnaire.

It was realized that not all the material would be used. This is in keeping with the nature of exploratory studies, as Selltiz et al. (1959) wrote: 'At the time of data collection, the investigator does not know which aspects may turn out to be most important.'

1.4.6.2 Structuring the questionnaire

Goode and Hatt (1952:185,186) wrote of the interview method:

Increasingly the social scientist has turned from books to social phenomena in an effort to build the foundations of science...the interview is, in a sense, the foundation upon which all other elements rest, for it is the data gathering phase.... The development of highly structured schedules was seen as one possible solution to the problem of standardization... Neither reliability nor depth can be achieved, however, unless it is kept clearly in mind that interviewing is fundamentally a process of social interaction. Its primary purpose may be research, but this is its purpose for the investigator. For the respondent, its foundation and meaning may be different.

Young (1956:183), considering the advantages of the structured questionnaire stated:

The structured questionnaire is designed to produce two things - accurate communication and accurate response. Accurate communication is achieved when the respondents understand the survey objectives. Accurate response is obtained when the replies contain the information sought and at the same time fulfill the demands of tabulation plans and analytical program.

The questionnaire schedule would have to be so designed as to make possible simple coded recordings of replies to most of the questions direct onto coding sheets during interviews. Information would be translated
into tabulated data from the coding sheets. A set of coding sheets is reproduced in the Appendix.

Additional sheets were prepared, for noting any extra information supplied in response to the category 'specify' in the questionnaire. Such information would be recorded 'shorthand,' where possible during interviews, and transcribed immediately after interviews. A sample of how the information from these sheets was extracted and collated appears in the Appendix (See Appendix D). Two further sheets for manual tabulation were prepared for supplementary information on health and child education, changes in divorce laws, special services and other reforms (see Appendix C).

The schedule was drafted in such a way as to make its administration to both custodial and non-custodial parents possible. The unit of investigation was the parent, either custodial or non-custodial, who was a member of either of the lone-parent organizations.

1.4.6.3 Improving the questionnaire

The pretest

The draft questionnaire was pretested several times: on four committee members of club 'B' and on a senior staff member of the university's Department of Applied Sociology in Social Work and rediscussed with senior University Departmental staff. The questionnaire was refined and shortened. Responses to questions asked in the pretest were recorded directly onto questionnaire sheets during the interview. Coding sheets were drawn up at a later stage, after consultation with the Computer Division of the University of Cape Town.

A question - 'are you dating' - was added to the final section of the questionnaire and as an introduction to possible discussions with respondents on sexual matters.

The researcher found that the 'pretest respondents' had no difficulty in understanding and answering the draft questionnaire, excepting for several questions which were removed as these were found to be too complicated, imprecise and ambiguous. The information elicited was adequate, and the questionnaire was not difficult to administer. Furthermore, the 'pretest respondents' appeared to feel comfortable during the interviews and showed great interest in the proposed study. Minor corrections and several changes were made. The revised draft questionnaire was pretested on the ex-chairman, who was no longer a club member, of club 'A.' Replies were recorded directly onto a 'test' coding sheet. Administration including recording of 'specify' responses took two and a half hours. The respondents expressed interest in the study and satisfaction with the questionnaire and its administration.
1.4.6.4 Computerization

There was consultation between senior members of the Department of Applied Sociology in Social Work and the researcher with the Head of the Computer Division of the University of Cape Town, to explore the possibilities of computerization and the discipline this would impose.

To familiarize herself with the basics of computerization programming, the researcher attended a short course being run by the University's Computer Division.

After examination and discussion of the aims of the study and the questionnaire with the Head of the Computer Division, the use of a particular programme, CROSTAB2, was agreed upon, in view of the numerous variables possibly requiring comparisons in this research. This package programme can be used to produce multidimensional tabulations (cross-tabulations) of the values of selected variables from a data set. (A more detailed explanation of CROSTAB2 is included in the Appendix to the study, see Appendix E).

In consultation with the Computer Division, the format of the questionnaire was adapted and coding sheets designed suitable for CROSTAB2. Samples of these coding sheets are reproduced in the Appendix to the study; see Appendix B).

The final draft of the questionnaire was submitted to the Computer Division and a method of coding developed in keeping with computer programming requirements. Coding of replies onto the coding sheets proved a time-saving, simple, efficient system, making smooth, easy analysis possible and within the management of a single researching investigator.

Many variables and cross comparisons of variables could be extracted for analysis by the method decided upon.

With the commencement of the study, it was decided that the following aspects would be investigated: economic, housing, social adaptation and effects on children. The study being exploratory, exactly which facets within these aspects would be finally analyzed and compared and drawn from, were not decided upon at this stage.

The questionnaire provided flexibility and scope (see questionnaire Appendix A).

1.4.6.5 Areas dealt with in schedule

The first section of the questionnaire deals with the general characterization of the sample, of each population element. Questions in this section fall under a heading 'identifying data' (I). Similar information about other members of the household is categorized in this section under
the headings 'other members of the household,' and 'children living away from home.'

Respondents' economic position such as their work history, is looked into in the section which follows, classified as 'economic position' (E). Housing including movement and change of housing, are covered by questions in the section 'accommodation' (A).

The division of household duties and functions of household members, including care and control of children are dealt with in the section which follows, classified as 'home management' (H). Information on childrens' rearing and education are obtained from questions classified under a section entitled 'children's education (C). This section includes a schedule for a manual table on whether children's school performance had not or had been affected by the lone-parenthood situation.

Information on the health of the respondents and their families is recorded in the section following entitled 'health' (H). This is a smaller section.

The largest section of the questionnaire deals with numerous aspects of social readaptation. These are classified under the heading 'social readaptation (S)' including particulars about

(i) lone-parent club membership;

(ii) adjustment to lone-parent status.

Responses were sought on crisis experience, guilt, loneliness, effects on children, use of outside help, contact with ex-spouse and other relatives, substitute identification by the children, leisure activities, children's negative or positive reactions to respondent's friends of the opposite sex, patterns of going out, friendships and dating, and opinions on re-marriage, respondents' knowledge of the law of divorce and suggestions for its improvement and their use of and satisfaction with existing social services; respondents' experiences of discrimination from different sources, and respondents' assessment of community attitudes to divorce, widowhood, never married motherhood.

Respondents' opinions on the need for and types of reform were provided for. This is in the final section of the questionnaire categorized under 'reform' (R).

While the project may be regarded as a 'here and now study' several of the questions are concerned with histories, events, personal feelings and aspirations before the time of interview, and in some cases a comparison is drawn between experiences, situations and feelings before and after lone-parent status; in sections of the questionnaire, questions are framed to enable comparison of previous with present situations.
1.4.7 Interviewing respondents

The preliminary interviews were conducted in July, 1977, and the interviews for the findings during August, September, October and part November, 1977.

1.4.7.1 Method of approach to respondents

The first step was the preparation of a card index system for all the members on the lists provided by the two club secretaries. The cards were typed and had room for notations regarding contact. The method of initiating the interview had then to be decided upon.

Some researchers (La Grange 1970; Arsenau et al. 1971; George and Wilding 1972) first approached their prospective respondents by mail. The response rate varied greatly. George and Wilding had a good response rate, mentioning in their table (1972:14) that 208 of 865 eligibles refused to participate. Arsenau et al. (1971) on the other hand only received two replies to their 40 initial mailed enquiries to all members of a single-parents' organization. George and Wilding (1972) had little choice but to initiate interviews through mail as the territory covered by them was vast.

The two membership lists for this study, obtained from the club secretaries, numbered 129 in all. Any large reduction in numbers, through non-response to a mailed approach, might have rendered it either too small a universe or, were the non-responses to come from a particular category of the lists, the population would be unrepresentative of club membership and even further removed from the estimated proportion of categories of single-parents in the South African White population. A high response rate was important.

1.4.7.2 Telephoning for the interview

All members were listed as being contactable telephonically either at home or at work with more females than males having telephones at home. The researcher decided to personally telephone all club members, basing her decision partially on the positive response from telephonically initiated appointments during preliminary enquiries and pretests. This was strengthened by George and Wilding's (1972:13) appraisal of the power of the personal approach and the 'eloquence which the researcher himself might bring to his request for an interview.'

Contacting a prospective participant at his place of work was only undertaken if there was definitely no telephone in the home. Even where a residential number did not appear on the membership lists, the telephone directory, telephone enquiries (for new members) and the club secretary were first checked. As stated, all the telephoning was done personally.
A telephone call to a place of employment was started with an introduction and an enquiry about whether perhaps the respondent had a home number, could he take a personal call then, or should the researcher telephone back and if so, when should she call back. Most would-be participants telephoned at their place of employment were friendly, interested, agreed to being interviewed. Appointments were made immediately.

Telephoning all possible prospective participants took several weeks. During this time respondents may have met at club meetings and socially. As mentioned, the researcher did not participate in club activities, to avoid arousing discussion about the study amongst the members. However there was no way of knowing to what degree members discussed the study and influenced each other.

1.4.7.3 Refusals

In practice, the choice of the telephonic approach proved itself. Of the 81 who qualified (not remarried and were parents) and were approached, only 11 refused to participate. Of the 81 approached, 72 were from club 'A' and nine from club 'B'. In the course of obtaining the nine participants from club 'B' who, together with 61 from club 'A' make up the universe of the study, there were no refusals, as already explained. The writer feels that the low rate of refusals (13.6%) she encountered was largely due to the fact that:

(a) she herself telephoned prospective respondents and made the appointments for participation;

(b) as was later brought out in the interviews would-be respondents were interested in their own situation of lone-parenthood. They had much to say and had not really had anyone to say it to before.

The researcher operated a daily diary, recording activities as the research progressed and all telephone calls and their outcome were also recorded in the diary. The nature of the 11 refusals, reasons for their non-co-operation and the researcher's feelings of embarrassment, disappointment and confusion were recorded. Refusals were mainly by the more educated, professional or business class (the professions of the members appeared in the lists provided). One recording from the diary (1977) reads:

...when a male professional interrupting the flow of my confident, lucid, friendly introduction, cut me short and said "dear lady, don't bother me, I've been divorced seven years; I'm no different to you or anyone else. I don't really belong to that club; I haven't been to them for donkey years. The secretary would do you a service by taking me off their phoney list," and he closed the telephone on me!
While refusing herself to be interviewed, a widow preferred to supply the researcher with the names of widows and widowers, who might be interested. A divorcée, a professional, refused to participate because he was not prepared to "do my laundry with someone who was doing a research project. My private business is entirely my business."

Two other refusals, a man and woman, said they were engaged, planning to get married, were very busy and were quite sure they did not qualify. The writer was very interested in interviewing each of this couple separately, for the very reason that they planned marriage.

Another person who refused, asked the researcher three times to telephone again when she was not busy, yet eventually withdrew; she was a never-married mother (the only one then in the club), who worked all day and said she had not sufficient time for her baby, weekends or evenings, let alone for a research project. The researcher wonders if, perhaps, there was any connection between her status of never-married mother, the stigma she may be exposed to and the subjective prejudice she may feel. (Although aware that one could not draw any conclusions regarding the category from findings about one never-married mother, the writer was disappointed about this refusal.)

Tapp (1963) too did not have any never-married mother in his sample. Is this an indication that never-married mothers shun joining one-parent clubs because even there the stigma against the unwed mother persists?

1.4.7.4 Conducting the interviews

The researcher had decided to conduct all interviews personally as she felt that a population of 70 was of a size manageable on her own. This investigation was not one with a carefully drawn sample, covering a large number of people, but a case-study with a questionnaire that was deliberately designed to allow for unstructured material and with the knowledge that it would be administered personally.

The writer is by profession a social worker. George and Wilding (1972:15) were of the opinion that

...the use of social workers as research interviewers is fraught with difficulties. It can be argued that because of their training and experience in interpersonal relationships they are very suitable as research interviewers. On the other hand it can be argued that, because they are professionally committed to providing help to people, they find it difficult to restrict their relationship simply to gathering information.

The researcher found her social work experience most helpful in striking rapport. She managed to limit her involvement to factual information as to the relevant agency to approach, when asked for advice.
Writing of his position, Weiss (1975:x) explained that when he asked permission to interview members of a Parents Without Partners organization,

...what finally decided them in my favour, I think, was that I, too, was a parent without a partner. They saw no reason to fear that I would disparage them just because their marriages had ended.

The researcher did not find that not being a lone-parent was a barrier in winning the confidence of her population. Many of the respondents asked the writer whether she was a lone-parent. She truthfully replied that she had a husband and child. Any initial embarrassment disappeared within a short time.

1.4.7.5 Venues and times of interviews

While the researcher, when arranging appointments, gave respondents a choice of venue, she stressed that she was quite prepared to come to their homes. The majority chose their homes which was where almost all the interviews were conducted.

Strydom, in her research which was also of a highly emotional nature (1972:342) in stressing the importance of the home as the ideal location, wrote:

Die keuse van die plek waar die onderhouvoering sal plaasvind is by voorbeeld belangrik. Die informant en die navorser moet privaatheid geniet en onnodige steurings en onderbrekings moet uitgeskakel word. Die informant moet veral op sy gemak en tuis voel. Al die onderhou e, behalwe vier, is aan die huise van informant gehou en was hulle dan ook op so 'n wyse gereel dat privaatheid gehandhaaf was.

The researcher, like Strydom, found that the majority of her respondents preferred being interviewed in their homes in their familiar setting and where they could assure themselves of privacy. All made the writer feel welcome, offered tea and talked freely and at length, no doubt also due to the venue.

Hart (1976:233) stated

Most interviews were conducted in the respondent's home and this provided an additional source of insights into the material dimensions of the status passage. Some people were reluctant to invite me to where they lived, and in these cases I carried out the interview in my own flat.

The writer too found that the interview process involved not only the collection of data but the formation of intangible impressions. One of the advantages of the personal home interview is the ability to formulate impressions through observation of the environment, and, what Strydom (1972) refers to as the 'non-verbale taal' including interaction with children, attitudes, facial expressions, intonations, and movements in her natural setting (Hollis 1964:174). However, as the interviews were by
advance appointment, respondents may well have prepared both their homes and themselves to convey incorrect impressions.

The National Council of Women put its centrally situated office at the disposal of the writer. This alternative venue proved most useful in two cases; one where a male respondent was boarding with a family and did not regard the address as his home; the other where a male was living with a 'girl-friend' and preferred a meeting away from his place of residence. Two respondents chose to come to the researcher's place of address on a Saturday morning. Most appointments were fixed by choice of the respondents for evenings -- after dinner hours, i.e. after 7.30 p.m.

The time of interviews was determined, to a large extent, by whether or not the respondents worked, and the hours they worked. Respondents who were housewives, were asked for appointments during the day, which arrangement some found convenient. Not all working women in the population, however, were prepared to be interviewed during the day, largely because their children were around during these hours. Many were busy with household chores during the mornings.

1.4.7.6 Recording the data in practice

The respondent's permission for note-taking was sought, and willingly granted. This was done in shorthand, during and after the recording of the coded data. Writing on the lap and often with inadequate lighting necessitated copying of coded data onto a second sheet of coding sheets upon returning from the interview. The non-coded information also had to be rewritten and shorthand notes transcribed.

In addition a capsule summary of impressions and information was typed onto the respondent's card in the cardex system.

1.4.7.7 Emotions evoked

Interviewing respondents on a subject of such a nature as this study can be emotionally demanding on the researcher and on the respondent. Subject matter of most interviews was of a highly emotional nature. The Canadian Council on Social Development (1971:42) recorded:

In this project, interviewing meant becoming immersed, if only for an hour or two in the deeply-felt experiences of another person.

Emotional exhaustion from an interview was another factor which limited the possible number of interviews a day.

Respondents' interest in the study, and their urge to voluntarily, and apparently candidly, unburden themselves of their fears and problems,
repeated itself almost throughout all the interviews. There was no resentment at the length of the questionnaire. As interviews progressed, informants not only answered questions, but volunteered much other -- some relevant, some unconnected suggestions and information, providing a growing amount of material for the subject of the study.

In discussing several matters, very carefully deliberated judgements had to be employed by the investigator before broaching this personal, delicate subject with respondents. During interviews many respondents were eager to talk of their sexual concerns and experiences since marital breakdown. Some were shy and reticent. As one respondent put it: "This is bedroom business; I don't discuss it with anyone."

1.4.8 Possible biases

1.4.8.1 Possible interview biases

Even before interviewing commenced, bias may have set in. The very consent or refusal to be interviewed, may contain some implications. According to George and Wilding (1972:15) discussing partners who refused to be interviewed:

...it seemed that there were both those fathers who had settled down so well that they did not want to discuss a situation which was not problematic to them, and those who had come to terms with motherlessness and did not want to expose themselves to an interview which they anticipated would be painful.

Rosen (1977:246, 247) expressed the same view.

Hamilton (1940:112) in discussing the importance of understanding what, why and how people talk about themselves, wrote:

...We know that people, even in telling their own story, tend to disguise their real feelings and do not always give an accurate account of themselves -- though they usually believe what they are telling us to be true and it is important because it is true for them.

Many of the questions, by their very nature, involved subjective, evaluative replies by respondents. A great deal of information gathered, particularly the general characteristics (identifying data) of the sample, are objective, but much else is the evaluation of a situation by the respondent. These interpretations are not controlled. As La Grange (1970:5) stated in her study of divorced women:

_Die vrou is as die enigste bron van inligting gebruik en haar medelings is op geen wyse gekontroleer nie._

No tests or questionnaires were applied to the children themselves as to their adaptation, in their new familial setting. The parents' responses were the basis for the findings.
It is in human nature to exaggerate success and minimize failure in oneself.

Assessment of economic adequacy is also not purely objective. According to George and Wilding (1972:17) 'what is needed for contentment is not ease, but an acceptance that things cannot, could not and will not be otherwise than they are.'

There is also the fallibility of human recollections of the past and where recollections are concerned with areas of stress where bias was likely to be present in the first place, additional bias may set in. Besides forgetting, one is loath to recall unpleasant experiences.

Bott (1957:49) had written

There is no reason to suppose that they were not telling the truth as they saw it, but it is well known that people sometimes distort things without knowing it.

One is loath to admit certain feelings to one's self. Goode (1956) pointed out that a former wife is more likely to accuse her ex-spouse of being a scoundrel than admitting she hates him. In addition, subjective evaluations are influenced by the circumstances at the moment of the interview.

Respondent's perception of the interviewer and the interviewer's perception of the respondent, are other sources of bias. The interviewer's perception of the respondent may influence the manner in which a question is posed to a respondent, whose answer, in turn, may be biased by his perception of what the interviewer expects of him. One divorced, co-habiting at his 'girl friend's' home, may have slanted his responses in accordance with the bias he may have suspected in the researcher.

Notwithstanding all the hazards of bias with which the face-to-face interview is fraught, it remains, in the words of Young (1956:207) 'the only instrument by which significant memories of the past and plans for the future can be ascertained.'

1.4.8.2 Possible biases in the universe

The main likely biases in the universe of the study may be summarized as:

(i) the unrepresentative proportions of categories of single-parenthood as compared to the percentages of these categories in the total population, as emerges from the overview of the literature;

(ii) the universe is drawn from membership lists of one-parent clubs. Participants of such organizations are possibly of a particular typology. In addition it was essentially middle-class and, in the South African context, further biased because membership was restricted to Whites;
as with most studies, participation was voluntary and this itself may have weighted the sample with a typology of single-parents.

1.4.9 Personal experiences and difficulties of the researcher

Most of the respondents lived many miles from the writer's address. They would generally see the researcher only in the evening. She did not return 'home' after most interviews till about midnight. Only one interview an evening was possible. Frequently the researcher was unfamiliar with the areas respondents lived in, and had to leave home earlier to allow for 'searching' time, as telephone directions, although always given, were often unclear. Many lived in ill-lit fringe areas. In addition to the evening appointment, only one day appointment was possible as travelling consumed considerable time, and the administration of the questionnaire, which was lengthy, took an average of two and a half to three hours. Emotional exhaustion from an interview was another factor which limited the possible number of interviews a day. Two male respondents, interviewed in the bedrooms of their second-grade hotels, and not in a state of complete sobriety, were more embarrassed, probably than the researcher. A friend of the opposite sex, arriving during an interview, was, after being introduced to the researcher, told to go home by the respondent, to the researcher's embarrassment. Some of these suitors were later met in their own homes by the researcher as they constituted part of the interviewee population.

1.4.10 Self-criticism of the methodology

The questionnaire may have been somewhat too ramified. This resulted both from the complexity of the subject as well as from the methodological research which reveals a consensus that an exploratory study requires as broad a base of data as possible. Sections of the questionnaire were not used in the findings but are available for further analysis.

The writer had some reservations about the division of the interview into the specific areas chosen as such compartmentation could entail some overlapping of common aspects. The decision was influenced by

a) the fact that many of the studies in the field dealt with particular categories of population and areas of interaction;

b) it would make reference for comparisons with findings or for further research simpler.

In practice the extent of the overlapping proved to be but slight relative to the advantages.

The experience of the unmarried mother, the divorced, separated
and widowed differ in many ways and, while situations, problems and implications can be equated or compared in the universe of the wide literary overview, this becomes difficult in a limited sample of 70, composed of all these marital categories except the never-married mother. As a result, the data are insufficient for generalizations. These findings, as those of Arsenau et al. (1971:30), can only be seen as characteristic of or pertinent to the 70 subjects interviewed. This is however inevitable, as Bott (1957:5) points out, in an exploratory study, where the achievement of the research consists not so much in finding complete answers as in finding interesting questions to ask.

A specific study of the divorced and separated and involving both marital ex-spouses could more thoroughly and conclusively have investigated the intensity of the ongoing relationship between all members of the triad (mother, father, child) as suggested in the overview of the literature. In addition, further comparisons could have been drawn between situations of custodial and non-custodial parents. This was regrettably not possible in the present research which is exploratory only and limited in size and nature by the means, time and resources available to a single researcher, although this aspect was investigated to some degree. The writer found that single-parent membership lists, by virtue of the inclusion of the non-custodial parent, according to the organizations' constitutions which permit either the custodial or the non-custodial parent to join these clubs, most useful for her purposes. With committee permission and permission of the spouse who joined first, two ex-spouses could be members.

Maximum use could not be made of the full potential of the computer. Computerization makes the extraction of data, straight cross-tabulation and cross-tabulation with more than two attributes or variables a simple mechanical process freed from laborious time-consuming effort. Even in the smaller sample (such as this study), where the simple data and straight cross-tabulation could have been managed manually (though it may have taken longer), the construction of tables with a third variable would have been time-consuming without the aid of CROSTAB2. The elaboration of survey results was now only limited by the degree of ingenuity of the researcher in the introduction of test variables. Unfortunately the breakdown of a small sample of 70, often first into categories, then according to more than two variables, by reducing the cells, limits the full exploitation of the computerization programme employed; but even from use within these restricted limits, it was clear to the researcher that, in planning a study, the possible use of a computer should be seriously considered.

As pointed out, the original population was envisaged to be somewhat larger. With the knowledge of hindsight, the researcher having decided upon the use of CROSTAB2, could perhaps have restricted
the population to a particular category of lone-parents although a large enough one-category cohort may have been hard to locate. It would have permitted fuller use of the mechanical means but would have involved a change in the orientation of the study. Alternatively, the sample should have been bigger. This was of course impossible because of the time factor and the limitation of drawing the universe from the membership of the clubs. When commencing using the computer, it was known that the size of the universe had been reduced to 70 but nevertheless the researcher certainly is happy she did not retract in the exploration of the use of the computer.

In spite of all the reservations and though only limited use was made of it, the writer feels that the value of computerization in research— even of a relatively small sample — has been established. It is also clear that the value of computerization increases in greater than direct proportion to the size of the sample.
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...the concept of the broken home is scientifically unsatisfactory and should be abandoned. It includes too many heterogeneous conditions having very different psychological effects. (Bowlby 1951:12)
2. THE ONE-PARENT FAMILY

2.1 Defining the one-parent family

The one-parent family differs from the two-parent family unit primarily by the absence of one of the parents. Horowitz and Perdue (1977:503) defined a single-parent family as:

A single-parent family comprises one parent and one or more children. Simply stated there is one parent who fulfils the parenting role in contrast to most nuclear families in our society in which two people share parenting responsibilities to a greater or less degree.

According to Sprey (1975:50) 'the single-parent family is defined as an ongoing nuclear unit consisting of one parent and at least one dependent child.' As an ongoing nuclear unit it would have to continue the functions of that unit.

During the course of her reading, the researcher found that writers used different terms in referring to the one-parent situation. The terminology included:

one-parent (family)
lone-parent (family)
single-parent (family)
solo-parent (family)
sole-parent (family)
single-handed (family)

In addition, as Sprey (1975:49) points out, terms such as 'broken homes,' 'incomplete families' and 'single-parent families' are often used interchangeably, though each of these may, in its exact context, apply to a different situation.

Lone-parenthood is, according to Sprey (1975:51), a situation resulting from some specific critical event. It can result from the death of a parent in the case of the bereaved family, legal marital dissolution in the case of divorce, and from desertion or separation by consent in the case of the separated. The unwed mother family results from the decision of the mother (for whatever reason) to keep the child of premarital conception. In addition, there is the rare situation where lone-parenthood is the result of a man, not necessarily the putative father, adopting a child.

Desertion by a spouse, extended absence on military service or business, as also prolonged illness of a parent, also creates a one-parent family situation, with emphasis on the word situation. This is not dealt with in this study.

Regardless of the cause of lone-parenthood, the following characteristics are common to the situation of lone-parents:

(a) The family is incomplete by virtue of the absence of one parent. In fact, La Grange (1970) uses the Afrikaans term for 'incomplete,'
'onvellosde gesin,' to describe the one-parent family. The degree of this absence may vary. Strictly speaking, only in the case of the unwed mother, where the identity of the putative father is uncertain, or in the case of the adoptive father, where the mother is unknown, is there complete parental absence.

Sociologically speaking divorced and bereaved families are not incomplete because the absent parent still may be a significant reference figure. (Sprey 1975:49)

(b) The lone-parent situation is a minority one, in a society where the so-called intact two-parent family is the accepted norm. Our society is socially and economically tailored to, and is better equipped to provide for the needs of this majority and the lone-parent minority is disadvantaged. As a result of being a minority and considered deviant, as it differs from the normal two-parent family, it may be subject to varying degrees of stigma.

(c) Lone-parenthood is a transient state with remarriage (and in the case of the unwed, marriage) and reconstitution (or constitution) of the two-parent family as the almost universal goal, being one of the major solutions. This can, for most cases, best be illustrated by the following figure from Schlesinger (1975:vii)

```
| Marriage +       | Family life — |
| Remarriage +     | One-parent family + |
```

2.2 The incidence of the one-parent family (see also 4.3)

The high incidence and marked increase in one-parent families in Western industrialized countries is indicated by some statistics in this section.

For the United States of America, Ogg (1976:2) sums up the situation thus:

Since 1960, the number of one-parent families has grown seven times as fast as the number of traditional two-parent families. Despite beliefs to the contrary, the trend is to be found among both whites and blacks of all classes.

By 1973 (U.S. Bureau of Census 1977) single-parent families represented at least 11% of the U.S. population and ‘they are as diverse in demographic characteristics and group behaviour as are two-parent families.’ In 1975, of the (approximately) 30 million families with children under 18, over 4.5 million (15%) were headed by a single parent and by 1978 the proportion of such families reached 19% (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1975, 1979). Approximately 90% of these families were headed by women and ten percent by men. By 1978, according to Glick (1979) 22.3% of children under 18 were not living with two parents as compared with 12.5% in 1960 — almost a two-fold increase. His projection for the year 1990 is a rise to 29%.

In Britain by 1971, the Finer Report’s (1974) basis for statistics, one in ten families with dependent children were one-parent families with 2/3 million parents looking after one million children single-handed. Peculiar to Britain was the large number of separated mothers -- there were 190,000 compared with 120,000 divorced, 120,000 widowed and 90,000 never-married mothers. Lone fathers numbered about 100,000 (just over one in six).
In the Scandinavian countries, while divorce and separation are combined, still the chief cause, as it is in all Western countries, of loneparenthood, unwed motherhood is responsible for a good proportion of one-parent family children. In Sweden 40% of all single mothers were unmarried and in Norway 30% (Finer Report 1974, Vol.2:18). (Refer to Table AI).

In the Republic of South Africa* the incidence and family structure of one-parent families (White) in relation to the total White population (comparing 1960 and 1970 figures) is shown in the following table:

**TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Compiled from Population Censuses 1960 (Vol.11, No.1, Table 2.1) and 1970 (Report 02-03-02, Table A3), The Government Printer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family structure</th>
<th>Number of families in year 1960</th>
<th>Number of families in year 1970</th>
<th>Increase from 1960 - 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and woman</td>
<td>180,940</td>
<td>227,740</td>
<td>46,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father, mother and child/ren</td>
<td>496,680</td>
<td>629,610</td>
<td>132,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father and child/ren</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>42,770</td>
<td>37,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>9.3% of families with child/ren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65,280</td>
<td>7.93% of families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and child/ren</td>
<td>37,260</td>
<td>55,830</td>
<td>18,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of families</td>
<td>720,390</td>
<td>922,630</td>
<td>202,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of families with child/ren</td>
<td>539,450</td>
<td>694,890</td>
<td>155,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>3,069,000</td>
<td>3,831,000</td>
<td>762,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children in two-parent homes</td>
<td>1,203,149</td>
<td>1,531,057</td>
<td>327,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children in one-parent homes</td>
<td>78,771</td>
<td>127,378</td>
<td>48,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children in two and one-parent homes</td>
<td>1,281,920</td>
<td>1,658,435</td>
<td>376,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Republic of South Africa is in the course of this thesis also referred to as 'R.S.A.' or 'South Africa.'
While, from 1960 to 1970, the population (White) in South Africa increased by some 25% and the total number of families by 28%, motherless families increased by 71.5% and fatherless families by almost 50%. This represented an overall increase of nearly 53% in one-parent families and constituted (by 1970) over 9.3% of all families with dependent children. This is very close to the British figure of ten percent for 1971, but considerably short of the 15% in the United States in 1975.

In South Africa in 1970 one in seven of lone-parent families were father-headed compared to one in ten in the United States in 1975. While the number of children in two-parent White South African homes increased by about 27%, there was an almost 62% increase in the number of dependent children in White one-parent homes from 1960 to 1970 and constituted almost 13% of all children by 1970. Divorce, the main cause of single-parenthood, has more than trebled from a specific divorce rate (number of divorces per thousand married couples) of 3.5 in 1935 to 11.2 in 1975. The crude divorce rate (number of divorces per thousand population) had increased, over the same period, from 0.69 to 2.53 (compared to 5.00 in the United States in 1975) and the number of children involved increased more than six-fold, from 2,247 to 13,815 children (Department of Statistics 1976, Table D.1).

Statistics differ (as shown) in different Western countries, including South Africa, but more in absolute numbers than in trends. The continuing numerical growth of the one-parent family is more readily understood in the light of some of the following medical, social, and demographic changes which have taken place in most countries constituting our so-called Western society (Fullerton 1972; Finer Report, 1974, Vol.1; Hart 1976):

(i) More men and women marry today than in previous centuries.

(ii) They marry at younger ages than previously, but,

(iii) family planning has been made possible by the sophistication of contraceptive devices,

(iv) leading to, usually, smaller family units;
(v) with childbearing periods compressed into earlier years of marriage

(vi) the pattern of women's working lives and motherhood have changed. Excepting for a brief working period before or early in marriage, women today give birth, for the most part, between completion of a formal education and entering the labour market, returning thereto often while still young.

(vii) All these developments followed industrialization, urbanization, democratization, universal education and women's (relative) liberation.

(viii) This has made possible horizontal (geographic) and vertical (social) movement.

(ix) There has been a change in societal attitudes to sex and to the right of both parties to aspire to personal happiness in marriage. Society accepts a greater equality of roles between wife and husband within and outside the home and does not accept as axiomatic the permanence of marriage. The stigma of divorce (and, to a much lesser degree, illegitimacy) has weakened.

(x) In many Western countries following changes in societal attitudes, social legislation has materially, and to a lesser degree societally, made lone-parenthood a more viable alternative to turbulent marriage.

(xi) The cumulative result of all the above demographic and social changes has been an increase in the incidence of divorce;

(xii) but with death rates (particularly maternal mortality rates) having sharply dropped*

(xiii) the one-parent family is today mainly the product of divorce rather than death.

(xiv) There is, too, an increasing number of mothers of illegitimate children who are opting to keep their offspring, as also (some) fathers of illegitimate children who opt (and are permitted) to adopt them.

2.3 Functions of the one-parent family

Society expects single-parent families to fulfill all but one of the same functions as two-parent families. Horowitz and Perdue (1977: 504), drawing upon Duvall (1971) delineate parental, familial and societal obligations expected from two-parent families, including:

(i) satisfying its members basic needs (food, clothing, shelter),

(ii) providing socialization and authority,

(iii) placing its members in the larger society and

(iv) fulfilling emotional needs.

*We know that death rates have fallen sharply over the last forty years and are now so low in the relevant age groups that no foreseeable change is likely to have much effect on the numbers of one-parent families (Finer Report, Vol. 1, 1974:490)
All these functions are, in the case of the one-parent family, required to be fulfilled by the single-parent only. This makes the parental role more onerous and it is generally questioned whether all the responsibilities, which, in many cases, were previously shared with the other parent, can be adequately shouldered by the lone-parent. According to La Grange (1970:207):

Hierdie konfigurasiie van rolle bring nie alleen meer verpligtinge en verantwoordlikhede mee nie, maar leen homself tot moontlike rolkonflik, botsings en distansieering.

One basic function of the two-parent family, that of procreation (and legitimizing sexual expression), the one-parent family does not fulfil. This, perhaps, is to a considerable extent the cause for some of the reservations found in societal attitude to the one-parent family and expressed in varying degree, ranging from suspicion, ambivalent and negative attitudes and lack of acceptance, to overt prejudice. It may also be the reason why the one-parent family is so often merely of a transient nature until remarriage. Sprey (1975:50) extrapolates: 'As long as the intact family is considered the normal and desirable way of rearing children the situation' (remarriage) 'is unlikely to change.'

2.3.1 Economic factors

There is a consensus amongst researchers that the economic situation constitutes perhaps the severest problem common to most lone-parent families. It is probably not accidental that Hart (1976), in the flyleaf inset to her book, gave precedence to material disadvantage. She wrote:

The breakdown of marriage for men and women alike can mean financial hardship, domestic problems, social isolation, the experience of being stigmatized, and personal disorganization of a kind that can induce mental ill-health and even physical deterioration.

Some writers have criticized fellow researchers for focusing so much attention on the psychological difficulties of lone-parents. They thus lose the import of the full reality of the severe nature of the single-parent's reduced financial position, and its resulting traumatic concomitants. This is brought out by Herzog and Sudia (1972:179):

The psychological problems of the middle-class one-parent mother have received more research attention than the physical demands and economic stresses her role is likely to impose. Nevertheless, although the relative weighting may be different, she is not immune to many of the problems so vividly documented for the poor.

This holds true in various degrees for either lone-parent in different economic strata. According to Hart (1976:144, 145) it is the
upper working and lower middle class who suffer most. With the poor, the standard of living remained largely unchanged. Their dependence on the community and the state continued, perhaps to a larger degree. For the upper working and lower middle class, however, marital breakdown inevitably meant material deprivation even in the case of the men: They maintained their income but often they had to pay maintenance and mortgages on the house retained by the ex-wife, in addition to running their own home. The women in this class could not maintain the standard they had become accustomed to during marriage.

Ogg (1975:17) points out that, together with the possibility of decreased income which may result from divorce, there is the probability of increased expenditure. A study by the Community Council of Greater New York in June, 1973, showed that for a typical family of four, in which the husband is the only breadwinner, the costs increased by about 25% after divorce. Numerous researchers (Rowntree 1954-1955; Wynn 1964; Marsden 1969; Hunt et al. 1973) have all written about the financial hardships experienced by one-parent families. These difficulties, in many cases bordering on poverty, often result in serious widespread deprivation.

Some researchers (Hunt et al. 1973; Finer Report, Vol. 1,1974) point out that economic hardship* in one-parent situations rather than being eased, has, in many cases, perpetuated itself within the last few decades. This is in keeping with the deductions of Glasser and Navarre (1965:107) that both the lone-parent structure and poverty 'are being transmitted from one generation to the next.' Hunt et al. (1973:64) too suggest from their findings, that deprivation may sometimes be self-perpetuating:

...parents whose own environment is unsatisfactory may be more likely to have broken marriages and thus produce an unsatisfactory environment for their children with the possibility of deprivation for the succeeding generation... effecting improvements in the conditions of disadvantaged families...may also break the vicious circle of continuing deprivation and hence reduce the problems of the next generation.

A lack of income is often associated with, perpetuated by, and results in stressful conditions. According to Ferri and Robinson (1976:61):

Insufficient income, housing problems, difficulty in co-ordinating work and domestic responsibility and of ensuring that their children were properly cared for -- these were the chief sources of potential stress which family breakdown brought to parents.

*Such hardships are, for instance, brought out in a report of a study conducted in 1970 by the Social Survey of the British Office of Population Census and Surveys entitled Families and their Needs, with Particular Reference to One-Parent Families by Hunt, Fox, and Morgan, 1973.
The single-parent family structure of one parent and child/ren generally means that such a family has fewer resources with which to run its household (Marsden 1969; Finer Report 1974; Ferri and Robinson 1976). Its purchasing power is reduced. In two-parent families where the woman is also working, her income affords the family elevation into a higher income bracket and very often lifts the family out of the lowest group, while, as a result of the one-parent situation, the economic position of most such families deteriorates, either due to loss or reduction in income or increase in expenditure, the mother-headed family is usually hit hardest. As a woman's earning capacity, due to inequality of salaries generally prejudiced against women, is lower than that of the man, where the lone-parent is a female the drop in income is even greater; and as in most Western countries between 85% to 90% of lone-parent families are mother-headed, the probability of economic hardship amongst the one-parent structured family is therefore high. Hunt et al. (1973:29-31) found that single-parent families' incomes are far lower (generally bordering on half that of lower income two-parent families).

The great difference in income between the two and one-parent family is illustrated by the following table of incomes of White families in the Republic of South Africa (R.S.A.):

TABLE II
INCOMES, R.S.A. (WHITES)
TYPES OF FAMILIES -- FAMILY INCOME
(Extracted from Report 02-03-02 Population Census, 1970 The Government Printer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>R 0 - R 400</th>
<th>R 400 - R 2,000</th>
<th>R 2,000 - R 6,000</th>
<th>R 6,000 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband and Wife</td>
<td>30,310</td>
<td>620 (2.84%)</td>
<td>5,510 (18.17%)</td>
<td>19,030 (62.78%)</td>
<td>5,160 (17.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father, Mother and Child/ren</td>
<td>69,120</td>
<td>910 (1.3%)</td>
<td>4,520 (6.53%)</td>
<td>48,790 (70.58%)</td>
<td>14,900 (21.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father and Child/ren</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>40 (5.22%)</td>
<td>200 (16.12%)</td>
<td>810 (65.32%)</td>
<td>180 (14.51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and Child/ren</td>
<td>6,770</td>
<td>640 (9.45%)</td>
<td>3,370 (49.77%)</td>
<td>2,400 (35.45%)</td>
<td>340 (5.02%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to only under 8% of two-parent with child/ren families with an income of under R 2,000 a year, there were almost 20% motherless families and almost 60% fatherless families in this income bracket. For the over R 2,000 bracket, which in 1970 provided a 'livable' income, only one out
of three fatherless families qualified. This shows that in South Africa the lone-parent situation causes economic hardships very similar to those suffered by such families in other 'Western' countries.

The reasons for the one-parent's family's usual material disadvantage is by and large common to most of these countries. Single parents are frequently restricted in the number of hours they can invest in earning a living. Overtime work and shift work is often ruled out. Some lone-parents must work shorter hours and stay away when the children are ill or during school holidays. Some have to give up work which involves travelling far from home. Some have to be content with less remunerative employment, because duties, functions, responsibilities in the home must come first. Sometimes home-management, child rearing and a loss of self esteem (dealt with in the later ensuing sections, 'Fatherless, Motherless') undermine the single-parent's work efficiency. Demotion in employment or even unemployment may result.

According to Marsden (1969) and Hunt et al. (1973), whether a lone-parent has decided to carry on working or to take up employment, the number of hours she works, depends largely on her economic position at the time of her lone-parent status, the number and ages of dependent children, the composition of the household, the social services available and also the norms prevailing in her environment, the single-parent's attitude to work and the type of work available and performed by the lone-parent. Financial matters are often uppermost in employment decisions. Satisfaction offered from working, escape from drudgery, the chance of meeting people and increasing social contacts, work tediousness and monotony, all may play a part in helping a single parent decide to work or give up employment or change working hours or place of work. It has been found (Hunt et al. 1973) that very often there is no choice at all because of compelling economic circumstances and that in both full-time and part-time employment a higher proportion of non-married males and females are engaged in lower level occupations. In the lower income-bracket particularly, the financial position of the widow is usually better than that of the divorced, separated or unmarried mother. She is generally entitled to a widows' pension (although not in South Africa, for instance). The deceased husband often has left the widowed family with some financial provisions in terms of a deceased estate and/or insurance policy. Some are left with property, although debts owing on a mortgage may be high.

In analysing the financial stress of one-parent families, the cost of home management, child rearing and socializing must be taken into

* The feminine gender is used here as women far outnumber men in lone-parent situations.
account. While there is, in a one-parent family situation, one less adult to feed, house and clothe, this potential economic saving is almost inevitably counteracted by the economic disadvantages of lone-parenthood. From the outset of this situation the lone-parent is generally faced with debts such as mortgage on a property or hire-purchase debt on furniture, incurred during the two-parent situation. This must now be paid by the single parent from a (probably) diminished budget. The lone-parent, after the breakdown, very often has to set up home from scratch, has to procure furniture and make other heavy essential purchases. Both male and female lone parents (male generally more so), particularly when working to earn a living and performing parental functions, buy more expensive frozen or pre-cooked convenience foods (George and Wilding 1972). Children must often be looked after by outsiders, during the solo-parent's working day, after normal working hours, when a solo-parent cannot or chooses not to be at home, during vacations and holidays, and when the parent or child is ill. Unless extended family members (not so readily available as in previous centuries), or other householders (such as siblings) undertake this and other help, such functions must be paid for. Because of their limited economic resources (often because with the restrictions imposed by their new conditions, they are less exposed to and less able to take advantage of favourable opportunities) the horizontal and vertical mobility of one-parent families is limited.

In many Western world countries there is still a lack of institutional care (such as creches) for children of solo-parents. Hunt et al (1973:63) state that child care, employment and financial arrangements are not, but should be such, that lone-parents who choose to stay at home with their children and those who choose to go out to work, should be able to do so. As it is, children in one-parent families are often deprived of adequate fathering or mothering. Employment for economic 'gain' concurrent with home management, is frequently not a choice but a necessity for many lone-parents.

2.3.2 Housing and the one-parent family

The break up of a marriage (for whatever reasons) is frequently followed or preceded by the break up of the home. Depending on the arrangements arrived at (by decree or private mutual arrangements), upon the factual or legal dissolution of the marriage, the house will either

a) be sold off with both parents leaving it, or

b) one of the parents will retain it, often, but not necessarily, the one retaining the custody of the children.

In the former, both parties must set up alternative housing arrangements; in the latter one must do so. The setting up of two households which
usually follows the break up of the conjugal home obviously involves additional expenses as there is duplication of goods and services. There is normally no or no proportionate increase in the aggregate income of the members of the family. The financial amount available for housing therefore decreases.

Hart (1976:141) focuses on the problem of housing usually faced by the one-parent family thus:

Marital breakdown destroys the laboriously constructed equilibrium of the household economy. Its most striking material consequence is that only one partner can continue to occupy the family home.

The Finer Report (1974:508) stresses that, second only to financial difficulties and exacerbated by them, housing is the largest single problem of one-parent families.

Large numbers of one-parent families do not even have a home of their own and have to share, usually with relatives (Marsden 1969). A high proportion, too, are forced into the rapidly shrinking private rental sector, where they generally have to pay high rents for inferior housing. They tend to move more often than two-parent families, and are more likely to become homeless (Ferri (a) 1976). A much smaller proportion of one-parent than two-parent families own their own houses. The most acute housing difficulties are among unmarried mothers who often have no home of their own to start with (Pringle 1975; Finer Report, Vol. 1. 1974), and among the divorcing families, particularly at the point of marriage breakdown, when the ownership and occupation of the marital home may come into question.

Thus, closely related to the downward spiral of deprivation experienced by many one-parent families, are their poor housing conditions, often costing them an unequal, disproportionate amount of their incomes. The fatherless, being generally in the lowest income bracket, are also comparatively the poorest housed, in the least desirable areas. (See also 3.1.2.1 and 3.2.2.1)

The never-married mother is more stigmatized and, being considered a less desirable tenant, is allotted the lowest rung. Some single-fathers (and single-mothers to a much lesser extent) may resort to hotels or boarding accommodation, often of an inferior quality.

Lone-parents, particularly the younger, may, upon becoming a lone-parent, move in with their parents. Single-parent families have a higher density of occupation than two-parent families. A lone-father or mother, out of choice and/or out of need, may sleep not only in the same room, but also in the same bed as the child (Marsden 1969; see 3.1.2.1).
Regarding the feelings of satisfaction, lone-parents had about the standard of their accommodation since their lone-parent situation, Ferri (1976(a):82) found that it closely followed the relative change in the quality of their accommodation. With the motherless, where there was little or no deterioration in housing, there was general satisfaction. The fatherless, especially the divorced, separated and unmarried mothers were much less satisfied, with only one in four expressing some degree of satisfaction.

Housing not only provides a roof over the head. Its condition and situation is also generally regarded as an index of the social class of the family. With the deterioration in housing conditions and location, usually following lone-parenthood, there is a continuation of the downward economic and social spiral. Fatherless families, being relatively more disadvantaged as well as more numerous than motherless, are those most affected (See 3.1.1 and 3.2.1).

As in most of the Western industrialized world, in South Africa too lone-parenthood is often negatively linked with the type of accommodation occupied. This is illustrated in the following table.

**TABLE III**

**HOUSING, REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFIRICA, 1970 (WHITES)
TYPE OF FAMILY AND TYPE OF DWELLING**

(Extracted from Report 02-03-02 Population Census, 1970
The Government Printer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Flat</th>
<th>Hotel and Boarding</th>
<th>Other dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband and Wife</td>
<td>227,780</td>
<td>155,010</td>
<td>65,720</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and Child/ren</td>
<td>629,610</td>
<td>555,340</td>
<td>66,500</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>3,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father and Child/ren</td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>7,540</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and Child/ren</td>
<td>55,830</td>
<td>39,410</td>
<td>15,090</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note i) The unlisted, to make up the 100%, were in old-aged homes and hostels.

ii) It is presumed that 'other dwellings' are mainly with relatives.
While (in 1970) close to 90% of two-parent families lived in a house and only 10% in a flat, only some 70% of fatherless families occupied homes and almost 30% were in flats. There were almost six times as many fatherless as motherless homes. These father and child/ren families, because of the higher income level of the male, could afford better accommodation than their female counterparts. Almost two percent of them lived in hotels and boarding houses. As Ferri 1976(a):71) points out, while no generalizations can be made, it is reasonable to assume that a house, especially with a garden, is a preferable type of accommodation for a family with young children.

The table does not reveal the standard of home or apartment but, being comparatively economically deprived (see Table I) the fatherless obviously are more likely to be able to afford only lower-bracket homes in lower-bracket locations compared to the fatherless family and even more so compared to the two-parent family.

2.3.3 Lone-parenthood -- status passage

One of the purposes of the family is status-ascription (Green 1968:352). Presuming the one-parent family must, or is expected by society, to fulfill the functions of the two-parent nuclear family, it is pertinent to examine if, and how, the absence of one parent affects status-ascription. For this review of the status passage the writer drew mainly on Hart (1976:124-128). The lives and histories of all individuals are made up of a series of social positions of status they pass through. Each status the individual, particularly the male, goes through is related to a different set of social relationships and interactions. A man's marital status (Hart:1) is related to his home and his nuclear kin. A man's occupational status is related to his work associates and his place of employment.

The context and structure of an individual's social identity, his own assessment of where he belongs in society, and who he is, is determined by the sum of all his statuses, in their relative importance.

Through the social interaction an individual enjoys, through the role support he obtains, he is able to legitimize his own role identities. While the role support of others is important, the individual's own role involvement, his own claims to an identity, are significant factors in the establishment of his social identity.

Marriage is an important determinant of social identity. Hart (1976) quoted Becker and Hill (1942:82):

Each young man who marries brings with him, both consciously and unconsciously, his idea of the part to be played by himself as husband and the part to be played by his wife as his wife. Similarly, the young woman enters marriage with a preconceived notion of the roles of
husband and wife.

When their expectations are not fulfilled, dissatisfaction sets in. The marriage is in jeopardy.

The social class the male belongs to in society is classified by his current occupational role and the female's usually by that of the male with whom she shares the most intimate relationship -- her father or her husband. From this it is clear that:

(a) Males are the determinants of social class, generally;
(b) Females are the inheritors of social class, from their fathers, until marriage, and their husbands afterwards.

But there is an incipient tendency to question the finality of the above. Hunt and Hunt (U.S., 1977:11) raised the point that 'when the homemaker wife becomes a wife with a paycheck, the balance of power in the house often changes because, for most of us, money confers power.' To the extent that man's dominant role in establishing social class stems from his dominant role as breadwinner, the basis for man's exclusive dictation of status is undermined.

Demands made upon marriage by its partners, expectations unfulfilled, can and often do lead to conflict. Individuals will more readily break loose of a marriage where there are viable alternatives to their current married state. For instance, availability of social benefits, alternative living arrangements, a new partner in the wings, independent earning capacity or income -- any one or more of these will, where conflict exists, influence a person's decision to cut the conjugal bonds.

Almost all of society has been indoctrinated to view monogamous marriage as a life-long relationship for two people. This largely explains the individual's usual lack of preparation for the breakdown of marriage and his reluctance to recognize that his marriage has come to an end. But as access to divorce becomes easier and its societal acceptance increasingly widespread, marriage is viewed more and more as an open-ended contract of partnership rather than in its (hitherto) historical role which is still the accepted norm.

When marriage breaks down, it necessitates a transition by the individual to a new status. The impact and demands on the individual of new activities, roles and relationships, and identity loss, may be considerable. Class, income, cultural constraints, ethnicity, residence, family constraints, all affect the individual's adjustment and acceptance of his part in his status passage. The individual's level of expectation and the extent to which it may already have been incorporated into the individual's self, affects his adjustment and social identity. Thus, where an individual finds himself alone with his problems after marriage breakdown, his adjustment to his new, temporary status is difficult.
His adjustment is even more difficult because other people refuse to become involved and so not help.

Nor are there any comparative provisions such as often exist for easing the passage in status associated with other conditions of crisis such as bereavement, accident, unemployment or retirement. The divorced or separated lone-parent is simply left to negotiate the status passage on his own without the benefit of recognized or accepted rules or norms. Nicky Hart (1976:125) called this an 'unstructured' status passage as compared with Glaser and Strauss's (1965) term 'non-scheduled' in their study involving bereavement. Hart (1976:178) referred to the particularly severe problems faced by those who had married upwards (status-wise) and, upon their divorce or separation, could not return to their parents except for visits, as their achieved status was no longer validated by their home of origin. By virtue of the fact that the woman's status is dependent upon that of her spouse, that men therefore suffer no downgrading in marrying below their 'class,' and it is the woman who generally marries 'up,' it is also, generally, the woman who suffers most in such marital breakdowns. Goode (1956:102) similarly stated that men stand to lose little by marrying downward. Goode deduced consequently that

(a) a man is more likely to marry downwards than a woman is and therefore

(b) unions in which she marry upwards are more common than unions in which the woman marries downward.

Hart (1976:126) contended that:

When a status is anticipated, the effects of the status passage are devastating. Separation and divorce for this reason constitute a reversal of expected life careers and many respondents described the event of marital breakdown as the end of life itself. Hopes of reconciliation further delay the process of identification with the new status... Status passage...is critically a subjective process, compounded of individual perceptions as much as 'objective' structural dimensions...

2.3.4 Parental familial roles, emotions

Researchers (Goode 1956; Hunt 1966; La Grange 1970; Weiss 1975; Hart 1976; Hetherington, Cox and Cox 1978) have pointed out that the experiences single-parents live through are much greater than imagined by them before they are faced with their single-parent situations. Part of the problem is having to cope, without the other parent, single-handed, with day-to-day decisions. In many cases, alone, the single-parent finds himself grappling with his own painful adjustments to the breakdown of a marriage or to the death of the marriage partner. Generally he must also help the children overcome their sense of deprivation and their anger at having only one parent in an as yet predominantly
two-parent societal framework. A never-married single parent is, like other single-parents, expected to fulfil the tasks of both mother and father, but often in the face of societal non-acceptance, disapproval and even stigmatization, directed more strongly against them than against other lone-parents (see 2.5.4.8). Problems of parental deprivation are discussed in Chapter 4, 'Effects on children.'

At the onset of one-parent status, a lone-parent's reaction to the new status is largely affected by the nature of the crisis which caused the new situation. As has been mentioned already, loneparenthood is brought about by choice, as in the case of single-parent adoption and (sometimes) unwed parenthood; or by unavoidable necessity as in the case of widowhood. Divorce, separation, or desertion may be a choice to one parent and unavoidable to the other or a mutual choice, or a mutually unavoidable situation may have been created. According to Sprey (1975:50) the relevance of the 'crisis-provoking event is frequently ignored as a major explanatory factor in the study of singleparenthood.'

Although there are differing categories of one-parent families, classified by sex and marital status, most types of lone-parent families experience similar problems. These may run the gamut from physical disorders to emotional ones involving the parent, the child or both. Some of the problems, according to La Grange (1970), Weiss (1975), Blechman and Manning (1976) and Horowitz and Perdue (1977:506-508) are:

(a) crisis, trauma and shock
(b) loneliness,
(c) guilt,
(d) depression,
(e) loss of well-being, and
(f) generalized functioning difficulties;
(g) societal prejudices and social readjustment.

(a) Crisis, trauma and shock

La Grange (1970:165) considers the term 'crisis' more applicable than 'trauma' to experiences in divorce situations. She is of the opinion that the term 'crisis' is more relevant to social work, as opposed to 'trauma' which is the term used by Goode (1965:184-187) and which has psychoanalytical connotations, although it does, La Grange explains, refer to elements involved in crisis, such as pain, injury (besering) and an incapacity to handle unaided a traumatic situation. La Grange (p.165) cites Selby's (1969) analysis of crisis.

La Grange does not deal with divorce itself as a crisis. She places emphasis on the subjective emotional reactions of her respondents to the crisis as being the determining factors rather than objective elements. Consequently, the divorcee's diverse emotional experiences, which come to the fore, and the ability to handle problems -- all of which
differ so much from person to person -- may be decisive in the resolution of the crisis.

Because the average amount of conflict between divorcing spouses is usually more frequent and more intense than between spouses whose marriage came to an end through death, Goode (1956), concluded that the trauma of divorce would, in fact be less, than the trauma experienced by a surviving spouse after a marriage partner's death. Goode distinguished between high trauma and low trauma according to six behavioural items which he assumed would vary according to the impact of the conflict. According to Goode (p. 187):

The point of greatest disturbance appears to be the time of final separation. Roughly one-fourth to one-third of the cases in which there was trouble, experiences this period as one of the greatest disturbance, for each of the seven items... the separation is a public act for the reference groups involved, even though it has no legal standing. Both husband and wife have to begin playing the role of divorcee to some extent, once they have broken up their common household, and the change cannot be hidden from their families and friends.

Over three-fifths of Goode's respondents seemed to have gone through some personal disorganization, the emotional impact being severest not at the time of the decree but at the final separation. But the trauma did not appear so overwhelming as to disorganize his respondents (p.188). Goode found that in the case of younger divorcees, the longer the marriage, the higher the degree of trauma at separation, and with older divorcees, the longer the marriage, the less the trauma at separation.

Goode (1956:198) found a positive association between the reported experiences of discrimination and trauma. Respondents experiencing trauma, were more sensitive to 'slights and rebuffs' and more often ascribed them to their divorced status. In Goode's sample, 50% of the respondents who had experienced discrimination, were classed as high trauma respondents, compared with 38% who reported not having met with discrimination. Weiss (1975:237) explained that immediately after the separation, some individuals, though generally only a minority, experience a few days of shock and denial. As these separated persons have pushed off the recognition that the separation happened, they do not feel the distress of the separation. This reaction seems most likely where the separation has taken the individuals concerned by surprise. The sensations described by these individuals were of having felt 'numb, giddy, lightheaded.' Weiss wrote: 'The separation appeared unreal, as though they were watching a movie in which they happened to have a role.'

(b) Loneliness

The feeling of intense loneliness may be best described as isolation in a society of people, of aloneness. Loneliness or isolation is not a state of being alone. Marris (1958), Arsenau et al. (1971), The Canadian Council on Social Development (1971), Caine (1975) and Weiss (1975)
all wrote of the aloneness of the lone-parent.

Single-parent families live within society. There are millions of other single-parent families like them. The feeling is intense. A widow, describing her loneliness, said, 'It isn't the loneliness, my dear, one can cope with that; it's the aloneness.' *(N.C.O. Publication, 1975: 7).* The Canadian Council on Social Development (1971:12) described the experience of loneliness as 'a feeling of social discontinuity or of social displacement.' In its Report, the Council pointed out that 'this feeling appeared to be very common and very uncomfortable.' Hart (1976: 160) pointed out that the isolation and aloneness of the divorced was experienced by them (i) outside their houses and (ii) within their houses. Hart reported from her investigations (p.159) that eighty percent mentioned some form of social isolation as their most pressing problem and seventy percent thought that loneliness was a common feature of both divorce and widowhood. There is a difference in type and degree between loneliness after the death of a spouse and loneliness felt by the divorced. After death, bereavement sets in in the form of sadness and often anguish and remorse. After divorce, all this may be experienced, together with a sense of failure and rejection.

Although this form of marriage breakup is today a common experience, because of the social stigma still attached to divorce, the lone-parent may experience, in addition to loneliness -- a loss of self-esteem. Some writers and reformers have, in their analysis of loneliness, concluded that the feeling cannot be cured but only shared.

The widowed, who may suffer immeasurable grief and anguish on the death of a spouse, often take solace in the memories of shared joy with the deceased. Sometimes their memories veer on unrealistic exaggerated involvement with and praise for the dead. It is as if the bad experiences and unpleasant memories in reverence of the dead, perhaps through fear and superstition, can and are pushed aside. Weiss (1973) described loneliness as a problem affecting particularly unmarried, widowed, divorced men and women.

The single-parent often lacks the meaningful intimate relationship of a second parent. Weiss (1973) found she has painful yearnings for links to a social network, for sharing, for intimacy. Other writers have shown that the extent of the experience of loneliness is greatly influenced by the supports available, personally and socially; by the type of loss, the age and emotional maturity of the single-parent.

(c) Guilt

Many lone-parents experience an emotion of guilt. This has been defined as a feeling of remorse arising from some wrongdoing or violation of a value. This feeling of guilt may be on an unconscious or on a conscious level. The experience of guilt among single-parent
families has largely been explained by the Western 'mythical' (Horowitz and Perdue 1977) assumptive belief that the best possible home environment for children to grow up in is a two-parent family environment. Consequently, explain some researchers, single-parents take upon themselves blame, guilt for the loss of the other parent, the death, separation or divorce and the circumstances leading up to it, which brought about the loss. In addition, the remaining parent (and the never-married mother often blames herself for having brought an illegitimate child into the world) blames herself for having to deprive the child of the two-parent family environment. She sees herself as a bad parent and a failure. Because of her socially unacceptable status she blames herself for the societal stigma attached to her status. Because of societal stigma attached to single-parent families, especially when its cause is 'socially unacceptable' for example divorce, desertion, unwed motherhood, parents often feel guilty for the existence of such a situation. It makes little difference whether her guilt is well-founded or unrealistic. The lone-mother suffers as a result of it.

La Grange (1970:212), in her study, ascribed most of the feelings of guilt of divorced mothers to their blaming themselves for depriving the child of a father. This was particularly heightened by societal sympathy towards children in one-parent families, regardless of the causal circumstances. The children compared themselves with their peers from intact homes and the mother felt guilty that her children belonged to a deviant, minority group, and that the children missed their fathers. La Grange found several cases in her study where the children took upon themselves the guilt for the estrangement between the parents. The feeling of guilt is very disturbing and very painful and often very difficult to resolve. It may lead to depression.

(d) Depression

Depression has been defined as an expression of loss of self-esteem, an expression of powerlessness and helplessness. The individual's aspirations to be superior, to be unaggressive, to be good and loving, to be appreciated and loved, are not fulfilled. The individual feels guilty because the break has occurred. His self-esteem is lowered. He feels he is not secure enough nor strong enough to handle the family's burdens. His anger at his plight is directed inwards. He is depressed. Often this depression leads to difficulty in functioning, such as inferior work performance.

(e) Loss of well-being

Frequently family members, affected by the separation, experience a loss of well-being. Men and women are differently affected (Krantzler 1973).
It has generally been found that men are more hard hit than women. Generally, they are more significantly unhappy than women. Biological ('given') factors of health, age, sex, affect the individuals' post-separation well-being; older men and women appear to be more affected than younger, men more than women, the sick more than the healthy. Social context factors, those related to the marital status, such as length of marriage, numbers and ages of children, size and type of kin relationships, also affect well-being. Likewise, and in addition, achieved social factors of education, work, finance, influence the well-being of familial members.

(f) Generalized functioning difficulties

Often following and because of loneliness, guilt, lack of well-being, stigmatization, change of financial circumstances, single-parents and their families find difficulty in functioning. The single-parent cannot cope with demands which are complex, varied and aggravated by the limited financial and depleted emotional and often poorer physical resources at her disposal. Children's school performance frequently suffers. Other family members' regular work and performance of functions deteriorate. The entire family appears disorganized.

(g) Societal prejudices and social re-adjustment

Blechman and Manning (1976) analysed the difficulties experienced by single-parents in making new friends or keeping friendships with the opposite sex as extremely difficult, as 'dating and parenting behaviours are regarded as mutually exclusive' (p.75). In addition derogatory stereotypes set up by society such as 'the merry widow,' the 'gay divorcee' influence societal perceptions of the lone-mother and make her heterosexual adjustment still harder. Additionally, the single parent's difficulties are increased by the unfavourable reactions of children. Jealousy, fear of abandonment, a comparison of the custodial parent with, and a yearning for, the missing parent, often set up a chain of hostile behaviour actions by the children. Many single-parents prefer social isolation to these unfavourable situations. No norms exist to guide the single-parent in developing socially sanctioned heterosexual relationships (Gavai 1967; Weiss 1975; Hart 1976). According to Blechman and Manning (1976) lone-fathers are more accepted by society than lone-mothers. While the single-father is desired for managing the home and rearing the children, the single-mother is regarded by society as merely carrying out her expected role. The lone-father is treated more favourably than the single-mother by various community services, neighbours, kin and friends. The cause of single-parenthood greatly influences the social acceptability of the family and the social and material rewards, the family receives. Widowed families are usually sympathetically treated by society and receive more aid from maternal and paternal extended kin, than the single-family brought about by socially unacceptable
circumstances such as divorce, desertion, separation, unwed motherhood. Legislation reflects societal prejudices and tends to be favourable to socially acceptable family categories. Benefits are often provided for widows and orphans.

Societal approval and disapproval of the cause of lone-parenthood affects the family's subjective evaluation and negative community attitudes may cause self-castigation and lowered expectations within the family group. Single-parents generally have limited opportunities for meeting people. Societal discrimination and stigmatization often prevent lone-parents from making friendships, casual or more intimate. Because of preconceived ideas and societal assumptions, prejudices and accepted beliefs, a lone male parent rearing his children very ten cannot employ an 'eligible' female as help, without it being assumed that he is having intimate sexual relations with her. For similar reasons, often, he cannot easily and freely visit couples or wives or single women in his neighbourhood. Female lone-parents experience similar problems in their socializing with couples, married or single men. Often before their single-parent status the lone-parents harboured such ingrained prejudices themselves. The lone-parent regards himself and is regarded negatively.

(h) Comparative attitudes to widowed, divorced, separated and unmarried

Society is, by far and large, still a two-parent familial system. Widowed, divorced, separated, never-married persons are regarded as the 'fifth wheels' in their communities. Millions of men and women all over the Western world are raising children alone, yet by and large the societal norm remains that of the two-parent family. As a deviant minority one-parent families all share in common, but in unequal measure, societal negative attitudes. The degree of societal opprobrium differs according to the cause of the lone-parent situation. One-parent families may be ranked in this order of acceptance by society at large (Schlesinger 1975):

(1) Widowed
(2) Divorced
(3) Separated
(4) Unmarried

Harbert's (1977:6) summary is most descriptive:

There is considerable sympathy for widows and widowers but there is a fair amount of suspicion about the divorced, opprobrium for the separated and downright hostility for the unmarried.

At least at the beginning of their bereavement and, generally in an effort to comfort them, society often rallies around the widowed. However, according to Schlesinger (1975:5) pity on the part of many well-meaning persons can drive a widowed parent into apathy, despair, and isolation.
Society can accept the widow and look upon her as the poor unfortunate mother left alone with her children. In comparison, social disapproval is still, as a rule, the deserts of the divorced. They generally are not comforted by society and very often feel they must, because of this, cut themselves off from social contacts. The divorced woman is generally frowned upon by society. She is often not trusted by her married female friends and is often not wanted by them. If she is wanted, she often experiences a lack of security,aloneness and being unwanted, in a world of 'couples.' Men often regard her as easy prey for casual sex. The divorced man is less frowned upon but equally under suspicion by society (Blechman and Manning 1976). In describing the position of the separated in society, Schlesinger (1975:6-7) stated that, as they are neither married, nor single, nor legally free to marry again, they feel themselves in a vacuum and uncomfortable. They usually find it difficult to explain the separation and attitudes about the absent parent to the children. Rosen (1977:99) discussing the direct and indirect results of prejudice states:

Finally, the attitudes of society are also relevant. Society tends to treat bereaved families kindly, whereas divorcees tend to be censured. This increases their feelings of resentment, guilt and failure, all of which can be expected to affect their relationship with their children.

Herszog and Sudia (1972:180) stress the importance of recognizing the one-parent family as a form that exists, rather than as an aberration or sick family. This changing attitude, not only by sociologists, is finally seeping into public behaviour and legislation. The extent of changing societal attitudes, particularly the weakening of the stigma to divorce was highlighted by press coverage of the divorce of Princess Margaret, sister of the Queen of England. The Cape Times, the Cape Town, S.A. English morning daily headlined on May 25th, 1978 'Princess Margaret Divorced: First Since Henry VIII' (in 1539). The report following pointed out that divorce was a mere formality with neither party being required to appear in court as under the updated British Divorce laws based on irretrievable breakdown, of some seven years standing, divorce is automatic where spouses have been separated for a minimum period of two years from each other. The report also mentions that there was little doubt that there had been amicable agreement about access to their two children (16 and 14 years old). A previous Cape Town press report, Cape Argus (afternoon daily), May 11th, 1978, recalled that Princess Margaret, had, some twenty years previously, bowed to pressure from her family and the Anglican Church and had given up her hopes of marrying Group Captain Peter Townsend, because he was a divorced man.

Closer to home, in 1979, a divorced man was elected mayor of one of the large South African cities.
An example of the legal recognition in South Africa of these changing attitudes is the Divorce Law based on irretrievable breakdown enacted in 1979, subsequent to the author having completed her investigation for this research project. But in spite of the increasing occurrence and acceptance both by society and by legislation of the lone-parent as being different but not deviant, there is no doubt that the one-parent family still often experiences societal prejudice and discrimination. There are, in the main, two principal stigmas, the one very often following from the other:

(i) the stigma of single-parent status, and
(ii) the welfare stigma (Marsden 1969)

as many single-parents, particularly women, are welfare recipients, because of a lack of income. Single-parenthood very often means a lowering of social status because of lack of income. It often means a downward social movement. As one woman put it: For a woman to divorce is to drop two economic and three social notches (Ogg 1976:3).

The one-parent family is very much with us today, but has not yet arrived.

2.4 The non-custodial parent

According to Sprey (1975:53):

Any study of single parenthood resulting from divorce that does not incorporate the very specific nature of the relationship between the departed parent and the former family is meaningless.

The writer has found no definitive term in literature for the divorced or separated non-custodial parent. The terms 'divorced father' or 'divorced mother' are used by Hetherington et al. (1977, 1978) and Anderson-Khleif (1978) among others, whether or not they have the custody of the children; in such use of the terms, the ongoing parent-child relationship is implicit. Hunt (1968) uses the term 'formerly married' to cover all except never-married and widowed. For every custodial parent there is a non-custodial parent. Hetherington, Cox and Cox (1977:1) point out the dearth of research from this aspect. Social scientists have focused on the effect of divorce on mothers and children rather than on the entire family system including the father.' Hetherington, Cox and Cox carried out a study using a sample of 96 middle class families, half being intact families and the other half divorced families. The emphasis was on families. There was an effort to match the intact and broken families. According to Hetherington, Cox and Cox (1977, 1978) the divorced father who leaves the home and undergoes the negative experience of separation from his children, experiences more identity problems and changes in self-concept initially than his wife.
With him, these feelings may pervade for a shorter time. The intensity of his feeling of loss may lessen with time, but it does not disappear and many fathers in the sample remained concerned about their children. If the two parents agreed on child rearing, had positive attitudes one to the other, with a continued supportive relationship, there was more positive adjustment of the child and more positive mother-child as well as father-child interaction.

Women the father was closely involved with, relatives and married friends offered the next effective support in his relationship with his child. Divorced fathers at the beginning generally saw their children very much more regularly; in fact, in the first two months after the divorce they may have been in more direct contact with the children than before the divorce. This changed over the months. Some fathers, described as 'highly involved, attached and affectionate parents' (p.13), although experiencing a deep sense of depression and loss, claimed they could not endure the pain and were, two years after the divorce, seeing the children only infrequently. Where there was a high degree of conflict between the spouses during the marriage, the divorce and the end of interparental strife in the presence of the children led to improved relationships of fathers with their children. The non-custodial fathers were more often included together with their children in the social activities of married friends than the custodial parent was.

The first year was a stressful period to both parents due to a testing of 'a variety of coping mechanisms in dealing with changes and stresses in their new life situation' (p.34). By the second year they were busy at various attempts to improve their self-esteem, the men more so than the women. Within this time the non-custodial father's use of negative sanctions with his children increased. The behaviour expressed in the phrase 'every day is Christmas' wore off. Parallel with this, the divorced mother's use of negative sanctions decreased and by two years after the divorce these mothers were using more explanations and more reasoning with their children.

Where the non-custodial fathers maintained frequent, regular contact with their children, their influence on the children did not decrease as much as when their contact was infrequent. Generally, two years after the divorce, mothers were influencing the children more and the divorced non-custodial fathers less.

The relationship between the divorced parents was predominantly characterized by 'acrimony, anger, feelings of desertion, resentment and memories of painful conflict' (p.18). However, there was considerable ambivalence, attachments persisted and, in some cases, even increased. Some fathers and some of their custodial parenting ex-wives reported that 'in the case of crises the ex-spouse would be the first person they would call' (p.18). With time, however, feelings of both conflict and attach-
ment wore off. In addition, remarriage or the formation of new intimate friendships by one or both parents, particularly weakened the divorced couple’s relationship.

It appears from this study that interaction between the spouses and between the non-custodial parent and child generally continues in varying degrees after the divorce. As it was a longitudinal study limited to two years, no conclusions could be arrived at as to the relationships in the future.

Weiss (1975:204) found that the feelings between spouses are not cut with the severance of the marriage bond. He also found that broken families join together on some family occasions or religious holidays out of sheer loneliness. There was a desire to 'maintain a sense of continuity in their own lives' (Hetherington et al. 1977:20). Sometimes contact was for the purpose of retaliation. Weiss found that with time the non-custodial parent sees his children less often, and, becoming more detached, becomes less nurturant. According to Hetherington et al. (1977:20) there was a desire to 'maintain a sense of continuity in their own lives.'

H. Raschke, in her computerized ongoing divorce related research compilation, in an updated report sheet (1978:62) summarizes a study by Anderson-Khleif (U.S.) of 50 divorced women having custody and 26 non-custodial fathers. One aspect studied was the relationships between fathers and children after divorce. Anderson-Khleif found that 'most fathers in the working, middle and upper-middle classes are not completely absent after divorce but rather enter some new and ongoing relationship with their children.' Most important was the nature of the ongoing contact: It was found that there was a distinct link between the social class and the behaviour of the divorced father (non-custodial in the study) to the extent that Anderson-Khleif constructed profiles on four types of father-child contact.

All these recent studies distinctly point to an ongoing relationship after divorce (or separation). The divorce decree (or legal separation), while dissolving the marriage, cannot and does not legally end all parental roles and relationships between the parents and particularly between the parents and their children. As pointed out by Elkin (1977), 'parents are for ever.'

2.5 Dating

According to Weiss (1975:278-293), although the actual term 'dating' is associated with adolescent experiences, 'dating' is practised by formerly married for various purposes:

a. the manifest purpose of spending an entertaining evening;
b. the latent purpose of re-entry into coupled society and
c. the unexpressed purpose of commencing and evaluating that continuation of a relationship with a member of the opposite sex, usually with a view to remarriage.

Dating is viewed as an opportunity for curing loneliness and for re-establishment of self-esteem, lowered by the separation or divorce. Particularly the first attempts at dating after marital breakdown may be a source of tension as there is a possibility of rejection of one party by the other. The tension of dating may bring a yearning to return to the spouse. There are no special rules of sexual conduct laid down in Western society about the dating behaviour of the formerly married. Weiss (1975:286,287) opined: 'Each person makes his or her own rules and then asks whether there is a joint policy compatible with them.' Some formerly married, whom in abbreviation Hunt (1968:19) refers to as 'FMs', date to take revenge on the ex-spouse. It may be regarded as repudiation of and distancing from the ex-spouse.

M. and B. Hunt (1977:53) found in their survey of the formerly married, that 'by the end of the first year, five-sixths of the men and three-quarters of the women are dating, including about a third of the pessimists.' They wrote further that the FMs, men and women, were afforded valuable learning experiences through a variety of dating experiences and that some of the experimentation also involved sexual experimentation. They wrote (p.53) 'the formerly married are even more accepting of casual sex than the young never-marrieds are.' They felt that FMs not only do not go out of their way to hide their sexual activities from their friends, but that a third of the men and about half the women, when asked about their sexual activities by their children, do not lie to them, either. However, the purpose and the goal of dating is generally remarriage, although after a few years the typical male FM has had ten partners and the woman five.

Hunt (1968) stated that such is the recuperative power of the normal psyche that three out of four FMs despite practical difficulties they may experience in finding suitable partners, do begin dating within the first year, and over nine out of ten do so before the end of the second. FMs are, according to Hunt (p.115) outgoing and communicative when they go on a date, and talk about themselves, and are pleased to have an opportunity to share experiences. This can be viewed as a special form of courtship. Hunt also pointed out that FMs are ambivalent about the purpose of their dating. While they wish to experience and enjoy their new freedom for variety, they generally fear repeating previous mistakes; yet they hope the dating will lead to a permanent relationship.

Goode (1956:255-282) felt that one needs opportunity to meet people and go out. The divorcée, Goode found from his research, is more likely to meet eligible men in an established circle of friends,
who felt more committed to the divor©©e's destiny, than in a new circle of friends. The opportunities for remarriage, Goode stated, are generally afforded through dating. Dating indicated a willingness on the part of the divorcé to start a new life, while also providing a stimulus and introduction to that new life. In Goode's sample (p.258) there were 188 divorc©©es who had not remarried and not going steady. Goode distinguished between casual and steady dating. He stated (p.269) '...in our family system we enter marriage typically through courtship, and that therefore a marriage is more likely to grow out of a steady dating relationship than out of an ordinary dating relationship; and much more likely than out of no dating relationship at all.'

In his sample of 188, 48% almost never had a date; 14% had one to two dates a month; 20% had one date a week; 18% had more than one date weekly. It was the young (those under 30 years of age) who dated most frequently. He found they had most opportunity to meet people and therefore they dated most; but those about 30 years old dated less as (probably) they had lost much of their appeal, but had not adjusted to this fact. The slightly older, on the other hand, accept this fact and accept dates which the slightly younger group would not consider. They have, therefore, a greater chance of remarriage. The educated, Goode found, dated more, and the middle and upper classes, belonging to more formal organizations, having larger social networks. Once dating begins, there is little retreat into isolation, and the social interaction usually continues until a new marriage is made. More of those who were still in love with their ex-husbands or had negative feelings about their ex-husbands were never dating than those who had friendly though not in-love feelings. Writing of the steady daters, Goode found that of those under 25 -- 48% were steady daters, and in all the other age groups in his sample, 34% were steady daters. More of those with one child were dating steadily than with more than one child, and amongst those with three children and more, the proportion dating steadily was higher than those who had only two children.

2.6 Living together arrangements (cohabitation)

Readmission to the conjugal state, may, according to Hart (1976:227) be through reconciliation, cohabitation or remarriage. Remarriage, however, remains almost the universal goal of the lone-parent. The widow/er, separated or divorcé©©e tries to fill the void (emotional, social, economic, sexual) left by the departure of the spouse. Being unwilling, at the particular point of time (perhaps because of its premature implication of permanence) or unable, in the case of the separated, to remarry, the lone-parent may enter into a
relationship with an acquaintance of the opposite sex euphemistically and descriptively termed as 'living together arrangements' commonly known as 'cohabitation.' The Concise Oxford Dictionary (1976:194) defines cohabitation as v.i. Live together, esp. as husband and wife (usu. of persons not married to each other).

From Weiss (1975) and Hart (1976) and for the purpose of this study, 'living together' (cohabitation) involves a man and woman living together under one roof with at least one of them having been divorced, widowed, or separated and having the child/ren or both or either living with them. Besides there being a sexual liaison, the cohabiting couple will have arrived at some form of pooling or sharing or division of income and household expenses, and a division of house-management and child rearing functions. As opposed to marriage, which is regarded as irreversible (Hart 1976:184), cohabitation is considered reversible. Weiss (1975:298) stated that whereas in the past (in American communities) living together arrangements (cohabitation) was generally restricted to the lower income groups, to whom remarriage was out of reach, and to the wealthy and the bohemian, of late cohabitation has been adopted more widely by young middle-income couples not yet ready for childbearing and middle-income couples beyond childbearing age. Weiss even ponders if cohabitation may be an emerging alternative to marriage.

Living together carries with it the reactions of neighbours which may range from negative to being intrigued by the difference between this situation and marriage. While there may be disapproval in varying degree, there is, however, no more the universal condemnation and intensity of stigma cohabitation aroused only a generation ago. These changes in prevalence and attitudes is also reflected in the increasing number of lone-parents who choose to enter such a relationship.

The extent of the erosion of the braking influence of traditions and religion on cohabitation is borne out by figures cited by Peters (Canada, 1976:335). In the city of Quebec (predominantly Catholic), 30% in the 30 - 35 age bracket reportedly practised cohabitation. Nor can this be ascribed mainly to religious restrictions on remarriage as the remarriage for the divorced is only about five percent below the national average. For the United States, in the July - August 1977 issue of 'The Single Parent' (p.11) it is stated that, of the divorced who do not remarry, 'a good many enter into committed relationships that are, in fact, quasi-marriages.'

* 'Single Parent': A monthly periodical published by Parents Without Partners Inc., U.S.A.
Where children are involved, the decision to do so obviously usually comes after greater deliberation, as their reactions have to be considered and the commitment is greater. Roles and duties are more complicated. The relationship with the children may be midway between that of steady and that of spouse. Weiss (1975:300) felt that most couples living together live as two equal partners each with his duties and responsibilities in the shared household rather than quasi wife and quasi husband. Because there is an absence of traditional roles the parties may more easily feel exploited one by the other. For the same reason they may more readily perform symmetrical duties not traditionally associated with their own.

While not universally condemned, cohabitation is still largely considered a deviant relationship and brings in its wake societal and legal problems. For instance, credit facilities are not as easily granted. In England 'the cohabitation rule,'* according to the Finer Report, Vol. 1, (1974:339-343), stipulates withdrawal of supplementary benefits from a lone-parent upon being listed as cohabiting. The rule aroused intense heat and criticism, which itself may be an indication of the extent of cohabitation in Britain. One of the criticisms of its application is based on the allegation that judgement may be 'distorted by prejudice' amongst the staff, totalling 18,000, 'many of them reflecting the values of the local community in which they live' and of which 'they are a representative cross-section.' There may be non-acceptance not only by community but also by kin.

2.6.1 Some differences between cohabitation and marriage

Weiss (1975:302-303) points out that the difference between cohabitation and marriage or remarriage is not only the absence of a public ceremony and registration. The marriage vow not only expresses the assumption of permanence in marriage, the pooling of resources, reciprocal difference of interests and expectations of mutual support. It not only affects the manner of playing out the understood social rules and duties within the home and in public. Marriage also establishes legal and publicly recognized kinship. The parties to the marriage become one another's closest family -- one another's next of kin. Only through marriage do the relatives of one become the relatives of the other.

Living together arrangements are, more often than not, impermanent, being often regarded as a trial period which may lead either to marriage or to the dissolution of the arrangement. But, not having been regarded as a permanent status in the first place, it is usually emotionally easier to end the relationship. Just as divorce, cohabitation is increasing and is usually a temporary stopping place on the road to remarriage ('The Single Parent,' July - August 1977:11).

2.7 Marriage and Remarriage

...others expect the participant in tragedy to modify his life, while the participant himself learns with some surprise that such a modification is more difficult than anticipated. Indeed, their expectation is embodied in constant pressures to force the participant to continue his former habits, or to start new ones only on the foundations of the old. (Good 1956:203).

2.7.1 Single-parenthood and remarriage

Single-parenthood is more often than not of a transitory nature. Single-parents may marry and remarry and many do and at an increasing rate (Weiss 1975:303). While there is a consensus that societal prejudices to lone-parenthood still persist, there is also a consensus that societal attitudes are decreasingly negative in degree. Parents are today less fearful of becoming single-parents as this status is now so much more widespread and accepted and the societal stigma attached to the status is no more the deterrent it once was to the dissolution of a union or the reformation of one. The lowering of the barriers to divorce and its ever widening acceptance already makes every union a trial marriage and all partners trial candidates for remarriage. Goode (1964:100) stated that in the relatively free courtship market of the United States, well over 90% of those who lose a spouse by death or divorce (should this occur between the ages of 20 and 35) will eventually remarry.

The American founders of Parents without Partners, Jim Egleson and Janet Frank Egleson, wrote (1961:188):

One steady interest, one important goal of a single-parent, is remarriage...soon they realize that life alone is not desirable and their children, of course, grow eager again to be part of a "whole family."

Hunt (U.S.A. 1968:244) termed the formerly married a subculture and pointed out that two generations ago, when this subculture was less widespread and less developed, only one out of every three divorced people ever remarried. 'Today, although the FMs life has
become easier and socially more acceptable, six out of seven do so.'
(p.244). Sixty percent of the time they remarry other divorced people, perhaps because they are, 'more exposed' to other divorced people. The fact that they failed in their first marriage, and the statistical probability of failure in their second marriage is higher, does not dampen their marital aspirations. The world of the formerly married is not so much a substitute for marriage as a training ground for remarriage. This phenomenon holds good, in varying degree, in all the Western countries covered by this study and is exemplified in the following table of South African marriages in 1976.

**TABLE IV**

1976: MARRIAGES (R.S.A.) -- RELATIVE MARITAL STATUS

(Extracted from Table A 6, Department of Statistics, The Government Printer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Marriages</th>
<th>Bachelor to</th>
<th>Widow to</th>
<th>Divorcé to</th>
<th>Widower to</th>
<th>Widow to</th>
<th>Divorcé to</th>
<th>Male Divorcé to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Divorcé</td>
<td>Widower</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Divorcé</td>
<td>Male Divorcé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Divorcé</td>
<td>Widower</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Divorcé</td>
<td>Male Divorcé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40480</td>
<td>29400</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.63%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>5.09%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides the high incidence of remarriage indicated by the figures in the above Table and extracted to illustrate this more directly in Table V following, Table IV shows that, of the 9,270 divorced who remarried in 1976, 6580 (in 3290 marriages) chose as their spouse another divorced person.
TABLE V
1976 TYPE OF REMARRIAGE (R.S.A.) -- NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL (WHITES)

(Extracted from Table IV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Marriages for year</th>
<th>Type of Marriage</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40,480</td>
<td>Where at least one party was previously married</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>27.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(divorced or widowed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,480</td>
<td>Where at least one party was a widow/er</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,480</td>
<td>Where at least one party was previously divorced</td>
<td>9,250</td>
<td>22.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,480</td>
<td>Where both parties had been previously married</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 27.37% of all marriages in 1976 in South Africa at least for one party this was the second marriage. Of all marriages eight percent were entered into by widowed and almost 23% of all marriages contained at least one party previously divorced. For 4.2% it was for both partners their second marriage. While the theory that lone-parenthood is a transitional stage on the road to marriage is advanced by almost all studies, there is a dissenting minority view. This is advanced by Hofstein (U.S., 1978:232). He points out that the mean duration between divorce and remarriage is a period of five to six years. As a great proportion of divorces occur after a shorter period of marriage, can the term 'a family in transition' not be equally applied to the married? While remarriage is largely the result of divorce, remarriage has increased, as Hunt (1968) has pointed out, even more than divorce. This is because marriage has increased as the accepted norm. It has become almost universal in the Western world (Finer Report 1974); this in spite of the ease with which sexual and other comforts of marriage are obtainable outside this institution. Ogg (1976:9), quoting the 1976 U.S.A. Census Bureau estimates, stated that five out of six divorced men and three out of four divorced women do remarry -- usually other divorced persons, and about half of all widows and two thirds of all widowers between the ages of 30 and 50 also marry again. This preference in marriage for their peers (and no doubt also
one reason for their joining single-parent organizations) is explained by Hunt (1968:246):

"To the divorced person, another divorced person is knowable, familiar, and in a sense dependable, the broken previous marriage is taken as an earnest of his or her intent to have an unbroken one... The customs and social mechanisms of the World of the Formerly Married not only maximize the exposure of the divorced to other divorced people, but help them ready themselves to try to make good these hopes and promises.

Single-parenthood is, therefore, generally speaking, not considered a status to aspire to, an advantageous familial structure, but rather a transition period with the two-parent family being the goal. Once remarried, the reconstituted family, as Duberman (1975) found (in a study of 88 Cleveland coupled under 45 with children under 18 at time of remarriage seven to ten years before) makes great efforts to appear to be and in fact, to be as 'typical' as possible and to resemble closely the 'ideal' American two-parent nuclear family. The intact family has maintained its historic role as the basis of society.

2.7.2 Happiness and remarriage

The chance of happiness in a remarriage is discussed by Hunt (1968:254-255). Basing his work on studies made at various times in different parts of the United States, he found that, although the figures differ somewhat, the divorce rate of the remarried is always higher than that for first marriages.

The Eglesons (1961:199) suggest that a reason for this may be the fact that the remarried family is thrown together 'ready-made, after having built different habits under different circumstances.' One study for the early 1960's, quoted by Hunt shows that 'remarriages are twice as likely to break up as first marriages. Nevertheless at least 60% of second marriages do endure until death.' With third and subsequent marriages there is still a higher risk of divorce, with the rate soaring to nearly five times (compared to first marriage rates) if both spouses have been divorced twice or more. Fullerton (U.S.A., 1972:449) however, quoted data which tend to show that as remarriage becomes more common, it may also be growing more stable. All these divorce figures, Hunt (1968) felt are however not necessarily proof that divorced people lack the capacity to make successful marriages. Some, perhaps even most, are acting upon what they have learned: that divorce is not as dreadful as they had once thought. (In the words of Hunt:255):
that the life of the F.M. is not necessarily unhappy or unrewarding; and that even the distressing aspects of divorce are less destructive of the personality than remaining in a bad marriage.

2.7.3 Housing and remarriage

Egleson and Egleson (1961) warned that in remarriage, (and they felt it applies equally to living together arrangements) housing is an important factor. The remarried family, uniting adults and children, comparatively strange to each other, under one roof, must have enough room to ensure privacy and growing together. When both parties of the remarriage have children who must share the home, the position is made more difficult. Separate rooms may be required for children of even the same sex and age. Sharing a room with the parents, when unavoidable though undesirable, may become impossible.

2.7.4 Children and remarriage

Remarriage being such a widespread and growing social phenomenon so, ipso facto, is step-childhood and step-parenthood. The Single Parent Journal (September 1977:26) points out that every year some three quarters of a million American children become step-children. Our Western society is particularly sensitive to problems related to children. The social implications resulting from lone-parenthood, and the remarriage generally flowing from it, therefore affects a considerable percentage of today's children. Besides the high emotional hurdles, there are the obvious practical problems with low emotional undertones.

Calling the new parent by a suitable name -- "daddy," "pappa," or first name -- may pose certain problems and at the same time may cause resentment by the natural separated parent or his family or the kin of the deceased parent. Different last names of the two parts of the remarried family may cause problems. Egleson (1961: 205) quoting Kaufman wrote this about adoption by the new stepparent:

The connections, identity and inter-dependence, developed during infancy and childhood are not only precious and critical, they are actually irreplaceable and unique in the life of the individual. Beware of destroying the roots of humanity! One additional word of warning against any casual consideration to consanguinity. What, if after the process of adoption, the second marriage breaks up? Heaven help the child then!

The Eglesons (1961) ask what happens to the remarried family when the divorced mother or father is a visiting figure. They point
out:

1) The place of the natural missing parent is not easy in the remarried family.

2) Remarried households are made up of children, but not necessarily all, of either or both of the remarried parents. The households may contain children who visit regularly and have their belongings in the house; children who have a room, children who visit occasionally, and there may be new children of the remarried parents who live there permanently. Children of either parent may likewise leave this home for the home of the other spouse, irregularly or regularly, for longer or shorter periods. The children in these households have two sets of kin, paternal and maternal, and a new set of kin from the reconstituted family.

The problem of the relationship of stepchildren to stepparents is one side of the coin. No less a problem, perhaps, is the relationship of the stepparent to the stepchild, between the stepchildren, and the effect the relationships have on inter-spousal attitudes and relations.

2.8 Kin, extended kin and new extended kin

2.8.1 The nuclear family and extended kin

As a consequence of changes in the macro-systems of modern societies there emerged, what Green (1968) terms, 'the restricted conjugal family -- husband, wife and offspring.' It is the smallest family grouping in history. These units are usually isolated from parents and grandparents and not only from distant kinsmen. Parsons (1943) and Goode (1963), among others, hypothesized the existence of a preponderance of such isolated nuclear families. Lopsta (1978(a): 355) summarizes the evidence in America mustered by Litwak (1959-1960), Sussman (1965) and Shanias and Streib (1965) questioning this proposition.

2.8.2 Interaction between nuclear kin and extended kin

Sussman and Burchinal (1962) documented extensive support systems within what Litwak (1960a, 1960b, 1965) termed the 'modified extended family.' Sussman (1965:62-92) reviews this and postulates that:

There exists in modern urban industrial societies, particularly in American society, an extended kin family system, highly integrated within a network of social
relationships and material assistance, that operates along bilateral kin lines and vertically over several generations.

Bott (1957), uses the term extra-familial kin, to define 'kin outside the family of procreation, if the speaker is married, or outside the family of creation, if he is single.'

Various works investigated the result of separation (divorce and otherwise) upon kin relationship. The studies of Spicer and Hampe (1975), Weiss (1975) and Anspach (1976), all suggest that affinal kin is weakened after marital separation while consanguinal kin is maintained or even strengthened. Affinal kin contact may be more positive if there are children.

Gonglin and Wales, California (1977), studied 210 lone-parents (separated or divorced for under two years) out of a sampling frame of 2,400 cases. They used

(i) support from extended kin, and
(ii) interaction with extended kin as independent variables and three adjustment to separation scales as dependent variables:

i) satisfaction with life;
ii) self-esteem;
iii) positive and negative feelings.

An 'ego' approach was used in the study rather than a group approach (p.4). The individual was used as the central focus of the kinship system and not the nuclear family. This is in contrast to most previous studies (such as Parsons 1943; Sussman 1962). The findings supported the ego-concentration hypothesis used and validated that consanguinal relationship is strengthened and the affinal bonds weakened when the nuclear family is split.

Hanson and Spanier (U.S. 1978) found from a sample of 205 individuals separated for up to 26 months that support from and interaction with extended kin are unrelated to the adjustment to marital separation. This supported Goode's (1956) findings 22 years earlier.

From all the above, it appears that the separation of spouses usually means separation from affinal kin (with possibly slight modifications). This obviously has implications both for the spouses and the children involved.

2.8.3 New extended kin

Remarriage brings with it not only stepchildren and step-parents -- there is the whole spectrum of the new extended family, the family of accretion. Westoff (1978) compares second marriages with 'a Cecil B. DeMille production with a cast of thousands.'
Bryant (South Africa, 1977), writes of these new, acquired, extended families arising out of the increased rates of divorce and remarriage, stressing the following:

1) More and more families find themselves linked to new sets of relatives to whom they are not related consanguinally.

2) Remarriage muddles up the age difference between the generations. Thus, for example, grandparents can be closer in age to their 'instant grandchildren' than would be biologically possible.

3) Remarriage creates a new type of extended family which may provide a way out of the shrinking and 'claustrophobic cauldron of the nuclear family.'

4) It is difficult and perhaps without scientific basis to assume that the same loyalties and affections are felt towards extended kin as to the original family -- to affinal kin as to consanguineal kin.

5) However, more opportunities are offered within the new extended family and members are left to make as little or as much of these opportunities as they choose.

6) In the cases of divorced parents, the other adult, stepmother or stepfather, may be put in a quasi-parental position.

7) Other relatives of this newly constituted family also may be put in quasi-positions.

8) The visiting father or visiting children now have two complete sets of families:
   a) the family of origin
   b) the family of accretion.

9) No societal norms or standards of behaviour have been laid down to indicate what is expected of all the parties concerned, in their relationships with each other.

As lone-parenthood increases, so does remarriage and more and more families become blended, reconstituted families.

2.9 Positive aspects

For the child it is better to come from a 'broken' one-parent home than being broken by warring parents in an intact two-parent home. Many a lone-parent and child are brought closer to each other (see 4.5). Blechman and Manning (1976:81) contended that, in the two-parent family, to 'preserve the cohesiveness of the parental dyad,' the parents maintain a barrier of emotional detachment between themselves and the children, whereas in the single-parent family there is an emotional coalition between parent and children. Particularly in the case of widows, there may be increased inter-member communication and heightened consciousness among family members.
Single-parent families have been found to succeed in society. They are probably those who have learnt to acquire realistic attitudes about family life. Blechman and Manning (1976:82) wrote:

The search for evidence of heightened pathology among members of single-parent families has obscured the unique contributions that may be made by adults socialized in well-functioning single-parent families. These adults may be more self-sufficient and more tolerant of statistically deviant life-styles than adults reared in comparable two-parent families... and contribute to the dissemination and acceptance of alternatives to perpetual or serial monogamy.

Lone-parenthood and subsequent remarriage is not considered any more an unremitting disaster. Its positive aspects are being recognized. Settleman and Markowitz (1974:140) believe that remarriage and step-familyhood is a 'process of addition rather than subtraction.' The popular assumption that children are capable (or should not) experience love and loyalty to any but their 'real' brothers and sisters, seriously undermined the potential for forming bonds with others; 'motherly, fatherly, sisterly and brotherly feelings are born out of love and shared experience, and out of blood.'

The above and other positive aspects of divorce or remarriage are included in studies such as by Goode (1956), Bernard (1956), Lasch (1966), Hetherington, Cox and Cox (1977). Divorce (and remarriage) is not regarded automatically as having negative implications on family life. It is becoming increasingly recognized that there are strong positive implications both as to the role of the one-parent family and the reconstituted family -- two family forms which are taking on new dimensions (not only statistically).

2.10 **Summary and some implications**

2.10.1 **Summary**

In this chapter, through an overview of statistics and literature on lone-parenthood, the significance, effects and impact on and of lone-parent phenomena, are assessed. According to Horowitz (1977): 'A single parent family comprises one parent and one or more children.'

There is agreement that the lone-parent situation has increased numerically and percentagewise throughout the industrialized Western countries covered by this study and accounts for up to 11% (in the U.S.A., 1973) of the population. Illustrative of this growth are the figures for South Africa. While the (White) population increased from 1960 to
1970 by 25% and families by 28%, motherless families have increased by 50% and fatherless families by 71%. This growth is mainly the product of divorce rather than death. With marital breakup occurring largely in the early years of marriage, particularly large increases were recorded in the number of children and especially young children affected.

The problem of the non-custodial parent is reviewed. Considering that for every custodial parent there is a non-custodial one, there is a dearth of research on this aspect. Most recent studies point to an ongoing relationship in the triangle formed by custodial parent, non-custodial parent and child.

There is general consensus that, because of its being a one-parent form, the family suffers economically, socially, emotionally. Economically this is reflected mainly in income and housing. In South Africa, for instance, in 1970, eight percent of two parent families had an income of under R 2000 a year compared to almost 60% of the fatherless families.

Although often handicapped, the one-parent family is expected to fulfil the functions of the two-parent family. The ascription of status, which is one of the functions of the family, is discussed, based mainly on Hart (1976). The prevailing view is that status is determined by the male, and, according to his occupation. As women, and particularly those who are lone-parents, are becoming 'bread-winners' in increasing numbers, there is an incipient tendency to question this age-old dominance (Hunt and Hunt 1977).

While societal prejudice towards the one-parent family has lessened, subjective and objective stigma continues to exist. Harbert (1977) is quoted as summing up society's negative attitudes to one-parenthood:

There is considerable sympathy for the widowed, suspicion about the divorced, opprobrium for the separated and down-right hostility for the unmarried.

The emotional effects of lone-parenthood are reviewed. With living together arrangements (cohabitation) no more restricted to the bohemian and the poor, Weiss (1975) ponders whether it may not be emerging as an alternative to marriage. Cohabitation would bring with it legal problems if children should result.

All the statistics and literature dealing with the subject agree that lone-parenthood is a transient state (Goode 1956; Egleson 1961; Hunt 1968; Dubermann 1975) with marriage as the goal. This applies to the divorced, the widowed and the unwed mother. The increased acceptance of divorce has lessened the stigma of the divorced as a desirable partner. South African figures show that in almost 50%
of the marriages in 1976, one of the parties was a 'formerly married.' Remarriage creates an increasing number of stepchildren and stepparents as well as new extended family not consanguinally related (Bryant 1977; Westoff 1978).

There is a consensus that marriage is still the norm but minority deviant groups are becoming more accepted.

Finally, positive aspects are being stressed, especially in more recent literature (Gettleman and Markowitz 1974; Blechman and Manning 1976; Horowitz and Purdue 1977; Rosen 1977). Amongst these are:

(i) For the child it is better to come from a 'broken' home than to live in an 'intact' turbulent home. New bonds can be formed.

(ii) 'Adults socialized in well-functioning single-parent families' may 'contribute to the dissemination and acceptance of alternatives to perpetual or serial monogamy' (Blechman and Manning 1976:82).

(iii) 'Remarriage and stepfamilyhood should be looked upon as a process of addition rather than of subtraction' (Gettleman and Horowitz 1974).

2.10.2 Some social implications

There is a consensus in the literature reviewed that the one-parent family, and especially the fatherless one, is generally disadvantaged economically and societally and is in varying degree, emotionally affected, mainly indirectly, by its lone-parent status.

Furthermore the overview shows that current literature tends to view lone-parenthood, (which is largely a transient state) as a viable ongoing process which has not detracted from or destroyed the historic role of the intact family as the basis of society.

It is therefore the duty of society, and in its best interest, to evolve the machinery to compensate for the practical and emotional support which might have been provided by the missing parent.

There should be recognition of the potential of the non-custodial parent to contribute to the happiness and development of the children of divorce through an ongoing relationship between non-custodial parent and child encouraged by interparental understanding.
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Divorced women who have occupied passive, submissive roles and have practised nurturing and homemaking skills for many years of marriage, suddenly find themselves forced into the unprotected world with no perceived support system, no salary base to negotiate from, nor a viable job vitae. They feel hostile, defensive and hopeless... (Herman 1977:116)

One of the major changes in the family today, is the redefinition of parenthood. The concept of father has traditionally been limited to the economic support and provider roles of the family... But the concept of the nurturing father is now increasing in prevalence... or because they are coming to see an important need that they can meet in their children, many are coming 'back home' to assert their parental presence. (Orthner and Brown 1977:3)
3. A. FATHERLESS
   B. MOTHERLESS

One-parent forms resulting from death, divorce, separation, as well as that of the never-married parent, are either fatherless or motherless, according to the sex of the missing parent.

3.1 FATHERLESS

3.1.1 The incidence and implications of fatherlessness

In all countries of the Western world, of all single-parent family forms, the fatherless is the largest group both numerically and proportionately and far outnumbers those led by a male parent.

This high percentage of mother-led families results largely from divorce actions (where custody of the children is usually given to the mother); from desertion cases, where the father is usually the one who leaves; from death, where women generally outlive their husbands, and from the unmarried circumstances, where the mother keeps the child. By far the largest and fastest growing group however is made up of divorced and separated women. These demographic factors are clearly borne out by the statistical evidence of divorce and reflected in Tables IX, X, and XI (see 4.3). In the United States, according to Glick (1979), the number of children living with a divorced mother had trebled from 1960-1978 and the number of mother-headed families was ninefold that of father-headed lone-parent families. In absolute numbers, this means that by 1978 there were approximately ten million children living with lone-mothers. As the increase in the last two years has been minor, it would appear from Table IX (see 4.3) that, of these children, who in 1976 constituted 15.8% of all the children under 18 in the United States, over 70% were with divorced or separated mothers. In 1960, these formed but under 50% of the children of lone-mothers.

In 1972, Janeway stated that almost six million families in the U.S. were headed by women, comprising a total of approximately 20 million mothers and children. This would compare with some 600,000 families headed by lone-fathers. In Great Britain there were, in 1971/2,000 lone-families headed by women compared to 100,000 headed by men. It appears that proportionately, while still greatly outnumbered, there are more father-headed lone-parent families in Britain than in the United States.

In South Africa (see Table 1) the number of lone-parent families increased from 42,770 in 1960 to 65,280 in 1970. Of these 37,260 and 55,830 respectively were families headed by a lone-mother. While the total population during these ten years increased by only some 25%, the number of lone-mother families increased by almost 50%.
Some general implications of fatherlessness

Before considering some of the features and influences of fatherlessness, it is necessary to portray a very clear picture of this century's mother typology. This is best achieved by reproducing a quotation from the report of the Finer Commission (1974, Vol. 1:63):

"On the eve of the Second World War, the representative woman worker was young and single, doing a job between leaving school and getting married. Now she is married, over 35 and with a grown-up family."

Many women have taken up employment. Some women work half a day, some a full day. Where there are two parents and older siblings in a family, division of labour and distribution of function is generally easier and takes place often. The emotional and physical overload of working mothers in these families is far less than of working mothers who have no one to help them. Where there is no father in the home, the responsibilities shouldered by a mother depend very much on her emotional, physical and mental ability to cope, the construction of the household, extra kin and societal, environmental factors. It also depends on economic, physical, psychological conditions before and after breakdown.

Marsden (1969:4), in his introduction to his study, describes a fatherless family thus:

"A fatherless family lacks a person who embodies the expectations, duties and functions usually fulfilled by a father... The role Father is not clearly defined in our society; the actual behaviour of fathers may differ widely and so too may the role which they are expected to play... The word fatherless focuses interest on the children, upon possible long-term effects such as delinquency, poor school performance, failures of sexual and social development or the incapacity to form stable relationships in adult life."

Marsden (1969:134) pointed out that fatherlessness very often for the children entails the loss of the mother too as the mother is too tired, depressed and guilt stricken to perform her maternal duties.

While there are different kinds of fatherless families, with the divorced and separated mother-headed the most prevalent, it would appear that fatherlessness is traditionally associated with widowhood. As Marsden (1969:245) puts it: 'in the Bible, the fatherless child is the widow's child.' Thus, according to the Judeo-Christian nurtured Western civilization, the first legal and voluntary provisions were made for this category of one-parent families.* The widowed fatherless family in society, it can be generalized, finds social re-adaptation easier, social provisions are more adequate and there is less stigma attached to widowhood.

On the other hand, in many Western countries there is a dearth of

---

* In the U.S.A. not until 1976 were Social Security benefits, available to widows with children to rear, extended to widowers in the same position.
social provisions for the separated and divorced fatherless family and for the never-married mother.

Although most one-parent families have problems flowing from single-parenthood, it has been found that the one-parent mother-led family despite its dominant prevalence and continuing growth, is still today subjected to even greater difficulties and frustrations than the father-led one-parent family.

Fatherless families not only mean that children growing up in a fatherless home may be deprived of the example of a father figure; that mother must be mother and father; that father is not around to help mother, to act as handyman; that mother is faced with a three-fold responsibility -- mother, provider, socializer; it also often means a significant loss in income,* with all its concomitants.

Though many women do work,** whether to supplement the husband's income, to earn extra for luxuries, or for social reasons, financial familial support is still largely regarded as the male's prerogative and responsibility. While more participation by husbands in child nurturing and domestic activities is spreading, a woman's domain is still largely considered to be the home. Her work is still usually regarded as secondary to marriage and to her homemaking and childrearing roles. Generally, woman's income in the labour market reflects this secondary position.

La Grange (1970:208) noted that her respondents found that the change, from sharing responsibilities with a husband while married, to bearing these on their own after the divorce, was a drastic one. Although, vaguely aware before the marital dissolution of the roles they would have to fulfill after the divorce, as single-parents, in relation to the children these mothers were so involved in their own emotional lives, that they became aware of their responsibility towards the children only after the divorce. This author found her respondents repeatedly talking of the woman's role as an authority figure, of their feelings concerning this role, and especially their feelings of inadequacy. La Grange explained that the woman interprets the fact of her having been awarded custody of the children as investing her with absolute authority over them, and is therefore under the impression that, having been recognized as the authoritarian figure by the court, she is also regarded as such by society. This situation provides her with the power she wished for, but she is unsure of

*In a study by Arsenau et al. (1971:49) of 40 female lone-parents, the authors found, for example, that 'for most of these women, their present day income was less than the income which came into their home before they became single parents.'

**In Canada, for instance (Report of an inquiry on one-parent families in Canada by the Canadian Council on Social Development, (1971:75), two and a half million women, constituting a third of the female population old enough, were working.
her abilities, an uncertainty resulting partially from the damage to her self-concept, especially through feelings of rejection.

Goode (1956:215) over 20 years ago, pointed out that, as in the course of her adjustment, the lone-mother is involved in various activities, whether these be work, dating or other social activities, other than her primary role as mother, she is gradually seen and judged, in these other contexts. The lone-mother begins to be referred to as girl, worker, club member and her new activities and behaviour change the divorcée's focus from the past and direct it towards the present and future as an individual 'rather than as a person with a historical connection with a particular man' (p. 215). According to Goode this emphasises, in the case of divorce, the 'finality of the divorce', freeing the lone-mother to assume a new status towards remarriage.

The significant changes in the traditional socio-economic sexual roles in recent years (Rosen 1977:27) has made the lone-mother's position and functions as family head and her performing of roles other than that of mother, more expected, acceptable and possible. Increasingly assuming, and being accepted in the role of provider, the single-mother assumes, and is accepted in the authoritarian role traditionally associated with that of the earner.

Because social attitudes to merging and changing familial role-functions have and are changing, the single-parent mother-led family is being considered less as a deviant social institutional structure. Basically, although the historic male-tilted edifice has remained largely intact, society's traditional structure has been dented and cracks have and are appearing.

3.1.2 Economic connotations

Economic stress and fatherlessness are often associated. The stigma of poverty is added to the stigma of lone-parenthood. As the Finer Report (1974, Vol. 1:6) states (to gauge the seriousness of the financial position of the mother-headed lone-parent family):

*fatherless families...have to depend upon a single wage at a time when men have largely ceased to be the sole breadwinners for their families save for a short period early in the family building cycle.*

It is obvious therefore that the economic pressures for the lone-mother to seek employment are greater than on the mother in the two-parent family where such work is usually optional and constitutes merely an additional income. For example, according to the Finer Report (Vol. 2:353), in Great Britain:

- 50% of all lone-mothers were working away from home.
- 30% of all lone-mothers were holding down full-time positions.
Moss (1977:2) notes the high proportion of lone-mothers working full-time. In most cases this is out of economic necessity. They share, as women, the disadvantaged position in the labour force but more acutely so; they have to face the demands of both job and family.

Nor is this phenomenon confined to Britain. Table three of the Finer Report (Vol. 2:20) shows the predominance of the lone-mother as compared to the married mother in some Western countries compared to Great Britain.

TABLE VI

PROPORTION OF MOTHERS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN IN EACH FAMILY TYPE WHO ARE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE

(Reproduced from Finer Report 1974, Vol. 2:20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31 (1965)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced and</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = Not available

The low work frequencies in Britain of the separated, divorced, and above all, unmarried mothers is noteworthy. The Finer Commission in its report (1974, Vol. 2:20) summed up the table as follows: 'A greater tendency to work outside the home distinguishes not only single from married mothers, but also different types of single parents from each other.' It is also related to the propensity of women to enter employment in that country. The lone-parent as a group tends to match the working frequencies of the unmarried women of the country.

The lone-mother is also the lone-earner -- and a low-earner at that (relatively to the male). Marsden (1969) states, 'Fatherless families lack a man's wage.'

According to Ogg (1975:28) the median income in 1973 of the U.S. female lone-parent was $3600 -- only 30% of that of their male counterparts.
with pre-school children. Hofstein (1978:230) reports that in the U.S. the median income of the lone-mother family was 46% of that of the two-parent family.

A woman's income is less not only because she usually fills the lower rungs of employment. Ogg (1976:5) found that, on the average, women earn about 40% less than men doing comparable work -- theoretically because men have families to support and women do not.

In Great Britain, in the Finer Report (1974, Vol. 2:342) a Family Expenditure Sample (F.E.S.) indicates that, overall, the younger lone-mothers are more likely to have lower net resources than the older ones. This derives from the fact that the younger mothers, who are most likely to have a child under five (preschool) in single-unit households, have greater limitations in seeking employment than similar mothers in multi-unit households.

A quarter of mothers under 31 years of age had negative net resources compared to one in ten mothers over 40. Each family's 'net resources' was calculated as the difference between its resources and its needs.

In South Africa (see Table II), in 1970, almost 10% of lone-mother families had an income of under R400 per year (compared to 1.31% in intact families); almost 50% earned between R400 and R2000 (compared to only 6.53%); 35% earned $2000 to R6000 (compared to over 70%) and only 5% earned above R6000 (compared to 21.55% of the intact families).

It is obvious from all available data that women in our culture generally earn less than their male peers (Goode 1956; Coser 1964; Podoluk 1968). Their earning power is often further reduced because they interrupt their education or career to raise families.

A mother (and even more so a lone-mother) with very small children will be limited in choice of employment outside the home by the availability of kin (reduced with the shrinking family) or adequate institutional care (such as full-day creches).* Goode (1956) reported that there was great social pressure (in all social classes) for lone-mothers to leave employment to look after young children. On the other hand, according to Arsenau et al. (1971), the Family Service of Calgary, Canada, (1964) stressed that in some circles, mothers, particularly with one child, were under pressure to seek employment. On the whole, they held down inferior and less responsible positions.

In Arsenau et al.'s (1971) sample half of those (lone-mothers) working, occupied clerical and sales positions and nearly all the sample had not gone beyond high-school level. The greatest number of deserted-

* Arsenau et al. (1971:14) quote The Catholic Family Service of Calgary Canada (1964), Beer (1952), Harris (1966) as bearing out the difficulties of the lone-mother in finding suitable care for children.
separated women in the sample fell into the lower economic class. Most of the women in the lower and middle economic classes stated that 'their financial situation was generally a strain'. They were not able to cope or barely so. On page 56 of the Arsenau et al. study (1971), it is noted that 83% (15) of the women who worked enjoyed their work. They felt more emancipated and self-confident that the drudgery of household duties was broken. Some of the women however reported that the responsibility of coping with the children, the household and 'without support from anyone' was too much. Some had to miss work to look after sick children. One reported she had lost her job because of absenteeism.

Two of the divorcées and one separated reported that, once the marriage was severed, they were better able to concentrate on their work.

Although a small sample, the writer quotes from it as it contains most of the economic problems with which the fatherless family is confronted.

With the middle class family, the downward economic slide is likely to be aggravated by the loss of credit facilities (which are often withheld from lone-parents by banks and business) on which many two-parent middle class families so heavily rely. Nor could they continue to draw on the free and friendly assistance of male neighbours for repairs, house decorating and the like. They were now suspect by their married neighbours.

Other writers too (Goode 1956; Tapp 1963; Hunt 1968; Hart 1976; Hofstein 1978) have written about the drops in income experienced by all classes of a fatherless population, particularly where the break-down was caused by separation or divorce. In writing about the downward spiralling economic trend, they stressed its multiple chain-like effect-cause-effect influences on individual and group interaction at personal, familial, social and cultural levels. These undesirable effects are frequently perpetuated from one generation to the next, often with paralysing results causing immemorable and widespread suffering, (Marsden 1969; Finer 1974; Ferri and Robinson 1976).

A very high proportion of families (in Britain) receiving National local welfare assistance are fatherless families (Finer Report: Vol. 1, 1974). As pointed out by Marsden (1969:3): at any given time probably one quarter to one third of all fatherless families and a higher proportion of children in such families were receiving assistance, compared with only one person in twenty in the general population.

The poverty of these fatherless families isolated and cut them off from participation in community life. They could just not afford additional outlay. Marsden's (1969) sample was equally divided: half the fatherless were widowed, the others separated and divorced.

In Marsden's sample economic suffering in varying intensities was felt by all the fatherless groups. The widowed had the highest incomes of
these impecunious groups. The never married (as well as the divorced and separated) with young illegitimate children had the lowest incomes. Most of these received assistance but their allowances were reduced because of suspected cohabitation. His study revealed that, because of their poor economic circumstances, the sample of mothers reported they ate too little (most missing at least one meal a day) or they ate the wrong food. 'These problems of eating were moulded by past hardships and the influence of relationships within the family as much as by the present budget' (Marsden 1969:44). During the week, he found, the children had school meals. They were most likely to suffer at weekends.

The mothers' financial deprivation was also evident from the clothes they wore. They generally did not buy clothes. They felt guilty about spending money on themselves as they felt the children should come first. Many of the mothers had washing machines and television sets as these had become symbolic rewards for other deprivations. More than half of the mothers smoked and they often went seriously short of other things, to smoke.

The families of this study did not cope financially on their incomes and, tired of the strains attached to their conditions, often splash-budgeted for special occasions and got into debt. As Marsden pointed out, it is difficult and misleading and arbitrary to divide financial outlays into essential and non-essential expenditure, for -- to many mothers -- and probably more so to those in impecunious situations, some kinds of expenditure are most important for psychological wellbeing and for social participation. While the mothers splash budgeted, these families experienced deprivation. Marsden very aptly summed up this situation as 'no single deprivation could account for their overall sense of deprivation nor was their general feeling evidently compounded of a number of smaller hardships' (p. 61). 'The association between feeling hard up and income was not at all close or consistent' (p. 60).

The impoverished economic conditions of these families was, in the separated and divorced cases, often caused by unsatisfactory maintenance payment. Sums set down by the court are often, from the outset, inadequate. Payments are made neither timeously nor regularly,* and with the passage of time, as the contact between husband and wife decreases and new liaisons develop, payment may stop entirely. This finding is in keeping with that of Goode many years earlier (1956:221-227). Goode reasoned '....moral obligations are (also) dependent for their strength

---

* Goode (1956, p. 222) tabled the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuity of Child Payments Made to Divorced Wife</th>
<th>Did husband continue to make payments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in a while</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely or never</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
and continuity, upon the continuing social interaction with its concomitant sanctions and rewards" (p. 225).

The Finer Report (1974, Vol. 1:101) stated: '...the real problem of maintenance is not the unwillingness but the inability of men to pay. There is not enough money to go round.' As most lone-mothers fall into the lower and lower middle economic classes, they are frequently forced to turn to welfare assistance to supplement the earnings from their employment.

Goode (1956) found that only 26% of the 75% of the 425 divorcées in his sample, who needed aid, depended on welfare agencies as their main source of outside financial aid; 57% were, in case of need, helped by their own families. The ex-spouse, his family, and friends, rated only between 2% and 3% each. When asked, if as a second choice, they would turn to their ex-husbands for help, almost two-thirds of the sample answered in the negative.

Goode (1956:231) notes: 'The total divorced group improves economically only because an increasingly higher proportion is remarried.' Concerning the adequacy of income, Goode explained (1956:217) that it is not only the amount of money a divorcée has to spend or had to spend when she was married that qualifies her assessment of her financial position. Her evaluation of whether she has enough money depends on her social situation and not only on her weekly pay packet.

Of his sample, only 33% of the not remarried, compared with 69% of the remarried, claimed to have sufficient income to meet expenses (p. 232). Goode's opinion was that, through her job, the not remarried divorcée may increase her total income to a survival level. The remarried divorcée takes a job because her general feeling is there is not enough.

Goode also posed the question of whether the respondents felt they were economically worse off, about the same, or better than in the former marriage. Only 13% of the remarried, compared with 54% of those who had not remarried, claimed to be worse off. Goode reasoned that the 'not remarried' divorcées tended to view their situation as even worse than it objectively was.

That the percentage of respondents working had increased from 40% to 50% from the time of final separation to the time of interview, Goode interpreted as an indication that they were making adjustments to their new economic problems. While the amount of money she earns is important to the divorcée, that she can control her income and that by working she has a steady income, is important to her (p. 229). It gives her a feeling of security.

Economic reforms

Economic disadvantage (resulting even in deprivation) has been shown, according to the above studies, to be almost endemic in the fatherless family. With the increasing realisation by politicians of the potential
power of the woman's vote and woman's own discovery of it (Mrs. Margaret Thatcher has in 1979 been elected the first woman to head a major Western democracy) there is growing pressures for reform.

Moss, Britain (1977:9-18) has brought forward a number of suggestions based, to some extent, on Swedish experiments and practice, to rectify woman's, and particularly the lone-mother's, disadvantaged position in employment. The main suggestions can be summarised as:

1) Increase in day nursery provisions.
2) Training and retraining of married (or lone-parent) women and payment of unemployment benefits upon registration for seeking employment.
3) Deliberate attempts to end the heavy concentration of women in a very narrow range of (lower-paid) employment. Such an experiment has been initiated in Sweden in 1973 through grants to companies.
4) A 'parental' benefit scheme whereby a working parent of either sex would be granted paid leave in case of children's illness and a six hour work-day for one working parent with partial compensation for loss of earnings.

Moss (1977) points out that between 1965 and 1975 the proportion of Swedish women who went out to work increased from 37% to 57%. He considers the Swedish approach as being far ahead of other countries. He mentions three salient features of the Swedish policy (p. 10)

i) Their commitment to sexual equality involves rethinking men's roles in home and family.
ii) The heavy costs of training and retraining women are compensated for by their positive contribution to the economy in terms of productivity within a short period.
iii) The Swedes are anxious to protect women's own choice about whether to work or not.

3.1.2.1 Housing conditions

As stated in 2.3.2, the fatherless, being generally in the lowest income bracket, are also comparatively the poorest housed in the least desirable areas.

According to Goode (1956:239) the higher propertied class, generally also more highly educated, tended to split the property in the divorce settlement. Where the property is limited, the wife gets most of it, including the home and furniture. Her claim to these are strengthened because she usually is granted the custody of the children.

She may, however, be faced with the full mortgage expenses and the costs of maintenance, both of which she can now ill afford because of the depleted family income. Someone other than the absent husband must usually be found to do repairs. Wishing for various reasons (economic, closer proximity to place of employment, school, relatives, a more central or
'safe' location), some lone-mothers may be instrumental in having the common marital home sold.

Some single-mothers (Marsden 1969; Hart 1976) return to their parental home after marital dissolution. Hart (1976) found that in her sample (consisting primarily of lower and middle class and upper working class) the women who returned to the natal home, had all returned from another part of the country and, in some cases, even from another part of the world. They needed their parents' help with child-rearing and child-minding so that they could take up employment. They did not want to move into housing which might indicate a downward trend in their economic and social standing. A return to their parents sometimes mitigated this. Kin also helped financially, supplying money, goods, labour and helped fill the gap created by the absence of the marriage partner. Marsden (1969:4), in discussing the poor housing conditions of fatherless families, points out that, among the fatherless, bad housing is not restricted to the poorer families. In his investigations of the reasons for fatherless families living under the same roof with parents, he found that (particularly the younger) never married, divorced and separated mothers move back into their parents' homes. This tendency is corroborated by statistics of the Finer Report (1974, Vol. 2:335).

Table seven of this Report indicates: the high number of young lone-mothers in Great Britain living in multi-unit households and the high percentage of young lone-mothers having to receive benefit.

| TABLE VII |

| TYPE OF HOUSEHOLD -- AGE -- PERCENTAGE RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFIT |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Age of Mother</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under 26</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>41 and over</td>
<td>all ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Unit</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Unit</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Households</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage rec. suppl. benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Unit</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Unit</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Households</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although, according to Marsden, 1969, moving back into their parents' home may make certain economic and other benefits possible, it does mean a change in role identity and often leads to conflicts in a household. Many of the unmarried girls had had their babies at home. Marsden (p. 114) found that young divorced mothers were often readopted by their parents -- which perhaps solved the physical aspect of their housing problem. However, this led to tension, and generally, after some period of living under the same roof, because of the intolerable situation thus created, they moved out and went to live on their own. His study clearly showed the stigma attached to the never-married mother status.

According to Marsden, where a woman (together with her children) deserts the spouse, the problem of housing can be equally or more acute. More than half of his sample had housing problems. The mother often, for financial reasons, must settle for housing in inferior locations and for more cramped living conditions. The general shortage of housing and societal stigma and prejudice against lone women with children, act as lubricants to this downward slide. Marsden found that two thirds of the unmarried and half of the separated and divorced mothers lived in poor housing privately rented from non-relatives. Ferri (1976 (a):83) pointed out that single-mothers were regarded as questionable potential tenants and inflated rentals for the poorest type of accommodation were often extracted from them.

Of Marsden's sample, one third had to find a new home when they became fatherless. The council authorities had rehoused many, but in their cases there was evidence of a reluctance to rehouse fatherless families as they were thought to be a financial risk. Of all the classes, the unmarried mother lived in the worst housing conditions. Valuing their anonymity, they put up with their poor housing, living incognito in depressed neighbourhoods. Often no particular interest was shown by them in renting a council house. They felt that that would be admitting and accepting their (stigmatized) non-married status as permanent. This double stigma of lone-motherhood and poverty (both in the relative and absolute sense) expressed itself in various ways.

When applying for national assistance, the lone-mother experienced a cold reception by officials who wanted to be sure that welfare recipients were not living with another man or even with their husbands before agreeing to give them aid. Officials often relied on anonymous letters from the community to police mothers' activities and tended to bring pressures to bear on mothers, particularly those of illegitimate children, to look for work. They felt unhappy and unwanted in their communities and felt even more uncomfortable because they were conscious of being economically dependent on the community. But not only was there an overall picture of overcrowded housing. One fifth of the families in the sample had no furniture and if one compared the average position in the rest of
the country, they lacked household appliances. They were even short of food.

Many of the above findings of Marsden in 1969 were not found to be basically different in 1976 by Elsa Ferri's (1976 (a):70-85) research: Whereas only 7% of two-parent families were in privately rented accommodation, 17% of fatherless families were, and an especially high proportion of the divorced and separated (20%) and families with illegitimate children (26%) were in rented accommodation.

When use of basic amenities and bedsharing were examined, families who were fatherless through divorce, separation or illegitimacy again fared worst. For example, though 17% of children in two-parent families were sharing beds at the age of 11, 26% of children in fatherless families were in this situation. Children in fatherless families had moved home (and changed school), (much) more often than those in two-parent families (see 4.4).

Arsenau et al. (1971:54) found that 62% of their population of 40 had moved home after becoming single parents.

La Grange (1970:224) found in her study that the divorce meant that the mothers had to move to housing in inferior areas. They were concerned lest their children make friends with the children of the neighbourhood whom the respondents regarded not good enough as friends for their children.

3.1.3 Lone-mother emotions; interfamilial and societal attitudes.

Not only the material situation is affected by the familial structure, relationship, ages and circumstances at the time of the breakdown. There are also the social-psychological aspects. The relationship of the family with kin and community changes. Lack of money had a constricting effect on the social life of the fatherless family, relations with neighbours, their social classification, their aspirations.

Their absolute or relative impoverished conditions, their longings for their husbands or resentment of them, their strivings and hopes for the children, their constant feelings of deprivation, their unsatisfying and conflicting relationship with their children, their social isolation (often voluntary) are the norm -- the established patterns of their existence as lone-mothers.

Marsden (1969:233,234), in a study (of mainly working-class marriages) while not spelling out the causes of breakdown, found there were psychological tensions underlying all the cases where the marriages broke down. As in over half the sample the wives claimed they had not been adequately supported during marriage, the fear of non-support after dissolution did not act as a compelling deterrent for separation or
divorce. Community disapproval had been influential in their maintaining a facade of conjugal unity in spite of the tensions. Marsden tabled how the marriages broke down: In 21 marriages the wife left her husband; in 22 she forced her husband to leave and got her separation or divorce. In the other 33 cases the husband deserted the wife. Those who had left or evicted their husbands blamed them for offensive or intolerable behaviour. Where the husbands deserted the home, the wives blamed the husbands much less and their emotional involvement with them persisted, in some instances for years.

The unmarried mothers' positions were affected by their own age at the time of the birth of the baby; whether they had managed to save any money; whether they could remain at home after they had the baby. There were, in Marsden's sample, separated, widowed and divorced who had an illegitimate child after their marriage had broken down. They claimed that 'the birth came as a response to the loneliness of life without the husband.' (Marsden 1969:234)

Fatherlessness brought changed relationship with kin, who took sides. The absence of the husband proved for some mothers a 'relief from an intolerable situation.' However, many felt extreme strain in having to rear and nurture the children and having to earn a living. They found it was difficult to be both authoritarian and affectionate. A quarter of the mothers reported having had nervous breakdowns. Nine mothers had tried to commit suicide.

Weiss, (1975:167-204), writes of certain emotional experiences and difficulties of single mothers: In many fatherless situations, the lone-mother has, principally because of her responsibilities to her children, withstood strain and carried on functioning. Unfortunately, although they tend to overidealize the romanticism of their new greater responsibility to their children, these lone-mothers often find their responsibilities and one-parent mother roles tedious. Because they have put so much weight on the importance of succeeding in their roles, the failures and disappointments they then experience can be particularly distressful. They may experience terrible loneliness and if they do go out and perhaps leave the children alone, they may feel deep guilt at doing so. They also experience concern as to what is happening to the children.

Yet, continues Weiss, in most cases, their children's well-being still remains the most important consideration in their lives (p. 173):

*We do not know how to account for the force of this maternal commitment to children: to what extent it has biological bases, and to what extent it is socially imposed. This deep emotional relationship, while being of the highest priority in her life, lacks balancing rational elements and makes her single-parental role demanding. This is not to say that there are no joys and fulfilments in parenting alone.*
Woodward (1976:16) reporting an investigation of the divorced person and his feelings of loneliness, found that loneliness does occur often in divorce situations.

Women were more affected by these situations than men. The following variables revealed the greatest feeling of loneliness: 1) social situations where women felt that people thought less of them after discovering they were divorced; 2) decision making situations when women felt they had no one with whom to share responsibility; 3) when women felt that finances were a limiting factor; 4) when women had certain tasks to perform and felt there was no one with whom to share the responsibility. In addition, both men and women were lonely when they felt out of place at a particular time or event.

The Arsenau et al. study (1971:61-65) investigated the effect the marriage breakdown had on the social life of the mothers as expressed in their friendships. Twenty-six out of the sample of 40 felt their social life was more restricted since the change in their marital status. This applied to the whole spectrum of the fatherless. Of the 14 others, only three considered that their social life had improved. Fourteen of the 40 were going out socially and were dating mostly divorced persons.

La Grange's (1970:227) respondents appeared to socialise even less. She found that her respondents felt lost in a couples' society and cut off from it. They were inclined to feel attached to the past and their participation in social life was limited. Their communications were limited to relatives and co-workers; their children's friends and, in some cases, the parents of their children's friends. The men they met were also through these circles.

Goode (1956:241-254) viewed the circle of friendships the lone-mother had, as a significant part of her social adjustment. He defined social adjustment (1956:241) as

"...the individual is going through the phases of -- once more finding her own identity as a person -- and being accepted as a person who is eligible to -- be a spouse... (The adjustment of divorce can be defined as the) ...integration of the divorce experience into her total life experience, such that the individual lives by the daily and future demands of his or her new social position, rather than by constant reference to the ties defined by the previous marriage.

According to Goode (1956:241) the term 'friends' does not, in the United States, suggest great intimacy of relationships.

That almost all his respondents were either drawn into a new friendship circle, or were retained in their old friendship circle, indicated to Goode that the divorcée's circle of friends accept her divorce experience. Correlatively, Goode opined that if, at the time of interview, the divorcée still has no friends, then her social adjustment is not yet complete.

Goode, in regarding the divorcée's friendship patterns as an index
of social adjustment, held that maintenance of, or entrance into a circle of friends, is one of the social activities that precedes remarriage.

This author pointed out that changing of friends may not be due to rejection, but perhaps to having moved residence. While the data of the residential mobility of his respondents was, he said, not reliable, it was known that most urban Americans move frequently and that divorcées move still more frequently.

Regarding their friends during the separation and divorce phases, 52% of his sample stated that their most active friends remained those they had during the marriage; 44% claimed new friends, and only 4% reported no friends at all. The important evaluation to the divorcée, whether she moved into a new circle of friends, or stayed in her old circle, was their regard to her status -- not as the ex-wife of a man, but as a person in her own rights (p. 247).

Goode's study also showed that 65% of the upper occupational group and the college group, compared with 51% of all other educated classes kept their old friends, and 60% of the highest income group, compared with 48% of the lowest income group, kept their old friends. As 48% of his respondents said their new friends were (qualitatively) the same as their old friends, and 42% said they were 'better than the old friends', Goode reasoned (p. 247) that the 'kinds of friends the divorcée had, even when she changed her circle of friends, were not much different than before.

The type of job the divorcée holds and her exposure to meeting people, particularly males, through her job, is important in helping her make friends.

According to Goode, the divorcée's moving from old friends in search of new friends, may be an active or passive part of her search for dating partners. He pointed out that the attitude one has to love and remarriage, positive or negative, influence one's dating opportunities. More of those who had positive attitudes to love and remarriage, dated, than those who had negative attitudes -- 62% as compared with 51%. Age may have been a factor in this, as the young viewed love and remarriage more positively.

Comparative attitudes of and to widowed, divorced, separated and never-married lone-mothers.

In the Arsenau et al. (1971:58) study, the widowed group felt their friends had been very supportive. The divorced and separated reported that at first they had not told their friends at all about the problems they were encountering in their marriage. Many friends had themselves guessed and when told of the final breakdown, were pleased that the break had at last been made. Others were shocked and surprised at the change in status
but eventually accepted it and gave moral or financial support. Some of the divorced/separated said they had to make or choose to make new friends as their old friends had also been their husband's friends. In 50% of the cases the new friends were also single parents.

The separated women in the sample reported that they were looked down upon. They said that men regarded them as sexual prey and women mistrusted them as they feared they would take away their boyfriends or husbands.

One never married mother said she felt people looked at her out of malicious curiosity, trying to sum up what kind of mother she was to her child. They refused to understand (p. 59) that 'she had wanted the baby and that she could feel as close to the child as a married woman could.'

Goode (1956) pointed out that the widow, unlike the divorcée, has a well-defined role to play in society, that she evokes social support, enjoys greater sympathy, obtains more help and support from kin and friends.

E.T. Harris (1966:92-98) felt that a divorcée experiences rejection as she is regarded as unstable, irresponsible, immoral. The widow, according to this researcher, is also rejected, because society considers her inadequate, helpless, pathetic.

Ilgenfritz (1961) in comparing the emotional plight of the divorcée and the widow, pointed out that both experience a fear of loneliness (aloneness), hostility toward men, a loss of self-esteem as a woman. They feel men regard them as easy prey. The widow, he pointed out, while taking shelter in a temporary, grieving situation, immediately following the death of her husband, must come back to reality and face and make countless decisions. The divorcée may experience some momentary very short-lived relief from the strain and conflicts experienced during the unhappy marriage. She must soon face up to countless problems often not envisaged, prior to her new lone-mother status.

Freudenthal (1959), in drawing a parallel between the widowed and divorced, found in his group of single-mothers that both the widowed and divorced experienced a feeling of guilt, a sense of failure and incompleteness.

Marsden (1969:111) quoted a divorced woman. 'I do get invited to the odd party by married couples, but where you find the odd man of a certain age is welcome, the odd woman of a certain age is very odd indeed.'

Hunt (1968:75) spoke of divorcées referring to themselves as 'we' and to married people as 'they' but strikes a positive note too: 'She is not just someone's cast-off wife, not an escapee who could not endure her marriage, but a person apart from that marriage -- a separate, valuable and whole human being.'
The widowed, divorced, and separated fatherless all undergo similar as well as different emotional and social experiences, similar in their loss of partner, economic deprivation, social identity loss, emotional insecurity, grief and isolation, stigmatization. However, for the widowed, mainly because of their economically more favourable situation, the socio-legal provisions, their own feeling of the inevitability of their loss and society's greater approval of their situation -- their plight, position and emotional experience is less acute.

Deserted wives felt loss of self-esteem, often because they were unable to find an explanation for their husband's actions which was not damaging to their self-esteem. They often experienced jealousy and a desire to wreak vengeance as their husbands had gone off with another 'the other' (Marsden 1969:99) woman.

Often the women recalled their own childhood and saw the lack of affection they had experienced in childhood, the terrible poverty they had lived through as links in the chain leading to a too hasty and subsequently broken marriage.

Researchers found that the familial, extended kin relationships of the fatherless groups also depended on the causes and forms of breakdown. The circumstances which led to the breakdown (whether death or desertion), the extent and amount of tension in the home, all affected role functions, inter-familial and kin attitudes.

Peter Marris (1958) found that the widowed at the beginning of their grief experienced sympathy and interest by relatives. This wore off. Their deceased husband's kin showed less and less interest; the husband dead, the chief link with husband's kin had gone. The family ties with the in-laws gradually fell away.

In cases where the breakdown had been caused by desertion or divorce, the relatives took sides, husband's kin usually aligning themselves against the wife (Marsden, 1969). Some relatives and friends avoided taking sides so as to avoid social embarrassment. The lone-mothers often found that moving to a new neighbourhood did not help very much. People did not ask "how's your husband?" They asked "Where's your husband" (Marsden 1969:106-7). Many of the mothers no longer had friends so they turned to one another for companionship. Their common bond was fatherlessness. It united women of quite dissimilar tastes and behaviour. Apart from company and advice, they helped each other in ways which they could not obtain from anyone else.

Their poverty and economic deprivation very often altered the quality of the social relationships of female lone-parents. Sometimes neighbours and relatives, by their condescending attitudes aggravated their feelings of poverty. Sometimes, feeling too poor, they avoided kin. 'The differences in living standards meant that their social awkwardness
could more readily harden into permanent estrangement' (p. 224, Marsden). Poverty tended to push some mothers away from their children and to cut the family off from kin and neighbours.

The attitude of the widowed to the divorced and separated tended to be hostile. They regarded them as loose and undeserving of state support. The divorced and separated in turn resented the widows' more advantageous economic situation, including their receipt of pensions. The divorced and separated were each suspicious of the other and judged each other by their toughness and ability to face the problems of fatherlessness. The other three groups (widowed, divorced, separated) regarded unmarried mothers with illegitimate offspring as 'loose'. The poverty stricken mothers preferred to be described as being 'hard-up' rather than 'poor'. The latter term, they felt, stigmatised them.

**Effects on children**

As the bulk of one-parent families are fatherless (in South Africa over 85%), most of the children affected by the lone-parent situation are children being cared for singlehanded by mothers. The effects on these children are reviewed in chapter four, 'Effects on children'.

3.1.4 *Remarriage*

Remarriage is a common wish or hope amongst lone-mothers. The reasons for this attitude may be subjective, objective, societal pressure or a combination of any or all three of these. The growing extent of remarriage is reflected in this study. (see 2.7)

Society generally expects the single-mother to remarry. Her single-parent status is regarded as transitional, impermanent. The single-mother probably experiences even less security because she is expected to remarry. Goode (1956) points out in his study that married couples invest energy and time in trying to get unmarried friends married. The majority of children suggest at some stage to their divorced mothers they should remarry. Generally, the mothers seem to think positively about remarriage. Goode (1956), Egleson and Egleson (1961), Weiss (1975), Hart (1976) bring this out in their studies.

Wylie and Delgado (1959) and Ilgenfritz (1961) pointed out that the single-mother often bears hostile feelings to men, competitive attitudes, vengeful attitudes. She experiences loneliness, as well as feelings of being a potential threat to other women who have husbands. Wishes and aspirations, realisations and actualities, are -- for these mothers -- filled with ambivalences.

The study evidence in the Arsenau et al. research (1971:64-65) was that:
While most of the divorced subjects said they felt they wanted to remarry, they also expressed fears because of the unpleasant experiences they had been through in their previous marriages. An unmarried single mother said she would like her children to have a father. While contemplating remarriage, the mothers said, they felt that their chances were slim as most men are not interested in a woman with a family. Also, because of the children, they felt remarriage had to wait until the children were older and not so dependent on them.

Marsden (1969:235) in his sample, found that the children's hostility towards the mother's male friend spoiled the chances of remarriage. Another consideration was that they had to weigh the advisability of giving up national assistance if they remarried (p. 235). According to Goode (1956), divorced mothers were afraid of making another wrong marriage, and/or of losing their independence. They hardly went out and so did not meet men easily. Their chances depended on their age, as women's chances drop sharply after the late thirties.

The following figures from the Finer Report (Great Britain, Vol. 2, 1974:335) illustrate the proportion of different age groups of lone-mothers who remarry:

- Just over 25% of all lone-mothers 25 or younger
- About 50% of all lone-mothers 26-40
- Just under 25% of all lone-mothers over 40 years of age.

The extent of remarriage (in England for example) is described by this quotation from the Registrar General's Statistical Review of England and Wales (1964:23-28)

On average a divorced woman under 25 years old will remarry within three years and a widow of the same age within six years. However, the chances of remarriage drop sharply in a woman's early thirties.

Contrary to popular belief, women with two or more children are, according to Goode (1956:272, 281, 282) almost as likely to remarry as women of the same age who have only one child: The mothers with more than one child generally dated more seriously and were not as selective in the choice of a marriage partner.

The majority of children suggest at some stage to their divorced mothers they should remarry. Generally, the mothers seem to think positively about remarriage. Goode (1956), Egleson and Egleson (1961), Weiss (1975), Hart (1976) bring this out in their studies.

Goode (1964:136) stated that 'given the intense and relentless pressures to marry, it comes as no surprise that more than 90% of the people who divorce, eventually remarry.'

He also stated (1964:100) that:

in the relatively free courtship market of the United
States, well over 90% of those who lose a spouse by death, or divorce, will eventually remarry, if this occurs between roughly the ages of 20 and 35.

Goode also found (1956:335,336) that 92% of the remarried (women) claimed that their second marriages were better or much better than the first and 84% had stated that the first marriage had made the second easier. Whether the anticipation of possibly greater contentment in the second marriage is an incentive to the breaking of the first, has not been investigated.

Both widowed and divorced who remarry are 'living' not alone with the second spouse but to some degree, emotionally, also with the first spouse. Amongst the divorced remarried the continuing, varying, post-divorce emotional relationship between exhusband and ewife has only some slight effect on the new marriage. Goode (1956:337) found that 74% of these women claimed that they never had arguments with the second husband about the first husband. This is, in the case of the divorced explained by the fact that the relations with the first husband are likely to be strained and she will therefore see her first spouse under the least favourable circumstances. Whether the first or second time, lone-motherhood is a transient stage on the road to remarriage. Remarriage is the solution almost universally aspired to and found by the overwhelming majority of those heading fatherless families. In a society which is based on the two-parent family, the pressure to conform is too strong. The re-constituted family emerges.
3.2 MOTHERLESS

3.2.1 The incidence and implications of motherlessness

The motherless form of the one-parent family has been in existence throughout the centuries of human development. Maternal mortality at childbirth mainly accounted for this form of single-parenthood until the twentieth century. For example, in America, as recently as 1935, the maternal mortality rate was 58 deaths per 10,000 live births, compared to today's rate of approximately 2.5 deaths per 10,000 live births (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1975). In previous decades extended family members provided substitute mothering for children, concealing the nature and extent of the problem of motherlessness.

While the number of motherless families caused by death has considerably dropped, the number of motherless families brought about through separation and divorce has grown (see Table X).

There is a small but growing trend for single males to adopt children. These adoptions are as yet limited to hard-to-place children, those handicapped, racially mixed or older (Kadushin 1970). The limited extent of this practice can be gauged from the fact that in New York City, between 1968 and 1972 there were only 50 such adoptions. Male single parents almost routinely adopt male children.

While also constituting but a small percentage, there are records of never-married fathers who adopt their own biological offspring. Orthner et al. (1976) had two in their sample of 20. Being a small sample, no definite conclusions could be drawn. Fain (1977:40) cites the award of an illegitimate twin to their father.

A more important contribution to the numerical growth of motherless families is being made by divorce courts in increasingly granting custody of children to fathers; not only where the mother deserts, but also where on divorce she voluntarily relinquishes custody because she has become emotionally involved with another man or wishes to pursue an education or career. In Goode's (1956) study 2.4% of the children were awarded to father's custody whereas some 20 years later in Palmer's (1976) study, this percentage had increased to 17% -- a sevenfold increase. Although the two studies differ in many respects and are not strictly comparable, the increase in father custody is so pronounced that this deduction cannot be entirely ignored. These men represent a growing dimension of both fatherhood and parenthood, the single-parent father (Orthner et al. 1976).

Rosen (1977) examined the history and changing attitudes in awarding custody: (See also 5.7).

The cultural milieu of the 19th century which dictated the roles of mothers as homemakers and fathers as breadwinners compelled the decision that young children be placed with their mothers. With significant changes in the traditional
It is no more automatically assumed that it is in the child's best interest to be raised by the mother. There is a growing tendency to compare objectively the relative abilities of parents to care physically and emotionally for minor children. This trend is regarded by some (Dereyn 1976) as the most important recent development in the area of interparental custody disputes. Rosen quoted Steinzor (1969), Podell (1973), Title (1974) and Taylor (1975), and Cardwell (1975), who all questioned (particularly in view of socio-economic changes) the traditional attitudes to the issue of custody by the mother, rather than by the father. As far back as 1925 the Guardianship of Infants Act (quoted by Giles (1959) and Bromley (1962) in Britain ruled:

The court...shall regard the welfare of the infant as the first and paramount consideration whether...the claim of the father...is superior to that of the mother, or the claim of the mother is superior to that of the father.

(Rosen 1977:28)

This development has not yet reached South Africa although legislation in this direction is in process through parliament. According to South African law (at the time of investigations made by the writer for this study) the father seeking custody must show the mother to be unfit as custodial parent and himself to be the more suitable custodian. Nevertheless, although South African legislation has not yet adequately recognised changing societal attitudes to custody, there is no denying them, even if the motherless family is still regarded as atypical. It is becoming more accepted for men to perform nurturant roles -- both in the two-parent and one-parent family.* In Western countries, there is a definite movement in the direction of 'mothering' (Orthner et al. 1976) losing its sexist connotations. (See also 5.7.2)

Some U.S. statistics

The U.S. Census of 1960 revealed 10% of single-parent families to be motherless. By 1974 the proportion had grown to 13%. Considering that the proportion of single-parent families also increased in this period, it is clear that the absolute number of motherless families grew even more than fatherless families. The 1976 U.S. statistics reveal that in nearly half a million families, the father is the primary parent because there is no mother present in the household. In 1976 close to 900,000 children in the U.S.A. were living with lone-fathers (Ogg 1976:1). Of these over half were children of divorce. The U.S. Census Bureau reported the following figures for children of divorced parents living with their

*In Britain, a Supplementary Benefits allowance is paid to fathers who give up their work and stay at home to look after their children although the amounts paid are insufficient for lone-father headed familial subsistence.
fathers:

In 1970 -- 6.75%; 1971 -- 5.7%; 1972 -- 7.2%; 1973 -- 8.1%; and in 1975 -- 8.4%. As a five year period is not sufficient for arriving at binding long-term conclusions, this proportionate increase in the number of children living with a divorced father may not hold good in a demographic perspective. Glick (1979) points out that while the number of children in the United States, living with a divorced father has trebled from 1960 to 1978 so has the number living with a divorced mother. He expects the present proportion of ten percent to continue until 1990. This could be changed by changing societal attitudes as to the assumption that children 'belong' with their mothers.

Republic of South Africa

From 1960 to 1970 (according to the Population Census, 1970) the number of (White) families headed by a lone-father has increased from 5523 to 9448, an increase of 71.50%. During the same period the total White population increased from 3,069,000 to 3,831,000 -- an increase of only 24.82% while the total number of families increased 27.79% from 721,962 to 922,630.

3.2.2 Economic connotations

A father generally regards his contribution to familial functioning as that of providing family income. 'A man usually considers his work to be the focus of his fathering behaviour. If he is a good provider he is a good father.' (Bigner 1970:19)

Ferri and Robinson (1976 (a)) found in their study (of 750 children from one-parent homes -- of whom 652 were fatherless and 98 motherless -- and 12,000 children from two-parent homes in Britain) that 17% of lone-fathers were unemployed as against only 8% of fathers in intact families. Compared to the lone-mother, however, the lone-father is economically usually less affected by his transition to lone-parenthood. His income usually is well above that of the woman. Another good reason for this position is stated by Orthner et al. (1976:432)*:

It is not surprising to find that the average social status level of the single-parent fathers is above the norm. For

*Dennis K. Orthner, Terry Brown, and Dennis Ferguson, 'Single-Parent Fatherhood: An Emerging Family Life Style' The Family Coordinator, U.S.A. October 1976. Out of 20 lone-fathers in Greensboro, North Carolina area, 12 were in professional or managerial positions, another in sales. There were only five blue-collar men. One was a student and one a former manager temporarily unemployed. Sixteen had some post-high school education, including 13 with degrees. Their average annual income exceeded $18,000.
a man to get custody of minor children, he has to demonstrate a degree of resource availability that will be respected by the courts, his peers, and perhaps his former spouse.

In South Africa, in 1970, for instance (see Table II), under 20% of the motherless families had an income of under R2000 per year compared to almost 60% of fatherless families. While only about 8% of intact families (with children) were earning under R2000, almost 20% of lone-fathers fell into this bracket.

The South African figures cited approximately reflect the norm in our Western society and is typified by this quotation from Ogg (1976:7)

Solo father...most are employed full time and their incomes tend to be higher than those of solo mothers. A 1973 Canadian survey found the poverty rate among solo mothers to be almost 60 per cent compared with only 14 per cent among solo fathers.

While there is almost always a deterioration in the financial position of the motherless family, it is usually comparatively slight, resulting more often from increased expenditure rather than from decreased income. The decrease in income could result from the loss of the (usually) second pay-packet of the working spouse or the difficulty of overtime work or moonlighting as parental responsibility necessitates his presence at home, or absenteeism from work due to a child's illness. His choice of work may be restricted by his inability to work shifts. In the lower income homes some fathers may not go to work at all* to avoid the necessity of children going to live with relatives or going into the care of local authorities (George and Wilding, 1972:13).

An increase in expenditure could occur for several reasons. The lone-father may be faced with the expense of having a housekeeper or paying to have the children boarded out. Because of lack of know-how or lack of time, some lone-fathers resort to expensive readymade convenience foods. Many fathers do not budget as economically as women, in purchasing items for the home and in home management. Often men buy from a store they are nearest to geographically or where it is most convenient for them to shop, rather than where the products are cheaper. 'I think I do less well on the money I get, than a woman can who knows how to make the money stretch.' (George and Wilding 1972)

Other more recent studies far smaller in size and more localized than George and Wilding's (1972), such as Orthner, Brown and Ferguson's (1976), have found that motherless middle class families cope adequately

'*There is societal pressure and marked disapproval to this as shown from this quote in an article 'One Man's Point of View', Nick Carter, printed by the National Council for One Parent Families, 1978:9. (National Supplementary Benefit official): 'Mr. Carter, we are not going to pay you any more.' I said, 'How am I going to live then?' and the officer said 'You will have to make other arrangements. It's a father's duty to provide for his children.'
with nurturant and authoritative parenting functions and they are less likely to turn to public bodies for welfare assistance. Most fathers did not use outside help with housekeeping. In most cases child care did not cause employment problems. Out of a sample of 20 from the Greensboro, N. Carolina area there was one case where, in a tight economy, the father lost his position, 'was fired', because he had to interrupt his work schedule to see teachers, periodically take the child to a physician, or carry out other such responsibilities. He began to get unfavourable evaluations from his employers. Such cases are however comparatively rare as custody is not easily granted to fathers in impecunious positions.

Partly because they wished to show their competence as parents and their independence and partly because they enjoyed a higher than average income, they did not make much use of public assistance. Single-mothers are much more likely to use government assistance programmes to subsidize their incomes than single-fathers. These fathers expressed a wish for tax relief instead, for example, that any school expenses through college should be tax deductible.

3.2.2.1 Housing

The axiom that after marital breakdown only one parent can (but not necessarily does) continue to occupy the family home obviously affects also the motherless lone-parent family. While generally speaking, the housing conditions of the lone-father are also affected negatively by the marital breakdown, his position is usually better than that of the divorcée in that he is generally less affected economically by his transition to this status, usually earning more than the woman.

For this reason, particularly in the middle and higher income groups, the motherless family faces comparatively little housing difficulty no matter what the arrangements of the breakup about division of property, as the physical aspect of housing is largely a matter of finance.

An adequacy of income enables the lone-father to employ a female housekeeper for his house who also acts as child minder if required to do so. There is a qualifying condition however: Such a (in his opinion suitable) person may not be available and then he may be forced to seek other alternatives including return to the parental home. Usually even this is dependent on whether his place of work is not geographically too distant.

Not always is the middle class male's housing better however. According to Hart (1976:145) it was the middle-aged, lower-middle class male divorced who sometimes suffered the most drastic reversal in his material circumstances and, consequently, housing conditions. He had inferior lodgings while continuing to pay his ex-wife's mortgage.

Compared to the fatherless, in the lower income groups too the
housing problem of the motherless family while it deteriorated was not as acute. Hart (p. 142) reported that in her sample of 63 lone-parents, (compared with only five women) seven men (four of whom had the custody of the children) returned to their parents' home. These men were all working-class and still resided (after marriage); before the breakup, in the same area as the family of origin. Their return meant that their breadwinning role was not interfered with, as parents took over child-minding and domestic duties at least in their working hours. While, materially therefore suffering less than his female peer, the home he moved to was not intended for and was inadequate for two family accommodation. The non-custodial father may sometimes, at some stage, move to a hotel or boarding house but this will be influenced by his relative economic position and the intensity of his desire to have a home where his children, even though not in his custody, may visit him on weekends or holidays.

It may be concluded, therefore, that housing is less of a problem for the motherless because:

a. Generally their earnings are much higher than the fatherless and custody, if granted to the father at all, is granted usually if his income is a decisive factor.
b. Numerically there are many less such households as custody is usually granted to the mother.

3.2.3 Lone-fathers' emotions; interfamilial and societal attitudes.

George and Wilding (1972) from their study found that: At the beginning of their new motherless status, friends, relatives, neighbours, often helped the lone-father, regarding a difficult situation as in an emergency or crisis period. However, generally, after their first year as lone-fathers, they felt that neighbours, friends and relatives were tired of helping them as it was no longer an emergency. The families were then, generally, left to their own resources.

One of the most common emotions, especially at the commencement of the status, is that of loneliness, most strongly felt at birthdays, anniversaries and holidays. A quotation from one of George and Wilding's (1972:76) interviews is most illustrative of the extreme loneliness experienced by the single father:

*It can be very miserable. Wherever you go, with or without the children -- even to friends you are missing a partner. If you are at home you miss her even more.*

They felt their social life was adversely affected by their lone-parent status. They could not go out often as they were tied down to their children. They felt they could not visit female neighbours as this would meet with suspicion. Many friends had cut off relationships with
them, not wishing to take either their side or that of the divorced spouse. Divorced fathers especially felt that many of their old friends avoided them as they were not sure whether to stay friends with the ex-wife or with them. Some friends feared they would be asked for financial help.

Middle class single-parent fathers are not positive about the value of belonging to lone-parent organizations. Lower-income single men do not generally go to meetings as it is too expensive to use babysitters and they feel uncomfortable socially at the lone-parent gatherings.

Many lone-fathers, alone and insecure in their new single-parenting situation, felt isolated, confused, ill-equipped, afraid, to make decisions about the children. There was no one with whom to discuss problems such as, for instance, whether or not to call a doctor if a child was ill at night. Many a father worried who would care for his children if he (the father) were incapacitated by illness.

Discussing difficulties, economic, emotional, physical, of working lone-fathers, George and Wilding (1972) pointed out that they experienced 'stress and strain though of a different kind.' These fathers held down a job by day, performed household chores, functions and duties in the evenings and weekends. Many left for work early in the morning and returned home late in the afternoon. Some worked shifts. They were anxious about the children until they returned home and saw they were well and unhurt. They also worried about them during school holidays and when the children became ill.

They felt embarrassed about having made a habit of taking help from neighbours or that the neighbours extended this help grudgingly. Their mental, physical, emotional strain and concern expressed itself in changes in their patterns of behaviour, in their smoking, drinking, eating habits. They felt loneliness and isolation.

The widowed felt more depressed than the separated as they had been torn asunder from a spouse by irreversible death. In the United Kingdom those on supplementary benefit probably felt it even more, as they had to stay at home, struggle financially and perform routine household and child care tasks.

While female single parents are often mistrusted and labelled 'she-devil', 'husband-snatcher' (Burgess 1970) fathers are not treated with quite such suspicion. They lead a more active social life, having female as well as male companions and form social networks outside the family.
3.2.4 Division and sharing of familial functions and responsibilities.

The nuclear family as it exists today, being smaller in size, is more closely knit and interdependent. The tensions and pressures in family relationship, any crises, are felt much more acutely by its members. In the still further reduced single-parent family (Blechman and Manning, 1976) this is even more so.

George and Wilding (1972) found that widowers generally were most upset about the change in marital status. Often, missing the deceased parent, they were more likely to see work, domestic arrangements, care of the children, as less satisfactory since the wife's death. The separated and divorced saw their new familial situation as part loss and part gain. Many were keen to assert that relationships had improved since the wife's departure.

Sixty-eight percent of the fathers in their sample said that motherlessness had brought them and their children closer together; 18.6% reported that the breakdown had made no change in their relationships which had been close, free and easy before the breakdown; 13.4% reported that this was true in only some father and child relationships in motherless families.

Prior to the breakdown some of the fathers had participated in domestic and child care duties -- some together with their wives -- others taking more interest in the children, because of the children's own mothers' lack of interest in them. The relationship was two-way between children and father, fathers consulting children and children consulting their fathers. Oldest daughters were often relied upon to mother the children.

Orthner, et al. (1976) found (pp. 431-432) that the single-fathers felt quite competent in rearing teenage daughters. Two who had such daughters were surprised when confronted with a need to give girls 'a proper sex education.' They regarded such problems as situational rather than overall or continual. Fathers became more nurturant oriented. In their desire to compensate for being the only parent, they tried to give their children as much time as possible and tried to have a close affectionate relationship with their children.

Sanctuary and Whitehead (1970) pointed out that men left alone to care for their children attract more sympathetic assistance than lone-mothers. Fathers can also employ female housekeepers, who may, to a certain extent, fulfill the mothering role, an option not practically available to mothers seeking father surrogates.

A younger father has a greater chance of a grandmother being alive to help him care for his children. Older men are more likely to
have elder daughters who can assist in caring for younger siblings. Fathers in the middle range, 40-49 years old, are more likely to be left to cope single-handed when the family unit is broken.

Generally a much higher percentage of fathers (as compared to lone-mothers) had the assistance of another parent substitute of the opposite sex. A study by Elsa Ferri (1976) showed 24% as against only 5% of the mothers.

According to Burgess (1976), there is, for the male, no counterpart of parental socialization received by the woman as a young child and which socializes her into her parental role. Also the therapeutic role (Nye and Berardo, 1973) of love, affection and tenderness, is traditionally a woman's domain. Manhood and womanhood is societally associated with masculine and feminine roles. Recent research on man-child relationship does, however, reveal (Fein, 1974) that men are becoming more involved with their children and there is an increasing interchange of roles and increasing societal acceptance of this.

Woman's ever expanding participation in commerce, industry and politics has a great deal to do with this.

In Burgess's research 'with no exceptions, fathers reported their children helped more around the house now that their mothers were dead' (p. 6). Orthner et al. (1976:435) found that in essence, the older the child the more help he provided around the house. Parents of single-fathers generally helped with household management, child care, offered emotional and also financial help. Friends were of help, professional counsellors were used and one father reported that he 'discussed problems with his minister.' The study concluded that:

> These fathers feel quite capable and successful in their ability to be a primary parent of their children.

Their determination to succeed, their pride in their children's success and in their being able to cope as single-parents, compensated for the role strain they may have felt. They were concerned to fulfill nurturing roles rather than overly instrumental authoritative roles. They felt quite comfortable generally in their expressive roles.

> Hopefully, the notion that fathers are the instrumental leaders of the family while mothers control the expressive roles has come to rest. (Orthner et al. 1976:436)

If this very important conclusion is indeed correct and it refutes many beliefs about instrumental and nurturing familial roles, much else that is vital follows.

Unlike other researchers (Marsden 1969; Biller 1974; Weiss 1975), this study did not show that single-parent fathers tended to
'overuse' mother surrogates. They themselves spent weekends and evenings with their children.

The extent to which fathers are assuming nurturing roles and the acceptance of this as the norm must be seen in its proper perspective. It is still only relative. Ferri and Robinson (1976:59) found that children were twice as likely to have kept in touch with absent mothers (six out of ten) than with fathers (three out of ten) who had left the home. This difference is perhaps a sign of the relative importance which is attached to the mother-child relationship in our society.

Orthner et al. (1976) found in their sample that fathers 'dated around' rather than see the same female continuously, and generally satisfied with their life style, were not in a hurry to marry. They found that almost all led an active social life with dating an important part of the life-style of these single-parent fathers. Over two-thirds rejected co-habitation for themselves as they felt that it lacks the sexual discretion demanded by their parental roles and the permanence their children require; yet they approved of it as an acceptable means for others to test their relationship prior to marriage. They often expressed suspicion or disinclination to discuss sexuality. One third 'indicated rather frequent sexual contacts.'

**Self concept**

The divorcing male's perception of self and attitudes toward divorce was studied in 1978 by Lehmann. His sample comprised 15 males in the process of legal divorce. The 'Tennessee Self Concept Scale', consisting of 100 short, self-descriptive statements constructed to measure self-concept and the 'Divorce Opinionnaire', consisting of 12 statements using a Linkert-type scale to measure attitude toward divorce, were used.

Findings indicated divorcing men have a significantly lower self-concept in family-self compared to a standardised group. The initiator (of the divorce) group scored higher in total positive and family-self scores than the group whose wives filed for divorce. The study also concluded that 'the family, instead of serving as a primary source of support, is perceived by the divorcing male as a source of social isolation. The interpretation is that the divorcing male seeks a social network outside of his family system to provide support during the post-divorce adjustment. (1978:59).

From almost all the recent research it appears that, side by side with changing societal attitudes, parental roles have become more
fluid and flexible and the lone-father is coping pretty adequately. As Burgess concluded (1976(a) :7):

*Men are capable to play the parenting role in its fullest sense as are women. Their so-called inability or reluctance to play the tender, caring role seems to be rooted primarily in social structure. As men and women truly value an involved father-child relationship at the emotional and intellectual levels 'father' will become more than 'provider' in the norms of our society.*

3.2.5 Remarriage

As with the fatherless, so too with the motherless, remarriage is a common resolution of their lone-parent situation. Here too the reasons may be subjective, objective or societal pressure (with societal pressure playing less of a role than in the case of the fatherless). It can be hypothesised that this may be due to the lower proportion of young children left in the care of lone-fathers as social attitudes still largely dictate that in divorce or separation the younger child/ren should remain with the mother.

A research was carried out by Ferri and Robinson (1973-1976), as part of a wider study of the children followed up in the National Child Development Study in Great Britain. Figures were based on a sample group (at the age of 11) of 237 children from one-parent homes.

The study showed, amongst its findings, the relationship and proportion of remarriage and the age of the lone-fathers. This is reproduced in the following table.

**TABLE VIII**

**PARENTAL COMPOSITION -- AGE**

(Reproduced from British Journal of Social Work, 1973, p. 96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Father</th>
<th>Father alone</th>
<th>Father and stepmother</th>
<th>Father and mother substitute</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was found that the percentage of parents who had remarried (or were cohabiting stably) was 35% of fathers and 34% of mothers. It must be borne in mind that this reflects the position at a certain point in time irrespective of the time of the family rupture. Obviously the final proportion of remarriages would be higher. The table showed that 59% of the remarried were under 40 at the time of the survey, with only 26% of the under 40's bringing up their children alone. It may perhaps be hypothesised from this that there is a distinct relationship amongst the motherless between the desire for a mother substitute and remarriage, particularly amongst the under 40's.

It can also be presumed that, mother-child ties in our society being what they are, the motherless family, when reconstituted (and reconstituted largely when parents and children are still young) is likely to bring in its wake complex familial relationships, consanguineal (ties of blood), affinal (ties of marriage) and extended affinal.

3.3 Summary and some social implications

3.3.1 Summary

The fatherless is the largest group of all single-parent family forms. The divorced form the bulk of this group. Other forms are the separated, the widowed and the unmarried mother.

Socio-economic developments, particularly the virtual invasion of the labour market by women largely explain the changing and merging role functions of men and women and the changing societal attitudes to the mother-led one-parent family. At the same time, the mother-led solo-parent family is, despite its continuing growth and greater prevalence, in an age of increasing opportunity, subjected to even greater difficulties and frustrations than the father-led single-parent family.

The threefold responsibility of mother, provider and socialiser must be fulfilled by the lone-mother alone, while usually faced with a significant loss of income. The lone-mother is also a low-earner because of her sex and functions connected with her motherhood (Finer Report 1974).

Although a great proportion (ranging from about 50% in Britain to about 70% in Sweden (Table VI) were working, their incomes were insufficient. Maintenance granted by courts are generally inadequate and not enforceable. The lone-mother often becomes dependent entirely or
partially on welfare assistance from governmental or other agencies and her housing conditions deteriorate. Her self-esteem drops. She feels isolated and often isolates herself in reaction to societal prejudice. Her relationship with kin and community changes.

The widows' position is normally better economically and socially than that of the divorced. The divorced fare better and are faced with less prejudice than the separated. The unwed mother suffers greatest stigma and severest economic strain.

Reflecting changing attitudes there have been (particularly in Scandinavian countries) legislation and provisions to ameliorate the disadvantages faced by the lone-mother. Other Western countries are going in the same direction.

Remarriage is still the goal of most lone-parents. There is societal pressure for this. Goode stated (1964) that over 90% of people who divorce will eventually remarry, with a particularly early remarriage amongst those under 25 years old. Widows and unwed mothers also remarry although to a lesser extent. The number of children the lone-mother has is, contrary to popular opinion, almost no bar to remarriage (Goode 1956; Bernard 1956).

Remarriage is the almost universal solution of the problems of the fatherless family.

The motherless, although statistically far less prevalent than the fatherless family form, is growing mainly due to the increasing incidence of granting the father custody of the child in the case of divorce or separation. In South Africa, for instance, from 1960-1970 lone-fathers have increased by over 70% as against a population increase of just under 25%. The number of motherless families caused by death has considerably dropped.

The solo-father is economically less affected by his transition to lone-parenthood than the lone-mother, by virtue of his traditional role of breadwinner. (See Table II) He was seldom dependent on welfare, except in the lowest economic class.

It is becoming more accepted for men to perform nurturant roles, both in the two-parent and one-parent family. In the one-parent families and particularly the motherless middle-class ones, the lone-father coped adequately (Orthner et al. 1976; Orthner and Brown 1977). He had greater assistance from relatives (particularly initially). Most lone-fathers felt that motherlessness had brought them closer to their children (Burgess 1976). The children assisted in domestic chores. The lone-father was freer to engage a parent substitute of the opposite sex.
Lone-fathers felt that their social life was restricted by their lone-parenthood though they socialized more and were socially more accepted than lone-mothers.

Lone-fathers felt alone and confused. Their self-concept was lower than that of their peers in the intact family.

As with the fatherless, so too with the motherless, remarriage is a common resolution of their lone-parent situation (see Table VIII) with less societal pressure to do so however.

3.3.2 Some social implications

From an overview of the literature according to the classification by sex of the lone-parent, the disadvantaged position economically of the lone-mother gathers greater significance. Nurturant and authoritarian roles are merging and interchanging between the sexes though traditional sex roles are still rooted in society (Ferri 1976 (a)).

While the lone-mother in particular requires provisions for economic relief, all lone-parents require society to provide the facilities to complement their fulfilment of role functions and duties which the lone-parent may not be able to successfully carry out alone.
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From the divorce or separation which divides a family, or the loss of a parent by death, it is the child who suffers most.

(From the Preamble to the Constitution of Parents Without Partners, Inc., U.S.A.)
4. EFFECTS ON CHILDREN

4.1 Introduction

According to Pringle (1975:108)

*there are five groups of children who are particularly 'vulnerable' or 'at risk' of becoming stunted or damaged in their psychological development because of personal, family or social circumstances.*

According to this child psychologist and educationalist, these five groups are:

1) Children in large families with low incomes;
2) children with physical or mental handicaps;
3) children belonging to some minority groups;
4) children who have to live apart from their parents for shorter or longer periods;
5) children in one-parent families.

This vulnerability of children in one-parent homes, is, according to most current researchers, such as Herzog and Sudia (1972) and Ferri and Robinson (1976), not due to lone-parenthood per se, but to social and psychological circumstances connected with the one-parent situation.


*there is much evidence that a considerable proportion of one-parent families are likely to suffer financial hardship, if not actual poverty.*

This is due to the more limited earnings of only one parent, particularly when that parent is a mother, compared with the earnings of two parents. Low income usually means inferior housing in an inferior environment. As the National Child Development Study* showed, fatherless families are the most prevalent of all lone-parent situations. In that study one in twenty children were being brought up by one parent only and for every one motherless family, there were six fatherless families.

The psychological and social effects on children of growing up in one-parent families vary, because the age of both parents and children, when one parent has to take over the functions of two, varies.

*This was a national study on children carried out in 1965 and 1969 in Britain and used (amongst others) by Ferri and Robinson (1973-1976) for their findings on children in one-parent homes.*
The duration and nature of the period during which only one parent cared for the child, as well as the sex of the parent and child, possibly influence the effects of single-parenthood on both parents and children. Also the cause of lone-parenthood, whether single-parenthood resulted from bereavement divorce or unmarried motherhood, may affect the outcome.

As Ouston (1973) explained, many problems experienced by children, ranging from delinquency to failure in school, have often been blamed on the one-parent family situation. Lone-parents may indeed find the stress of coping more difficult than when in a two-parent situation. Single-parents must cope with their own emotional reactions to the absence of the other parent, while, at the same time, usually under adverse social and economic circumstances, having to shoulder full (or almost full) responsibility for the family.

In this chapter the writer, drawing her material from the overview of the literature, looks at the possible psychological and social effects of the different variables, on children in one-parent families.

4.2 Family functions in relation to the child

According to Traill (1968) the four functions of the family to ensure the social and psychological development of the child, are: --

1. providing the child with a stable home and secure framework within which he can be free to experiment and learn about his world;

2. providing the child with two parental figures from whom he can learn role behaviour and with whom he can identify;

3. providing the child with a disciplinary framework, made up of different forms of support from each parent, through which he learns the norms of social living;

4. providing a safe atmosphere for emotional development, through the give and take of intimate relationships with adults and other children.

It would appear that the child requires, ideally, both parents (Rosen 1977:68), "a parent of the same sex to identify with and who serves as a role model, and a parent of the opposite sex who serves as a basic love object." Father absence in childhood may cause difficulty in the forming of lasting heterosexual relationships. Children's academic cognitive development is related to the extent and quality of fathering they enjoyed (Biller 1974). The mother is normally the nurturant figure and to fulfill her role satisfactorily, she needs the emotional support of her husband (Dicks 1967; Lidz 1970; Fleck 1972).
The child, experiencing paternal love learns through his parents to love. For a better understanding of these fundamental roles of these familial heads, some theories on this aspect are briefly recapped.

When the intact family does not fulfil the four functions outlined by Traill (1968) adequately, due to absence of interparental support, the presence of strife, illness of a spouse or outside (e.g. economic) pressures, there is not the optimal environment required for the physical, social and psychological development of the child. The ideal environment requires two parents supportive of each other in their roles: the mother to nurture and love, the father mainly to protect and support. It would therefore appear that the one-parent family is not the optimal environment for a child's social and psychological growth.

There is, however, agreement amongst researchers (Goode 1956; Kelly and Wallerstein 1975-1977; Hetherington et al. 1975-1978; Raschke and Raschke 1977; Rosen 1977) that the paternal or maternal deprivation in the one-parent home is less likely to be more damaging to the child's development than interparental strife in the two-parent home.

This chapter devotes itself to a consideration of some emotional aspects as well as specific problems arising from the one-parent family situation, largely in relation to what are generally considered the functions of the family in the care of children. As most one-parent situations are brought about by divorce, some sections of the chapter deal only with the children of divorce.

As the subject is so vast and this overview is of necessity limited, some interesting and relevant findings will no doubt be omitted.

4.2.1 Theories on the psychological and social development of the child.

Erikson's Theory:

According to Erikson (1950), the mother's emotional state, which in turn is affected by the support she receives from her husband, is important in establishing basic trust between mother and child. The sense of trust is to some extent dependent on the confidence, degree of relaxation and warmth she feels with the act of feeding. The mother's emotional state when handling her child will later affect the child's emotional development.
Emotional development was seen by Erikson as 'growth of ego together with the quality of ego experience afforded to the child by his immediate environment' (Rosen 1977:64). A child's personality passes through, as postulated by Erikson, eight developmental stages, each associated with one particular crisis central to the person's social-psychological development. The degree of the previous development of the child's ego strength will determine and facilitate the individual's response at each sequential stage.

Rosen pointed out that, while Freud stressed libidinal development phases and location of pathology in early childhood, Erikson wrote about ego functioning, successful solutions of developmental crises, and equipping the individual with ego strength to overcome difficulties.

Bowlby's theory:

Drawing upon numerous reports and research of the preceding 15 years on early deprivation of maternal care, Bowlby in 1951 presented a report to the World Health Organization. In exposing 'the prevalence of deplorable patterns of institutions upbringing' Bowlby developed his theory on maternal deprivation.

The child's instinctive aim of survival is the basis for the intense attachment to the mother. He contended that 'the nature and intensity of a child's earliest emotional relationship to his mother is vitally important! He stressed that the bond which is established must be a lasting bond. If it is irrevocably broken or never established satisfactorily, the resulting physical, intellectual and social effects on the child's development may be serious, even permanently so.

Attachment behaviour is significant throughout the latency of a child, but the first three years of a child's life are vital for attachment relationships which affect his later emotional development. A threat to the child of losing the attachment figure causes anxiety in the child and actual loss causes sorrow. Anger may result too. Rosen (1977:66) compared this theory with Erikson's of 'basic trust'.

Bowlby's earlier (1951, 1953) conceptions rigidly contended that the natural mother alone is able to supply the basis for attachment behaviour. In 1969 he expanded his theory to include mother

* The conception that a mother is better suited than a father in the nurturing of the child strongly influenced the application of the tender age doctrine in custody decisions.
surrogates; any person 'who mothers a child and to whom he becomes attached' (1969:52). This does not weaken Bowlby's emphasis on the importance of 'attachment behaviour and on a young child's need to form lasting bonds with other people' (Rutter, 1972:124). Erikson (1950), Bowlby (1969) saw parent-child bonding weakened when, during adolescence, peers and other adults begin to be as important to him as his parents. His maturation and development is not disturbed by this.

Rutter's views:

Rutter (1972) shifted the emphasis on the quality of the relationship rather than physical proximity, sex or kinship. According to Rutter (1972:125)

the chief bond need not be with a biological parent, it need not be with the chief caretaker and it need not be with a female.

Furthermore, the person with whom there is the main bond is not necessarily the most important one in his life. For some things, that person will be most important, but not for others.

The range of the object of bonding is further widened by Rutter's (1972) suggestion that separation and bond disruption are not synonymous. There need be no negative effects from separation nor need it involve bond disruption (p. 124). For optimal development, bonds need to be formed with people of both sexes.

In weighing out the possible effects of maternal separation and paternal separation, Rutter felt that both parents are important to a child's development. Which parent is more important for any child, differs with the child and with the situation. 'It has not made much difference which parent the child got on well with as long as he got on well with one parent.' (Rutter 1972:248)

Conclusions from theories

The following conclusions may be drawn from Erikson (1950), Bowlby (1951, 1969) and Rutter (1972). The family has not been replaced as the basic unit of society and still provides the optimum environment for the child's development.

Bonding and attachments are of utmost importance to the child's social and psychological development; but the quality of the relationship is of more importance than physical proximity, sex or kinship. A turbulent home environment is more damaging than lack of a biological
parent. New attachments can be formed when existing bonds are disrupted or in addition to them.

The above conclusions are endorsed by Pringle (1975) who stresses that persons other than the mother can give or assist in giving the necessary love and warmth required by the child. Temperamental, intellectual or sexual incompatibility leads, according to Pringle, if not to open quarrels between parents, to a tense atmosphere adversely affecting the child's development and future ability to relate positively. Hostility between parents may generate repetitive behaviour in the offspring.

4.2.2 The child and the one-parent family

As has already been reviewed (see 2.3), the one-parent family is expected by society to perform almost all the duties of intact parent families, which include the functions defined by Traill (1968).

While from the theories of Erikson (1950), Bowlby (1969) and Rutter (1972) it can be deduced that the absence of a spouse in the one-parent family is not, at least theoretically, an overriding factor in the development of the child, there are opinions which are not as tolerant and question its adequacy.

Glasser and Navarre (1965), in discussing mother or father loss, pointed out that a loss of one parent produces a structural distortion in the communications between the child and the adult world and, since such communication is a factor in the development of the self-image, of social skills and of an image of the total society, the totality of the child's possible development is also distorted. Researchers such as Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) and Pidgeon (1970) have viewed the one-parent family, by virtue of its being a minority, as a deviant form. They have questioned the ability of the one-parent framework to afford optimum opportunity for enculturation of its children.

If the family structure is itself incomplete through the absence of one of the parents, then it faces difficulties in dealing with its function of the socialization of the child. There is an absence of status (either the male or female figure), absence of a role (mother or father); even the remaining parent may have ambivalent feelings about his or her own role.

Some writers, such as Sprey (1975), Elkin (1977) and Fain (1977), questioned the possibility of their being absolute lone-parenthood (with some exceptions) for any but the widowed. The non-custodial parent remains a parent who, generally, continues parenting partially, in varying measure, to a lesser degree. In the case of the
widowed, as pointed out in 2.1, the departed parent may have remained a significant reference figure for the child.

The involvement and interaction with each other, and with and through the child, is an ongoing process even after separation and divorce. To quote Egleson and Egleson (1961:46):

And it is a relationship: For although you are on the brink of divorce, at the end of your marriage, you will always be tied together through your parenthood.

Through the children, in case of separation and divorce, parenthood normally remains binding, to some degree, on both parents (Goode 1956; Weiss 1975; Hetherington, Cox and Cox 1975, 1978).

4.3 **Statistical data** (see also 5.2)

Some statistical data is included to give an indication of the extent of the number and the incidence of children growing up in lone-parent families.

As the one-parent family is today in most Western countries largely a product of divorce (or separation) rather than death (see 2.2), most children in one-parent homes are today no more the orphaned.

Excepting for the widowed, the comparatively young age characteristics of the different one-parent family types result in a large number of children, and young children particularly, being involved. Douglas (1970) had found that family breakdown, caused by divorce and separation, tended to be concentrated in the early years. According to the Finer Report (1974, Vol. 2:19) the average age of widowed single-parents is in the mid-forties, divorced and separated in the mid-thirties and unmarried mothers increasingly in the earlier twenties. The United States Current Population Report (1975) gives the median age of the youngest child at time of divorce as 4.0 years.

In considering statistical figures it must be kept in mind (as warned by the Finer Report (1974, Vol. 1:21) that figures for marital breakdown (and therefore for the children of such homes) are often incomplete as there is no de jure record of purely de facto marital breakdowns.

**United States**

Weiss (1975:167) states that more than 60% of divorcing couples have children at home. The 'typical postmarital family is a mother with one or two children in one household, and a father alone in another.'
The following table presents the living arrangements of all children under 18 years of age in the United States.

**TABLE IX**

**LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE BY RACE AND MARITAL STATUS OF PARENT(S): UNITED STATES, 1960, 1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living with both parents (including reconstituted)</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with mother only</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other married, husband absent</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with father only</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with neither parent</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*The above table includes figures for 'Black', although the American demography is not in this respect typical of the Western countries in the orbit of this study.

Information for one-parent family children in the United States are drawn largely from the Population Bulletin prepared by Glick and Norton (1979), (incorporated partially in Table IX) which formed the point of departure for a paper by Glick entitled 'Children of Divorced Parents in Demographic Perspective' (1979). Of particular interest, as it may be indicative of likely trends elsewhere, is the projection to the year 1990 contained in this paper.

As one-parent children are largely caused by divorce, divorce-related statistics figure prominently.

Since 1960 nearly 60% of divorcing couples had one or more children under 18 years of age at time of divorce, although the average per divorce decree has declined with the fall in the birthrate from 2.25 in 1964 to 1.81 in 1976. This decrease has, however, been
more than offset by the increase in the number of divorces, so that the total number of children involved in divorce rose from 0.5 million (under 1%) in 1960 to 1.1 million (1.7%) in 1973, and has remained at that level till 1976 (as has the number of divorces through to 1978). Allowing for remarriages, Glick estimates that about 28% of all children under 18 in 1976 had experienced parental divorce. By 1990 this proportion will reach close to one in three. In the United States, the percentage of children under 18 living with only one- parent has almost doubled from 9% in 1960 to 17% (over 11 million) in 1976. At a conservative estimate, the proportion is expected to come close to trebling by 1990, from 9% in 1960 to 25% in 1990 (of all children under 18). Of the children born in 1977, an estimated 45% will have lived in a one-parent family before reaching the age of 18, and the proportion will reach 50% by 1990.

The proportion of fatherless children under 18 has doubled, from 8% to 16%, since 1960. In 1976, as in 1960, 10% of children living with a divorced parent lived with the father, but there has been a threefold increase in the proportion of young children living with a divorced father.

There has since 1960, been almost a sixfold increase in children under 18 living with unmarried mothers. Glick notes that with the decline of the number of children living with two natural parents, the proportion of children living with a stepparent and a natural parent, will increase from the 1960 figure of ten percent, to 15% in 1990.

Great Britain

According to Ferri and Robinson (1976) the National Child Development Study (1970-1973) estimated that at least one million children were being brought up in Britain in nearly two thirds of a million one-parent homes. For every one motherless family there were six fatherless families. One-parent families constituted (in 1971) 9% of all families with dependent children (Finer Report Vol. 2:17) and one in 12 of all children. By 1976 the number of one-parent children had increased to almost a million and a quarter (according to Information Sheet ISSN 0309-1104 of the National Council for One Parent Families, London).

The following table is reproduced from the Finer Report (1974).
TABLE X

ESTIMATE OF NUMBER OF ONE-PARENT FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN RESULTING FROM ILLEGITIMACY, FACTUAL SEPARATION, DEATH AND DIVORCE

GREAT BRITAIN, 1971

(Reproduced from Finer Report, 1974, Vol 1, Table 3.1:22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Number of families</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married*</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>520,000</td>
<td>920,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Separated

Republic of South Africa

With divorce being the main cause of the one-parent family, the increase in divorce is indicative of the increase in the number of children in one-parent homes. According to governmental statistics for 1976 (see Table XII.) the specific divorce rate (number per 1000 married couples) has increased from 1935 to 1975 from 3.5 to 11.2 -- an increase of over 300%. Except for the post-war year of 1945, the increase has been steady. The 1976 figures (not shown here) indicate a braking of the increase with the numbers equaling the 1975 figures.

Most children (as in all Western countries) were in fatherless one-parent homes. The following table was compiled from figures from the Government Census of 1960 and 1970 and shows the distribution according to sex of family head.
TABLE XI

COMPOSITION OF FAMILY, R.S.A. (WHITE) -- AGE OF CHILDREN IN ONE-PARENT HOMES

Compiled from Population Census 1970, Government Printer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition of family</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Age of children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-10 years</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father with children</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>7,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother with children</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>16,003</td>
<td>52,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children in one-parent homes</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>18,343</td>
<td>60,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children in all homes</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>660,273</td>
<td>611,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Age of children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father with child/ren</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6,526</td>
<td>14,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother with child/ren</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>24,992</td>
<td>83,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children in one-parent homes</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>31,518</td>
<td>97,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children in all homes</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>798,327</td>
<td>860,108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures show that while the total number of children in all homes in South Africa (intact and one-parent) increased from 1960-1970 by just under a third, the number of children in one-parent homes grew by almost 70%. The number of lone-fathers with children has more than doubled, although homes headed by mothers still outnumber those headed by fathers by almost five to one. The number of children under ten years involved increased by almost 75%.

From the above table (for Whites) in South Africa, children living in one-parent homes numbered, in 1970, almost 130,000. Considering that the specific divorce rate has, from 1970 to 1975 increased over 22% from 9.0% to 11.2%, and, allowing for no comparative increase in widowed and illegitimate children, it can be estimated that this number has reached at least 145,000.

Although these children would still constitute (allowing for the increase) only about 8% of the total number of children compared to an estimated 17% in the United States, South Africa is closing the gap.
4.4 A study: Effects on children

4.4.1 Introduction

While it is generally agreed by researchers that the lone-parent situation negatively affects the social and psychological development of the child (Pringle, Butler and Davie, 1966; Marsden, 1969; Douglas, 1970; Crellin, Pringle and West, 1971; Hunt, 1972; Hetherington et al., 1975-1978; Lakin Phillips, 1978), there are differences of opinion as to the aspects and the degree.

These effects are, as stated by, among many others, Herzog and Sudia (1968), not necessarily due to fatherlessness (or motherlessness) per se but by circumstances which caused or flowed from the lone-parent situation.

All researchers have, however, found that most socio-economic repercussions from one-parenthood, in a society in which it is a deviant minority, are likely, in varying degree, to adversely affect the functioning of the one-parent family and the functioning and psychological and social development of the child.

To illustrate some of these problems, as they affected the children, the writer summarises findings from the first nationally representative sample of one-parent situations researched by Elsi Ferri and Hillary Robinson in Britain and published in 1976. It is a comprehensive research airing most of the problems.

For the first time, we were looking at a whole national typical sample of one-parent families. But not only that, we were looking at a child-based sample. This was the first time that anyone in this country had looked at a totally representative group of children living in one-parent families. (Ferri 1974)

4.4.2 Scope of the study

The study, carried out from 1970 to 1973, compared the environment, educational attainment, behaviour and social adjustment of 11 year old children, growing up in one-parent families, with children living with both natural parents. A long-term follow-up study, carried out by the National Child Development Study (NCDS) in 1965 and 1969 of 16,000 children, all born in one week of March in 1958, in Great Britain, provided the data for the Ferri study. The NCDS follow-up in 1969 covered 12,750 (of the original 16,000) children, of whom 750 were one-parent children and 12,000 were from two-parent homes.

Of the 750 children from one-parent homes, 652 were fatherless. Of the fatherless children, just over half had divorced or separated
parents; in 35% of cases the fathers had died, and in 9% the children were illegitimate. Of the 98 motherless children, in half the cases this was due to bereavement, and in half due to divorce/separation (Ferri, 1976 (c):7).

While the number of boys and girls in one-parent homes caused by a parent's death or illegitimacy were approximately equal, an interesting difference was found in fatherless and motherless families, resulting from divorce or separation. In such fatherless families, the girls outnumbered the boys (55% compared to 45%), while amongst the motherless children, the boys outnumbered the girls (63% as against 37%). Therefore, while 88% of the children remained with their mothers, there appeared to be a tendency for the children to be cared for by the parent of the same sex.

4.4.3 Economic hardships

Regarding the economic hardships experienced by the families, the findings of the Ferri study were in keeping with those reviewed in the previous chapters. Both the fatherless and motherless were economically disadvantaged compared to the children from two-parent homes. The degree of hardship was largely related to the cause of lone-parenthood and the fatherless suffered more than the motherless, with the unmarried mother family being hardest hit.

There were proportionately more (29.5%) children with semi or unskilled family backgrounds in the divorced and separated homes as compared with (21%) children in the widowed and two-parent homes.

4.4.4 Housing

In housing too, the findings of the Ferri study lent support to findings by other researchers reviewed previously. There was frequently a close relationship between a family's economic circumstances and housing conditions and, being generally economically disadvantaged; their housing conditions were inferior to those of children from two-parent homes. As with economic hardship, the degree of housing hardship was related to the cause of lone-parenthood.

Discussing the effects of housing movement on the child, Ferri (1976 (a):79-81) found little or no incidence of a change of home causing some disruption; the effect is generally temporary, and, the child soon adjusts himself. However '...sense of security and stability so essential to the young child, might be seriously undermined', when there are frequent and numerous changes of home, particularly when
such movement is the result of adverse circumstances rather than of positive choice.

Ferri found that the children, in her sample, fatherless because of divorce and separation, had moved the largest number of times, only 14% of them not having moved at all. The children of the widowed had moved least, with over a third not having moved at all. Children in motherless families hardly differed from children of two-parent families in their moving of home.

The relation between moving home and change of schools is discussed under 'changing schools.'

4.4.5 Employment and day care and children placed into care

A problem of great concern for single-parents is the necessity of having to provide financially for the children as well as looking after them. (This aspect has also been dealt with in 2.3, 3.1.2, and 3.2.2): 62% of the 652 fatherless children's and 57% of the two-parent children's mothers, were working for the 12 months' period before the survey was undertaken. Only one third of the mothers in two-parent families compared with more than half of divorced, separated and widowed mothers had full-time jobs. Amongst mothers of illegitimate children, the figure rose three-quarters. Percentages of unemployed revealed that 17% of the fathers in motherless families, as compared with 8% of the two-parent family fathers in the sample were unemployed. This high percentage reflected a correlation between the perhaps impossible task of combining full-time work (to earn a living) and child-rearing. However, Ferri (1976 (a):66) felt that society views with disapproval the father who stops working in order to look after his children full time. 'The social system is not geared to help these fathers look after their children.'

Like Marsden (1969), Ferri pointed out that while children from one-parent homes where the single-parent is working all day and would benefit most from nursery education, because there is a shortage of nursery school accommodation, they often cannot be placed in such centres.

The lack of care facilities for children was particularly problematic, should children become ill. Ferri and Robinson (1976:49) quoted the example of a divorced mother, who had said "You tend not to believe the child at first because you want so desperately for him not to be ill."

While only 5% of the fatherless sample enjoyed a father substitute, some 25% of the motherless sample were being cared for by a mother
substitute. Society seems more sympathetic towards the motherless and more ready to help. This includes a tendency of extended family members and neighbours willingness to assist. Society, it would appear, seems to assume that a woman (mother) can and should more easily and more readily combine earning a living and rearing the children.

Of the fatherless in the study, one in ten of the children had been in care at some time and one in eight of the motherless, compared with one in 50 of the two-parent group of children. Wynn (1964) had estimated that the loss of a father increased by 18 times the risk that a child would be received into care.

The study sample excluded children who were actually in care at the time of the study. Therefore the percentage of children vulnerable to the risk of care is in fact much higher.

Most of the parents who had children under school age, when asked who looked after the children while they were at work, reported that a relative, particularly a grandmother, looked after the children. Elsa Ferri concluded from this (1974:4) 'I think this fact rather challenges the popular myth about the breakdown of the extended family.'

4.4.6 Changing schools:

Ferri found that the changes of school of the children from one-parent families were largely similar to the pattern in the change of homes, with the widowed children changing schools least (very close to the incidence of those in two-parent homes), and the fatherless, caused by marital breakdown, or illegitimacy, experiencing several changes of schools, with 10% of their children having been to four or more schools over a period of about six years.

The surprising exception to the pattern referred to, were, the motherless children. Whereas the housing movement approximated that of the two-parent family, one in eight of these motherless children had been to four or more schools. Ferri (1976(a) :81) explained this by the suggestion that motherless families move home because of family-oriented problems, such as a wish to be close to relatives who could help look after the child, whereas the two-parent family, when it does move, is freer to restrict their choice of new home to the proximity of the child's school.

Ferri thought that adapting to a new school, new teachers, methods, curricula and new friends, is likely to be a problem, and a 'potentially disturbing experience and repeated upheavals of this nature
will be found to have an adverse effect on one or other aspect of the children's development' (pp. 81, 82).

4.4.7 School attainment level: social adjustment

Two other factors influenced by their unique situation of having to grow up in a more economically deprived environment than children in two-parent homes, were examined -- school attainment and social adjustment of the children.

As part of the follow-up survey, the children were given tests to establish their arithmetic and reading levels. The teachers also submitted an assessment of the children's social adjustments.

Without controlling other influential variables such as income, class and housing, a simplistic straightforward comparison of the single-parent and two-parent children revealed that children from one-parent families (excepting in the case of the widowed) had lower reading and arithmetic scores than those of two-parent family children. The cause of the one-parent situation was also a factor affecting the school performance of the children.

The children in fatherless families resulting from divorce or separation showed significantly poorer arithmetic scores, but only slightly poorer reading scores, than children in two-parent families. This tends towards a contention of some researchers (Funkenstein 1963; Carlsmith 1964; Gregory 1965) that quantitative rather than verbal aptitudes, are depressed by the absence of a father (1976(a) :119). There was no difference between the progress of boys and girls amongst children who were fatherless due to divorce or separation, both these groups making equally poorer progress than the two-parent family children. Amongst the children of the widows, however, the boys did less well than the girls, compared with their counterparts from two-parent homes. This difference, however, disappeared within the four year period between the study at age seven and follow-up at age 11. Ferri hypothesised that this may have been due to the initial shock of the bereavement having worn off.

Even when other factors had been taken into account, children in motherless families, regardless of the cause of motherlessness, did less well in reading and arithmetic than children from two-parent families. Social class appeared a significant variable -- the higher the class the better the progress made.

The performance of the illegitimate children, whose mothers worked full time, equalled that of children in two-parent non-manual background homes. Where their mothers worked part-time or not at all,
the children's performance was comparable to the performance of children from two-parent manual backgrounds.

Whereas the mothers' full-time employment had positive effects on the performance of the illegitimate children, not so with the fatherless children in divorced and separated homes. The divorced or separated full-time working mothers' children read less well; there was no difference between the reading ability of children whose mothers were working part-time and those whose mothers were not employed. Ferri (1976 (a):112) quoted Wallston's (1973) cautionary note:

Care must be taken in using conclusions about positive or detrimental effects of maternal employment on children to encourage or discourage mothers interested in working. Until causation can be shown, there is danger in drawing implications for relevant social action.

In view of the increasing attention which was being paid to the interplay between the pupils' performance in school and the teachers' expectations (Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968; Pidgeon, 1970), the Ferri study suggested that awareness by the teacher of the 'deviant' family situation might have the effect of reducing the teacher's expectations.

As with poorer reading and arithmetic attainment, so too with the poorer social adjustment (as measured by the teachers, using the Bristol Social Adjustment Guide which contains some 250 descriptions of behaviour) of the children in one-parent homes, was due to socio-economic factors associated with their parental situation, rather than with lone-parenthood per se. Amongst children in divorced or separated homes, there was, however, a tendency for them to be seen as rather less well adjusted in school than children from two-parent homes (p. 130). The mothers of these children, particularly with their daughters, were slightly more aware of problems in their children's behaviour at home. Fatherless boys at the age of eleven were found to be more enuretic than were their counterparts in two-parent families.

Ferri found (1976 (a)) that generally any differences in behaviour and adjustment between one and two-parent family children were but insignificant and not of the magnitude so often attributed to being caused by the absence of a parent (p. 130). On the whole, the relationship between one-parent status and school attainment and social adjustment was but slight after allowances had been made for all the unfavourable conditions (including those particularly characteristic of one-parent families), such as social class, poverty, size of family, parental aspirations, housing, change of school and having been in care. As other researchers (Davie, Butler and Goldstein, 1972) pointed out, all these socio-economic factors affect school
levels and social adjustment.

4.4.8 Aspirations for the future

The aspirations and ambitions of parents for the future of the children from single-parent and two-parent homes were largely the same. The majority wanted their children to continue their studies beyond the statutory minimum with some form of further post-school training.

The aspirations of the widowers for their children were lower than those of other lone-fathers. So too were the aspirations of the unmarried mothers, compared with mothers in two-parent families. The divorced and separated mothers had slightly lower aspirations for their daughters than mothers in two-parent homes.

Kriesberg (1970) suggested that while unsupported mothers who worked had higher educational aspirations for their children than mothers who did not work, Ferri herself suggests that perhaps working mothers are those with the most resilience and energy and the greatest determination to overcome the disadvantaged position in which their family circumstances have placed them.

Ferri (1976 (a):103) concluded:

In every aspect of parental involvement and aspirations investigated, a majority of mothers and fathers in all types of family situation showed an interest in their children’s current progress, and concern for their future development and success.

The expectations and aspirations of children in one-parent homes were generally lower than those of the children in the two-parent homes. The motherless children of divorce were more likely to aspire to further education than those of the widowers. The aspirations of the children may have been a reflection of the attitudes of the fathers.

The job aspirations of the one-parent children did not differ from those of the two-parent child, by and large. However, because of their families' usually poor financial position, the lone-parent sons (particularly in the case of the fatherless) expected to take up employment immediately upon completion of school; not having had any training, they would not obtain skilled higher-paid jobs.

4.4.9 Emotional and social behaviour problems

Although one-parent families are not the only minority group to
suffer material deprivation, their problems hit them at a time when they are at their 'lowest ebb' in having to adjust to the breakdown of a marriage or the death of a spouse. When questioned about the effect of lone-parent status on the behaviour of their children, four out of ten parents felt their children's behaviour had been affected and one in four felt the children were still experiencing behavioural problems expressed by school absenteeism, symptoms of depression, anxiety, withdrawal, hostility, aggression. In a few cases problems were more serious, such as truancy and delinquency. Mothers felt guilty and unable to cope, particularly in sharing a son's interests or performing 'male' tasks such as repairing bicycles.

The lone-fathers experienced difficulties in offering the children the emotional support previously given by mothers. Parents often passed their feelings of inadequacy, fears and frustrations, on to the children. Frustrated parents are probably unable to meet the demands of their children.

Both mothers and fathers experienced difficulties in discussing emotional and personal problems with children and in providing sex education.

4.4.10 Ferri's conclusions from her research

In her own assessment of the importance of her study, Ferri (1974) pointed out that her research revealed little evidence of any adverse effect on the one-parent family situation per se on the children's development. Furthermore, taking into account that lone-parents bring up their children singlehanded, under conditions of hardship and deprivation, the fact that so many do succeed, in spite of their difficulties, is a tribute to the resources and resilience of both the children and the parents. They succeed in spite of, rather than because of, any treatment they receive from society. Ferri's concluding remarks (1974:6-7) are most important:

...the major contributing factors to poorer development in one-parent children are factors which are external to the family situation, and these factors can be changed through social practice and policy, if the will and the means are there.

In the follow-up study report entitled Coping Alone (1976), Ferri and Robinson showed that much of the assistance to one-parent families (especially in housing, employment and day care) was given by relatives; neighbours, friends and employers.

The specific practical recommendations given below were made because the follow-up study found that the passage of four years had
in most cases not ameliorated the difficulties faced by one-parent families. While some had remarried, 73 per cent of the parents still had to continue to cope alone with their children.

   i) provision of flexible day care,
   ii) supervised activity in and outside school hours,
   iii) house-help services to cover the needs of the one-parent family,
   iv) a wider-ranging counselling service for parents.

4.5 Some educational, emotional and social aspects

4.5.1 Introduction

In almost all the relevant research, there is a consistency in the findings that the circumstances of the one-parent family are generally adverse, and may adversely affect some of the children's educational progress and emotional development and behaviour. Children in one-parent families show greater signs of stress than do children in two-parent families, 'as demonstrated by these children in school-work, through maladjustment, or emotional disturbance and through delinquency.' (Finer Report 1974, Vol. 2:364).

4.5.2 School performance

One of the aspects of the child's development affected by the family experiences of the child, is the educational one. The child spends much of his waking day of his formative years at school. The Ferri study reviewed (1976 (a)) devoted considerable space to the comparative scholastic attainment of children of different marital statuses. In view of the importance of the educational aspects, some further research, which complements and by and large reinforces the Ferri study, is briefly dealt with.

The work of Douglas (1964) and Douglas et al. (1968) is particularly relevant to variations in educational developments. Douglas and his colleagues had conducted a longitudinal study of children at ages 8, 11, and 15. The sample of Douglas was made up of 5,362 children out of 16,695 children born in Great Britain in one week of 1946. The study excluded illegitimate children and twins.

His conclusions included findings about school performance. These revealed that insecurity, whether because of the death of a father, his illness, or his unemployment, affected children's school
performance negatively and is associated with poorer school performance
and earlier school leaving. But, according to Douglas, it is prolonged
insecurity that seems to be important; the sudden death of a father has
no apparent effect on children's school work.

If a father died before the child was 11 years old, the child
scored well in all tests, but if the father died after the child was 11,
his results showed an adverse effect. In the secondary school stage,
long illness of a father before death appeared to have an adverse
effect. In case of divorce or separation, whether the break occurred
early or late in the child's life, such children were adversely affected
in all the test scores, but especially in mathematics.

In 1973 Douglas presented to the Finer Commission his findings on
540 children from broken homes, who formed 11.4% of the remaining cohort
of 4,701 children in 1964, death and emigration having reduced the
original sample from 5,362 to this figure. Of the 540 children, 207 were
from families which had broken up before the children had reached the
age of six.

Douglas' findings revealed that children from such homes broken
by death before they were six years old, and whose mothers had not re-
married or were not cohabiting, tended to equal at the age of eight, but
to do better at the age of 11 and still better at the age of 15, as
compared with the average of the 3,626 children (of the remaining cohort
of 4,701 children) for whom there was the relevant information. Remarriage
of the widows reversed the scores on the children, bringing them to lower
than average.

While children of divorce and separation scored lower than all
others in the sample, the children whose mothers remarried, scored lower
still. The children of divorce and separation who were reared by their
fathers, foster parents, relatives, or in institutions, scored the lowest
points of all. The presence of the mother, and her remaining unmarried,
whether widowed or divorced, and where the family breakup occurred
before the child was six, affects positively the scholastic attainments
of the child.

Broadly, the findings of Ferri (1976 (a)) and Douglas are
supportive of each other. Both agree that the school performance of
children in one-parent families, excepting the children of widowed mothers
is generally lower than that of children in intact homes, with children
in motherless families scoring lower than those in fatherless homes.
Ferri particularly stresses however that, after allowance has been made
for unfavourable conditions flowing largely from the disadvantaged
material position usually associated with the lone-parent situation, the
differences in school performance are comparatively slight.
Like other researchers, Marsden (1969) was concerned with the effects of material deprivation on children's school performance and the importance of the school as a socialising agent. According to him, especially the economically deprived fatherless children require the social stimulation of school to enhance their educational achievements. Yet, for financial reasons, in their fatherless situation, such children missed school outings, wore wrong clothes and could not bring school friends to their drab homes. In the words of Marsden (1969:56)

This tipped the balance between getting into a high or low stream at school. Thus, children already deprived had their life chances further diminished by being excluded from the full benefit of education.

La Grange (1970:225), even more than Marsden (1969), found that the mothers in her study attached great importance to the roles of the schools in the children's lives. These divorced mothers regarded the school particularly as the source from which the children would draw their values. Nevertheless, while expecting so much from the schools, the mothers, feeling uncomfortable in a couples' orientated society, shied away from attending P.T.A. meetings. Even in some cases where they wished to do so, physical impediments such as lack of transport, household chores, lack of baby-sitters, prevented this.

In a study based on data from the National Child Development Study of the 1958 cohort, Crellin, Pringle and West (1971) drew some findings of comparative school performances of illegitimate, adopted illegitimate and children in intact homes. While all children born illegitimate are generally considered 'children at risk', the adverse effects flowing from illegitimacy are almost completely cancelled when these children are adopted. Their adjustment and progress then equals that of their peers of the same social class of children reared by both natural parents. Illegitimate children in the relatively advantaged environment of middle-class homes, compared unfavourably with legitimate and adopted children in such homes. There was found to be a twelve months' difference in reading progress between the adopted and the not-adopted illegitimate children. The illegitimate group was found to change schools more than the adopted or legitimate; the parents of the illegitimate children showed least interest in their school progress; school attendance was least regular; the proportion of 'maladjusted' in behaviour and school performance was almost twice as high among the illegitimate as among the legitimate; the adopted sample more closely resembling the legitimate. The illegitimate children had had a poorer start in life, were beset by a number of unfavourable circumstances; their hardships and deprivations continued, manifesting themselves and resulting in poor and problem behaviour.

Palmer in Canada (1976) examined the effects of access and
custody arrangements of 291 families with 566 children under 16 years old. The school performances of children who enjoyed regular, but not too frequent visits from the non-custodial parent were superior to those who had regular weekly visits. Palmer held that regular (defined by her as at least monthly, but less than weekly) visits did not upset the child's daily routine and yet assured the child of the continuing interest of the non-custodial parent. Palmer's methodology may (according to Rosen 1977) be questioned, as her evidence of effects on children of divorce was entirely from telephone reports given her by teachers rather than from clinical evidence.

Lakin Phillips (1978) points out that children of father-absent homes, suffered in their school achievements, as shown by arithmetic and reading results. 'It is as if the more that might be expected of the child on the basis of ability, the more the achievement ability gap occurs' (p. 9). Biller, (1974:10) suggested that male teachers could have a positive effect on pre-elementary school children's academic development. Also, in father-absent families, where a child has an older brother, he will suffer less of a deficit in academic aptitudes than a boy who has sisters.

Biller's (1974) and Pringle's (1975) findings tend to indicate possible bonding, other than maternal or paternal, to the developmental advantage of the one-parent family child. Weiss (1975) has indicated that children in fatherless homes may develop better verbal skills than children in two-parent homes, because of their greater closeness to their mothers in the absence of the father (although Ferri (1976 (a)), in her sample (see 4.4.7) found such children's reading scores to have been slightly poorer than those of children in two-parent homes). On the other hand, academic cognitive development is paternally related, according to Blanchard and Biller (1970) among others.

Preschool children, too, were found to have been affected by the parental marital situation. Hetherington, Cox and Cox (1978) conducted a study on 24 middle-class boys and 24 girls from divorced families, where the mother had the custody of the children, and on an equal number of boys and girls from two-parent homes, all at the same pre-schools. The average age of the children at the beginning of the study was 3.92 years. The children were each observed for six half-hour sessions, at 2 months, 1 year and 2 years after divorce in free play situations, in the classroom and in the playground.

These researchers were of the opinion that, by observing children's play and peer interactions, they could observe stress and coping in children, in response to divorce.

They found that the children's play and social relations at
school paralleled the findings in family relations. The transition period immediately following divorce was a stressful one. The play patterns of children of divorce, in the first year following the breakup, were more fragmented and less cognitively and socially mature. There were more dysphoric play patterns in children of divorce in the first year. For boys, the negative play forms, including expression of hostility and anxiety, continued into the second year.

As this study only lasted two years, it was not possible for the researchers to establish whether boys would eventually readjust themselves so fully that they would show no difference in their play and social interactions to those shown by children from two-parent homes.

4.5.3 Children's self-concept

As self-concept may be regarded as a measure of personal and social adjustment, the researcher, in an attempt at an understanding of what possibly affects the self-concept of children, reviews a current research study. In this study, by Raschke and Raschke (1977), the sample consisted of 289 school children of whom 61% were black, 39% white; 44% of the children were males and 56% females. The children themselves were questioned.

The Raschkes set out to test two hypotheses (p. 6):

(1) that family structure (intact, single-parent or reconstituted) will make no significant differences in children's self concepts.

(2) that children who perceive greater conflict in their families will have significantly lower self concepts.

The Raschke and Raschke findings showed that:

(1) Self-concept was not affected significantly by family structure.

(2) Self-concept was related to fighting between adults in the family and the perceived happiness of adults. Children who perceive greater conflicts in their families will have significantly lower self concepts.

(3) There was no significant relationship between the child's perception of parental happiness and family structure.

(4) Children from one-parent homes reported less fighting among adults 'probably simply because there was only one adult in most of these homes' (p. 16).

(5) The number of siblings, race, sex, age of the children were not related to self concept.
Where children perceived parental happiness positively, their self concept was positive. The greater the perceived happiness of their parents, the higher the children's self concept (p. 8).

In the words of Raschke and Raschke (pp. 18-19):

The findings lend support to the proposition that children are not adversely affected by living in a single-parent family, but that family conflict and/or parental unhappiness can be detrimental, at least to self concept, which is also a measure of social and personal adjustment.

The findings of Raschke and Raschke were not wholly in keeping with some of the findings of Rosenberg (1965). Rosenberg compared self-concept of children in intact homes with children from families broken by death or by divorce and separation. He found that, whereas children from families broken by death showed similar scores in self-esteem to children from two-parent homes, a higher proportion of children from divorced or separated homes were detrimentally affected by this and showed low self-esteem. It may again be assumed that the conflict, unhappiness and trauma related to divorce preparation was the factor in lowered self-esteem in these findings too.

Horowitz (1975) in an exploratory investigation on the effects of father-loss on the adolescent girl's sex role identity, self esteem and locus of control, recorded:

1) No effect on the adolescent girl's sex-role identity excepting for girls who had lost their father before the age of twelve.

2) Father loss showed no significant effect on the adolescent girl's self-esteem, irrespective of age or type of loss.

Hunt's findings (1972) were that father absence adversely affected self-concepts among White boys and among Black girls. From these and other studies, Lakin Phillips (1978) concluded that no permanent or transcondant type reaction to father absence seems to emerge.

4.5.4 Emotions

The loss of a parent may bring with it various and differing reactive emotional disturbances of shorter or longer duration in children. Most of the findings are in relation to loss through divorce rather than death.
4.5.4.1 Trauma, confusion, anger and guilt

Landis (1962) found that the degree of trauma experienced by adolescents from divorced homes, depended on whether the children felt they came from happy or unhappy homes. Where the teen-agers in his sample recalled their homes as battlegrounds of their parents, their own divorce-related trauma was less. Where they saw their homes as happy before the divorce, their own divorce-related trauma was greater.

According to R.A. Gardner (1974:4), the child of divorce often experiences great instability.

If his mother and father (whom he once considered to be omnipotent) cannot solve their problems the world must be a shaky place indeed. If his mother, for example, can get rid of his father so easily, what is to stop her from getting rid of him with equal impunity?

A child may find himself confused because his mother may tell him she loves him and yet spend weekends and nights away from him with strange men. His father supposedly loves him yet does not send maintenance.

Weiss (1975) wrote of the meaning of the separation to the children. According to him, many children's first reaction to parental separation is one of distress and anxiety. They become tearful withdrawn, hostile. Their repressed hostility may express itself in nightmares. Most children want their parents to stay together. Some will make attempts to bring about parental reconciliation. Some will fantasize and pretend the parents have become reconciled. Young children blame themselves for the breakup: "Please daddy, please don't go, I'll be good" (Weiss, 1975:209). Most children will not indicate a preference for one-parent to the other in custodial arrangements, not wanting to alienate either.

According to Weiss, some children of divorce display a wide variety of symptoms of an emotional origin such as hyperactivity, nailbiting and stomach cramps. The children are afraid the parent they are left with will desert them and let them down too. They want to feel sure there will always be someone to care for them. Some of them seek identification with the absent parent and, in doing so, try to replace the absent parent with themselves. This may result in pathological withdrawal.
G.E. Gardner (1956), La Grange (1970), R.A. Gardner (1970, 1974), wrote about the divided loyalties of children of divorce; how, as parents denigrated each other, the children soon learnt to play one against the other; how children experience guilt feelings about missing the non-custodial parent; about not wanting to see the non-custodial parent; about leaving the custodial parent.

Weiss (1975); Hetherington et al. (1975-1978) and others found that most children of all ages experience and express anger at one of the parents, frequently the non-custodial one. This anger is generally focused upon the parent they blame for the separation and, according to Weiss (pp. 208-212), sometimes continues indefinitely, and may be evoked by the remarriage of a parent and the formation of a new family. R.A. Gardner (1974) explained that anger, and the denial of it, is a very common reaction of children of divorce. Sometimes their anger expresses itself through reaction formation, so that they become over­­concerned about their parents, fearing the parents will come to harm. Gardner stated that having lost one parent, the child is afraid of doing anything to annoy the other parent. Occasionally a child will run away from home, usually in an attempt to join the non-custodial parent, and to cause worry and frustration to his parents by his absence.

The Ferri study, 1976, brought out that children from divorced and separated homes showed more nervous or difficult behaviour than those in two-parent homes. Bedwetting, often regarded as a sign of anxiety, occurred more frequently among 11 year old boys in fatherless homes than in two-parent homes (1976 (c): 3). Douglas (1970) reported greater incidence of enuresis which persisted up to the age of 15, in children from one-parent than from two-parent homes.

Weiss (1975), in describing the reactions of children in different age groups, explained that younger children feel guilty and blame themselves for the separation, thinking their bad behaviour brought it about or, as Brun (1964) reasoned, the children feel guilty because they had wished for the separation of the parents. Older children (adolescents) may not feel guilty that the separation occurred, but of having allied themselves with one spouse against the other. Some adolescent children attempt and may succeed in assuming a stance of aloofness about the separation, to enable them to maintain their balance during the early phases of it. At later stages this tends to give way to a warm and sympathetic concern for both parents. Some of the older children may hide their unhappiness, keeping up good spirits at school, yet be unhappy at home.
4.5.5  Anti-social behaviour

According to Murchison (Finer Report 1974, Vol. 2:370) the line between groups of children expressing stress, through anti-social behaviour and those expressing it through 'maladjusted' behaviour, is very slim. Several writers such as Andry (1960) and Anderson (1968), have found indications of correlation between lone-parenthood and delinquency. Others have disputed the existence of direct connections.

Cowie et al. (1968) found that tensions and conflict between parents are probably more likely to cause delinquency than the absence of the parent per se. According to Glueck and Glueck (1962), juvenile delinquency is more strongly associated with lack of family cohesiveness and low family standards than father absence. This is in contrast with some earlier views (Bowlby, 1946) which linked delinquency with defective mother-child bonding.

Nye (1957) compared the adjustment level of adolescents in happy unbroken homes with those of adolescents in unhappy unbroken homes and children of broken homes, whether through divorce, separation or any other reason. Adolescents in broken homes showed less psychosomatic illness, less delinquent behaviour, and better adjustment to parents than children in unbroken, unhappy homes. The differing significant factors influencing children's possible favourable or unfavourable normal or deviant behavioural and intellectual trends is therefore harmony and stability of parental relationships, rather than presence of one or two parents. It is possible to hypothesise that there is more likely to be stability in a one-parent than two-parent situation as there is no interparental turbulence in the one-parent home.

Herzog and Sudia (1972) largely supported Nye's findings and suggested that if all relevant variables could be controlled there would be but a slightly higher rate of juvenile delinquency in fatherless than in intact homes. The differences, however, are too small to have any practical importance. Father-absence has no permanently harmful effect on children. This is somewhat in contradiction to Biller's (1974) view. He felt that early father-absence has a particularly strong association with delinquency amongst males.

Gregory (1965) felt that the most important factor in preventing delinquency was the relationship between the same-sex parent and child. This was more crucial than any aspect of the relationship with the parent of the opposite sex. This view may explain the tendency of many courts of law in awarding custody to the parent of the same sex as the child (Rosen 1977). McCord, McCord and Thurber (1968) discussing maternal deprivation, point out that rather than explain delinquency by paternal absence it should, largely, be attributed to the general
instability of broken homes.

Re-adaptation of parents to divorce, rather than divorce itself was indicated by Dominian (1968) as the difficult, critical factor which may cause anti-social behaviour. From a Swedish study of 305 delinquent boys who were compared with 500 boys attending child guidance clinics and 222 nondelinquent normal boys, 42% of the delinquents were sons of divorced parents, compared with 19% of the nondelinquent boys. Important influencing factors in delinquency were the absence of any stability and the lack of visiting by the boy's father and antagonism between the boy and his stepfather. According to Dominian (1968:224):

The psychological reconstruction phase following the divorce probably meant more than the acute conflict during the divorce proceedings.

Hetherington and Deur (1971) claimed that if the father had been the cause of the conflict in the family, his absence possibly had an ameliorative effect on other remaining familial members.

With few exceptions, the overall consensus from the literature is that it is the kind of home and the type of supervision afforded a child that influences his behaviour, rather than the number of parents (one or two), he has. (Nye 1957; Landis 1960, 1962; Rosen 1977 Raschke 1977).

4.6 Differences between divorce and death

The cause of familial breakdown may affect the development of children in different ways. Children may react differently to a one-parent situation resulting from bereavement than if brought about by separation or divorce.

Divorce is reversible, death is irreversible. There are different evaluations of the missing parent depending on the manner of loss. After death, a parent is usually idealised, and his image is presented to the child by the surviving partner with love and pride (Traill 1968); after divorce, usually devalued. Children of bereavement must, and consequently find it easier to accept the finality of their parent's death; children of divorce often cherish hopes of a reunion between their parents, 'a hope doomed to be unfulfilled' (Kliman, 1968, ex Rosen:99).

Rosen (1977) also pointed out that whereas the divorced tend to be censured by society, it tends to treat the families of the bereaved kindly. The unsympathetic attitude to other than bereaved parents adds to their feelings of guilt and resentment and in turn affects their relationships with their children. After the death of a parent, children
often develop closer bonds with the remaining parent, and the small nuclear family unit becomes even more intact. The initial shock of the loss of a parent is however, often traumatic to the child.

According to Marris (1959) the reactions of widows' children to father's death 'ranged over an extreme variety.' Whereas some of the children became withdrawn and unsociable, others cried for weeks afterwards, having become violently hysterical. Many of the younger children especially did not seem to react at all. Some other children became unsociable and withdrawn.

Rutter (1966) contended that particularly when the parent of the same sex has died, and particularly if this has happened in early childhood, not in infancy, the bereavement and loss has a 'sleeper', delayed effect, which often develops only in adolescence, perhaps because the child, as he reaches maturity, experiences the deprivation of a model for adult behaviour.

Writing of mother-loss by children through widowhood, as compared with divorce, George and Wilding (1972:76) reported that

While 70.5 per cent of widowers felt that the children still missed their mother at the time of the interview, the corresponding proportion for the separated and the divorced was only 27 per cent.

More longitudinal studies may establish the accuracy of these findings.

Herzog and Sudia (1968) concluded, in their review of research into fatherless families, that although studies that control for type of father absence do report differences between children whose parents are divorced or separated and those whose fathers are dead, these differences are not always in the same direction. In their opinion, the ascribed effects on children of father absence through divorce or separation are, however, on the whole more marked than the effects of father absence through death.

Goode (1964) explained lower delinquency rates among children who have lost a parent through death as compared with those who lost a parent through divorce by the turbulence in the home preceding divorce, problems of identification and loyalty in children of divorce, and the social support afforded the bereaved.

Overall, it appears that children are less affected by bereavement than by divorce and separation. It must be remembered, as Rosen (1977:98) points out that death is as likely to occur in a family that has previously functioned well, as in one that has not. Not so in divorce and separation. Usually a divorce has a longstanding history of turbulence that has preceded such dissolution, and, as found in the
overview, it is the conflict which is damaging to the child's social and psychologocial development.

4.7 Parental marital dissolution and children's adaptation

4.7.1 Emotional and legal divorce

Parties to a divorce go through both emotional and legal divorce. The 'divorce' actually starts many months, and in some cases years, before the legal dissolution of the marriage; in many instances the turbulent relationship between the spouses continues for a considerable length of time after they are divorced (Rosen 1977).

The child is almost always, as found in the overview of the literature, the victim of such interparental conflict. As Goode (1956) stressed, it is not the divorce itself but the divided home and the bitter conflicts that led to the divorce which have a deleterious effect on the children of divorce.

Despert (1953) was the first person to talk of 'emotional divorce.' While legal divorce is generally preceded by emotional divorce, the latter is not always followed by legal divorce. Usually the reason for this is the presence of children in the family, particularly when such children are still young.

Despert (1953); Hunt (1968); R.A. Gardner (1974); Gettleman and Markowitz (1974) and others consider it wrong to want to save a marriage fraught with tension and friction for the sake of the children. This is in keeping with current concepts that a home of overt antagonism or constant denigration between parents is harmful to the child (Raschke and Raschke 1977; Rosen 1977). One of Rosen's conclusions was that levels of interparental turbulence and adjustment in children are significantly interrelated.

A constant theme running through most relative research is that a happy, broken home is, for the child, preferable to an unhappy, unbroken home (Nye 1957; Raschke and Raschke, 1977). Writing of emotional divorce, where the couple are still living under the same roof but there is tension and disharmony and constant bickering in the home, Egleson and Egleson (1961:25-26) wrote that the 'child of emotional divorce cannot ask to have confusions clarified, his fears explained away.'

The unidentified situation between his parents is far more threatening to a child than a realistic situation, however painful, which is squarely faced, together with his parents.
Ackerman (1958) and Westman and Cline (1971) pointed out that many emotionally divorced couples may not undergo legal divorce. Nor does legal divorce necessarily mean emotional divorce. Furthermore, more often than not, whether the parents are emotionally or legally divorced (or both) from each other, only the marriage is dissolved and not their parental bonds with their children. Some studies show that the non-custodial parent often developed a closer relationship with his children than that which existed before the divorce. Wallerstein and Kelly (1974-1977) found in their sample that 44% of the non-custodial fathers of their pre-school children had developed a closer relationship with their children. In the sample of Hetherington, Cox and Cox (1975), 25% of the non-custodial fathers were seeing their children more often than before the divorce.

Rosen (1977:273) points out that although divorce means the breakup, and to the child the loss of his intact family, the child does not necessarily lose one of his parents. This is in accordance with Rutter's (1972) explanation of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation that it is the quality of the relationship with the child rather than length of the relationship which is important and that physical separation is not the same as bond disruption. There can be effective substitutes in a positive bonding relationship.

4.7.2 Age and sex of child and divorce:

The age of the child at the time of parental loss, may have an effect on the child's subsequent psychological and social development. Sears (1951), Biller (1969), Douglas (1970) and others stressed that effects are more likely to be detrimental if familial breakdown occurs during the early period of childhood.

Douglas for instance, found that the only differences in delinquency rates were in families broken before the child was six years old, compared with children in intact homes.

Rosen* (1977), on the other hand, found no proof of any particular relationship between the age of the children at the time of divorce and their subsequent adjustment to their situation; any problems which had been assessed as having been caused and influenced through the divorce

* Rosen's sample consisted of 92 children, 45 boys and 47 girls, ranging in age from 9 to 28 years, median age 16, of 51 divorced parents drawn from the records of the Supreme Court, Cape Town, South Africa. Fifty-one children had been awarded to their mother's custody and 41 to their father's custody. The design of the study was retrospective. The general adjustment level of the children was examined. Variables selected included custodial pattern, i.e. whether mother or father was custodial parent, and interparental turbulence.
circumstances, the children in her sample had overcome with time. As a possible explanation of the fact that the studies of McDermott (1968) and Hetherington, Cox and Cox (1975-1978) found (unlike her results) that young children were affected by divorce and develop multiple behavioural disturbances, Rosen pointed out that the children in their samples were:--

(a) examined much sooner after the divorce than in her sample
(b) the children of their samples were much younger (3-8) than her's.

Rosen’s findings are more in agreement with those of Palmer (1976): The children of her sample did not differ from children of intact homes and were not maladjusted.

Besides the age of the child at the time of parental loss, the sex of the child may influence the effects of such loss. Most research has been directed at the effects of the absence of a father. According to Ferri (1976 (a)) research has shown that the loss of one or other parent has different applications for boys and girls, and boys tend to be more adversely affected by paternal absence. Ferri cites Wallenstein as having found as far back as 1937, greater differences in boys and girls in broken homes than in normal homes in both personal factors and academic retardation.

Rosen's findings too showed a tendency for boys to be more affected by divorce than girls and bears out findings of Rutter (1972) and Palmer (1976), Hetherington et al. (1977, 1978). However, Rosen (1977:277) found no overall sex differences emerged in relation to adjustment. Rosen concluded that automatic preference for the mother as custodial parent is not justified; each case should be judged on its merits. Hetherington et al. (1975-1978) deduced from the longitudinal study conducted by them that reasoning seems to procure more compliance than negative parental commands with boys than with girls.

While numerous studies of sex-role development show lower masculinity scores for fatherless children, Herzog and Sudia (1970) question such findings, as also the over-emphasis of the importance of the father's presence for the development of the child. They point out that it is often forgotten that a resident father is not the only source of masculine identification, and that the absence of a father from the home does not necessarily impair a boy's masculine identity.

In spite of doubts raised by (particularly recent) research, the tender age and the same sex principles are still usually considered as being in the best interests of the child and still largely constitute the basis of custody decisions in many Western countries (see 5.7). As divorce and separation largely involve parents with young children, the
usual interpretation of the above doctrines therefore generally results in mothers being granted custody of young children, who make up the majority of children of divorce. Paternal deprivation is therefore very much more common than maternal deprivation — two concepts much used in research on lone-parent children. As custody of older children is often granted the parent of the same sex, there should, theoretically be approximately equal numbers of maternally and paternally deprived older children if indeed older boys are entrusted to their fathers' custody and older girls to their mothers'. The same sex principle, when applied in cases where siblings are not of the same sex, may cause problems, as it involves splitting up of brothers and sisters (Rosen 1977:37).

A study by Kelly and Wallerstein (1975-1977) of the effects of divorce on children at various ages is included in 4.7.4.

4.7.3 Custody and access*

In the situations of divorce and separation, when children are involved, it is the issue of custody and access which is the most controversial, most bitterly contested and may substantially effect the wellbeing and adaptation of the child (Rosen 1977).

Decisions concerning custody and access arrangements may be taken in the best interests of the child, while implementation by either or both parents may be manipulative, with destructive effects on the children of divorce. Dominian pointed out (1968:121):

Children develop many physical and psychological manifestations because they are torn between parents, becoming a shuttlecock between the parents, no longer a concern of their love but an object, a tool to obtain what they cannot achieve by other means. The children's school work deteriorates. They develop conduct and behaviour disorders.

According to Lakin Phillips (1978:6) 'the child's needs tend to get lost or distorted in the battles between the parents.'

The state, in response to societal sensitivity to the problems of children and in pursuance of its assumed role of protector, usually becomes the arbiter, through legislation enforced by its courts. Custody and access, because of their dependence on legally sanctioned

*In most English-speaking countries, the term 'access' is used to denote contact between the non-custodial parent and the child. In the United States and Canada the terms 'visitation' and 'visiting' are used respectively.
decisions and interpretations and being peculiar only to the children of divorce and separation, is dealt with in the chapter on divorce, which is devoted to divorce, separation and their legal aspects.

4.7.4 The needs and reactions of children of divorce.

Woody (1977) felt that, while the phenomenon of divorce continues to interest professionals, relatively little attention has been devoted to the special needs of the child thrust into a parental divorce situation.

During the divorce process, children experience a number of special needs. Their primary emotional needs include:

(i) the need for age-appropriate and ongoing accurate information about the parents' divorce;
(ii) the need to mourn the loss of the parental pair;
(iii) the need for predictable family routines and for a stable environment;
(iv) the need to develop a meaningful relationship with each individual parent as opposed to the parental pair and maintain emotional ties with both parents;
(v) the need for a sense of self-worth and emotional security;
(vi) the need to deal with and to express the differing emotional reactions: guilt, denial, anger, sadness brought about by the divorce process.

Despert (1962) held that the unresolved needs of the children, rather than the divorce itself, leads to stress. Children can, however, adjust to the impact of divorce if these needs are met, but children have limited resources for coping with family crisis and must therefore be helped.

An interesting five year clinical research project, which, in the course of extending some such help, furnished a wealth of information, was set up by Kelly and Wallerstein. They evolved an experimental intervention programme in relation to the needs of children and parents in divorcing families. This was initiated as part of a research project aimed at exploring the experience and tracing the effects of divorce on normal children and adolescents, at the time of parental separation, a year later and four years later. They sought to recommend and develop educational, psychological and social measures, to alleviate concomitant distress and reduce psychopathology. The authors reasoned that divorce in the life of both the adults and children involved, is, while disorganising to parents and children, but of a temporary nature. Both parents and children can be helped to place the situation and their own feelings within the correct perspective, and counselling
treatment within a time-limited psychotherapy model would help them sort out and clarify their feelings, particularly the children's fantasies.

This research programme known as the 'Children of Divorce Project', started in 1970, studied 130 children between the ages of three and eighteen at the time of parental divorce, to evaluate the reactions of children of different ages. In 59 cases mothers were custodians and one father was a custodian. Subjects were respondents to an advertisement offering a free counselling service, in the local newspaper in Marin County, California, an affluent area with a 'nearly homogeneous population.' The researchers ascribed importance to this factor, as offering a better opportunity of studying divorce without the interference of poverty and crime. School psychologists, teachers, family lawyers, paediatricians, social agencies and the court also referred cases. The study confined itself to 'normal' children (i.e. those who did not have a history of psychological illness.) This was, according to the writers, the first in-depth large-scale study of children drawn from a normal (i.e. non-clinical) population.

All members of a family were interviewed individually, over a period of six weeks, for evaluation sessions of four to six hours each, immediately after the divorce, a year later and four years later, to help parents and children understand and cope with the divorce. The information the authors obtained included data on:

(a) the family's pre-divorce history, including that of parent-child relationships;
(b) interactions of family members including relationships of siblings;
(c) the descriptions of parents about their communications with the children about the reasons for the divorce; access arrangements, children's caretaking;
(d) parents', teachers', therapists', children's own accounts of their responses to the situation, including 'fantasy configurations and play;
(e) the support systems available in the community and within the extended family;
(f) the parents' capacity to use intervention models.

Many parents were already involved in some programme of ongoing psychotherapy, but this apparently hardly affected the parent-child relationship on which the Wallerstein Kelly Project which was preventive, child-centered and planning oriented, was based.

Findings and main treatment models were as follows:

**Pre-school children:** 34 children in all: divided further into three subgroups: youngest, middle and oldest pre-schoolers:
Youngest: 2 1/2 - 3 3/4 years: There were nine altogether, four boys and five girls in this subcohort. Their immediate response to the divorce expressed itself in regressive behaviour in all the children, with no sex differences, and most severely in those who had not been given an explanation of their father's departure. Kelly and Wallerstein compared these children to those described by Bowlby (1951) following separation of children from the primary caretaker. Symptoms were temper tantrums, irritability, whining, crying, general fearfulness and separation anxieties, various sleep problems, regressions in toilet training, despite a history of stabilised control; possessive behaviour with toys and other belongings. These symptoms had largely improved by the time of follow-up, a year later. Of the nine, the reactions of three who lived in families still in strife, were reported to have deteriorated by one year follow-up.

Middle preschool group: 3 3/4 - 4 3/4 year olds: there were 11 children in this subgroup, five boys and six girls. Regression manifested itself immediately after parental divorce in 50% of the cases, expressing itself in whining, tearfulness and irritability. These children were afraid that they would be replaced by other children, by their parents. They were afraid of the loss of both parents. They sadly voiced their fathers' absence. They expressed their wistful oedipal fantasies and self-blame for their fathers' departure, in their play. These self-accusations were found to be highly resistive to educational interventions by parents or by the research team. By follow-up seven of these children had deteriorated. This deterioration was related to discord in their families.

The oldest preschool group: 5-6 years' old: consisting of 14 children, nine boys and six girls. All these children experienced aggression and heightened anxiety, temper tantrums, moodiness, whininess and restlessness, at the time of parental separation. These children, unlike the younger ones, seemed to have a reasonable understanding of the divorce-related changes. Their liveliness or self-confidence did not seem affected. Kelly and Wallerstein found that the divorce acted as a stimulus to growth and maturity to this cohort, providing them with a developmental surge. By one year follow-up, the authors found that two-thirds as many mothers and fathers had changed in their interactions, than remained the same. The rejecting parents responded with greater warmth; the close, affectionate, parents becoming more neglectful.

Of the non-custodial fathers, 44% had become closer to their children than before the divorce, either because their relationship now disentangled from the problematic marriage, they could more freely express their affection for their children, or in other cases, the limited
access arrangements allowed them, provided them with emotional safe­
guards, to exhibit their love more freely. Kelly and Wallerstein found
that whereas the father-child relationship generally improved, mother­
child relationships generally worsened, in these children.

Discussing the intervention model for the pre-school child, these authors found, after five years of experimentation, that most
effective intervention for this age group was in the form of working
with the parents to help them to explain the divorce situation re­
petently and carefully to the children over a long period, and by
discussing with the parents effective intervention methods they could
adopt to help the children overcome temporary behavioural symptoms;
helping them reinstitutionalize visiting, or stabilize the parental
caretaking situation, so as to reduce their children's suffering. Kelly
and Wallerstein (1977:31) explained:

*It is our conviction that the intervention of choice for preschool children who do not have a history of psychological difficulty is that made on their behalf with their parents, based on strategy derived from the divorce-specific diagnostic profile.*

_Early Latency children:_ There were 26 children, 7-8 years old in this group: 14 boys and 12 girls. The common themes characteristic of these younger latency children was their pervasive sadness, according to the authors. These children could not, like the preschoolers, use denial through fantasy. They were instead, aware of their intense suffering, more than any other age group, and they had great difficulty in obtaining relief. The intensity of their sadness was, sometimes, in proportion to the discord in the home and even in the absence of overt parental turmoil, these children experienced great suffering, although they did not blame themselves for the divorce. They were too young to find relief in sublimated activities through play. Many parents, pre­
occupied with the bitterness of their own situation and their plans for revenge on the other spouse, were not supportively available to the children.

_Intervention strategies with children in early latency:_ These children were in a developmentally difficult phase, unable to use denial as effectively as younger children, unable to mobilise themselves into various coping activities to facilitate the mastery of pain, like older children, and experiencing great difficulties in talking about their parents' divorce, which caused them even more pain. 'Furthermore, their awareness of the realities of the divorce, combined with immature egostructures, made for difficulty in integrating the painful experience' (Kelly and Wallerstein 1977:32). With this age group the most effective intervention strategy was the 'divorce monologue, wherein the therapist
gently spoke to the child about other seven years' old children's experiences of parental divorce, to provide these children with emotional relief about their own extremely painful experiences of their longing for a father who stopped visiting. The therapist stressed to the angry mother, the child's loyalty to both parents, explaining to her that her attitude might weaken the parent-child relationship she was trying so hard to preserve. Most of the children, particularly the boys, expressed a desire to see the non-custodial father more often than through the existing arrangement of visitation by the father, every alternate weekend. By and large, in fact, only the children who had free access arrangements and could visit their fathers at will, were satisfied. Many of these children, torn by loyalty conflicts to both parents, reluctant to direct their anger at their fathers, directed it at mothers, while fearing to antagonise them. (See 'custody and access', 5.7).

At one year follow-up the researchers found that with 50% of these children psychological functioning had improved, and with 23% psychological functioning had deteriorated. In many of these children the intensity of the pain subsided into sad resignation. Children whose parents continued their anger towards each other, also felt more angry about the situation, themselves. During counselling interviews, more than half the children expressed their sorrow. Sobbing and crying was common among the boys particularly, for they felt their world had been shaken. They felt a need to fill the emptiness in their lives caused by the departure of the non-custodial parent, by reverse fantasy play. They expressed this need by a need and urge for new, expensive toys. Although in many of these families there was a history of chronic marital conflict, to which most of the children had been witness, none of them had been pleased or relieved with their parents' divorce. Particularly the younger boys missed their fathers' visits and often visitation took the form of overt interparental strife. These children, therefore, in addition to coping with their own sorrow about seeing their fathers less, also had to endure anger as the quid pro quo for the opportunity to visit. Often they would express their anger through displacement on siblings, friends, teachers; for the boys this often served as a protection and defence against repressive oedipal fantasies. These children felt a desperate need to hold on to both parents, often in secret and at considerable psychic cost. Often the school provided these children with a source of continuing gratification, which had disappeared from home. A third of the boys continued to wish for reconciliation of their parents, and where, at followup the parents had continued their anger at each other, the children felt cheated and angry, and conveyed a sense of decreased trust in adults, to the therapist. It is not the divorce event itself, but rather the whole
chain of events set in motion by the separation and often lasting several years, which is found to be the central factor in determining the outcome for such children, according to Kelly and Wallerstein.

Later latency children: In this subcohort there were 31 children, nine to ten years old, from 28 families. The authors wrote thus about this group: "Many of these children had presence, poise and courage, when they came for their initial interviews" (Wallerstein and Kelly, 1976:257). The soberness and clarity with which these children perceived the realities of their family disruption, particularly when compared to the younger children, who appeared rather immobilised by their grief and worry, was quite surprising. As the children regarded their father's departure as rejection of themselves, they loyally covered their hurt and shame and anger about this. In this group, psychosomatic problems were evident for the first time. As, according to the authors, the child's concept of his own identity is developmentally dependent on the physical presence of parental figures, and closely tied to the external family structure, this explained the sense of a loss of identity with some of them. At the time of initial counselling, most of these children were unable to see any justification for their parents' decision to divorce. A quarter of them were worried about being abandoned or forgotten by both parents. With half of these 31 children their school performance also deteriorated noticeably, and peer relations deteriorated during and following the parental separation, with also a decreased ability to concentrate in class, and increased aggression on the playground. However, by one year follow-up, all but four of these children had resumed their previous social and educational achievements. Although with about half of these children their dependence on a more fragile family structure and their fear of being abandoned had disappeared, and most of them had come to accept the divorce with a sad finality, the other 50% showed evidence of being even more distressed. Depression, low self esteem and scholastic difficulties were diagnosed. Only a few of them were able to maintain good relationships with both parents.

Intervention strategies: For both later latency children and preadolescents was by way of direct intervention, because of the greater maturity and complexity of ego in these children. They needed to discuss the various details of the separation and divorce with someone outside the family. In the words of the authors (1977:36):

Reassurance and reality testing with the therapist, encouragement to raise these same issues with their parents, coupled with interventions on the child's behalf, with parents, reduced the youngsters' suffering and often set the stage for more productive communications in general between parents and their children. These children felt guilty at having precipitated the divorce and their angry response to their
parents' divorce served in part as a defence to ward off grief and pain. With some of these children, therapists were able to use extended intervention which raised their self esteem.

Adolescents: Twenty-one children, 13 years and older constituted the group. These children tended to regard their parents' divorce as a betrayal. They were worried about money, because it related to their future education, and needs. They were concerned about their own future marriage. They felt a sense of loss and sadness and were angry at their parents. They felt embarrassed with regard to peers. As most of this group were able to return to normal within a year, Kelly and Wallerstein felt this was greatly due to their ability to make use of withdrawal; to involving themselves with more social activities, thus staying more away from home, this as a defence against the pain of divorce. The normal developmental progress of teenage children of dis-engaging from parent figures, and their ability to perceive parents as separate individuals helped them.

Rosen (1977:137) warns against over generalizations from this study, beyond specific individual psychological experiences described, because the sample was obviously biased, as respondents came in response to an advertisement offering a counselling service. The very fact of offering counselling during the investigations and in some cases psychotherapy too, may have affected the nature of the responsive behaviour of the sample. Furthermore, as Rosen pointed out, when the sample was broken down into subcohorts, the numbers were in all probability too small for generalizations, beyond the participants themselves. However, the study does mark a 'milestone in our knowledge and understanding of the effects of divorce upon children at various ages and the progression of post-divorce coping mechanisms.'

In addition to the divorce counselling service, Kelly and Wallerstein discussed sibling support and extended family support, especially that of grandparents. They referred to the school and teachers, both as an alternative to the unstable home environment and as a central stable figure in the lives of the children, 'in some cases the only stable figure in these children's environment' (1977:28). These were considered excellent support systems to children 'feeling emotionally undernourished' at home.

Kelly and Wallerstein found children's visitation patterns of importance and this aspect is included in 5.7. One of the salient findings of their project was the 'changed yet significant role of the part-time parent...in the context of the extraordinary continuity in contact for many parents and their children following divorce' (1977(a):51).
Many of the points raised by Kelly and Wallerstein are also brought forward by Weiss (1975). He sees a significance in an ongoing relationship with the non-custodial father contributing to the children's security and enriching their lives. Supportive relationships outside the home, including schools and friends, he too considers helpful, particularly to older children.

Some of the confusion and stress, both of the children and the parents in one-parent situations, is due to the lack of societal norms of behaviour for those involved. Hunt (1968:237) hopefully predicted that the growth of the incidence of, and the numerical dimensions reached by, divorce, will 'generate some fairly reliable techniques for dealing with this common problem.'

4.8 The Israeli Kibbutz -- A supportive parental care system.

The Israeli kibbutz system* is reviewed as the only Western child-rearing pattern which is noticeable different to those in other Western countries. The purpose of the kibbutz system is to relieve the woman of time-consuming tasks of child care so that she may be an equal, productive member with her spouse. She works shifts in the kitchen, laundry, nurseries, clinics.

From the earliest months of a child's life, child rearing and education on the kibbutz is shared between professional educators and parents. Mothers nurse their babies in the baby house. Nurses prepare the babies' baths, mothers and nurses bathing them, together. Between feeds, nurses care for the babies. Older babies are fed by the nurses. Mothers take their babies to their own homes in the late afternoon to spend a few hours with the family. Siblings, separated in the babies' and children's houses, meet at home with mother and father, daily. The school system includes a weekly session with a clinical psychologist. Kibbutz teenagers preferred their fathers to their mothers. The adolescents have a lower level of polar gender classification.

The emphasis in the kibbutz is on the family as the basic social unit. The women, through their participant child-centered duties, have generated kibbutz family life. The kibbutz reduces the females' child-rearing load and responsibility and kibbutz members are afforded most of the joys of family living, a few hours each day, with spouse and children in their own homes. These homes are now comparatively large and their children often sleep over.

*The information for this section is taken from Pringle (1975), 'The needs of children' and from Tiger L. and Shepher J. (1977) 'Women in the Kibbutz.'
Kibbutz society is made up of married couples. Singles are often sent to live and work in the city in the hope that, through outside contact, they will meet a future spouse.

Youth fully participate in all communal responsibilities from the age of 17. Gifted youth are assisted to further their art or education, if necessary outside the kibbutz. Kibbutz members are often highly motivated and thus form a disproportionately high percentage of leadership in public and army life.

The independence of the spouses of child nurturing and enculturation afforded by the supportive systems has not had any effect on the divorce rates. This has fallen in the last decade by 0.2% for men and 0.3% for women from a figure which was, in any case, lower than the rate of the urban Jewish population. Collective child-rearing and educational methods assist a lone-parent in fulfilling parental child development responsibilities. Nor has family life been weakened. More than in the city, the unmarried single over 24 is considered a deviant. Although it may seem one, the kibbutz system was not evolved as a solution to maternal deprivation, but to make it possible for women to perform family functions together, with their full participation in kibbutz life.

4.9 Stepparents and stepchildren

Stepparents are, to judge by recent studies, falsely maligned by popular literature. 'Step' just happened to be a four letter word, according to Hartzler (1977) who, in claiming that 'it's better to come from a broken home than to live in one', cites studies showing that stepparents can be as kindly and supportive of their stepchildren's mental and emotional health as natural parents.

A research team headed by Paul Bohannan (1977) did a study based on two sets of data from two nationwide studies -- the 1973 General Social Survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) of the University of Chicago and the 1973 Youth in Transition Survey (YIT) by the Institute of Social Research of the University of Michigan.

The NORC survey comprised 1500 persons representative of the total non-institutionalised population of the United States aged 18 years and older. These were asked to reflect back in time and answer questions about the circumstances of their family structure when 16 years old. The YIT study involved 2213 young people interviewed once a year for four years from when they started their sophomore year of high school.

Previous studies in this field were meagre and conflicting. For example, Bernard (1956) concluded that relations between stepparent
and child may be 'mutually supportive and healthier overall than the problem filled family situation associated with disruptive first marriage.' On the other hand Bowerman and Irish (1962) stated that stepparent families were 'more likely to have internal stress, ambivalence and less cohesiveness than other families.'

The NORC study selected for analysis 68 social and social-psychological characteristics. In 58 of these there was no difference between children with stepfathers and those with natural fathers. The characteristics investigated included proclivity to crime and delinquency, treatment by parents, occupational prestige and satisfaction with friendships. Nor was there any difference in their pattern of marriage, divorce or separation, personal evaluation and happiness. The differences existed in religion (more with stepfathers were Protestant) and education (stepchildren had an 11 years three months, and the natural father group 12 years two months educational level) although the stepfathers themselves had a higher educational level than the natural fathers, but natural parents earned more. Also the children with natural fathers 'felt other people more helpful' and were more satisfied (when married) in their family life.

The YIT study was possibly deeper both by virtue of the questions posed as it dealt with the subject's current situation and it had a greater number of children with stepfathers in the sample. Out of 39 variables (which fell under eight substantive categories of characteristics: Demographic, Religious, Stratification, Political, Crime and Delinquency, Interpersonal relationships (General), Interpersonal Relationships (Family and Personal Evaluation) used in the analysis, in 38 the correlation coefficient was under .10 and therefore the difference between children of natural fathers and children of stepfathers for these characteristics were not considered significant. The only variable not supporting the 'null hypothesis' was educational attainment. After controlling for socioeconomic status and mental ability, the partial correlation co-efficient did not reach .10 and the 'null hypothesis' was therefore not rejected (p. 532).

Most importantly, the study showed no difference in supportive interaction with their parents. The possibility is postulated that 'the presence of a stepfather is a stabilising element of social control within the family.' The differences between the NORC and YIT studies may be due to the retrospective nature of the former. Living in a stepfather situation 15 years ago may have been far more traumatic for a young person than today.

These positive findings are supported by an in-depth study of ten natural father households, selected from a stratified random sample of
1,764 respondents in San Diego County, California. The children rated their stepfathers no worse and no better than children did their natural fathers and were equally happy and at ease with their parents. The mothers agreed. The natural fathers gave themselves a higher rating, while stepfathers downgraded their success as fathers to their stepchildren. It is theorised that stepfathers were influenced in their self-approval by the commonly held negative image of the stepfather stereotype. (The Single Parent, September 1977:33).

In conclusion, this investigation, generally supported other previous findings in the field: Goode (1956); Lerner (1957); Burchinall (1960); Landis (1962); Bohannan (1970) that the effects of a 'broken home' family life and of a reconstituted family life may be predominantly negative, predominantly positive, predominantly mixed, depending on many preexisting, transitory and adaptive factors. There cannot be a categorical assumption that such families are inferior to natural parent families for children's well-being.

The two studies referred to relate to stepfathers, as this is the dominant form of stepparenthood in our society where custody is generally granted to, or assumed by, the mother.

Children's attitude to remarriage

Most lone-parent children, missing the second parent or, to conform in the eyes of their peers to the generally accepted norm, urge their parent to remarry.

According to Hunt (1968:250-251), as the parent becomes more involved with the prospective partner and marriage approaches, he has less time for the child and the child's feelings become ambivalent. The parent is uncertain and apprehensive of the child's reactions to the news. Small children respond with happy tears or tantrums, older ones with expressed pleasure or critical outspokenness (Weiss 1975). Fatherless children react more strongly (usually positively) than the motherless, as these children have less contact with their fathers anyway.

Weiss (1975) points out that the child and parent have to redefine their relationships on remarriage. While being pleased at concerning themselves with their mother's morale (the majority of lone-parents are women), they are resentful at the reduction of autonomy and distance from her. Acceptance by the children of the stepparent appears critical to the success of the remarriage.

According to Pringle (1975) marriage produces new types of extended family and, quoting Benn (1969), 'the family of the future will be polynuclear.' Toffler (1970:236), referring to the children of
Children in this super-industrial society will grow up with an ever-enlarging circle of what might be called 'semi-siblings' — a whole chain of boys and girls brought into the world by their successive sets of parents.

4.10 Summary and Implications

4.10.1 Summary

An overview of literature shows that the concepts of family functions and development as defined by Erikson (1950); Bowlby (1951); Traill (1968); Rutter (1972); Woody (1977) and others, can form a framework to which the development of the child in a one-parent situation can be related. Paternal or maternal deprivation does not stop development — it may affect it. All those involved in the breakup remain participants of an ongoing process.

Statistical data showing the increase in the number of children affected by lone-parenthood are cited. In South Africa (White) lone-parent children increased by 70% from 1960-1970 compared with a growth of about 25% in the population.

A study made by Ferri (1976 (a)) is reviewed in some detail. This national research project covering some 16,000 children in Britain investigated most of the problems faced by children of one-parent families. Many of these problems are due to difficulties not resulting from the one-parent situation per se. One-parent families can succeed. This is the optimistic conclusion of Ferri herself.

The optimal environment which is an untroubled strife-free two-parent home, with the emphasis on untroubled strife-free, is the control used in examining the degree to which the one-parent family succeeds or fails in fulfilling its nurturant and enculturational functions.

Almost all current research reviewed agrees that there are comparatively minor negative effects, mostly temporary, on the child's development attributable to maternal or paternal deprivation. It is the turbulence and instability preceding, concurrent with and continuing after the loss of the parent, which is responsible for the stress in the child. This is borne out in studies by Nye 1957; Landis 1962; Weiss 1975; Hetherington et al. 1975-1978; Kelly and Wallerstein 1974-1977; Raschke and Raschke 1977; Rosen 1977 on self-concept, trauma and other emotions, school performance and anti-social behaviour.

Comparing the difference in effect of the death of a parent with
the loss of a parent through divorce, researchers found that, because of the finality of death the child accepts the position more readily, while the child of divorce fantasizes about parental reconciliation.

There is a consensus (Despert, 1953; Goode, 1956; Hunt, 1966; Gettleman and Markowitz, 1974; Weiss, 1975; Rosen, 1977) that the process of separation (emotional divorce) starts many months, or even years, before the legal dissolution of the marriage. It is the interparental strife experienced and witnessed by the child at home, whether there is a divorce or not, which adversely affects the child's social and psychological development (Nye, 1957; Raschke and Raschke, 1977). More often than not divorce or separation ends the marriage but does not dissolve the bonds of either parent with the children (Hetherington et al. 1977, 1978; Elkin, 1977).

As the tender age and same sex principles in the best interest of the child constitute the basis for granting custody and access in most Western countries and divorce mainly involves young children, most one-parent homes are fatherless homes.

The literature reviewed reveals no, or little apparent correlation between age of the child at the time of divorce and his subsequent adjustment. Within two years after the divorce children are again developing normally. Boys may be more affected by divorce than girls.

Divorce does not necessarily mean the loss of a parent. The bond with the child is not lost with the departure of the non-custodial parent. Degree of attachment depends on the quality of the relationship not on sex nor proximity (Rutter 1972; Rosen 1977).

Another point of agreement amongst sociologists is the need to inform and prepare children for divorce and provide a support system for helping them cope and overcome the effects of stress (Kelly and Wallerstein 1975-1977). Children of different age groups react differently to the parental-loss situation and require different approaches. School and teachers, siblings and kin can be positive instruments in adaptation.

Included in the chapter is a brief description of the family support system provided by the Israeli kibbutz. The two-parent family remains safely entrenched as the norm in the kibbutz.

By virtue of the popularity of remarriage most children of divorce become stepchildren. A study headed by Bohannan in 1977 revealed no difference between children with stepfathers and natural fathers in treatment by parents, occupational prestige, personal evaluation and happiness, their patterns of marriage. Any differences were of a completely minor nature.

From the overview of literature the child of the one-parent
family emerges as a resilient unit practically no different to the child from the intact family.

4.10.2 Some implications

As any differences in functioning and experience of stress between the child of the one-parent family and the child of the two-parent family are

i) due to the circumstances of the breakdown and not of the loss of the parent per se;

ii) of a temporary nature if dealt with concurrently with and following crisis;

therefore society must, in its own best interests, ensure the development of a variety of sources of support.

These should include counselling services, revision of laws regulating parent-child relationships, development of community resources and cultivating community care-givers.

The child needs both parents ideally, and the non-custodial parent's involvement with the child should be encouraged.

Conscious efforts should be directed at removal of societal prejudices against the child of lone-parents and against stepparents of children in reconstituted families.
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My guess is that, whatever protean changes it may undergo in the future, marriage as a union for life of one man and one woman deeply rooted as it is in the biological and psychological needs of human beings and their progeny, will victoriously emerge from its contest with concubinage, trial marriage and other short-lived unions, and remain with us for a long time to come. No better institution to ensure the survival of the human race has yet been invented. And as long as there is marriage, there will be its companion, divorce. (Hahlo 1975:26).
5. THE INSTITUTION OF DIVORCE

5.1 Introduction

As has been shown in the overview of the literature, marital breakdown resulting from divorce and separation largely accounts for the increase in the incidence of the one-parent family (and its concomitant effects) in the Western industrialized world, including South Africa. It is therefore considered pertinent to include in this section of the thesis a brief overview of the literature on the evolution and legal aspects of divorce and separation. This is of particular importance, as social implications of the one-parent family must ultimately lead to laws to serve as a basis for the institution of a system of services called for by these social implications.

Just as societal attitudes to divorce are changing, as the overview shows, so too are societal attitudes to divorce-related aspects such as custody, guardianship, access, maintenance, property (included in this chapter) and to remarriage and the reconstituted family (already dealt with).

These changing societal attitudes are ultimately given expression in law; drawing attention to these aspects may help to initiate measures to avoid, what Sherwin (1969) referred to as 'the inevitable lag between the world of societal fact and man-made laws':

Laws concerning the family, marriage, and personal behaviour, like new highways, are often obsolete the day they go into effect. It is the opinion of many experts among sociologists, lawyers, and criminal enforcement officers that there is a lag of approximately sixty years between the need for a law and the time it is finally passed (p.viii).

5.2 The incidence of divorce

In exploring the extent of the problem of divorce, it is important to bear in mind and stress the fact that many marriages are not terminated by the legal procedure of divorce, but by separation, including desertion. Unlike for divorce, no precise statistics are available either for the number of such marital dissolutions or the number of children involved. According to Anthony (1974) the incidence of separations does not fall far short of that of divorce and the magnitude of the problem therefore assumes added social significance. It is as yet uncertain to what extent the proportion of marriage dissolution due to separation will decrease with the ever-widening acceptance of irretrievable breakdown as a basis for divorce.
While an increased incidence of divorce is a well-known phenomenon of all contemporary society in the Western world, it has assumed particularly 'alarming' (Rosen 1977) dimensions in the United States, 'with the highest divorce rate amongst Western nations.' From a crude divorce rate of about two before 1940, it has climbed to a historic level of 5.1 per 1,000 population in 1978. Should the current level of divorce continue on a life-time basis, close to four out of ten marriages may end in divorce. There has, since 1976, been a levelling off in the rate of divorce, not dissimilar to the trend in South Africa. In the two decades from 1956 to 1976, the number of children involved in divorce tripled from 361,000 to 1,117,100 (Glick 1979; Glick and Norton 1973, 1976). Nor are such increases restricted to the U.S.A.

In Britain, as already mentioned in the overview (see 2.2 and 4.3, Table IX), family dissolution figures are marked by the unusually high proportion caused by separation. According to Rosen (1977), the number of divorced almost trebled from 1961 to 1971, from 25,400 to 74,400, and by 1972 numbered 119,000, 75% of whom involved children under 16 years of age. In all, 130,481 children in Britain experienced parental divorce in 1972.

South African divorce rates have consistently, since 1915, exceeded those in Britain (Harris 1967:87a), but have been considerably below American rates. 'But, by virtue of the increase, proportionately and absolutely, both of the number of divorces and the number of children involved, it has, in this country too, emerged as an issue of major social significance.' As can be seen from the following Table, the crude divorce rate has almost quadrupled from 1935 to 1975, from 0.69 to 2.53 per thousand population. The number of divorces has, in these 40 years increased by almost 800% from 1,370 to 10,730. The number of children involved rose by close to 700% from 1940 to 1975, from 2,001 to 13,815.
### TABLE XI
DIVORCE RATE, HISTORICAL TABLE, R.S.A. (WHITE). YEAR BY POPULATION, DIVORCES AND CHILDREN INVOLVED

(Extracted from Table D1, Report on Marriages and Divorces 1976, Report No. 07-02-10, Government Printer, Pretoria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of married couples</th>
<th>Number of Divorces</th>
<th>Crude divorce rate (per 1000 po r'n)</th>
<th>Specific divorce rate (per 1000 married couples)</th>
<th>Total Number of minor children involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1,970,000</td>
<td>391,590</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>unknown 1936 = 2247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2,160,000</td>
<td>455,681</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2,342,000</td>
<td>506,110</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2,609,000</td>
<td>575,309</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2,856,000</td>
<td>628,840</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3,069,000</td>
<td>681,450</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3,408,000</td>
<td>766,680</td>
<td>5,357</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3,831,000</td>
<td>860,971</td>
<td>7,748</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4,233,000</td>
<td>954,000</td>
<td>10730</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increased probability of marriages ending in divorce is graphically illustrated in Figure B, comparing specific divorce rates in South Africa and the United States. In South Africa, from under one per 1,000 married couples in 1915, the rate has peaked 11 in 1975. In America, from just under eight per thousand married women (vital statistics Report, Final Divorce Statistics, 1977 & 1979) in 1920, the rate has peaked 20 in 1975 (it rose to 21 in 1976 but is tending to level off).

In both countries, as in all the Western world directly involved in World War II, there was an unusually sharp increase in the immediate post-war years. No doubt the growth and high incidence of divorce in South Africa was a major consideration in the decision in 1974 to appoint the Commission to 'Report on the Law of Divorce and Matters incidental thereto' (see 5.6).
FIGURE B

SPECIFIC DIVORCE RATES (PER 1,000 MARRIED COUPLES) REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA (WHITES) AND U.S.A.: 1915 TO 1975

5.3 The purpose of the family, marriage and divorce

According to Green (1968:362) (as previously quoted):

The primary universal function of the family is the creation of new members of society in order to perpetuate it... The creation of new members is a fourfold task -- reproduction, maintenance, status ascription and socialization.

The family is the major instrument in the rearing of children. Marriage is (C.C.Harris 1969:53) the institutional means of providing for the performance of these tasks. The union of man and woman in a bond of marriage is a formal act creating the unit which has been evolved to best serve the 'supra-personal' or 'cosmic' purpose of the family (procreation and continuity) while providing

...better than any other for the satisfaction and development of some of our deepest urges, not only physiological, but also psychological. (S. N. Harris 1967:39)

Marriage provides man and woman the major opportunity for emotional satisfaction and continuity through intimate relationship, comradeship, companionship (Fullerton 1972).

In Western society, when these ideals, which are considered necessary for a successful marriage, are not fulfilled, the marriage is considered as having failed and dissolution of the union may be sought. Just as marriage is the formal union of man and woman, divorce is the formal dissolution of such a marriage (S. N. Harris 1960). Divorce is not the cause but the end result and the legal recognition of marriage (and family) break-up.

But each family is also a unit of the larger society, the state, and the state concerns itself with the order and wellbeing of its constituent parts.

Marriage and divorce laws are one means by which the government seeks to regulate sexual relations, child-bearing, childrearing, and economic support among its citizens. (Spanier and Anderson 1977:2)

The purposes of divorce and divorce-related laws are, contradictory as it may sound, very similar to the purposes of the laws regulating marriage as spelt out by the Finer Commission (1974, Vol. 1:64):

...it is the law which determines who may marry and how they shall marry; prescribes and enforces the web of rights and obligations both as to person and property, deriving from the status and relationships of spouses, parents, children; fixes or controls their claims for physical and economic protection; and deals with the failure to meet such claims.

But for the word 'marry!', the above quotation holds good for divorce. Divorce is, in fact, a marriage-related law, as it flows from marriage.
protects the children of marriage, and frees both partners for re-marriage.

La Grange (1970:71) pointed out the many important social implications. Such laws define, limit, sanction and lay down procedure for the implementation of social commitments and controls between and towards the members of the divorcing families. Some of the implications inherent in divorce related laws, mentioned by her are:

1. Informing the parties concerned which social conduct is permissible and which impermissible.
2. Laying down procedures for dissolution of rights and obligations legally contracted into by marriage.
3. Spelling out commitments not dissolved by dissolution of marriage and flowing from that.
4. Obligations relating to maintenance, custody, guardianship and access;
5. Changing the status of the parties involved in the dissolution of the contract, as for example, in divorce the spouses are granted the status of unmarried. They are free, thereafter, to remarry.

While the end concern of the state is, on the macro-level, the maintaining of marriage as the basis of the family, it cannot, particularly with the increased emphasis on the right to personal happiness, ignore the individuals who constitute the family.

A sound balance must be maintained between the interests of the parties concerned on the one hand, and the society as a whole on the other (South African Law Commission Report 1978:3-4)

A law of divorce should make it possible for a marriage which has ceased to exist as a marriage in its fullest sense and has irretrievably broken down, to be dissolved with a minimum of disturbance to the parties and with particular consideration for the interests of the minor children. Society has, over the last century, shown heightened sensitivity to the welfare of its children. Safeguarding the minor children of the broken marriage is generally considered as the major social implication of divorce and in an effort to deal with this implication the law lays down legally enforceable provisions for:

a) Maintenance (financial support of the children of divorce by the custodial parent)
b) custody (with whom the children are to reside)
c) access (how often and where the non-custodial parent will see the children).

Maintenance, custody and access are probably the three aspects calling for the most crucial decisions in the situation of divorce. Custody and access are particularly emotionally charged issues. Epstein (1975:196) wrote: 'In custody the stakes are at the highest. One is playing for the future....' Court rulings on these may have far-reaching repercussions and decisively influence the social and psychological development of the child and the adaptation of all the parties.
involved following family dissolution. Implementation of the decisions involves the three parties to the triad, the children and each of the two parents and affects interfamilial relationships. Being of cardinal importance, these are some of the aspects flowing from divorce dealt with more fully in this chapter.

5.4. The history of divorce

Societal norms of divorce and divorce-related laws are not static and to give a sense of continuity and possible direction, the evolution of divorce and divorce-related laws are reviewed; however, besides a brief historical resume, it is limited largely to Britain, the United States of America and South Africa. These countries have certain historical-cultural bonds in common. Both in America and South Africa the 'European' populations stem, to a considerable extent, from British stock. Though in South Africa the Whites of Dutch origin predominate, the legal system and laws, as its other cultural values, were largely influenced by the influx of population from Britain which commenced with the British occupation of the Cape in 1806 (S.N. Harris 1967). All three countries (in South Africa the reference is to the 'European' section of the population) can be considered as predominantly Christian and as belonging to the Western industrialized world.

The history and evolution of the family is encapsulated in the history of marriage and, inevitably, in the history of divorce. Divorce has evolved from a private matter, to a church matter, to a state-sanctioned institution in most industrialized Western societies.

According to Fullerton (1972), for the ancient Hebrews, Greeks, Romans and Teutons, divorce, like marriage, was a private matter. Merely by declaring "I thee divorce" or preparing a writ of divorcement, the ancient Hebrew husband could end his marriage. Divorce, historically, especially in the Mediterranean societies 'from which our Judeo-Christian tradition was drawn, was solely the husband's prerogative.

After the Punic Wars, in the third century B.C., Rome grew in wealth and power and finally became the centre of a vast Roman Empire. The former patriarchal society, in which women were subjugated to men, gave way to an open and free culture, in which the wealthy women at least gained comparative equality. Divorce was permitted by mutual consent and given at the will of either spouse. The upper classes ceased to regard marriage as a sacred obligation, but rather as a political tool. Roman marriage was a dissolute contract and Seneca bitterly commented that the Roman women 'counted the years by husbands.' (Fullerton 1972:404).
These liberal tendencies in Roman divorce practice were, however, brought to an abrupt halt with the rise and triumph of Christianity. Along with the stoic philosophers, the early Christians introduced the concepts of fault and guilt which still permeate the institutions of marriage and divorce in many Western countries (Gettleman and Markowitz 1974:156-157).

The early Christians, as opposed to the Romans, elevated celibacy above marriage, which was tolerated to avoid the greater sin of fornication. Once married, however, fidelity was to be strictly observed, particularly by the wife. The early Christian teachings opposed to divorce were based on Matthew 19.6:

*What therefore God hath joined together let no man put asunder,*

and Matthew 5.31-32:

*But I say unto you that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her, that is divorced committeth adultery.*

The exact interpretation of these two texts wavered over several centuries until, in 407 A.D., the Council of Carthage laid down the definitive doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage. But there were yet, according to Kephart (1961:112) '...limits to the Christian influence on marriage and divorce...since these were still regarded largely as private matters rather than as affairs of State.'

However, Christianity became the State religion in the fifth century and, with the fall of the Roman Empire, the Church succeeded in taking over power in many spiritual and temporal matters. Jurisdiction over all marriages came to be exercised by the popes. Despite the prohibition on divorce, ecclesiastical courts set up by the Church found ways to separate couples and even to dissolve marriages. By and large, however, for over a thousand years from the fall of the Roman Empire to the Reformation in the 16th century, Church dispensations were basically the only means of terminating an unhappy marriage. Divorce could be obtained only by the rich and powerful (Gettleman and Markowitz 1974:162).

Canon law regarding marriage and divorce was formulated slowly and was clarified at the Council of Trent, which met from 1545 to 1563. The bonds of marriage were declared indissoluble, but allowed separation 'a mensa et thoro,' from 'bed and board,' on the grounds of cruelty, heresy or adultery. This had the effect of a modern judicial separation. A marriage could be nullified because of some impediment found to the marriage, such as that one of the parties was under age at the time of marriage, or because of incest or bigamy, or certain factors existing
prior to the marriage, such as too close consanguinity. Thereafter, the marriage having been declared not to have existed, both parties were then declared free to marry someone else. This is, in fact, what is in law termed declaring a marriage void ab initio. Annulment became the means of bypassing the indissolubility of a marriage provided the party interested was powerful enough to exert pressure on the Churches' ecclesiastical courts.

The Reformation resulted in a schism in the Christian church. The breakaway Protestant church took a more liberal view of divorce. Although Martin Luther saw only adultery and desertion as grounds of divorce, most Protestant churches added to these grounds refusal of conjugal duty (sexual intercourse) and cruelty. While the Catholic Canon Law provided separation from bed and table, the Protestants seemed to favour full divorce. Both streams of Christianity, Catholic and non-Catholic, base their attitude to divorce on their interpretation of the scriptures. The Catholics' view is based more particularly on the passage from Matthew XIX,6: 'What God, then, has joined together, let no man put asunder.' The non-Catholic Protestant Christians base their attitude on their interpretation of a different portion of Matthew, XIX, 9:

\[
\text{And I say unto you: whosoever putteth away his wife except for impurity, and marrieth another woman, he committeth adultery.}
\]

According to the Protestant interpretation divorce was therefore permissible on the grounds of marital fault; and the innocent party permitted to remarry, but not so the guilty party. The Catholics, on the other hand interpreted the Gospel of St. Matthew as forbidding divorce.

The power and authority of the ecclesiastical courts diminished and Luther's teachings that marriage was not a sacrament became more accepted.

The schism caused by the Reformation weakened the Catholic church and various European countries broke with Rome and the jurisdiction for the granting of divorces was gradually taken away from the ecclesiastical courts. Marriage related laws came, according to Epstein (1975:108)

...to fall increasingly within the political sphere...

While divorce and annulment were taken away from the ecclesiastical courts, the new law set up to handle matrimonial causes through secular agencies was developed in such a manner as to give expression to religious tenets and religiously inspired ethics. As the church once felt responsible for marriage, so now did the state. So too, for the state as it had been for the church, was the idea of guilt at the center of divorce.

5.4.1 The history of English divorce law

In England, whose law considerably influenced South African law
and on which much of the law of the United States was founded, divorce
could, until 1857, some 300 years after the Reformation, only be granted
through Acts of Parliament. These were rare and costly and in the one
and a half centuries preceding 1850 numbered but 317 (Finer Report 1974,
Vol.2:92).

The first step in making divorce, with a right to remarry,
available to the wider population came in 1857 with the Matrimonial
Causes Act which set up a civil court, the Court of Divorce and Matrimo-
nal Causes, which replaced the ecclesiastical courts. Both husbands
and wives could now sue for divorce, the husband on the grounds of his
wife's adultery, a wife on the ground of adultery aggravated by additional
misconduct such as incest, cruelty or desertion. By this act, the civil
system of divorce, previously available only to the wealthy, by Private
Act procedure, was now made accessible to the growing middle class. But
this jurisdiction was centralized in London and remained very expensive.
The matrimonial problems of the poor were not solved by the reforms of
1857.

According to Hart (1976:70) the incorporation of matrimonial
offence in this law profoundly affected divorce legislation throughout the
next century. Over this period legislative reforms were introduced and
laws enacted easing the grounds for divorce, removing ambiguities and
iniquities based on sex and putting divorce within the financial reach
even of the poor.

It was, however, only the Divorce Reform Act of 1969 (which came
into force in January, 1971) which removed the principle of matrimonial
offence as the basis of divorce. According to this act,

the sole grounds on which a petition for divorce may be
presented to the court by either party to a marriage
shall be that the marriage has broken down irretrievably
(Epstein 1975:110)

The substitution of evidence of marital breakdown as the judicial ground
for divorce rather than the traditional proof of guilt, won rapid and
easy acceptance. This demonstrated that the Act was:

...one of those measures which commended itself to the
general conscience long before it succeeded in gaining
the statute book. (Finer Report 1974, Vol.1.:81)

According to the 1969 Act, divorce on the grounds of no-fault (irretrie-
vable breakdown) can be obtained after separation of two years where
both parties consent and after five years' separation where there is
unilateral repudiation of the marriage. Other grounds for divorce are
desertion of at least two years, adultery and behaviour plaintiff could
not reasonably live with. Where the divorce is based on consent to a
decree and continuous separation and there are no children, the parties
can automatically get divorced merely after filing the appropriate docu-
ments without either of them appearing in court. The 1969 Act has been
prior to the marriage, such as too close consanguinity. Thereafter, the marriage having been declared not to have existed, both parties were then declared free to marry someone else. This is, in fact, what is in law termed declaring a marriage void ab initio. Annulment became the means of bypassing the indissolubility of a marriage provided the party interested was powerful enough to exert pressure on the Churches' ecclesiastical courts.

The Reformation resulted in a schism in the Christian church. The breakaway Protestant church took a more liberal view of divorce. Although Martin Luther saw only adultery and desertion as grounds of divorce, most Protestant churches added to these grounds refusal of conjugal duty (sexual intercourse) and cruelty. While the Catholic Canon Law provided separation from bed and table, the Protestants seemed to favour full divorce. Both streams of Christianity, Catholic and non-Catholic, base their attitude to divorce on their interpretation of the scriptures. The Catholics' view is based more particularly on the passage from Matthew XIX, 6: 'What God, then, has joined together, let no man put asunder.' The non-Catholic Protestant Christians base their attitude on their interpretation of a different portion of Matthew, XIX, 9:

\[
\text{And I say unto you: whosoever putteth away his wife except for impurity, and marrieth another woman, he commiteth adultery.}
\]

According to the Protestant interpretation divorce was therefore permissible on the grounds of marital fault; and the innocent party permitted to remarry, but not so the guilty party. The Catholics, on the other hand interpreted the Gospel of St. Matthew as forbidding divorce.

The power and authority of the ecclesiastical courts diminished and Luther's teachings that marriage was not a sacrament became more accepted.

The schism caused by the Reformation weakened the Catholic church and various European countries broke with Rome and the jurisdiction for the granting of divorces was gradually taken away from the ecclesiastical courts. Marriage related laws came, according to Epstein (1975:108)

...to fall increasingly within the political sphere...

While divorce and annulment were taken away from the ecclesiastical courts, the new law set up to handle matrimonial causes through secular agencies was developed in such a manner as to give expression to religious tenets and religiously inspired ethics. As the church once felt responsible for marriage, so now did the state. So too, for the state as it had been for the church, was the idea of guilt at the center of divorce.

5.4.1 The history of English divorce law

In England, whose law considerably influenced South African law
and on which much of the law of the United States was founded, divorce could, until 1857, some 300 years after the Reformation, only be granted through Acts of Parliament. These were rare and costly and in the one and a half centuries preceding 1850 numbered but 317 (Finer Report 1974, Vol.2:92).

The first step in making divorce, with a right to remarry, available to the wider population came in 1857 with the Matrimonial Causes Act which set up a civil court, the Court of Divorce and Matrimonial Causes, which replaced the ecclesiastical courts. Both husbands and wives could now sue for divorce, the husband on the grounds of his wife's adultery, a wife on the ground of adultery aggravated by additional misconduct such as incest, cruelty or desertion. By this act, the civil system of divorce, previously available only to the wealthy, by Private Act procedure, was now made accessible to the growing middle class. But this jurisdiction was centralized in London and remained very expensive. The matrimonial problems of the poor were not solved by the reforms of 1857.

According to Hart (1976:70) the incorporation of matrimonial offence in this law profoundly affected divorce legislation throughout the next century. Over this period legislative reforms were introduced and laws enacted easing the grounds for divorce, removing ambiguities and iniquities based on sex and putting divorce within the financial reach even of the poor.

It was, however, only the Divorce Reform Act of 1969 (which came into force in January, 1971) which removed the principle of matrimonial offence as the basis of divorce. According to this act,

the sole grounds on which a petition for divorce may be presented to the court by either party to a marriage shall be that the marriage has broken down irretrievably (Epstein 1975:110)

The substitution of evidence of marital breakdown as the judicial ground for divorce rather than the traditional proof of guilt, won rapid and easy acceptance. This demonstrated that the Act was:

...one of those measures which commended itself to the general conscience long before it succeeded in gaining the statute book. (Finer Report 1974, Vol.1:81)

According to the 1969 Act, divorce on the grounds of no-fault (irretrievable breakdown) can be obtained after separation of two years where both parties consent and after five years' separation where there is unilateral repudiation of the marriage. Other grounds for divorce are desertion of at least two years, adultery and behaviour plaintiff could not reasonably live with. Where the divorce is based on consent to a decree and continuous separation and there are no children, the parties can automatically get divorced merely after filing the appropriate documents without either of them appearing in court. The 1969 Act has been
consolidated with other family law legislation into the Matrimonial Causes Act 1973, effective from January 1st, 1974. A similar no-fault principle of divorce and without the consent of one party, sometimes as the only ground for divorce and sometimes with an alternative fault ground, has been in operation in other highly developed countries, West Germany (since 1933), New Zealand (since 1954), Australia (since 1959), Canada (since 1968), the Soviet Union, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and California in the United States, (1970), Sweden (1973) and in South Africa (1979).

5.4.2 Divorce in America

With the founding of the American colonies in the seventeenth century, the anti-divorce doctrines of Roman Catholicism were transplanted to America. America thus inherited from England the innocence-guilt principle of divorce as well as the duty of the state to preserve a marriage and the family (Gettleman and Markowitz 1974:166-167). Broadly speaking, there was considerable similarity between the development in the laws of divorce in the United States and England. The crucial difference has always been that whereas in England there was one uniform body of law, American law has known no such uniformity (Epstein 1975:110). While in the Southern colonies, in early colonial America, divorce was practically non-existent, as it was in England of that time, in the Puritan colonies of Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Rhode Island, divorce was, although the grounds were strict, provided for in regular civil courts. By the early 19th century divorce was, in the United States, almost completely in the jurisdiction of civil courts. According to Fullerton (1972:405)

The political philosophy that was the foundation for American democracy embodied the ideals of individualism and the right to the 'pursuit of happiness,' and American marriages were supposedly love matches, based on free, individual choice. But there was no return to the ancient idea that marriage and divorce were private matters.

While some states recognized common-law marriages, desertion was not recognized as a common-law divorce. While the rights of the individual were to be protected in court, the state saw itself as an interested third party. Many American states tried to make divorce difficult and adopted very strict divorce laws, to ensure the continued support of minor children lest they become public charges and burdens on the state, which had, according to Fullerton (1972:407) become in 'many respects a surrogate for the kinship network of earlier societies.' Also

the interests of the state is more than financial; most state laws have implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) recognized that the family is the basic unit of social structure and that it is a primary means of maintaining social control and social stability (Fullerton 1972:406).
In the United States, the principle of no-fault divorce for marriage breakdown was first instituted in California by the California Family Law Act of 1969. This Act established new standards for the division of property, alimony, child-support, child custody and the divorce itself. California laid down only two grounds for divorce -

(1) irreconcilable differences, leading to irretrievable breakdown of the marriage;

(2) incurable insanity.

To minimize and reduce the perjury surrounding fault laws (as pointed out by Sherwin 1969; Ogg 1975; Spanier and Anderson 1979 and others), not specific acts of conduct, but general irreconcilable differences must be pleaded, except where evidence related to child custody is needed.

The new law did away with the lengthy negotiated procedure, involving attorneys and attorneys' fees to prove that one of the two spouses involved in the divorce is guilty and the other innocent. Over ninety percent of American divorces, before no-fault divorce was implemented, were uncontested divorces. The need to establish marital fault was merely to make negotiations for property and financial settlements possible. The California Act also laid down that all property acquisitions, built up during the marriage, must, on divorce, be equally divided between the parties, irrespective of their behaviour during the marriage. The term divorce has no legal standing in California. It has been replaced by the term 'marriage dissolution' (Ogg 1975:7, 8).

California is not the only state in America to adopt the principle of an irretrievable breakdown. Many American states have both an irretrievable breakdown and a system of law based on the fault of a party to the marriage. A fault law must prove one of the two spouses to be at fault, not on a variety of grounds, but on particular grounds. States varied widely and still vary in the diversity of particular grounds, as also in the length of residence required before allowing a divorce suit to be filed in their courts. The 'full faith and credit clause' in the American Constitution lays down that one state must honour the court decree of another (including the divorce decree). During the first year under the new no-fault law in California, the number of marriage dissolutions increased by 46% and dropped by 15% in Nevada. Apparently, Californians who would have gone to Reno for a divorce, now found it convenient to initiate proceedings in their home state (Ogg 1975:8). It must be stressed that like many other laws in the United States, divorce is a matter of state law and that while court decisions in any state are recognized by all the others, each applies its own laws and is not bound by rulings in the other states. But in spite of the diversity of laws applying, the trend is clear. Divorce is being increasingly granted by unilateral demand. Matrimonial lawyers therefore must concentrate more on the economic implications of divorce, such as property division.
5.4.2.1 Recent American developments

As the United States of America is the greatest Western industrialized power, and the divorce rate has, in some of its constituent states, reached the highest incidence in the Western world, divorce-related legal developments may be indicative of trends in our Western ethos. Also, as various marriage and divorce laws exist side by side in different states, interesting comparisons can be made and the direction towards change gauged. Furthermore most of the research on divorce and divorce-related aspects is being conducted in the United States and therefore it is considered pertinent to review two recent American papers.

The law and social psychological adjustment

According to Spanier and Anderson (1979) the parties to a divorce situation are generally involved in the growing-apart process for many months before and after the divorce is officially granted by the state to the separating spouses. One of the advantages usually advanced for the introduction of irretrievable breakdown as a more constructive basis for divorce is that, in reducing acrimony between divorcing parties, it will ease their post-separation adaptation. Irretrievable breakdown in some form exists as a basis for divorce in all the states excepting three, one of them Pennsylvania (p.7).

A recent research study conducted by Spanier and Anderson in that state is of interest in showing that, contrary to popular assumptions, the adversary system inherent in divorce-laws based on the guilt principle did not impede the adaptation process of the separating spouses. There was, however, awareness and resentment of the drawbacks of the traditional divorce laws and dissatisfaction with them, no doubt sharpened by the knowledge of the revised divorce laws existing in almost all the other constituent states.

Many writers (Sherwin 1969; Weiss 1975; Epstein 1975 and Spanier 1977), have found that an adversary system of law is open to abuse, perjury and collusion. Spanier and Anderson (1979), in investigating 'The Legal System and the Adjustment to Marital Separation,' were concerned with the possible impact of the legal system on post-separation adjustment. From a study conducted in Pennsylvania, the researchers wished to find out how the adversary system 'influences the ability of people to adequately negotiate the system and adapt to the new demands in their lives' (p.3). They found that the majority (84%) of the 205 separated, divorced or divorcing respondents in the sample had consulted an attorney; that half found legal fees too high; that a third had been advised by their lawyer to consciously institute conduct to annoy the other spouse; that attorneys had suggested 'that they do these things' (lie in
Anecdotal evidence tended to indicate that judges 'bend the law' when they want to rush a divorce decree through which they feel will benefit all the parties involved.

While the 'adversary system often encourages couples to become adversaries to a greater degree than they already are' (p.8) and 'while the legal system can be trying for individuals experiencing a marital dissolution, their social-psychological adjustments are not adversely affected by such difficulties' (Spanier and Anderson 1979). Health status, economic status, dating relationship are far more important in predicting the individual's overall adjustment.

The following table illustrates this non-relationship between satisfaction with the legal process and post-separation adjustment.

**TABLE XIII**

**POST-SEPARATION ADJUSTMENT BY SATISFACTION WITH THE ENTIRE LEGAL PROCESS**

(Reproduced from p. 19 of Spanier and Anderson 1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Adjustment</th>
<th>Levels of Adjustment</th>
<th>Satisfaction with the Legal Process (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very or somewhat Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very or somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect Balance:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The law of cohabitation and property distribution

Fain (1977) looked into the division of property following dissolution of marriage and after breakup of cohabiting partners, who lived together as man and wife although not married. He noted a growing recognition throughout the country that 'marriage is a marital partnership of
theoretical equals' and therefore '...criteria for property distribution are increasingly no-fault orientated.' (p.34). According to Fain (p.35), reflecting the sexual revolution, traditional stigma to co-habiting couples is receding and the changing concepts in property distribution increasingly apply to them too.

Respected authority has recognized the increasing prevalence of nonmarital relationships in modern society, the social acceptance of them, and the establishment of contractual and property rights resulting therefrom. (p.35).

Various courts of law, including those in California, recognized the property rights of the cohabiting female to her share of the property upon the breakup of a union, in passing judgement about property disputes concerning men and women who live together, though unmarried.

Clauses in the California Family Law Act of 1970, made it possible for the appellate court to decide in the case (1973) of In re Marriage of Cary, for example, that she, the 'wife', was entitled to get a share of the property the couple had built up together during the marriage. Although never married to each other, they were living together for eight years, to all intents and purposes as man and wife. Four children were born from their co-habiting relationship. They had filed joint income tax returns. They had obtained credit, borrowed money, purchased a home, together. The court, giving expression to the public policy implied by the Family Law Act, based their judgement on the theory that a family relationship with the same duties and benefits as though there were a marriage had existed during the relationship. It ruled that the 'wife' was entitled to get a share of the property the couple had built up together during the marriage.

The highly publicized Marvin v. Marvin case (1976) heralded a challenge to and revised traditional American concepts concerning the division of the accumulated property of a living-together, not married, couple. After separating from his wife, from whom he only obtained a divorce in 1967, the actor Lee Marvin, for six years, from 1964 until 1970, lived together with a divorcée Michelle Triola. Lee Marvin left Michelle Triola to marry another woman. Michelle thereupon sued for her share of the accumulated property, as, while they lived together, she had entered into an oral agreement they would share all property accumulated, and she would render her services to the common home as cook, homemaker and housekeeper; to the general public, they would behave as man and wife.

The California Supreme Court ruled that any division of property should come from the share of the man Lee and not from his first wife's (the first wife's -- Betty Marvin -- share of community had remained intact) and that their oral agreement must be recognized.
Agreements between nonmarital partners fail only to the extent that they rest upon a consideration of meretricious sexual services. (Fain:32)

The court ruled among other points that

In summary, we believe that the prevalence of nonmarital relationships in modern society and the social acceptance of them, marks this as a time when our court should by no means apply the doctrine of unlawfulness in a so-called meretricious relationship to the instant case (Fain:38).

The court ruling elicited a sharp dissent by Justice Clark of the California Supreme Court. At the time the investigations for this study were being carried out, the Family Law Committee of the State Bar of California was, to overcome such dissent and avoid litigation, busy with drawing up a law, to be called the 'California Uniform Nonmarital Partnership Act,' based on a 'mandate of a 1976 Conference of Delegates' (Fain:39). This would extend the changing concepts of property distribution of separating married couples to 'separating cohabiting couples, regardless of title, and according to equity and the circumstances of the case and of the parties involved' (p.34).

Fain (1977) in discussing developments in the United States in family law, to meet the needs resulting from the avalanche of family-breakdown, wrote

though we like to believe that law and the rules or regulations that are promulgated pursuant to law dictate our conduct, the fact is that law is or must eventually be governed by our conduct (Fain 1977:33)

Alimony, Spousal Support, Maintenance: (See 5.5 5 for 'Support in South Africa')

In the same article (p.39, 40) Fain (1977) briefly reviewed developments in the transformation occurring in the concepts and practice of spousal support or alimony. According to him, there have been changes in the principles for the granting of alimony, or spousal support (the term used in California) or maintenance (as it is referred to in some newer statutes). The term 'alimony' is derived from the Latin word 'alimonia' meaning nourishment, sustenance. Whereas in the past the tendency was to base the decision to pay maintenance on a theory of punishment for fault, the guilty party paying the innocent, the newer tendency is to grant alimony as an addition to that which is obtained from marital property distribution and to make it available to either party, based on the ability to pay, and on actual need.

Trial courts in California, for instance, pioneered a trend and particularly in marriages of shorter duration, of awarding alimony for only limited periods, so as to motivate recipients to self-support. Other factors taken into account, when deciding on the degree and duration of alimony are ability to earn a living, age, health and education. It
appears therefore that in the United States the laws pertaining to maintenance are moving away from the guilt basis inherent in South African Law (see 5.5) until passage of the Divorce Act, 1979.

5.4.3 Divorce in South Africa

The South African legal system is mainly borrowed from Roman-Dutch Law and influenced by English Common Law (S. N. Harris 1960 and 1967). The Roman-Dutch system of law was brought to the Cape by Van Riebeck, when he established his colony in 1652. Right up to the annexation of the Cape by England in 1806, these Roman-Dutch laws of Holland were largely binding on the Cape.

The Orange Free State republic, the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republic (Transvaal) and Natal also adopted the Roman-Dutch Law. Roman-Dutch Law continued as the official law of the Cape Colony, even after the annexation of the Cape by England, although thereafter English Law had a considerable influence in the Cape. The Cape Colony and Natal had mainly English judges and English Law was therefore, to a great extent, relied upon for precedent. Although the Roman-Dutch Law was the official law, in practice judges often borrowed from English Common Law. This was facilitated by the fact that, in 1809, Roman-Dutch Law was replaced by the Code Napoleon in the home-country Holland and was never reinstated there after that country had regained its independence.

The Roman-Dutch Common Law, which had become the basic common law of South Africa, recognized only two common law grounds of divorce, adultery and malicious desertion. In 1935, the Divorce Laws Amendment Act No. 32 of 1935 added two statutory grounds for divorce -- incurable insanity and imprisonment for five years after the defendant has been declared an habitual criminal. Throughout the years, with the exception of minor amendments mainly on jurisdiction, the laws of divorce in South Africa remained virtually intact. In 1975 the Law Commission of South Africa, after intensive research, put forward proposals to amend the laws relating to divorce. The proposals were largely adopted by Parliament and enacted as Act No. 70, 1979, known as the Divorce Act, 1979 -- subsequent to the writer having completed her research investigations. All the research in this study therefore relates to the laws existing at the time of the investigation while reviewing the Law Commission's recommendation for the (then) proposed Divorce Act, 1978. The main provision of this Act, a copy of which is included in Appendix G of this study, is the recognition of irretrievable breakdown as a possible ground for marriage dissolution. The new Act came into operation on 1 July, 1979, and repeals the following:
Act No. 32 of 1935 Divorce Laws Amendment Act, 1935, the whole,
Act No. 22 of 1939 Matrimonial Causes Jurisdiction Amendment Act, 1939,
the whole
Act No. 17 of 1943 Matrimonial Causes Jurisdiction Amendment Act, 1943,
the whole
Act. No. 35 of 1945 Matrimonial Causes Jurisdiction Amendment Act, 1945,
the whole
Act No. 37 of 1953 Matrimonial Affairs Act, 1953, sections 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10
Act No. 70 of 1968 General Law Amendment Act, 1968, Sections 21, 22 and 23
Act No. 42 of 1974 Publications Act, 1974, Sections 47(2) (f) (iii) and (3).

5.5 The existing divorce-related laws in South Africa


Whereas in most other Western European legal systems, the matrimonial offence is being supplemented or replaced by irretrievable marriage breakdown, as a ground of divorce, our law of divorce continues to be based squarely on guilt, and not on marriage breakdown, on fault, and not on failure.

The following pages contain salient information about the legal side of judicial separation and divorce in South Africa.*

5.5.1 Voluntary separation

Many couples may be separated voluntarily with a legal agreement of separation drawn up. In Hahlo (South Africa) it is referred to as willige condematie. In South Africa, it is effective in modern law, provided that, in the Cape Court (and Natal) the deed was entered into justa causa (under circumstances which would have justified a judicial decree of separation), and in all the provinces it must not amount to a prohibited donation between the spouses (Hahlo 1975:352). Either spouse may put an end to the agreement by requesting the other spouse to restore conjugal

* The information for the resume of the existing South African laws (at the time of this research) is drawn from the following sources:

Books
Gibson
The Law of Persons and Marriage, 1977, Boberg, Chapters 11, 12, 13, 14
The S.A. Law of Property, Family Relations and Succession, 1954, Lee and Honore, Chapter 10

Statutes
Children’s Act No. 33 of 1960 (S18(1); 18(2); (3); 18(4);10-82)
Divorce Laws Amendment Act No. 32 of 1935
Maintenance Act No. 23 of 1963 (S3; 4(1); 5(1); 5(2); 5(3); 5(4); till S(11), S7)
Matrimonial Affairs Act No. 37 of 1953 (S3; 5; 10)
General New Further Amendment Act No. 93 of 1962
Divorce Bill—1977——
Divorce Act, 1979, Act No. 70, 1979
rights and if he fails to do so, an action for restitution of conjugal rights may be instituted against him without having gone through the formality of having the deed set aside first by the court.

Property and maintenance settlement arrangements arrived at in a voluntary separation agreement are binding upon the parties, provided the amount is not far in excess of what the court would have sanctioned. The amount should not be interpretable as a prohibited donation.

_It is clearly not a donation, properly speaking, for however generous the property arrangements may be to one or other of the spouses, they are made for the purpose of separation, not _animō donandi_ -- out of 'sheer liberality.'_ (Hahl 1975, 4th edition:354)

Property arrangements whereby the one spouse is given property far in excess of what the court would have sanctioned, or maintenance arrangements by which one of the spouses undertakes to pay the other maintenance at a rate, taking into account the financial circumstances of the spouses, which may be regarded as exorbitant, is regarded by the court as a prohibited donation. Custody and maintenance arrangements of minor children, provided they may be altered by the court, for good reasons and in the best interests of the child, are binding on the spouses.

If even there was no justa causa (no grounds on which a judicial separation could have been authorized) a claim for past maintenance will be upheld because a husband must support his wife whether they are living together or apart. The court will only turn a voluntary deed of separation into a judicial separation if all requirements for a judicial separation are satisfied. Voluntary deeds of separation may be cancelled at the instance of either spouse. They are not agreements that are final.

According to Sherwin (1969), in the United States couples who decide to live apart often draw up a separation agreement which contains all the legal conditions of the separation, but until they have been divorced through a state court of law they are, in fact, not divorced. Unless particulars set out in the separation agreement are against the safety, welfare or health of the children, where there are children, or unless the terms of the agreement are illegal, the court usually makes the terms of the agreement part of its final divorce decree.

5.5.2 Judicial separation

This is a halfway house between marriage and divorce which suspends the reciprocal duty of the spouses to live together without dissolving the marriage tie. It is not granted simply by consent of both spouses for incompatibility of temperament but only if
a) further cohabitation has become dangerous and intolerable or
b) the defendant brought about the state of affairs by some unlawful conduct.

A decree of separation will not be granted if both parties are equally to blame. As a rule, however, an action for judicial separation is based on cruelty or neglect of both a mental and physical kind.

**Effects of judicial separation**

A decree of judicial separation does not dissolve the marriage tie, but suspends for the time being, and with a view to ultimate reconciliation, the personal consequences of the marriage. It suspends the right to cohabitation, but spouses must continue to observe conjugal fidelity towards each other; thus adultery is forbidden.

Subject to a few exceptions, a decree of separation does not automatically affect the legal capacity and property rights of the spouses. Usually the Community of Property or the Ante Nuptial Contract remain in force, unless the plaintiff applies for an order varying the proprietary consequences of the marriage, and this is usually done.

Where the spouses are married in community of property, the plaintiff may apply for a decree of division of the joint estate (boedelscheiding).

Maintenance orders are made as with divorce orders -- in favour of the innocent spouse: the husband must pay if he is guilty and the wife is not entitled to maintenance if she is guilty. The rights and duties (custody, guardianship, access and maintenance) of the parents in relation to their minor children are, in the case of judicial separation, as in the case of divorce and are based on the same legal principles (Hehlo 1975:344); see 5.5.4 and 5.5.5.

**5.5.3 Divorce**

The marriage tie is severed by a decree of divorce. Only the Supreme Court has jurisdiction over matrimonial matters and thus it alone can grant a divorce. There are four grounds for divorce in South African Law: adultery; malicious desertion; incurable insanity which has existed for not less than seven years; and imprisonment for five years after the defendant spouse has been declared an habitual criminal.

As seen above, the existing South African Law, apart from the reluctant inclusion of 'Insanity,' is based on the fault principle and not on the 'marriage breakdown' principle. This guilt principle* explains why

* Discussing the guilt principles upon which South African Law are based, Hehlo (1975, 4th Edition:362) explained 'Adultery and malicious desertion are breaches of the fundamental obligations flowing from the marriage contract.'
a divorce will not be granted, as a rule, where both spouses have committed adultery, unless the plaintiff admits to his/her adultery, and asks the Court for condonation of that adultery, which should have been committed after the defendant committed his/her adultery. The same reasoning applies to the situation where there has been collusion between the spouses to procure a divorce (i.e. where plaintiff bases his action, by prior agreement, on an adultery that has not taken place or where malicious desertion takes place by agreement).

Adultery and desertion are, in the Republic, the grounds most commonly advanced in applications for divorce. In South African Law there are three kinds of malicious desertion:

1. Actual desertion (the defendant leaving the common household).
2. Constructive desertion (plaintiff being driven out of the common household by the intolerable and/or dangerous behaviour of the defendant).
3. Refusal of marital privileges.

In cases of adultery -- the spouse may sue for divorce immediately, but with malicious desertion the plaintiff spouse must first apply for a restitution order, which calls on the defendant spouse to restore conjugal rights to the plaintiff on or before the return day of the restitution order, and failing compliance therewith, a final order of divorce will be granted.

General legal consequences of divorce

Effects of divorce on the property rights of the spouses depend on whether they were married in or out of community of property.

a) Marriage in community of property

the plaintiff spouse can apply either for:
(i) an order for the division of the estate -- the effect is simply an equal splitting of the estate.
(ii) An order of forfeiture of benefits of the marriage: the order is derived from the principle that a spouse may not benefit financially from the dissolution of a marriage that he/she has wrecked; therefore the effect of such an order is for the guilty spouse (defendant) to repay all the benefits he/she has derived from the marriage over and above his contribution.

b) Marriage out of community of property:

If an order of forfeiture is not made, each spouse takes his or her separate estate and all settlements or arrangements contained in the ante-nuptial contract.

5.5.4 Custody and guardianship

This section deals with the legal aspects of custody and guardianship; other aspects of custody are reviewed under 5.

S 5(1) of the Matrimonial Affairs Act deals with custody and
guardianship: basically, it provides that the court may grant 'sole guardianship' or 'sole custody of a minor to any parent' if it is proved that it would be in the interests of the minor to do so.

Where custody and guardianship are separated (as usually happens in divorce) -- the custodial parent has the care and control of the minor's person, the guardian parent the administration of his property and business affairs.

For marriage, the minor requires the consent of both parents, unless one of them has been awarded the sole guardianship of the minor, in which case that parent's consent is necessary and sufficient. In terms of the South African Citizenship Act of 1949, the custodial parent is the 'responsible parent.' Guardianship, under the Matrimonial Affairs Act of 1953, is subject to the same considerations as the awarding of custody, with the husband and wife being treated on a footing of equality. In practice, however, most awards of custody are made to mothers and the courts are loath to deprive the father of guardianship, and will probably only do so where the father refuses to perform the functions of the guardian, is irresponsible and neglectful of the interests of the child, or has left or is about to leave the country.

South African law, like other progressive legal systems, has 'grown away from rules directed toward penalizing the guilty spouse and towards a recognition of predominance of the interests of the child.'* Both at common law and under SS(l) of the Matrimonial Affairs Act, No.37, 1953, the interests of the child are the first and paramount consideration in deciding to whom custody is to be awarded. If the interests of the child will be better served by its being in the custody of the guilty than of the innocent spouse, the custody will be given to the guilty spouse. In cases where it is not clear what is in fact in the best interests of the child, the innocence or guilt of a parent may be the deciding factor. The custodial parent may, in proper circumstances, exercise the rights of custody vicariously.

Practically, young children and girls usually go to their mothers unless the mother's character or past conduct are such as to render it undesirable to leave the children in her care.

With respect to guardianship -- the courts still usually consider it in the best interests of the child to award guardianship to the father.

The non-custodial spouse has the right of reasonable access to the children. This exists whether an order of court has been made or not.

---

* per Schreiner, J.A. in Fletcher (1948 (i) S A 130 (AD) at 144 (S.A. Law Reports)
5.5.5 **Support (maintenance)**

*Duty of support between husband and wife*

There is a reciprocal duty of support between husband and wife during marriage (*Stamme Matrimonio*) which duty ends with divorce. § 10 (1) (a) of the *Matrimonial Affairs Act, 1953*, provides that the court granting the divorce (the Supreme Court) may make such order against the guilty spouse for the maintenance of the innocent spouse for any period until the death or remarriage of the innocent spouse, as the court may deem fit. This is usually a factual matter depending entirely on the financial position and needs of both spouses.

**Duty of parent towards his child**

In common law the father has the duty to support a child whether legitimate or illegitimate. This duty has been enforced by South African courts for years and the *S.A. Law Reports* record numerous precedents from *Van Rooyen v. Weiner* 1892 9 SC 425, to *Lamb v. Sack* 1974 (2) S A 740 (T).

Although this duty is spoken of as being solely the responsibility of the father, this duty is common to both parties and must be shared according to their means. On divorce, it is the court which decides the relative means and earning capacities of the spouses in order to establish how much the non-custodial should pay the custodial parent for maintenance of the child. Considerations of guilt or innocence do not enter into this matter when an order of court is being made. The interests of the children is the determining factor, plus social status of custodial parent and the abilities of parents to pay. In the absence of an order of court, the common law governing the joint liabilities of spouses apply.

Concerning remarriage by a divorced spouse, the following applies: if the father remarries, his extra burden will not prejudice the children's maintenance claim. But remarriage by the mother into a situation where she may better support the child takes some of the burden off the father. This duty is confined not only to necessities but also to food, clothing, medical and dental care, and education, on a scale determined by the standard of living of the parents and their position in society.

The duty to maintain a child ceases when he becomes self-supporting. A parent cannot evade this duty by giving up his employment.

**Duty of support on the death of a parent**

On the death of either spouse the duty of support falls on the surviving spouse, and if he or she is not able to support the minor, on the estate of the deceased spouse. If the first dying spouse dies intestate, the surviving spouse (apart from taking his or her half share

*Deceased estates also include estates of divorced spouses.*
of the net joint estate, if the marriage was in community) succeeds to
the estate of the first dying spouse in accordance with the provision of
the Succession Act 13 of 1934. There is no legitimate portion or widow's
share in South African Law guaranteeing the surviving spouse against
disinheritance. Whether the marriage was in or out of community of
property, the surviving spouse, if disinherited and left destitute, can-
not claim maintenance out of the estate of the first dying. This position
is generally considered to be bad, as far as social policy is concerned.
Following the recommendation of a Law Revision Committee that a widow should
received maintenance out of her husband's estate, a Bill was laid before
Parliament but was rejected by the Select Committee.

The child's claim is a first claim on the estate before all
heirs, legatees and creditors and lies in relation to his needs. Relevant
factors to be taken into account are: The amounts received by the child
under the will, the capacity of the surviving spouse to support the child
and of course his maintenance needs normally required such as schooling,
clothes, food.

Enforcement of the duty of support: Duty to support a child

A parent's duty to support a child can be enforced without a
maintenance order in terms of S 18(2) of the Children's Act, No. 33 of
1960:

Any person legally liable to maintain a child who, while
able to do so, fails to provide that child with adequate
food, clothing, lodging and medical aid, shall be guilty
of an offence.

The father/mother is presumed to be able to support unless he/she
can prove otherwise. A fine of R400, imprisonment for two years, or both
is provided for, in the event of non-support. It is only necessary for
the father to know of the existence of the child for him to be liable to
support the child. The fact that the father may not know exactly where
the child is situated is not a sufficient cause for the father's failure/
refusal to support the child. The person must of course be 'legally
liable' and, if paternity is denied, the state must prove paternity beyond
a reasonable doubt.

Maintenance orders and their enforcement

Making an order

Summons for the payment of maintenance may be issued in the
Supreme Court, but, as a rule, wives prefer to avail themselves of the
speedy and inexpensive alternative procedure provided under the Maintenance
Act 23 of 1963. The maintenance courts set up under that Act have power
to make, enforce, vary or discharge a maintenance order, including an order
made by the Supreme Court.
Since the passing of the Maintenance Act in 1963, the Magistrates Court now has jurisdiction to handle matters dealing with maintenance. The procedure is that a complaint is lodged with an investigation officer who, after investigation, institutes an enquiry in the Maintenance Court. Thereafter, the case proceeds in the normal manner in camera.

The important point is that in such maintenance procedure the magistrate may himself bring up what he feels are relevant issues of evidence, matters not raised by the parties. This differs from the old position where a magistrate could not do so. At the conclusion of the enquiry, the court may, in the case where no maintenance order is in force, make an order; where there is a maintenance order in force, the maintenance court may replace the existing one with a new one, or discharge the existing order, or make no order at all. Any person aggrieved by such an order may appeal to the Supreme Court.

Enforcing the order

S11 (i) of the Maintenance Act 23 of 1963 sets out the penalties for failure to comply with a maintenance order made under S10 of the Matrimonial Affairs Act, 1953, or under S5 of the Maintenance Act, 1963. Any person who fails to make any particular payment in terms of a maintenance order is guilty of an offence carrying a maximum penalty of a fine of R200 or one year's imprisonment. In addition, the court may make an order for the recovery of unpaid maintenance. It is the state which must prove such lack of payment.

Usually the court will not imprison offending spouses but issue a suspended sentence. A court can here order an employer of the spouse to deduct maintenance from the spouse's salary and pay it to the supported spouse. There is also provision in South African Law for the liability of a third person who has intentionally or negligently deprived a child or spouse of support, as by killing the spouse.

S.5.6 Legal costs of divorce

Legal costs may be very high. In South Africa, advocates are briefed by the instructing attorneys to handle a divorce action in the Supreme Court. Private detectives may be used by the parties to prove guilt. Either or both spouses may employ clinical psychologists to contest custody.

Defended cases are more expensive than undefended ones. In some Western countries, such as England, adequate state legal aid facilities subsidize and pay the legal expenses where the individual cannot afford the expenses or part expenses. In South Africa the Legal Aid Bureau no longer offers free services in providing a divorce attorney. An impecu-
nious individual seeking divorce may obtain through the court, in pauperis, the free services of an attorney who belongs to the Law Society.

5.6 The 1978 Report

This Report is dealt with at comparative length as the evidence and recommendations contained therein reflect the public discussion and rationale for the proposed introduction of the law in South Africa under pressure of changing societal attitudes -- all strikingly similar to the evolutionary process in this regard in other parts of the Western world.

In the early '60s, when other countries had already implemented divorce laws based on irretrievable breakdown (rather than guilt), researchers in South Africa had interested themselves in enquiries into the existing law and the need for change. S. N. Harris (1967: quoting Judge Brandeis) stressed the purpose of the law as:

*Nearly all legislation involves a weighing of public needs as against private desires; and likewise a weighing of relative social values...Law then is, or ought to be, an expression of the ideals and moral values of a particular society.*

In 1975 a Commission with the Honourable P. J. Rabie, Judge of Appeal as chairman, was appointed to 'Report on the Law of Divorce and Matters incidental thereto.' The inquiry stemmed from a more specific enquiry conducted by the Commission in 1974. From this earlier enquiry it became clear that South African divorce laws as a whole ought to be revised. The extension of the project to cover the whole field of the South African law of divorce was agreed to.

The laws of divorce in various Western countries and reform in recent years to these laws were studied. The problems of South African divorce laws were discussed and proposals and memoranda, as well as oral evidence, were invited from legal, welfare and other interested bodies.

After considering all the evidence submitted, the Commission prepared a final Bill in which its recommendations for the reform of the South African divorce laws are embodied.

In citing the role of the law in regard to marriage breakdown, it points out that South Africa has a very high divorce rate.

*It is calculated that the chances of divorce among the Whites in the Republic are at present one in every 3.2 marriages. As stability in married life is of so much importance to any society, the situation is giving rise to concern in all quarters (S.A. Law Commission Report, 1978:2)*

* Information was obtained by the writer from a telephone conversation with the Cape Town Secretary of the Law Society and a clerk of the Supreme Court, Cape Town.*
The Commission noted that stricter divorce requirements offer no guarantee against marriage breakdown. While this could result in fewer divorces, artificially curbing the divorce rate at a time when marriage breakdown continues unabated would be pointless. In addition, the Report contends (p.3), 'there is the danger that if divorce requirements are too strict, serious social problems may result' (p.3).*

The objects of the Law of Divorce were to make it possible for a marriage which no longer exists in its true sense to be dissolved with 'the minimum of disruption for the parties and their dependants and to ensure that the interests of minor children are put first.' Marriage should not be cheapened and a 'sound balance maintained between the interests of the parties concerned on the one hand and the society as a whole on the other.'

Realistic rules should be laid down which 'do not lose sight of society's conception of what is reasonable and just' (pp. 3 - 4).

The Report recounts the shortcomings in the existing law of divorce particularly that the guilt principle is in direct conflict with any possibility of reconciliation that may still exist between the spouses, putting them in opposing camps. It leads to farcical pleadings, fabricated evidence and collusion. Furthermore only the 'innocent' party can sue for divorce, and can keep the other party indefinitely bound to a marriage. As a result 'marriages that are in fact dead cannot be dissolved' (p.6).

The guilt principle is also found to be wanting as regards maintenance. Subject to an agreement between the parties, the court may only make a maintenance order in favour of the innocent party against the guilty party. A single misstep can deprive an otherwise innocent party of...

...all rights to maintenance, regardless of the duration of the marriage, the need for maintenance or the contribution which such a party has made towards increasing the property of the other party (p.7)

The Commission also thought the existing law does not sufficiently serve the best interests of the minor children.

The Report discusses divorce on demand or by consent of the spouses. The Commission found that divorce by consent only is not an acceptable ground of divorce for South Africa, although introduced in Sweden in 1973 and in Germany in 1977, (with the proviso of one year's separation).

*One of the reasons which caused Sweden to adopt 'instant divorce' was that 'it was felt that if marriage was to hold its own against the attractions of concubinage, divorce had to be made easier, and not more difficult' (Hahlo 1975, 4th edition:26).
The irretrievable breakdown of a marriage as a ground of divorce is examined in the Report at considerable length. The Commission found that a strong case was made out for this. Irretrievable breakdown is defined as meaning that

the marriage relationship has degenerated to the point where their marriage no longer exists as a marriage in the true sense of the word and where there is no reasonable prospect of a normal marriage relationship between them being resumed (pp. 10-11).

The emphasis is on the irretrievability of the marriage relationship, not on making divorce easier.

While 75% of those answering the questions favoured divorce on the ground of irretrievable breakdown there was debate as to whether it should supersede the existing grounds and apply as the only ground of divorce. There was also opposition to it in principle as rewarding the 'guilty' for misconduct at the expense of the innocent. The Commission agreed however with the view that the interests of the reluctant ('innocent') party in this case must yield to the interests of society.

The practicability of a court deciding whether a marriage is irretrievable was also questioned. The effluxion of a period of separation between the parties (such as exists in some countries) was suggested as a test of irretrievability, but it was felt by most that it would be unnecessary to prescribe a set period since 'the courts will probably have no trouble in determining when a marriage should be regarded as having broken down beyond retrieval' (p.16).

Regarding reconciliation of the parties, all evidence showed that guidance is effective before and during marriage rather than after breakdown. Nevertheless, the divorce laws should afford opportunity for reconciliation during the proceedings, however slim the chance of success. This should be through family courts. These family courts should do more than only attempt reconciliation. The family court, it was suggested, should have the status of a division of the Supreme Court, but its proceedings should be informal and readily accessible; should consist of a presiding judge together with experts in all fields of family life; should be remedial in its approach and not retributive and should have comprehensive jurisdiction. The difficulties of the practical application of these courts are raised (pp. 22 - 28).

The safeguarding of the children's interests should, according to the Report, enjoy the highest priority in divorces. Proposals are made as to changes in the granting of custody and guardianship. It is suggested that a decree of divorce should not be granted until the court is satisfied that the proposed arrangements with regard to the children are satisfactory. Divorce proceedings should be conducted in camera.
The Commission, in dealing with the patrimonial consequences of divorce (pp. 30-32), believed that the proprietary benefits of a marriage be only partially forfeited in certain cases, and not necessarily entirely. In granting maintenance, the guilt factor should be taken into account but not over-emphasized. Judicial separation, the Commission concluded, is not in keeping with the fundamental concept that the dissolution of a marriage that is dead should be possible if sought by either of the parties. It should be abolished.

Annexure A to the Report is a proposed 'Bill to amend the law relating to divorce and to provide for incidental matters.' To be introduced by the Minister of Justice the Act is to be called the Divorce Act, 1978 (Annexure A:1,14). The proposed bill was largely adopted in the Divorce Act (Act 70 of 1979) which came into operation on 1 July, 1979.

5.7 Custody and access

Custody and access, affected by and affecting interparental and child-parental relationships are, as previously noted, the most crucial issues arising from separation and divorce. The legal sanctions and interpretations upon which decisions are based have shifted over the years in keeping with changes in societal values and have been particularly influenced in the last half century by developments in the field of sociology and child psychiatry. Because, as a result, the laws are subject to change, and any decision is 'crucial to the life of the child and his relationship with his parents' (Rosen 1977:19), the court is faced with an extremely responsible and difficult task.

Defining custody

In its broader sense, custody refers to the relationship between parents and child in a normal family (Clarke 1968).

As a result of divorce or separation involving children, one parent generally becomes the custodial parent and the other parent the non-custodial parent. The custodial parent, according to Hahlo (1975:463), is entitled to have the child with him/her and to control its daily life; 'to decide all questions relating to its education, training and religious upbringing' and 'to determine what homes or houses the child may or may not enter and with whom it may or may not associate.' These responsibilities are, in South Africa, as already pointed out, distinct from the duties of guardianship (which entail the administration of the minor's property and business affairs), usually retained by the father when the mother gains custody.

Custody is awarded to the spouse who will better serve the best interests of the child. Hahlo (1975:459) cited Justice Steyn (1971) that the child must feel it is loved, wanted, welcome. The parent's ability to
provide for the moral, cultural, religious, as well as physical well-being of the child must be taken into account. Should both parents prove unsuitable, custody may, though in practice it occurs but extremely rarely, be granted to a third party, for example, an adoptive parent or grandparent' (Rosen 1977:17).

5.7.1 History of custody and the concept of the best interest of the child.

Historically the concept of 'the best interest of the child' has not always been the basis for court rulings on custody (and, though not always spelt out, access).

Legal decisions regarding the award of custody and guardianship can be traced back to the concept of 'parens patriae' stipulating the duty of the Court to protect the child who is unable to protect himself (Foster and Freed 1964; Hudson 1970). The Court regarded itself as the upper guardian of the minor child.

Roman-Dutch law (upon which South African common law is based) and early English common law (which influenced South African law after the British occupation of the Cape in 1806), in keeping with the prevailing practice, recognized a father's claim to custody as superior to that of the mother's, he being regarded as the natural guardian of his children.

It was not until 1839 that the position of the mother to be regarded as an equal claimant to custody of her minor child was first made feasible by a statute empowering the Chancellor of the English courts to award the custody of children under seven to a mother (Rosen 1977:17). For all practical purposes, before 1900, according to Foster (1973), Anglo-American law faced no dilemma in awarding custody. A woman was practically a legal nonentity, the father having a property interest in his children. The turn of the century saw an inversion of the former pattern of rewarding paternal custody.

Gradually, as with the developments in child psychiatry the mother came to be regarded as the most needed parent, particularly with children of tender years, it came to be considered in the best interests of the child for custody to be granted to the mother -- a practice which became almost automatic. The father's rights ceased to be sacrosanct if, what was judged to be the welfare of the child, demanded it. Where there was a dispute as to whom the custody in fact should be given, the main consideration became the welfare of the child and this was the paramount consideration of the 1925 Guardianship of Infants Act in proclaiming 'the equality of mother and father as custodians' (Rosen 1977:18). South Africa saw a parallel development. In 1948 the Fletcher v. Fletcher case marked a milestone when it held that a custody decision should be in the best interests of the child and not to one parent in preference to another;
custody is not given to as to reward one parent and punish the other. Nevertheless, as Hahlo points out, guilt and innocence remained a consideration, though not of paramount importance judging from the inclusion of the phrase 'does affect the enquiry' in the following words of Justice of Appeal Court, Centlivres, in the Fletcher case: (See also 5.7.2(c)).

The degree of guilt of one spouse does affect the enquiry whether that spouse is a fit and proper person to be entrusted with a custody of the children (Hahlo 1975, 4th edition:460).

The Matrimonial Affairs Act 37 of 1953 reflects a further departure from Roman-Dutch Law which stresses the innocence or guilt of the spouses when awarding the custody of a minor child. Section 5(1) lays down not only that the interests of the child are the first and paramount consideration in deciding to whom custody is to be awarded, but also that custody may be given to the guilty spouse if this is in the best interest of the child.

While the concept of the best interest of the child, being the basis of custody and access awards, has become almost universally accepted in the Western industrialized world, there is continuing debate and critical assessment of what in fact are in the best interests of the child.

Custody and access laws, and the interpretation of these laws therefore remain subject to modification. In South Africa for instance, the 1978 report proposes changes in the granting of custody and guardianship.

Some recent American developments illustrative of the ongoing changes in response to changing societal mores and attitudes are included in this chapter.

5.7.2 Some guidelines for determining the best interests of the child

The two main theoretical concepts upon which arrangements for custody of and access to children of separated and divorced parents have been based were the tender years and the same sex principles which were assumed to be in the best interests of the child. These two doctrines are still widely applied in court decisions (Foster and Freed 1964; Rosen 1977). The interpretations of the age and sex considerations in these concepts are being modified however. There is a decided trend towards increasing emphasis on the relative emotional bonds between parent and child.

Other guidelines which have evolved to assist the court in the onerous task of reaching a decision as to the best interests of the child, when awarding custody include, inter alia:
All these above guidelines have, in fact, been incorporated in the Child Custody Act of 1970 which became effective in Michigan in 1971. This act was drawn up, according to Benedek and Benedek (1972:829), with the assistance of behavioural scientists and reflects how societal sensitivity to the welfare of children is being translated from a moral preoccupation to the statute book. The Act stresses the need for each case to be judged on its own merits and that undue emphasis should not be placed on any single factor. Benedek considers this Act as withdrawing the automatic award of children under 12 to the mother and ending the assumption that any mother not gaining custody is guilty of moral turpitude and unfit to be a parent (Rosen 1977:32-33).

In its strict application tender age refers to children below seven years, although it is often extended to include children under ten (Rosen 1977:297). According to the legal encyclopaedia American Jurisprudence (p.892) it 'cannot be held as a matter of law that children eight and nine years of age are not of tender years.' This depends 'not alone upon its age but also upon its physical and mental development.'

There is a presumption that for younger children the mother is the vital nurturing figure. This almost universally accepted conception is largely based upon theories advanced on the psychological and social development of the child and influenced particularly by the rigid earlier conceptions of Bowlby (1951, 1953) of the mother as the figure of attachment. In keeping with these theories, children under three and a half years of age are, almost automatically and universally, awarded to the custody of the mother and such decisions are seldom, if ever, questioned.

In practice, as most divorces and separations occur in the earlier years of marriage, most of the children involved are of tender age and therefore it is usually the mother who is awarded the custody.

The same sex principle can similarly be traced to theories on paternal and maternal deprivation and the roles of each parent in the child's development. From this has evolved the doctrine that older children, particularly adolescents (thirteen years and over), should be placed with the parent of the same sex, upon the assumption that this is of crucial importance in identification, especially sex-role identification (Rosen 1977:21). This aspect has, for instance, been stressed by Biller (1969-1974).

In recent years there has been considerable criticism and re-evaluation of whether, and to what degree, the tender age and the same sex principles are, indeed in the child's best interest. Gettleman and
Markowitz (1974:112) went a step further and questioned why custody decisions should consider only the children instead of being based on the needs of all the family members. The debate has been largely endangered by the realization of the merging and changing of parental roles. In the nineteenth century, when the father's role was considered to be that of breadwinner and the mother's that of homemaker, it followed that the young child remain with the mother. 'With significant changes in the traditional socio-economic sexual roles...' (Rosen 1977:27) the traditional assumptions upon which awards were based are no longer always valid, and both behavioural scientists and members of the legal profession are among the critics.

Legal writers such as Benedek and Benedek (1972) opposed the conception that the sex of the custodial parent should be of crucial importance in custody awards. Each case, they held, should be dealt with on its own merits. Fain (1977:40) wrote that

...today the emphasis is less upon the determination of unfitness than an effort to decide more accurately, the critical factors that should determine the future custodial disposition of a child (whether given to parents, a stepparent or a foster parent). The stress is to place custody with the so-called psychological parent, with whom the emotional tie exists.

Tritico (1974) was of the opinion that judges show a strong tendency to award mothers the custody of their children. The very presumption that this is so, prevents decision-making in each case, on its own merits. (Rosen 1977). Title (1974) believed that there is no conclusive evidence to show that a mother is more important in a child's development than a father. Paternal separation may be as bad as maternal separation. Fathers can become as involved in children on as deep an emotional level as mothers, and are equally capable of responding to young children. Title suggested that family courts with social workers and behavioural scientists be set up to investigate cases and make suggestions to judges. He also suggested the appointment of an attorney to represent the child and consideration of the child's stated preference.

The shift of emphasis toward the emotional bonds between parent and child is in keeping with the views of Steinzor (1969) that what is important for the child is the warmth he receives and not whether it is given by the
mother or father. The mother cannot be assumed to be better suited to cope with child nurturing than the father. In practice little weight is as yet given to the intensity of the child's attachment in custody decisions.

According to Gursick (1976) of the Humane Services and Resource Center, Westhoven, Connecticut, from a study of divorced men seeking custody, there were only insignificant differences between custodial and non-custodial fathers in their predivorce relationships with their children. Rosen (1977) too found that custody is not usually granted in accordance with the degree of attachment of the child to the parent. Rosen's (1977) empirical study lends substance to the need for reassessment of the traditional concepts. She found no significant differences in the emotional adjustment of the children awarded at a tender age to their mother's custody as compared with those awarded to their father's custody. She found no empirical support either for the tender age or the same sex doctrine. This finding she considered as having far-reaching implications for members of the legal professional psychologists, parents and society in general (p.296). Rosen's findings were compatible with Rutter's that the presence of someone to whom the child is attached is necessary, but this person need not necessarily be his mother. Rosen (1977:299) suggested a possible expansion:

...if it is the bond formation that matters, rather than the person with whom the attachment is formed, then it follows that this person does not necessarily have to be a parent at all.

These findings can have ramified effects with implications concerning surrogates and stepparents.

The other considerations listed as guidelines in determining the best interests of the child, although less subject to controversy than the tender age and same sex doctrines, are interpreted with slight variations and different emphases in the various countries of the Western world. The following are some explanations and interpretations of these guidelines:

(a) **Child's preference (as between parents)**

A child who is sufficiently mature (generally considered as ten years of age or more) to express and form a rational opinion regarding his preference as to which parent should be custodian, must be allowed to choose 'which parent he prefers to live with' (24 Am.Jur 2d section 784:891). Although the 'child's desire is not conclusive upon the court' it must grant custody in accord with the child's election, unless the parent selected by the child is 'unfit by reason of moral depravity, habitual drunkenness or incapacity.' According to Gettleman and Markowitz (1974:195) the older the
child and the more intelligent, the greater the impact his feelings will have on the court of law. In recent years there is a tendency for the preference of adolescent children to be taken more seriously if only because an older child can negate a court decision by simply leaving the home of the parent he despises. In La Grange's (1970) study 11 children had left their mothers' homes and gone to live with their fathers. There is a growing recognition that the child's choice of custodial parent deserves consideration. In 1975 a British bill laid down that a local authority should find out what the child's feelings and wishes are and try to carry them out, while considering a child's age and ability to understand. Rosen (1977) found empirical support for this approach and highly recommended it. This is contrary to the view of Justice Galligan (1973) who believed that not much value should be placed on what children say, especially when under pressure at a trial; in addition the motives of children may change from day to day.

(b) Not separating siblings

It is generally accepted that it is not considered advisable to separate siblings. The strict application of the tender age, together with the same sex doctrine, may well result in siblings being split up at the time of divorce or upon one or some of them reaching adolescence. This does in fact still occur in practice. Rosen (1977) found that, contrary to popular belief, separating siblings from each other amongst father and mother is not necessarily detrimental to the children. The intensity of the bonding relationship between the child and the parent is of overriding importance to the children's adjustment level.

(c) Moral considerations

Moral unfitness of a parent should be considered in the light of emotional instability and inability to give love and affection. A person may be a bad marriage partner and citizen without being a bad parent (Payton 1971; Poddell 1973). Notwithstanding the misconduct of the parent, that parent will gain custody should it be considered best for the welfare of the child. Moral transgressions must be considered together with other relevant factors. Should adulterous or other immoral conduct be accompanied by frequent absences from the home, neglect of the children and indiscreet conduct in their presence, the court may and should disqualify this parent (24 Am Jur 2d section 788:895) as custodian.

(d) Financial considerations

While it is to be considered, the relative financial position of
the parents is not the 'controlling factor in determining the question of
custody.' The fact that a father is earning well while the mother is not,
and the child will have better prospects with the father because of this,
is not a decisive issue. Payton (1971); Sornarajah (1973); Rosen (1977)
support court attitudes in not attaching much weight to a parent's
financial position in making custody decisions. While Herzog and Sudia
(1972) had concluded that a mother's going out to work was detrimental for
children, Rosen reported (1977:293) 'In the present study there was no
support for this contention.'

(e) Continuity for the child

It is considered in the best interests of the child that custody
be granted in favour of the parent with whom he has been for some time
'as continuity of relationships, surroundings and environmental influence
are essential for a child's normal development' (Goldstein et al. 1973).
There are different opinions as to the question whether a father facing
imminent induction in the armed forces, should be disqualified from
obtaining custody. Besides breaking continuity, it has been held that,
as he will have to leave the child with a relative or strangers, in-
directly such an award to him will in effect be an award to a third party.

A case illustrative of this was the court decision in Kacev in
1952, where an interparental agreement was approved whereby custody and
guardianship of the minor child was granted and could be retained by the
mother provided that she did not marry out of her faith. Should the
mother marry a person out of her faith (and the faith the child was brought
up in) custody and guardianship would revert to the husband, this being
considered in the child's best interest (Hahlo 1975:470).

(f) Religious considerations

The religious preferences for or of the child will not be given
controlling weight where there are other important considerations which
may affect the temporal welfare of the child. A case in Wisconsin
(Walker v. Walker, 1964) held that custody cannot be withheld to agnostics.
Generally however, Rosen (1977:22) expresses the consensus when she states:
'It is felt that where possible continuity of religious education should
be preserved.'

Unless otherwise stipulated, the custodian has the right to control
the religious training of the child, excepting where the custodian is not
the parent of the child, in which case the courts have sometimes directed
that the child receives religious training in the faith of its parents
(24 Am Jur 2d Section 787:893).
Generally it may be said in summary that a divorce court, in determining who shall have the custody and care of the children of the marriage, are, in our Western world, guided, to an increasing extent, by what is considered to be the best for the welfare of the child.

The dominant thought is that children are not chattels, but intelligent and moral beings, and that, as such, their welfare and their happiness are of first consideration (24 Am Jur 2d 783:890).

South African court guidelines

The movement away from the tender age and same sex principles has not as yet reached South African (Rosen 1977:31).

South African courts are guided by the following criteria for awarding custody (Spiro 1971; Sornarajah 1973; Hahlo 1975), these being considered as being in the best interests of the child:

(i) Mothers should be given custody of all children of tender age.
(ii) Fathers should be given custody of older sons, mothers custody of all daughters.
(iii) An immoral parent should not be given custody.
(iv) The antagonism of a child towards a particular parent should be considered.
(v) Efforts should be made not to disturb a child's existing environment and associations.
(vi) The financial wealth of one parent as opposed to another is not a major consideration.

Notwithstanding the above guidelines, should the court be persuaded that the welfare of the child will best be served by granting custody not in accordance with the guidelines, the South African courts may, in theory, and do, in practice, make such decisions. Hahlo (1975:461) cites a case in point, in Katzenellenbogen, 1947. The child, though of tender years, was granted to the custody of the father. Justice Millin found that the father could make 'admirable arrangements' for the care and wellbeing of the child. Occupying a single living room and working in a shop, the mother would have had to leave the child in the care of a servant all day. It is interesting to note that Rosen (1977:293) found no support in her research for the contention that a mother's going out to work was detrimental to the child's development.

5.7.3 Types of custody

Whether in situations of divorce or separation custody is contested or uncontested, a court must legally sanction or decide upon custody arrangements for the children.

According to Despert (1953), in 85% of divorce cases involving children, the custody issue is agreed upon between the parties, prior to coming to court. Rosen (1977:60) quotes similar percentages by other researchers. Contested custody is often marked by intense acrimony and
denigration. Benedek and Benedek (1972) note that the old adversay laws encouraged parties 'to wage custody battles in the gutter.'

In the U.S.A. the new Michigan Law, known as the Child Custody Act of 1970, provides for a more positive attitude by inviting the party seeking custody to provide evidence in proof of his relationship with his children. As can be expected, children whose custody is contested come from families rated high in turbulence. This has strong psychological and social implications for the adjustment of the child. Rosen (1977:198) found that all the nine children in her sample whose custody had been contested came from strife-torn homes.

Custody may be granted conditionally and is subject to appeal and review. This is also implicit in the application of the same sex and tender age doctrine. A boy of tender years at the time of the divorce, and therefore awarded to the custody of his mother, would, in theory, automatically upon reaching adolescence, go and live with his father. This would be in conflict with the consideration that continuity too is in the best interests of the child. Custody is sometimes awarded conditionally with a court stipulating that under a particular set of circumstances, custody might revert from one parent to the other. Rosen (1977:62, 63) cites one of her cases of two very young children who had been awarded to their mother on condition that she would not remarry out of her faith. When this condition was broken, the father gained custody, with the children undergoing great trauma and unhappiness, which was still evident after several years, at the time of Rosen's research. She agrees with Goldstein et al. (1973) amongst others, that conditional awards may potentially introduce an element of uncertainty detrimental to the child's emotional development. However, she contends that final and unconditional awards may leave no scope for subsequent changes in situations and the child's welfare may suffer.

Gettleman and Markowitz (1974:195) list three types of custody: Joint, divided and split.

Under joint custody, the child may live with both parents. While the child may, but not necessarily does, live most of the year with one parent, both parents agree to act in concert and are entrusted to share jointly in decisions about the child's residence, general upbringing, including education, health and religious training and expenses. It is 'a flexible and open arrangement for living, sharing and loving' (Grote and Weinstein 1977:45) though being met so far 'with both welcome and scepticism,' (p.44).

Divided custody provided that each parent has the child for roughly half the year.

In split custody, the children of the marriage are split up between the mother and father, normally in accordance with the same sex doctrine.
According to Gettleman and Markowitz (1974), joint custody is common in the United States with the courts not looking favourably upon divided or split custody. There tends to be some confusion in the terms 'divided' and 'split' in relevant literature. Rosen (1977:292) refers to divided custody as 'splitting siblings.' Grote and Weinstein (1977:52) strongly feel that joint custody is an ideal, viable and practical solution to the dilemma of custody:

...the husband-wife relationship is dissolved legally and hopefully, emotionally. But it is still a family when seen through the eyes of the next fundamental family relationship, that between the parents and the children.

Joint custody, they feel, by structuring in relationships, rather than structuring them out, removes the threat of a loss of a child to a parent or a parent to the child.

The probable trend towards an increase in father custody in recent years is reviewed under 'Motherless,' (3.2.1).

5.7.4 Access

'Divorce merely ends the husband/wife role but not the parent roles, for parents are forever' (Elkin 1977:57). The parent denied custody is usually granted access, and thus maintains some degree of ongoing relationship as father or mother with the children and usually, through them with the ex-spouse. Rosen (1977) in her research found that in 90% of her cases an ongoing relationship existed between the children and the non-custodial parent. According to Goode (1956:313):

Whatever the custodial arrangements, these marriages usually continued after divorce through the lives of the children.

Perhaps second only to custody, access arrangements are crucial to the lives of children.

That a parent has a right to see his child is the basic principle for access rights being granted the non-custodial parent. This principle is departed from and the child is denied access only if, as a result of the relationship with the non-custodial parent, the child's well-being may suffer physically or emotionally. In the case of E, 1940, (Hahlo 1975:467), the husband asked for access to the child in order to make a blood test to dispute paternity and not for the purpose of seeing and maintaining contact with the child. Greenberg JP rejected the request holding it would not be in the interests of the child.

South African divorce orders usually provide for 'reasonable access.' Where access arrangements are not spelt out by the court in terms of the divorce or separation settlement, the court is, according to
Hahlo (1975:466), presumed to have granted reasonable access. The implementation of the term 'reasonable access' so commonly employed or implied in custody decisions invites contention however because of its lack of definition and lays itself open to wide interpretation.

According to Rosen (1977:161) reasonable access generally implies a regular weekly or monthly pre-arranged plan of contact between child and non-custodial parent.

5.7.4.1 Types of access

Types of access are usually categorized largely by their frequency patterns. Rosen lists four such degrees of access:

a) Frequent access which in effect is very similar to free access. Basically this means unrestricted and frequent contact with the non-custodial parent according to the free choice of the child. Theoretically, there can be a contradiction between free and frequent access as the child may prefer less or only occasional contact with the non-custodial parent. For frequent and, or, free access, both parents have by implication, to co-operate through a positive attitude on the part of the custodial parent and an inviting display of warmth towards the child by the non-custodial parent.

b) Regulated access: In terms of frequency or continuum, this would be rated as moderately frequent, and would meet the requirements of 'reasonable access,' decreed by the court. The child sees the non-custodial parent regularly, for instance weekends or alternate weekends as agreed upon between the parents or as stipulated by the court.

c) Occasional access. This refers to sporadic contact, without any set pattern, due to the reluctance of either the non-custodial parent or the child, or of both, or the attitudes of custodial parent towards closer contact between the child and non-custodial parent. Occasional access may also be due to geographic distance between the child and non-custodial parent.

d) No access refers to situations where all contact with the non-custodial parent has ceased due to abandonment or desertion or a court barrier because of the questionable character or behaviour of the non-custodial parent.

Rosen (1977) from the findings in her comprehensive study which dealt largely with custody and access of children of divorced families, puts forward practical suggestions to make the implementation of access more beneficial to both children and parents. She advocates

(i) counselling divorcing families, to involve also the non-custodial parent, so that they might understand the implication of reasonable access in the best interest of the child;
(ii) that clinicians help assess the interpretation of the meaning of reasonable access for each individual family;
(iii) that free access be encouraged.

One of the most striking clinical findings from Rosen's study was the feeling oft and clearly expressed by many of the children, for the strong need of free access. This, it was felt, was important, to
maintain a continued relationship with both parents. Where free access had been permitted, children perceived the divorce as least traumatic (Rosen 1977:300).

The manner in which access arrangements are in practice used and misused by parents and the problems occasioned by some visitation patterns and some family situations, are raised by Sherwin (1969).

According to Sherwin, children are often exploited by a parent—one parent playing the child against the other, and the child used as the source of information. In his own legal practice he had the experience of children of divorce telephoning him with all sorts of information which may be exaggerated or inaccurate or 'lies.' Some cases on attorneys' records show that a mother may seek deliberately to deprive a father of visitation rights, she becoming purposely malicious. She may deliberately move home from place to place, each time moving further from her husband's residential area. Often hostile parents indulge in message sending through the children. The child is placed in the position of betraying one or the other parent.

Sherwin (1969) discussed the possible effects of and arrangements for the following different access patterns and situations:

**Weekday visitation** can be very hectic for the children. A father may miss his children very much and assume that if he visits his children two, three or four days a week for just an hour, he may prevent the children from getting used to the fact that the family is now separated. Such visitation arrangements may disturb the children's routine and can be very disruptive, affecting their schooling and interfering with their adjustment to the new way of life necessitated by the divorce and living with the custodial parent.

**Weekend visitation.** One type is the one day a week visit that is given the non-custodial parent. Another is having the children for a weekend every fortnight or once a month. Many parents let the children sleep in the same room as them when coming on weekend visitations. Psychologically, it may be in order for a child to sleep in the same room. Parents have rights to their children but it should, however, be remembered, in connection with this right, that there are rules to be obeyed. The parent must consider the child's feelings and attitudes and the child's mother's (or father's) wishes as to the child's exposure to any overt intimacy between the non-custodial parent and friend.

**Holidays** such as Christmas may be difficult, as children may very much want to be with both parents on such significant occasions, yearning for a two-parent situation.

**Vacations.** Again, these may be difficult as the custodial parent may be loath for the child to be with the ex-spouse for such a stretch of
time. Grandparents and summer camps are a help. The children can spend their vacations there, on comparative 'neutral' ground with visits by either parent eased should interparental relations be strained.

Illnesses and injuries can and do occur when the child is with either parent. These may however be exaggerated or even faked by the child, or by the father or mother. Visitation problems may arise during a child's illness. A non-custodial parent, although unwelcome in the other spouse's home, may nevertheless want to, and will go to visit the child.

Confirmations, graduations and other formal events are, and in Sherwin's (1969) opinion, should be attended by both parents. He feels, however, that this should not be the case with birthday parties as the child may feel embarrassed in front of his friends by the parents' overt attitudes to each other. This is not an insurmountable problem however, as each parent can give the child a birthday party separately.

5.7.4.2 Conflicting opinions or effects of access

Goode (1956) in his exhaustive study of 425 divorced women, randomly selected from Detroit Country Courthouse records, explored also the effects the divorce had on the relationships of the 796 children (of the others in his sample) with both the custodial and the non-custodial parent. The children were not seen and the interviews were restricted to the mothers.

Writing of the contact between non-custodial parents and the children (94% of these children were in the custody of their mothers), Goode found that this was used as an ongoing means of the parents 'getting at each other,' and undermining each other in the eyes of the child. The mother used the granting of access as a weapon, particularly to extract support payments from the father or to punish him. Goode, as also La Grange (1970) and Weiss (1975) found that, through custody being given them almost automatically, women were granted power over their ex-spouses, and they resorted to this in decisions about the access rights of the ex-husbands to the children.

Goode (p.227) reasoned that, as the divorced woman remarries in time and/or becomes less dependent on her ex-spouse economically, she stops asserting her legal rights to maintenance payments. She then not only feels less obligated to see her ex-husband herself, but also less obligated to let the children see him. Goode (1956:227) wrote 'to this extent she can more completely build her new life without taking account of his activities.'

Regarding the effects of access, 25% of his sample reported that after visits with the father, the mothers considered their children more
difficult to handle, although Goode ascribed this as being a possible result of the mother's own tension and feelings of guilt associated with visits. Another explanation offered was that (p.332) loving the mother, but missing the father, the child expressed his frustration through difficult behaviour.

Goode found that with the passage of time, the visits of the non-custodial parent became less frequent, due to various reasons, including the expense such visits entailed for the non-custodial father, new friendships and remarriage of the parties, the tension evoked between the spouses by the visits, and the decreased intimacy and growing-away of the child from his father. In addition the child is in conflict during the visits as most children cannot really see the reason for parents to divorce and the child is haunted by feelings of abandonment. He is disturbed by the thought of having to separate again from the parent at the end of a visit. With neither the children nor the parents enjoying the visits, they become more sporadic.

Hunt (1968) expressed a view that, as the two parents live in two separate homes, usually with different, often antagonistic lifestyles, contact with the non-custodial parent can be disturbing to the child. He should not be encouraged to have frequent contact with the non-custodial parent. Goldstein et al. (1973) in expanding Hunt's (1968) belief that continued contact of the child with the non-custodial parent exposes him to two different sets of values, strongly urged that the parent who has custody of the child should have the right to decide if the non-custodial parent may or may not visit. Because of continuing strife between the custodial and the non-custodial parent, the child, finding it a strain to carry on the contact with both warring parents, experiences loyalty conflicts.

Sanctuary and Whitehead (1970) were of the opinion that non-custodial parents shower their children with gifts and treats in a desire to show their love, out of feelings of guilt that they do not see the child often enough. As a solution they suggest that the non-custodial parent be allowed to visit the child more frequently. They feel that more frequent visitation would cut down on present-giving. Writing about access and visitation arrangements with older children, they point out that as these children are more busy with school and social activities, they need less parental contact and parents should consider the children's activities and arrangements, rather than make demands upon them. Sanctuary and Whitehead feel that even at its best, access is unsettling for children.

Westman (1972) wrote that where parents themselves could not satisfactorily negotiate and regulate visitation arrangements, so that they are really in the child's best interests, according to the child's needs, and flexible enough to meet these needs, a neutral third party should be
given authority to make the decisions. School-age children were old enough to have a say in access arrangements. The quality of the relationship between them, rather than the amount of time the non-custodial parent spent with the child was what is important for the psychological development of the child.

Littner (1973) believed it essential that contact be kept up with the non-custodial parent for the psychological development of the child. According to him there must be contact between the non-custodial parent and the child. There must be an ongoing relationship. Littner believed so strongly about the importance of keeping contact with the non-custodial parent, that he recommended that children even maintain contact with violent or psychotic parents, because it is better for the child to know his real parents than to build up fantasies about them (Rosen 1977:44). In Littner's (1973) opinion, even if the child did not want to see the non-custodial parent, even when their relationship was a bad one, contact between the child and the non-custodial parent should be maintained.

As can be seen from the above studies, there is no consensus as to the extent, type, or desirability of access by the non-custodial parent to the child in its best interest, nor as to the effects of the various forms and degrees of access. There appears to be room for much empirical research.

5.7.5 Some recent American suggestions on custody and access

Two recent American papers, one by Weiss (1978) and one by Kelly and Wallerstein (1977(a)) illustrative of trends of modified and new directions in developments in custody and access, are reviewed.

Weiss (1978) in a paper prepared for the Laboratory of Community Psychiatry, Boston, on custody when parents separate, discusses:
(1) difficulties in the application of the best interests rule;
(2) when and if the child should be consulted; (3) what really is custody; and (4) the child's stake in both parents. Three of the recommendations relating to custody are:

(i) The relationship of the child with both parents should be safeguarded. The child should have free access to both parents.
(ii) Between the parents there should be fostered a relationship supportive of the other's parental efforts.
(iii) The non-custodial parent should be encouraged to visit frequently.

Giving custody to one parent and visitation rights to the other are not conducive to mutual support but rather to antagonism between the parents. Less then free access by the children to the non-custodial parent is unsatisfactory as the intervals between visits are perhaps longer than wished for by the children.
Another recommendation of Weiss (1978) is, therefore, that the courts should presume, unless there is evidence to the contrary, that divorce does not change either party's rights and responsibilities in relation to the children. In another investigation (1978(a)) entitled 'Implications of Various Custody and Visitation arrangements' (Raschke 1978 divorce related compilations, thirty-five, 876:36-37) Weiss concerned himself with the effects of various custody and visitation arrangements on:

(i) the relationships of the parents,
(ii) relationships of parents and children,
(iii) children's development.

Judges are required to make more than decisions, they are required to make long-range extrapolations from the present, often basing their judgments on their own personal values. Weiss discusses the sharing of residential custody, if agreed upon by both parents. To safeguard the child, there would be a need to regularly review whether such shared residential custody should be continued. Residential custody decides ongoing custody (as generally assumed by courts). The exception to this may be such proximity of the homes of both parents that the child can move freely between the homes. In such cases, the ongoing custody could be shared.

As part of the five year Children of Divorce Project (see 4.7.4) Kelly and Wallerstein (1977(a)) investigated the visiting patterns and situations between the non-custodial parents and 131 children from 60 divorcing families (1977:51).

The changed yet significant role of the part-time parent is discussed in the context of the extraordinary continuity in contact for many parents and their children following divorce.

The children and the parents were seen individually, for divorce counselling intervention, an average of 14 visits per family, and were interviewed a year following the initial extended contact.

While the custodial parent continues to cope daily with his children's demands, their behaviour, their needs, the interplay around which 'is largely the basis of the structure' for the maintenance and potential enrichment of parent-child relationships, the parent who has moved out, faces an abrupt discontinuity in relationship with his children. For some non-custodial parents release from the daily responsibilities to his child, is a welcome change, for others not seeing the children daily is deeply felt. These parents must learn to restructure their relationships with their children without the catalyst of daily intimacy in a familiar environment. For some, these very limitations enhance the relationship.

At the outset of the project, two-thirds of the children were visiting their non-custodial parents at least twice a month, with more of them doing so two to three times a week. Most visits were for a few hours
and only 25% stayed overnight or for weekends. All except the adolescent children (and particularly adolescent boys) were dissatisfied, although visits were quite frequent. What is referred to by courts as 'reasonable access,' visiting alternate weekends, did not satisfy the children, particularly the young. Only those seven to eight year olds who visited several times a week by cycling over to their father and had a sense of free access were satisfied, as this sense of control raised their self-esteem.

A quarter of the children saw their parents erratically and less than once a month. More disturbing to these children than the infrequency, was the uncertainty of the contact. The authors considered it important to report that only one non-custodial father (out of the 59) and one non-custodial mother had completely severed ties with their children at the outset of the project.

Strong differences emerged in the visiting patterns, when age and sex of the children were considered as variables. Overall, the two to eight year olds saw their non-custodial parents more frequently, with the seven and eight year olds visiting particularly frequently, more than half of them two or three times a week. Furthermore, it was these children who longed for more visits. Young boys tended to visit as well as stay overnight more than young girls.

Pre-school children weekended or slept over but rarely, largely due to the parents' feeling of uncertainty about their ability to cope. Most of the under 25% of the two to eight year olds whose visiting patterns were infrequent and erratic, were girls, who, despite their disappointments doggedly cherished fantasies of faithful caring fathers.

A greatly different visiting pattern emerged amongst the older children, for fully one half of the nine to ten year olds -- 'and in particular the boys' -- visits were infrequent and erratic. Maybe the children's anger, which was a central finding for this age group by Kelly and Wallerstein in 1976, contributed to the reduced contact.

While the adolescents (13 and over) had fewer contacts than the younger children, their contact was more frequent than that of the nine to 12 year group. As their infrequent and brief visits suited their developmental needs of emerging independence, and as they were 'more casual about their contacts with both parents,' they were more contented than the younger children, in spite of their irregular visiting pattern (p.52).

Siblings usually visited their father together and most often when he was alone without companions. The older children amongst the siblings, beginning to go their own ways, were less likely to visit as a group. Separate visits by siblings were viewed with envy and some distress by their brothers and sisters, and this factor is drawn to the attention of parents, regarding separate visiting.
In the follow-up interviews a year later, the number of children seeing their non-custodial parent at least twice a month had increased from two-thirds to three-fifths. The amount of overnight and weekend visiting had doubled and many fathers reported greater joy in their contacts — even those whose feelings were, at the outset, mixed. This, according to Kelly and Wallerstein, indicates increased closeness and 'mutual enjoyment developing within the context of the new post-divorce family structure' (p.53). This enrichment it was felt, may have been due to the counselling intervention. Following counselling, some fathers had resumed contact with their children.

Kelly and Wallerstein point out that though at follow-up the number of children with absolutely no contact was relatively small, eight percent, this would translate into 80,000 of the million children from yearly newly divorcing families in the United States.

For a child yearning to continue his relationship, and who has a father living nearby who has ceased visiting, such a break is emotionally harmful. He feels rejected, unloved, unworthy and unloveable, and his self-esteem is diminished; particularly is this so for the young child.

By follow-up, the previous significant sex differences in the visiting patterns had disappeared, except with the (now) eight and nine year olds, where boys still saw their fathers more often than girls. In the 9-18 years old cohort a sex difference had emerged, with the girls visiting their fathers more often and more frequently than the boys. In the intervening year (some 18 months after the divorce) nearly one-third of the men had become engaged or remarried and for the children visits tended to occur 'on a shared basis with the new step-family or not at all.' In the latter case this was caused by the children's increased feelings of deprivation and resentment, from the realization that attention would have to be shared with step-siblings. Most of the children however, did not mind sharing their father, and some even found the affection and warmth of the newly constituted family pleasurable.

Kelly and Wallerstein found that visiting patterns had been established largely by the parents. For some ten percent of the children, mostly the nine to 12 year olds, the pattern was established, after litigation between the parents, to a rigidly fixed schedule which the older children and adolescents came to resent. Changes were more likely to be made on the basis of the adults' needs and the child was seldom consulted.

Their preliminary findings indicate that factors associated with the divorcing process itself have a more central influence than the quality or closeness existing between the non-custodial parent and child, before the dissolution, on the post divorce visiting patterns.
They felt that their data point strongly to a new kind of parenting that is evolving in our society, namely 'where the ongoing continuous relationship is neither absent nor fully present, but maintains a significant and tangible presence in the lives of many of these children' (p.54).

Many parents were stubbornly unco-operative and unyielding to their children's requests. By follow-up, after counselling, the fathers as a group had become more flexible and accommodating. The 'hard line mothers' too had begun to yield, and only 13% continued their attempts to sabotage visits, considering them of no value to the children. The majority could now recognize their children's needs to spend time with their fathers.

The researchers discovered that infrequent visiting correlated highly and significantly with what (they considered) a 'destructive visiting pattern, based on an assessment of the overall effect on the child's continued development.'

Frequent visits were surprisingly rarely found to be detrimental to the child, even where there was severe pathology in the parent. Kelly and Wallerstein concluded from their research that for many of these post divorce families 'the relationship between the child and the non-custodial parent has the potential for increasing closeness and continued affection.' A brief clinical intervention, focussing on parental conflicts and related to the child's developmental need for continued contact with both parents contributed to the continuity.

5.8 Reconciliation and counselling
See also the 1978 Report, 5.6.

5.8.1 Before the divorce decree
Goode, already a generation ago (1956), in his study of women after divorce, examined the likelihood and efficacy of marital counselling saving a marriage. According to Goode, in most divorces there is a fairly long period of time that elapses between the decision to divorce, and the actual divorce, referred to by Goode as an adjustment to the idea of divorce (1956:158). Because of a lack of any available counselling at that time,

it is clear that toward the end of this period, the two spouses are likely not be to amenable to any kind of discussion or advice. Counselling after filing suit, is rather late, at best (Goode, 1956:158)
Twenty-nine percent of Good's sample claimed to have 'ever consulted any marriage counsellor'; 14% listed the Friend of the Court* as the counsellor they had used. 5.4% had spoken to a priest, four percent had sought the assistance of a social work agency, 3.3% that of a physician and three percent others. Catholics, hypothesized Goode, were more likely to seek counselling; those with a medium education and those who delayed more the final decision to divorce were most likely to seek counselling. Goode reported that more Protestants than Catholics would seek psychoanalytic or psychiatric help, but divorce relates closely to doctrine and there is greater internal conflict for them. Of those who got any definite advice, over one-third were told to get a divorce. Hunt (1968) wrote

Marriage counselling, though it can often heal a sick marriage, has little chance of saving or bringing a dead one back to life. (p.260)

...a truism among marriage counsellors, as among psychotherapists in general, that the patient has very little chance of improvement unless he wants to get better, but the vast majority of people who have reached the point of openly considering divorce do not want to be reconciled. (p.259)

According to Sherwin (1969), the action of accusation, one against the other by the litigants, makes reconciliation between the spouses very difficult.

Reconciliation, once the divorce machinery sets in, is made almost impossible by this very divorce machinery, for what once seemed a fantasy of grievances against each other, becomes very real, because now the parties are really acting out their hatred against each other, generally through legal stages such as the summons, complaint, evidences prepared, and the trial itself. As the pleadings may not have, as part of it, any terms to indicate that a settlement between both parties to the divorce was contemplated before the divorce proceedings, the attempts at a real amicable settlement are, by the very nature of the divorce-law, barred.

5.8.2 Post-decree counselling

With the increase in the incidence of divorce there is growing societal awareness of the duty to provide services to ease the adjustment to divorce, particularly of the children. Post decree counselling services, as part of family courts or as independent services, represent one such practical step.

* Hunt (1968) wrote that the 'Friend of the Court' agency in Wayne County, Michigan, offered marriage counselling to every divorced couple that wants it. Of the 11,000 who filed for divorce in 1965, only 401 accepted counselling.
The Los Angeles Conciliation Court, California, offers a post-
divorce counseling service of here-and-now, short contact, crisis
ounseling. All the parties involved in the marital dissolution con-
lict, such as parents, children, step-parents, and grandparents are
seen separately and together in a series of up to six sessions.

Elkin, Director, Family Counselling Services, Conciliation Court
of the Supreme Court of Los Angeles County, in a paper presented at the
third International Conference on Marriage Counsellors' Education, 1976,
points out that

...a divorce ends a marriage but does not necessarily end
a family, for families are forever for the child and for
the parents, if the parents want it that way (Elkin 1977:57)

Ninety percent of families seen through this service came because
of visitation (access) matters exclusively. The court through its
counseling services assists and encourages the parties themselves to
arrive at a mutually acceptable plan regarding custody and access which
they suggest to the bench. The results have so far been that almost one
out of every two families referred by the bench for post-divorce counseling
arrives at a settlement between them regarding access (visitation). An
important step is the court conference to decide on the conduct necessary
to maintain 'an amicable relationship between the parties for the best
interest of the children.' An agreement is drawn up by the Conciliation
Court known as a post-dissolution agreement about custody/visitation. The
parties return to the Conciliation Court after a six weeks' trial period
and if they wish to continue the agreement, the referring bench is asked to
sign it, to make it an order of the court. They may contact the marriage
counsellor and arrange for further conferences if further difficulties
arise. The marriage counsellor signs approval of the settlement agree-
ment drawn up for the best interests of the child. An important recogni-
tion is that the non-custodial parent must be more involved with the child,
as both parents are required for the emotional and physical development of
a child -- and the counselling service encourages this in the best interests
of the child and the best interest of the parents (Elkin 1977:57-60).

Parents are helped in establishing relationships with each other
and the children in the children's best interests. Children, through the
counseling service are given an opportunity to discuss matters bothering
them and parents and children are helped through the medium of joint discus-
sions. Step-parents are involved. Society is made familiar with post-
divorce roles of parents and children and the need for societal support
systems. Unfortunately, while no fault is applied in most states in
divorce proceedings

...since no-fault divorce laws no longer allow the parties to
vent their anger in court and to cite specific acts of misconduct,
the need to tear the ex-spouse down may be displaced onto custody
visitation conflicts. Unfortunately, the adversary approach is
still used regarding custody and visitation matters, even in courts
following the no-fault approach. (Elkin 1977:62).
The role of clinicians

Rosen (1977:343), particularly in her closing statement, urged the value of and need for a team of clinicians to counsel both parents. At the time of writing her thesis clinicians were privately engaged by the parents, 'one clinician being engaged by one side and another by the other side.' The latter practice reinforces the flavour of alignment or partisanship and the role of the clinician as 'fighting a battle between spouses, rather than fighting a battle for the child. Her suggestion may, in conclusion, be quoted:

'It is recommended that lawyers and psychologists alike should accept the principle of one clinician or team of clinicians counselling both parents' (Rosen 1977: 343).

This view is also held by Watson (1969); Finlay and Gold (1971); Westman (1971); Derdeyn (1976).

5.9 Summary and some social implications

5.9.1 Summary

The union of man and woman in a bond of marriage is a formal act creating the unit which has been evolved to best serve the 'cosmic' purpose of the family (procreation and continuity). The family is a unit of the larger society, the state. The state concerns itself with the order and wellbeing of its constituent parts and, as such, legislates for the formal constitution of marriage (and family) and its formal dissolution.

The purpose of such (state) laws is to maintain a sound balance between the interests of the parties concerned on the one hand, and the society as a whole on the other. (South African Law Commission Report, 1978).

The overview of the history of divorce shows that in Western society, which is based on Judeo-Christian concepts, divorce, like marriage, moved from being a private matter to becoming a church matter, and then a state-regulated institution.

During the centuries of church control, until the Reformation and the schism of the church in the 16th century, marriages were indissoluble as the Catholic Church based sanctity of marriage on their interpretation of Matthew XIX, 6. Annulment became the means of by-passing the indissolubility of marriage, provided sufficient pressure could be exerted on the ecclesiastical courts. With the Reformation, the breakaway non-Catholic Protestant churches developed a more liberal view, basing their interpretation of another portion of Matthew (Matthew XIX, 9), permitting
divorce on grounds of adultery, desertion, refusal of conjugal duty (sexual intercourse).

The weakening of the churches' control of divorce and the control thereof being taken over by the state, first appeared in England at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Thereafter, in stages, various Matrimonial Causes Acts (1857, 1878, 1923, 1937 and 1973), transferred jurisdiction of divorce from the ecclesiastical courts and parliament to the magistrate court, made the sexes equal in law regarding grounds for divorce, and eased the grounds for divorce. All the above developments were delayed reflections of changing societal attitudes and mores. The Divorce Reform Act of 1969, founded on the irretrievable breakdown of a marriage rather than traditional proof of guilt, has been described as the most radical measure in the history of British divorce law. The Finer Report (1974, Vol. 1.:61) could refer to it as

...one of those measures which commended itself to the general conscience long before it succeeded in gaining the statute book.

Similar no-fault principles of divorce, and without the consent of one party, sometimes as the only ground for divorce and sometimes with an alternative ground, have been in operation in West Germany (since 1933), New Zealand (since 1956), Australia (since 1959), Canada (since 1968), the Soviet Union, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and starting with the State of California in 1970, in most of the United States of America (Stone 1970). Other countries, such as Sweden (1973) followed as also South Africa in July, 1979.

California is in the forefront of legislation regarding cohabitation (living together). The California Family Act of 1970 confers on parties to cohabitation the same rights in division of property as those enjoyed by the parties in a dissolution of a marriage (Stone 1970).

The history of divorce in South Africa is reviewed. Based on Roman-Dutch law, it was strongly influenced by English law after the annexation of the Cape by England in 1806.

Only adultery and malicious desertion were grounds for divorce. In 1935 the Divorce Laws Amendment Act, No. 32, added incurable insanity and imprisonment for five years (after being declared an habitual criminal) as additional statutory grounds for divorce. Since 1935, the law of divorce in South Africa remained virtually intact but for minor amendments until 1979.

Various laws relating to marital separation are outlined. Amongst these are:
In South Africa, in 1975, a commission chaired by the Honourable P.J. Rabie, Judge of Appeal, was appointed to report on the law of divorce and matters incidental thereto. The Report was published in 1978. The object of the law of divorce was stated to be to make it possible for a marriage which no longer exists in its true sense to be dissolved with the minimum of disruption for the parties and their dependents and to ensure that the interests of minor children are put first. Laws should not 'lose sight of what society considers just and reasonable' (pp. 3-4).

The Report brings evidence that, with regard to reconciliation, guidance is effective before rather than after breakdown. Nevertheless family courts are suggested, which should be remedial in their approach rather than retributive.

The emphasis of the proposed legislation is on the irretrievable breakdown of the marriage relationship, not on making divorce easier, and on the safeguarding of the children's interests. Annexure A to the 1978 Report consists of a proposed Bill. The Act, as yet (1979) being debated in parliament, will be called the Divorce Act, 1978.*

Theoretical concepts, definitions and history of custody, access and guardianship are reviewed. The overview reveals a consensus in current opinion (as an evolution over the last few decades) away from the tender years and same sex principles in the granting of custody (Title 1974; Tritico 1974; Taylor 1975). The quality of the parent-child relationship is increasingly considered more important than the sex of the parent and the equality of mother and father as custodial parent recognised. Each case should be treated on its merits with the welfare of the child as the paramount consideration. Custody should not be granted to punish one parent and award the other (Hahlo 1975; Rosen 1977). The social and psychological development of the child depends on the psychological and not biological parent. There are proposals that custody be granted to persons other than the natural parent when it is in the child's best interest. But the very concept of what constitutes the best interest, is subject to various interpretations and yet the issue of custody and access is the most crucial to the lives of the children.

* The Act has since been passed in Parliament and is known as The Divorce Act, 1979. A copy is enclosed as Appendix G to this thesis.
The pros and cons of various types of custody and access are reviewed such as joint, split and divided custody, weekday, weekend, and holidays visitations.

The changed yet significant role of the non-custodial parent and the interaction of varying frequencies of access and non-custodial parent and child, as found from an empirical counselling research project of Kelly and Wallerstein (1977), is summarised.

A strong case is made out for free access (Rosen 1977; Kelly and Wallerstein 1977) and there emerges agreement that a continued ongoing relationship with the non-custodial parent is desirable for the development of the child (Littner, 1973; Rosen, 1977; Weiss, 1978). The sharing of residential custody is mooted.

The legal aspects of voluntary separation ('willige condemnatie') in South Africa are dealt with. Basically, it must not amount to a prohibited donation between the spouses. It is not final in that either spouse can cancel it. In America (Sherwin 1969), couples who decide to live apart may draw up separation agreements which are ultimately, upon divorce, incorporated in the decree.

Counselling to encourage reconciliation, Goode (1956) found in his study, is unlikely to succeed, as the emotional divorce precedes the factual divorce by months if not years, and is sought and offered (if at all) too late. Hunt (1968) concurred with this. Reconciliation cannot be forced upon the parties.

The Los Angeles Conciliation Court offers post-decree counselling on the premise that 'divorce ends a marriage, but does not necessarily end a family, for families are forever...' (Elkin 1977). This may be a pointer for future societal support systems, involving the use of teams of clinicians. This excerpt from Dean Hans Standigen's introduction (to Doroghi's Ground of Divorce in European Countries, New York, 1955) is still pertinent:

THE PROBLEMS OF DOMESTIC LAW, ESPECIALLY THOSE RELATING TO THE DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGES, HAVE BEEN A MATTER OF DEBATE FOR CENTURIES. THEY ARE TIMELY IN ALL PLACES, BUT THEY BECOME ESPECIALLY SIGNIFICANT WHEN THERE IS A MOVEMENT TOWARDS RECONSIDERATION OF SUCH LAWS.

5.9.2 Some social implications

There is overwhelming societal acceptance and increasing legal recognition that it is ridiculous to keep alive the shell of a dead marriage and 'prevent perhaps all three of the parties settling down to a happier life in happier circumstances' (Finer Report 1974, Vol. 1: 81). To reach these happier circumstances all three parties in the divorce
situation must be considered, and a balance sought between individual freedom and happiness and mutual and societal supportive roles.

The non-custodial parent's continued involvement in the child and his development must be fostered by suitable legislation governing access and custody backed by supportive systems involving the social work and psychiatric professions.

Counselling, to prevent dissolution of possibly viable marriages, should be preventive rather than remedial and should be available and known to be available to all. Family courts, employing panels of experts, should save marriages or, in severing an irretrievable marriage, prevent the divorce becoming rancourous.

Legal experts, in conjunction with sociologists, psychiatrists and other experts, must make conscious efforts to provide, timeously, the legal framework which will more clearly define the roles of those involved in dissolution and reconstitution. Considering the proportions reached by divorce (in California one out of two marriages will end in dissolution), the numbers affected and the involved affinal relationships resulting are self-evident.

Such legislation must provide for the process of divorce, the parties to divorce (also in the transient state in case of remarriage) and the property of divorce. Nor must these efforts be confined to divorce. All forms of dissolution and reconstitution (such as separation and cohabitation) must be provided for by law and society.

Considering the stigma attached to the term divorce, there is perhaps considerable wisdom in promoting the use of the term dissolution as more expressive of the possible positive aspects. There must be the optimal machinery for the dissolution of marriage to preserve the institution of the family.
That their father lives with another woman now makes sense to them. I too had met someone else. Weekends the children and I either go to my fiancé's home -- he has a son of eight who is often there -- or they come here. The children are now perfectly adjusted. They will not suffer through the divorce. They will be happy if I remarry. We'll be one big family.

(From the researcher's interviews: Divorced mother of three)
6. FINDINGS

6.1 Introduction

The research began with a broad study of literature and other sources of information pertaining to the legal, social, economic and psychological aspects affecting, and affected by, the parents and children in different categories of lone-parenthood, particularly in the divorced and widowed situations.

Having selected the universe, which deliberately included custodial as well as non-custodial parents, a ramified, structured, open-ended questionnaire was evolved to be personally administered, and which would provide possibilities of yielding exploratory data in selected fields (see Methodology, 1.4). As has already been pointed out (see 1.4.6.1), it was realized that, in keeping with the nature of exploratory studies, not all the data garnered by the questionnaire, would be used in this study.

The information presented in the following chapter, largely in the form of tables, is gathered from replies to the structured questionnaire and data recorded by the researcher during interviews with the respondents only. The findings from the researcher's population are often evaluated and compared with those in the overview of the literature in chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5. A finding not tabled, common to all the subjects and worthy of recording, was the eagerness of the respondents to share their experiences as lone-parents with the researcher.

It must again be pointed out that the researcher, having restricted herself to a small universe of the White population drawn from two single-parent clubs in a South African city, the findings are pertinent to and characteristic only of the 70 respondents of her population.

6.2 General characteristics of the sample

The following tables are presented to bring out the main characteristics of the total sample.

The characteristics analysed cover marital status, sex and age, religion, home language, length of lone-parenthood, education, employment category, club membership, relationship to household head, number of children, residential zone and type of accommodation.

The information presented is gathered both from replies to the structured questionnaire and data recorded by the researcher during interviews.
## TABLE 1

**AGE OF RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq.01. AGE (12).)

The composition of the universe by age, sex and marital status is presented in the above table. There were 70 subjects, 48 (68.6%) women and 22 (31.4%) men. Of the 70 respondents, 57 were divorced, one was separated and 12 were widowed. The ratio of men and women happened to approximate the ratio which existed in the two organizations from which the sample was drawn. Both amongst the divorced and widowed, men constituted under one-third of these categories.

Of the 70, 40 (or 57%) were from 35 to 49 years of age, and 19 (27%) in the 25 to 34 years' old bracket.

While one third of the divorced were under 35 years of age, only one of the 12 widowed fell into this age cohort. On the other hand, one third of the widowed were over 50 years old as compared with under ten percent (six of 57) of the divorced. There was a tendency for the divorced women to be younger than the divorced men. Thirty-eight percent of the divorcées as against 22% of the divorcés were under 35 years of age.

The exact age of each respondent was recorded during interviews in the 'specify' section of sheets specially provided for the purpose (see 1.4.6.2). An analysis shows that the median age of the sample was 41 years. The median age of the divorced male was 42.9 years; the divorced and separated female was 37; that of the widower 46.5, and of the widows 45.4 years.
TABLE 2

RELIGION OF RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Reformed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Catholic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample consisted predominantly (70%) of Christians, non-Catholic denominations (50 of a total sample of 70 respondents). Besides Anglican (18) and Dutch Reformed (5) the other non-Catholic category of respondents were mainly Protestant, including Methodists and Presbyterians. The Pentecostal and Baptist churches were each represented by one respondent. Twelve of the respondents were Jewish.

TABLE 3

HOME LANGUAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The home language of 90% of the respondents was English and in five cases (7.1%) the home language was Afrikaans. In another two cases, categorized as 'other,' although respondents had lived in South Africa for over ten years, their home language remained German. The fact that such an overwhelming majority were English speaking may suggest that perhaps there is less subjective stigma among English speaking single-parents, but is certainly not indicative of the proportionate ratio of lone-parenthood among English and Afrikaans sections of the White South African population. The predominance of English speaking subjects makes it clear that the sample is not representative of the White population of the country.
### TABLE 4
LENGTH OF LONE-PARENTHOOD OF RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Divorced*</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 months to 3 years**</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq.01, LENGTH LP.ST.(18).)

* For divorced, the period is measured from the final decree and, in the case of repeated lone-parenthood the time span since the last divorce decree is referred to.

**Two of the divorced men and three of the divorced women from seven months to one year.

Almost half (33 or 47.2%) of the universe had been lone-parents for less than three years; 27% (19) had been of this marital status from six to ten years. Only two of the population (2.9%) had been single-parents for more than ten years. This may be indicative of a high incidence of remarriage particularly within the first three years of lone-parenthood. Having perhaps adjusted themselves to lone-parent status, not having remarried within the first ten years of marital breakdown, there are not many in this ten year category who join single-parent clubs.

One man and six women in the sample had been divorced twice; one man had been divorced three times. Two of the widows and one widower had been divorced, remarried and widowed. One of the divorcees had previously been a widow. All in all, for 17% (12) of the 70, it was not their first experience as lone-parents and of stepparenthood.
TABLE 5
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educ. Level</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18 39</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 01. EDUC (19).)

The educational level of the sample was divided into four groups:

(i) primary (up to and including standard six, eight years' schooling);
(ii) high school (12 years' schooling);
(iii) technical college; nine or ten years' schooling and a minimum of two years' technical course such as hairdressing or fitter and turner);
(iv) university (Bachelor's degree and higher).

One of the respondents who did not strictly fall into one of these categories is listed under 'other.' She had completed standard seven, followed by six months of typing school. All but six of the total sample, 91.4%, had a secondary or higher (university) educational level.

The proportion of those with a high school (or technical) level was approximately the same amongst the divorced and the widowed. There was, however, a noticeable difference in the proportion of university graduates. Only one in 12 (8.3%) of the widowed as compared with eight of 57 (14%) of the divorced had a university education.

Slightly more than one in six of the divorcees had a university education, compared with one in nine of the divorces. Of the divorced women one had obtained her university degree after the divorce. All the university graduates were pursuing the professions for which they had studied.
TABLE 6
EMPLOYMENT CATEGORY OF RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Category</th>
<th>Divorced M</th>
<th>Divorced F</th>
<th>Separated M</th>
<th>Separated F</th>
<th>Widowed M</th>
<th>Widowed F</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk/typist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-professional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq.01, EMP CAT (III).)

Six of the men were in professions including engineering, law, computers. Another six, tabled under 'other' included owners of comparatively small independent businesses such as a discotheque, and a clothing door-to-door sales business, as well as outside salesmen for national organizations.

In keeping with their educational level (see Table 5) six women fell into the professional class, including teaching and accountancy. All the women in 'trade' were hairdressers. The 'unskilled' women included shop counter-hands. Of the seven listed as housewives, three were earning some money from part-time employment, one painting and selling her pictures among the neighbours, one acting as companion to invalids, and one seamstressing. The two widows classified in 'other' were carrying on their husbands' businesses, and the 'other' divorcée operated a beauty parlour and sold cosmetics from home.

All but one of the sample considered themselves middle class (see Table 16).
### Table 7

**Length of Club Membership by Sex of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 to 5 months</th>
<th>6 - 11 months</th>
<th>12 - 25 months</th>
<th>Over 24 months</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures shown in the above Table reflect the period respondents were members of the two associations at the time of interview. Before leaving South Africa the researcher found that, in the organization from which the largest number of members of the sample had been drawn, almost all of the respondents were still members. An unusual occurrence in the one organization was the membership of both partners of a formerly married couple (as reunion was contemplated by them, this may have been the rationale for their affiliation which points out the latent function of these clubs — see Appendix F). The association had not been in existence for a sufficiently long time to be able to extract figures of average duration of membership. It is clear however from the data in Table 7, that joining the club was not merely a passing whim of the subjects. More than half of the universe had belonged to the organization for over a year. Club membership, it may be hypothesized, filled certain needs of the single-parent (see Appendix F).

### Table 8

**Relationship to Household Head by Marital Status of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divorced M</th>
<th>Divorced F</th>
<th>Separated M</th>
<th>Separated F</th>
<th>Widowed M</th>
<th>Widowed F</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household head</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter/son of household head</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 01, RELSH H/H (114).)

(Seq. 01, RELSH H/H (114).)
The majority of the sample, 84.3% (59), were household heads running their own homes.

Two men who were included in this category had rooms in boarding houses, one of these sharing a room in a 'second grade' establishment with his 18 year old son. Of the nine in the total universe classes as 'other,' five were divorcés. Therefore, of the 18 divorcés the 'others' comprised close to one-third.

This 'other' category included a man and a woman living in an experimental commune; also two men and two women in a living-together arrangement. Both the partners had the children with them. The cohabiters insisted on stressing that authority and responsibility were vested equally in both partners, male and female. Two divorcés, who had returned to their parents' homes with their children, also were listed as 'other.'

**TABLE 9**

**NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children per family</th>
<th>Divorced M</th>
<th>Divorced F</th>
<th>Sep. M</th>
<th>Sep. F</th>
<th>Widowed M</th>
<th>Widowed F</th>
<th>Total Families</th>
<th>Total Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total families</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 01, RELATIONSHIP (115.).)

Table 9 gives the families by size; this includes all children of all ages whether living with respondent or not, irrespective of whether the respondent was a custodial parent or not, and included adult children, married or unmarried, living on their own. There were 156 children.

There were 17 families with one child and 17 with three children, each. Approximately 25% of the men, but only 16% of the women had two children each. The largest families consisted of four children. Seven women (6.4%), including two widows, had such families. Only one male had four children. The median number of children per family in this universe
of 70, was 2.23. This is close to the findings of other researchers of lone-parent middle class families (Parks 1977).

TABLE 10
RESIDENTIAL ZONE BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq.01, RES. AREA (16).)

The homes of respondents were scattered geographically. One divorcée lived on the fringe of the city's commercial centre, while 13 others lived in the city, but were further removed from the centre.

Eleven respondents resided in middle-class suburbs (in Zone 2) between five and 12 kilometres from the heart of the city. Twenty-eight others lived in lower-middle and middle-class suburbs spreading from six to 36 kilometres in one direction (Zone 3). Seventeen were scattered in suburbs in an opposite direction (Zone 4) at similar distances from the city centre. The majority of the respondents worked in the city (Zone 1) commuting by train or bus. Seven out of 37 divorcées lived in Zone 2 compared with one of the 18 divorcées. Very probably this was for its proximity to the city's office-areas.

Almost half of the respondents lived in houses. These homes were mainly in areas being developed or in the initial stages of development or conversion. According to the respondents, there was less prejudice in these areas against selling or letting to lone-parents because there was less
demand for housing by intact, middle-class families in such localities. Categorization of the class of suburb was according to generalization by the researcher of the respondents' evaluations of the zones. Choice of residence of the respondents reflects by and large their subjective, middle-class evaluations (see Table 16) of their 'social class.' Even movement to worse accommodation translated itself, in many cases, into moving to the fringes of, and to fringe middle-class areas. Nevertheless, three divorced and one widow in the sample, in spite of their having moved into decidedly socio-economic lower-class residential areas, considered themselves middle class. It would appear that lacking a middle-class address, they related their subjective class evaluation to their employment.

TABLE 11
TYPES OF ACCOMMODATION BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>5 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>7 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18 39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 50% of the population (nine men and 25 women, 34 of the 70 respondents) lived in houses and 40% (28 respondents, seven men and 21 women) lived in flats (apartments). The eight subjects (11.4%) who constituted the rest of the 70 had other types of accommodation. Of the six men: one lived in a second-rate boarding house, sharing a room with his grown-up son; one lived with his parents-in-law; one lived in a hotel; one was boarding with friends; one was in living-together arrangements, 'sharing a room with the son' of his female partner; one man had joined a commune located in a ten-roomed house. Of the two women whose accommodation was listed as 'other,' one was a member of the commune previously mentioned and the second shared a flat during the week with a friend and joined her own parents during the weekends.

Seven of the 12 widowed (almost 60% of the widowed), compared with 27 (47%) of the 57 divorced, lived in houses. More divorced, over 50%, lived in houses, compared with 39% of the divorced men. Although
an accurate comparison cannot be made, in the South African National housing census of 1970, which includes widowed, the percentage of father-headed one-parent families living in houses exceeds that of mother-headed families in such accommodation (see Table III).

6.3 Economic aspects

The findings in the tables in this section explore the following economic aspects: Adequacy and sources of income, socio-economic class, history of employment and job changes. Housing of respondents, including movement categories, ownership and standards of accommodation are dealt with.

Some of the tables are amplified with illustrative material taken from the interviews with the respondents. The questionnaire for the following table was not aimed at establishing the amount of the income. Absolute figures were not considered by the writer to be a complete gauge of adequacy of income, with the fluctuations in the value of money and cost of living characteristic of the last few years. Sufficiency of income is dependent on numerous variables such as size of family, health, outstanding debts, mortgages, and standard accustomed to before single-parent status. In addition there are the expectations of the respondents, usually related to their previous life-style. Adequacy of the income for household needs of all the members of the family as assessed by the respondents is chosen as the yardstick for this table.

TABLE 12
ADEQUACY OF INCOME BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy of income for household needs</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th></th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th></th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the majority (54%) of the total universe considered their income sufficient for their household needs. Thirty-four percent thought they had too little to make ends meet. Just over 11%
were uncertain; they could make out with the household income but only if they budgeted most carefully and had no unforeseen expenses.

These figures, however, are found to be somewhat misleading if analysed either by sex or by marital status. Excluding those categorized as uncertain who are 'border cases,' 17 (50%) of the 34 divorcedes had an insufficient income while only 15% (four of 16) of the divorced males fell into this 'inadequate' bracket. Although drawn only from a small universe, the tendency of the woman feeling disadvantaged economically repeated itself in the widowed.

The figures in this Table, showing a greater proportion of insufficiency of income amongst women, are in keeping with most statistics and literature mentioned in the overview, including South African figures reproduced in Table II from the 1970 South African Census.

As a group, the widowed fared better than the divorced. Eight (72.7%) of 11 considered their income sufficient compared with 29 (58%) of the 50 amongst the divorced. These figures exclude the respondents who expressed themselves as 'uncertain.' Marsden (1969) found a similar tendency in his lower-class sample (see 2.3.1). A considerable proportion of the literature reviewed stresses the problems faced by the lone-parent family and by the lone-parent mother in particular (Wynn 1964; Marsden 1969; Holman 1970; La Grange 1970; Hunt et al. 1973). Most of the authors, especially more recent researchers, warn against ascribing problems associated with the single-parent family, to the marital status rather than the concomitants of economic disadvantage to which the 'broken home' is so prone (Herzog and Sudia 1972).

The sources of income shown in the following table are not listed in accordance with their monetary value. Respondents may have enjoyed more than one source of income and these are included in Tables 13 and 14. The 'other' sources of income include support from the 'living-together arrangement' partner, pensions (of the late spouse), insurance, sales of property and valuables and rental from the previous home. To facilitate the presentation of cross tabulation, separate tables are shown for men and women.
TABLE 13
SOURCES BY ADEQUACY OF INCOME BY MARITAL STATUS
OF MALE RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of income</th>
<th>Divorcés Insufficient</th>
<th>Divorcés Sufficient</th>
<th>Divorcés Other</th>
<th>Widowers Insufficient</th>
<th>Widowers Sufficient</th>
<th>Widowers Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alimony)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of other householder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives or friends*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social assistance**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq.02, SOURCES (E3).)

* Regular assistance from relatives and/or friends not living under same roof as respondent.
** From State or sectarian family agencies.

Only one of the divorced males was in receipt of social assistance, although strangely enough, he classed himself in the 'sufficient' income category and in South Africa there is a strict means test for those applying for aid. One of the divorced men was unemployed and, having no other source of income (he did not receive social assistance either), was not included in this Table.

It must be borne in mind that with regard to alimony and child maintenance, the man is at the giving and not the receiving end. His income, to be classed as sufficient, must make provision for these expenses. Of the seven divorcés who were paying child maintenance, three were also paying monthly alimony. This was, however, somewhat compensated for by the advantaged position the male enjoys as an earner both in this universe and as clearly shown in the overview of the literature. (See 3.2.2). But while sufficient for the situation, four of the seven divorcés stated they could not afford remarriage as their income was insufficient to maintain two families.
TABLE 14
SOURCES BY ADEQUACY OF INCOME BY MARITAL STATUS
OF FEMALE RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of income</th>
<th>Divorcées</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Widows</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (Alimony)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child maintenance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your work</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of other householder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives or friends*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social assistance**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 02, SOURCES (E3).)

* Regular assistance from relatives and/or friends not living under same roof as respondent.
** From State or sectarian family agencies.

There were 48 women in the universe. Of the divorced women (see Table 12), 17 had insufficient incomes, 17 sufficient and five fell into the 'other' category. Three times as many of the divorced women who had insufficient incomes were partly dependent on relatives, friends and social assistance, than those with sufficient income. Maintenance was only received by three of the 17 with 'insufficient' income as compared with seven of the 17 in the category classed as 'sufficient.' After earnings from employment, 'child maintenance' was the main source of income. The probability of forfeiting alimony from the ex-husband proved, in at least two cases, a disincentive to remarriage. In Marsden's (1969:235) lower class sample, where their social assistance was endangered, a greater proportion preferred to remain unmarried. Almost all the women were working, whether in the 'sufficient' or 'insufficient' income categories. All the widows were working full or part time. Of the four widows who had insufficient income (see Table 12) one was assisted by relatives and one received social assistance. Of the total
sample, all except one who received social assistance, claimed middle-
class status (see Table 16).

From the interviews

A male respondent found that having to pay maintenance for three
children was a drain on his finances. The children were on his medical
aid and he had to pay any medical expense not covered by this. He em-
ployed a charwoman several times a week. He ate out a lot, and meals,
even at cheaper restaurants can be more expensive than preparing meals
at home. He was not able to save money at all and was very afraid of
the future, should he or his children ever be seriously ill. He would
also be morally bound to help his ex-wife if she really needed extra
financial help.

Another male respondent summed up his economic position with
"I'm living!"

Some of the women in the sample reported confused and sad
stories. Others spoke more cheerfully.

One woman claimed that she was receiving a welfare grant for each
child. "I went to 'Welfare' because my income was insufficient before. I
did not get an allowance before for the children, so my position is now
better than before" (her husband's death).

A woman working as a counterhand claimed she had more income,
even though the amount was still insufficient, than she had had before
the divorce. She and her grandmother and ex-husband had run a boarding
house. Their boarding house business has gone insolvent. She also
had worked as a hairdresser for some time. Her husband drank heavily,
practically since the marriage and was, because of his drinking, unable
to control the business. For many months before the divorce the
family was destitute. The family suffered.

An educationalist, whose ex-husband was a professional too, was
used to a higher standard of living before the marital breakdown. She
reported she had to lower her standard since the divorce. She had gone
to the university after the breakdown, to equip herself with a more
remunerative profession and retain, by virtue of her own qualifications,
the social and professional class the family had enjoyed.

Another respondent described their post-divorce condition with
the word 'battling.' She had moved to a cheaper fringe area, into a
smaller house. She no longer kept a maid. For the two older children
she received R30.00 a month maintenance each and R.40.00 a month for the
youngest. "It made it possible to make ends meet. I also sold the new
car. I was without a car for a bit, then I bought this old ramshackle
one. I don't know what I'll do when it falls apart."

Most of the women complained that the financial settlement
arrived at to obtain the divorce "was worse than a compromise settlement." Maintenance for child hovered, they claimed, between R.25.00 to R.40.00
a month, which was far too little. Their children wanted to be like
others who had two parents and, in most cases, two working parents.
They wanted clothes and toys and to go to a cinema or an ice-rink and
pocket money.

For the purposes of Table 15 employment was defined as working
continuously for not less than three months for as recently as three
months before being interviewed.
Table 15

Employment now and before L.P. status by marital status of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent does</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not work now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes; works now</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not work before</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.P. status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked before</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the universe, 62 respondents (88.6%) were working at the time of the interview and only eight (11.4%) were not working. While they were in a two-parent situation, 24 (34.3%) never worked. The decrease in percentage of non-working parents was entirely due to the increase in the number of female single-parents who entered employment after they had become lone-parents.

Of the 32 divorcees working, 12 had not worked while in a two-parent situation. All eight of the widows were working at the time of interview, but four of them had not been in employment during their two-parent situation.

From the recorded data which amplified the table on adequacy of income and from the overview of the literature (see Table 12 and 3.1.2), it was clear that most of the women working did so largely for financial reasons. For some of the respondents employment was also a place for meeting people, and an escape from loneliness. These women were a minority.
TABLE 16
SELF-APPRAISAL OF CLASS RELATED TO OCCUPATION
BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class because of occupation</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower class because of your occupation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class because of your occupation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class because of ex-spouse's occupation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class because of your occupation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See 05, WHY CLASS DIV NOW (S43).)

Over 75% (54 of the 70) of the universe appraised themselves as belonging to the middle class; of these 54, 38 were women and 16 men. The overwhelming majority of the women (32 of the 38) categorizing themselves as middle class based their class association on their own occupation. Only six did so on the strength of their ex or late spouses' occupation. This is not in keeping with the overview of the literature (see 2.3.3) which considers males as being the determinants of social class, generally. The findings are more in keeping with an emerging minority view mentioned in the overview that, with the woman entering ever widening spheres of employment, the pay cheque establishes her as an independent determinant of her class.

There were only six women (four divorcées and two widows) who considered themselves middle class because of their late spouse's occupation. They would hardly have qualified on their own credentials: one was not working and was dependent on social welfare; one was unskilled; one pursued a trade; one had been insolvent. Lacking a middle-class occupational identity themselves they fell back on the ex/late spouse's credentials for status ascription.

The reasons given by those who were classified by the researcher as 'other' for this status, were rather interesting and are perhaps best expressed by this reply of one of the respondents amongst the divorced:
"I don't belong to any class. Being divorced is a class on its own."

TABLE 17
HOUSING MOVEMENT* BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not move</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved once</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved 2-4 times</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 02, MOVEMENT (A3).)

*Refers only to moving since becoming lone-parents.

Since becoming lone-parents, there appears to have been considerable change of accommodation by respondents in the sample. Seventy-seven percent had changed their address, more than two-thirds of these having moved two to four times. To probe whether the extent of change of accommodation was related to their single-parent status, Table 18 was drawn up.

TABLE 18
HOUSING MOVEMENT RELATED TO SINGLE-PARENT STATUS
BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection with lone-parent status</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your NOT moving is NOT connected</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your moving ONCE is NOT connected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your moving 2-4 times is NOT connected</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your NOT moving is connected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your moving ONCE is connected</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your moving 2-4 times is connected</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 02, MOVEMENT (A3).)
Housing movement by lone-parent status

A majority of 60% (42 of 70) ascribed their change/s in accommodation as being connected with their lone-parent situation. The reasons given by the respondents for changing address, were:

(i) In terms of their divorce settlement either the home was sold or the other spouse remained in possession of it.

(ii) The party retaining the home, whether widowed (where the house may have been left her in a will) or divorced, could not afford to keep up mortgage payments and/or maintenance, or rental.

(iii) A house or apartment was considered too large or too luxurious or uneconomic. It was let, and a smaller apartment, at a lower rental and easier and cheaper for maintenance, was hired.

(iv) The family moved to avert the prejudices associated with their new single-parent status. They felt their neighbours disapproved of their new marital situation.

(v) They wanted to be closer to their places of employment (Table 19) and public transport, shopping centres, creches, schools, other public amenities and relatives.

(vi) Two of the universe had immigrated to South Africa after their divorces overseas.

(vii) They themselves felt more secure, and particularly more at ease about leaving their children alone at home in an apartment block rather than in an isolated house. This was especially the case with several of the women.

(viii) One divorcé and one divorcée in the universe joined an experimental commune with shared household expenses and duties.

(ix) Three men chose to live in isolated peri-urban homes where their comings and goings would not be questioned by neighbours.

(x) One male and female divorced in the universe purchased a home jointly, renovated it and both moved in together, with their children, running it with the accepted division of role functions and duties in a home where both parents work, and sharing household expenses.

Amongst the women in the universe, 60% had moved or not moved because of lone-parent status. The men who had or had not moved for this reason, comprised 59% of the male sample.

Amongst the divorced, their marital status influenced 70% of the women in their decisions regarding residence, as against 50% of the men. The main reason was economic and this finding is in keeping with findings of other researchers reviewed in the study (Marsden 1969; Ferri 1976). More divorced women than men changed residence; the women moved more often than the men, and most of the moving, particularly that of the divorcées, respondents ascribed as resulting from their marital status.
In the case of the widowed, a quarter did not move as compared with 14% only of the divorced. There being but 12 widowed in the universe, the percentages derived may be merely indicative of lesser movement amongst the widowed than the divorced.

To gauge a correlation between changes in, or holding on to employment, for reasons connected with their single-parent status and changes in accommodation, the following Table 19 was drawn up from computerized cross-tabulations.

**TABLE 19**

LONE-PARENT-CONNECTED JOB CHANGES BY HOUSING MOVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not changed jobs for reasons connected*</th>
<th>Changed jobs for reasons connected*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your moving or not moving is not connected*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your moving or not is connected*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 04, JOB CHANGES (E8).)

* Connected with their lone-parent status.

In this Table there were nine 'other', four of whom had not changed jobs for reasons connected and five who had changed jobs for reasons connected with lone-parenthood. Their moving or non-moving was unrelated to changes of employment, while nevertheless related to their single-parent status.

Of the 31 (six males and 25 females), whose job movements (change or not) were connected with their lone-parent status, 14 (45.1%) related their housing movement (or not) to their single-parent connected job changes. There appears to be a definite correlation between job changes and changes in accommodation of lone-parents.
TABLE 20

JOB CHANGES RELATED TO LONE-PARENTHOOD BY MARITAL STATUS

(The table reflects the position since the lone-parent status. The term 'job' also includes the self-employed and part-employed and housewife)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not changed for reasons not connected*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed for reasons not connected*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not changed for reasons connected*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed for reasons connected*</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>12****</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 02, JOB CHANGES (E8).)

* Connected with their single-parent status.
** These 12 included three divorcées who were not working also before lone-parent status.
*** One of the divorcées lost his job for reasons connected with his single-parent status.
**** These 12 included one who was seamstressing, one painting for sale at home and one working as companion. All three were pursuing these activities sporadically.

It may be pertinent to bear in mind the South African economic climate for the few years preceding this study. Employees tended to hold on to their jobs as employment opportunities were limited.

Over 44% of the sample changed or did not change jobs for reasons connected with their lone-parent status. The reasons were varied, and, in order of importance were:

a) fear, now that the salary was usually the main or even the only source of income, of not finding other work in a tight economy with prejudice against the single-parent still further reducing their chances;

b) need to be close geographically to creche, home, public transport (particularly because of the children now in their sole care);

c) chances of meeting new or more people of the opposite sex;

d) convenient hours of employment and a short working week for the children's sake: often lone-parents cannot take on or stay in a job requiring shift-work.

e) discrimination by employers and co-workers;
f) consideration by employers of the needs of the children, such as being allowed off when a child was ill.

The extent of change or non-change of employment was much greater amongst the women than the men: Twenty-one of 47 women (over 50%), compared with six of 22 men (only 27%). This difference is partly explained by the fact that a greater proportion of women had the custody of their children or had to seek work for economic necessity (see Table 14), although some women in the universe took up employment for social reasons.

Job changes in the population revealed little difference between the widowed and divorced.

From the interviews

One divorcée recalled: "I've changed jobs three times since the break-up. I was a saleslady, a cashier, and now I'm a clerk with an insurance company. I knew nothing of clerical work when I started." Before the divorce came through she was a "nervous wreck," she said, and so she "took the easiest job at first." She wanted to change because of the "too pitying attitudes of fellow workers and to earn more."

Another woman summed up her situation with "I've held this job for five and a half years. The pay's lousy, but the fringe benefits are good. I'm sticking to what I have. Times are bad and there is nothing better at the moment."

TABLE 21

CATEGORY AND OWNERSHIP OF ACCOMMODATION BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and ownership of accommodation</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separ.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat; you pay the rent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House in your name; you pay mortgage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House; you pay the rent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House in ex-spouse's name but you pay mortgage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House in your name. No mortgage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other accommodation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 02, FLAT/HOUSE (A1).)
Of the 34 respondents who lived in houses (25 women and nine men), only six, all women (8.6 of the total universe of 70) owned homes free of mortgage. Five others were paying off the mortgages on houses registered in their names. Three of the divorcées were paying the mortgages on homes registered in their ex-husbands' names.

Nine women (18.7% of the females in the population) lived in houses for which they paid the rent. In one case (included in the Table under 'other accommodation') this divorcée's parents were paying the rent. The conditions of tenure for the semi-detached cottage she lived in, in a fringe area, is indicative of the prejudice exercised by some landlords against single-parents. The owner of the cottage, even in this zone, insisted the lease be drawn up with the divorcée's parents, who lived in a duplex in a very much upper-class residential area. Such prejudice is brought out in the overview of the literature (see 3.1.2.1).

Of the nine men living in houses, seven (31.8% of the males in the population) were in houses registered in their names, but still mortgaged. Two lived in houses for which they were paying rent.

Of the 27 (seven men and 20 women) who lived in flats (38.6% of the universe), none had ownership of the apartment; they were all paying rent.

Of the 11 categorized in the Table as 'other,' amongst the five women included, two were living in flats for which they themselves were not paying the rentals, (In one case a father paid; in another a boyfriend paid the rent); and one had moved back to her parents' house. See Table 11 for accommodation of 'other' two divorcées and six divorcées.

Two of the five widows lived in homes free of mortgage, compared with only four of 20 divorcées. These cells may however, be too small for arriving at any definite conclusions and may be merely indicative of a pattern.

From the interviews

A woman, who had to use her brother as a front to purchase the house which was in a fringe redeveloping area said "I have managed to make a home for the children. I bought this house in a bad area but where else will they allow a divorcée to buy? I'll try to make it a good home."

One man claimed to be comfortable and happy in his bachelor flat. He said: "It is adequate for my needs. I don't really live in it. It is serviced. All I need virtually, is a place to sleep."
TABLE 22

CHANGES IN STANDARD OF ACCOMMODATION BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation worse</td>
<td>5  16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than before*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation as</td>
<td>5  10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation better</td>
<td>3  5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than before*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5  8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18  39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4  8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 02, ACCOM (A2).)

* before lone-parent status

Table 22 shows that close to 40% of the universe considered that their changed accommodation was worse than that which they enjoyed in their married situation. Even this comparatively high proportion contains understatements. Amongst the 15 who listed themselves as 'others,' two women had retained their homes but could not maintain them at the same high standard as in the past. There was no money for a gardener or for refurbishing. One divorcée had moved back to her parents' home which was in a better area, but her relationship with her parents was such that she was loath to spend her free time at home, except when she had to look after her child. Another had moved into a commune which, she stated, had advantages, but the physical conditions and area were worse than where she had lived before single-parenthood.

Four of the five 'other' divorcés were in various types of boarding accommodation. They found it more convenient and less lonely in their lone status, but in their cases too, both the areas and the physical conditions they lived in compared unfavourably with the previous middle-class housing standards they were accustomed to. These cases bring up the percentage of 'worse' accommodation to 50% of the universe, with 24 of the 48 women in the universe and 11 of the 22 men having experienced a decline in the standard of their accommodation. This overall deterioration in accommodation is in keeping with findings in the literary overview in this research. Under 13% considered their new premises an improvement on their old, with the men faring slightly better than the women, 17% compared with 13%.
The broken-up cells of the universe were rather small and may be indicative only. Both men and women in this category were prepared, if necessary, to stint in other directions, such as entertainment and clothing, in order to live in accommodation they felt suitable for what they saw as expressing their social class. This finding, although from a small population, has not, to the knowledge of the researcher, been brought out in the literature and may be of some importance in considering reforms needed.

**TABLE 23**

**DIVORCED, SEPARATED AND WIDOWED WOMEN**

**CHANGE IN HOUSING RELATED TO LONE-PARENTHOOD**

BY STANDARD OF ACCOMMODATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Your NOT moving NOT connected*</th>
<th>Your NOT moving NOT connected*</th>
<th>Your NOT moving connected*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worse than before**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same as before**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than before**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Seq. 02, MOVEMENT (A3).)*

* connected with their lone-parent status  
** before the lone-parent situation.

The Table was extracted from computerized cross-tabulations and only figures for women are tabled, as a breakdown of males would be too small. The Table reflects the connection, if at all, between any change in the standard of accommodation and the lone-parent status of the 48 women in the universe.

The figures show that of the 20 (41.7% excluding 'other') females who considered their accommodation had deteriorated after becoming lone-parents, 17 connected this change for the worse with their lone-parent status. Of the six (12.5% of the 48) whose housing conditions had improved, only two related this to their single-parent status. Their ex-husbands were alcoholics, not in steady employment and were an economic liability rather than an asset, so that the family could not afford 'decent' accommodation before marital break-up.
Of the 22 men in the universe, ten had moved for reasons connected with their lone-parent status; seven of these (see Table 22) to worse accommodation than before marital dissolution; eight of the ten men had moved two to four times.

Overall, the finding in Tables 17 to 23 are in keeping with those found in the overview of the literature, that there is a correlation between the tendency to move and lone-parenthood, and that a correlation exists between moving to worse conditions and lone-parenthood. While the sample is not a large one, a distinct and direct correlation appears between moving, moving to worse conditions and lone-parenthood (the three).

From the interviews

One divorced mother and her baby went back to live with her parents. Although she was not paying rent and only contributing R.20.00 a month to electricity, she complained "living here puts me in a child category, like a baby. I probably tell my folks too much, anyway."

Another woman had been ejected from an apartment "after the rent cheque had bounced the first time. My child is well-behaved but the landlord complained he was noisy. He's cagey and found excuses because I'm divorced. He wanted me out all along, I'm sure."

One man had moved three times since the divorce: to another apartment in another suburb, to a hotel near his work, then to the 'commune' type house where he shared the bathroom, lavatory and kitchen with seven others. When married he lived in the apartment bought in his wife's name in a fashionable area in Zone 2 (see diagram A).

6.4 Adaptation

The lone-parent being part of a minority group in society, aspires to rejoin the two-parent majority or at least to be accepted by it. His re-entry into the mainstream of society and his adaptation, is influenced by subjective as well as objective aspects before, during and after the commencement of the single-parent situation.
TABLE 24
DEATH, DIVORCE, SEPARATION AS CRISIS
BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of spouse was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT a crisis in your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death WAS a crisis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce itself was</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT a crisis in your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce or sep.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itself WAS a crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 04, CRISIS (S6).)

The loss of a spouse, whether by death or divorce, is subjectively considered as a crisis by an overwhelming majority of lone-parents.

The overview of the literature (see 2.3.4) deals with the emotions experienced at the onset of the single-parent situation. It could therefore be expected that most respondents would experience crisis. It is also to be expected that with the widowed, where the shock is often sudden and usually accompanied by immeasurable grief and anguish on the actual death, they will be more subject to a feeling of crisis than the divorced. Divorce is usually preceded by turbulent relationships and the separation may even come as a relief. From the researcher's interviews, an aspect hardly dealt with adequately in the literature, the shocking crisis of parting with the children became apparent. This aspect may, for the divorced and separated who do not gain custody of the children, be the most traumatic.

Of the 12 widowed in the universe, all considered the death of the spouse as a crisis at the time. Almost 80% of the divorced expressed the opinion that the divorce itself was a crisis in their lives. Amongst the divorced, over twice the proportion of women as men considered the divorce as not having been a crisis in their lives (25.6% as compared with 11.1%). This difference could possibly be explained from some of the interviews with the divorcées. Three of them looked upon the final act of divorce as a decided relief after years of turbulence usually fomented by an alcoholic spouse.
Particularly in recent years the turbulence often preceding divorce has been dealt with in literature on single-parents and effects on children (Kelly and Wallerstein 1974-1977; Rosen 1977; Raschke 1977).

From the interviews

Talking about the difficulties he went through, a respondent placed great emphasis on the trauma of loss:

"The crisis experience was because of the break with the children. The realization that I would never see the children again was a shock for me. I lost my job. The whole situation was no longer reasonable. I had had a break with the kids. I felt it was the end."

Another respondent said he had been married for five years and during that time the marriage "had its ups and downs...I could not get the custody of the kids. I wanted the divorce but when it came through, I felt my world had come to an end."

A separated mother of three children described the feeling as "It's like your life has actually stopped. You are breathing and living but not really living." She claimed "I have pulled myself together, but I'm not over the crisis by any means" (seven months after the separation).

A divorcee, after 12 years of a 'good marriage' said he felt panic-stricken. "It was not the aloneness of the situation, but losing the person you love." In his 12 years of marriage "I had oriented myself to a family existence" and to him "a stable family existence came before anything else."

To one divorcée, however, the divorce was the end of 18 terrible years. "The bickering and fighting that went on before the divorce was the bulk of the crisis and not the divorce itself. The 18 months' voluntary separation was traumatic." She kept on feeling sorry for her ex-husband and forgiving him.

TABLE 25
FEELINGS OF DISCRIMINATION BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination as lone-parent</th>
<th>Divorced M</th>
<th>Divorced F</th>
<th>Sep. M</th>
<th>Sep. F</th>
<th>Widowed M</th>
<th>Widowed F</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has NOT felt discrimination. Has NOT interfered with your progress</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS felt discrimination. HAS interfered with your progress</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS felt discrimination. Uncertain whether interfered with progress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. OS, INTFRCE (53S).)
Half of the universe had experienced discrimination from some source and considered this as interfering with their social and economic progress and societal acceptance. In the overview of the literature too there are numerous illustrations of societal prejudice (E. T. Harris 1966; Schlesinger 1969; Ogg 1975, 1976; Hart 1976).

The widowed felt very much less discrimination than the divorced: only three (27.9%) of the 11 widowed respondents as against 30 (53%) of the divorced. This difference in societal attitudes strengthens the findings and opinions from the literary overview, where the widowed, divorced, separated and unmarried are ranked in this order of acceptance (Schlesinger 1975).

Regarding the difference between men and women in their feelings of discrimination, the male fared better than the female. While a majority of males, ten of 18, did not feel discrimination, the position was reversed with the females, and the majority, 22 of 39 DID feel societal prejudice. It may be theorized that this is due to the fact that social class is, according to most of the literature, established by the male. (Hart 1976; see 2.3.3) The female sometimes drops a social notch or two (Ogg 1976); this largely because of the decrease in income, as she generally earns less than her male peers (Coser 1964; Goode 1965; Podoluk 1968).

### TABLE 26

**SOURCES OF DISCRIMINATION BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By whom discriminated against:</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sept.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 05, DISCR. (S36).)

The Table scores the incidence of sources of discrimination mentioned by the respondents and these scores indicate their ranking. Co-workers and neighbours topped the list with the scores of 11 each, with employers following (eight). This perhaps partly contributes to the high rate of movement both in housing and in jobs of the lone-parent. It is of interest to note that no divorce male listed neighbours as a
source of discrimination. The entire score of 11 for this category of discrimination was borne by the divorcées. The greater acceptance by society of the divorced male shown in this small study is in keeping with the literature reviewed (Hart 1976). In relation to their numbers, the males suffered more discrimination from co-workers.

The following Table was extracted to gauge whether there is a relationship between feelings of discrimination and the experience of crisis felt by the divorced.

**TABLE 27**

DIVORCED AND SEPARATED RESPONDENTS' FEELINGS OF DISCRIMINATION BY EXPERIENCE OF CRISIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination because of lone-parent status</th>
<th>Divorce NOT considered a crisis</th>
<th>Divorce or separ. considered a crisis</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did NOT feel discrimination</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did NOT feel discrimination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELT discrimination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Crisis and discrimination for only the divorced were correlated as there was little experience of discrimination felt by the widowed in the universe.

Although the breakdown into cells reduced the numbers, there was a decided tendency for those who considered their divorce (or separation) a crisis to be more prone to feelings of being discriminated against: 58% (27) of 46 compared with 33.3% (four) of 12. Of the 30 women who considered the divorce (or separation) a crisis, 63.3% felt discrimination as against 50% of the men.

From the interviews

Some respondents were very bitter about the behaviour of their friends after their divorce. One man reminisced: "Hundreds of friends had just walked out of my sight." Another said, talking about the attitudes of friends: "Friends play one against the other." He had not found his 'friends' were true friends. He and his ex-wife had moved in a particular circle, which ended as soon as they got divorced.

A divorcée, despite her university degree, summed up her feelings of discrimination with "the divorce pulled me down a peg or two."
Employers, claimed several of the respondents, viewed prospective and even already employed divorced workers with disfavour and suspicion. "They look at you askance when employing you. They almost ask aloud 'Why the hell is he divorced?'

A female respondent had said "Some employers think that a divorced woman badly needs her job. Being divorced once often gets you a job. When you're divorced once, the others still accept you. You want to be accepted, but when they learn you're divorced twice, they look at you differently. Other women in the job think there's something wrong with you. I suppose men too."

There were those who opined that perhaps some of the discrimination felt was basically subjective. A middle-aged female respondent reiterated the opinions of some of the others when she said: "Discrimination could have been a chip on my shoulder. Married people were mostly patronizing. To be patronizing is the most degrading form of discrimination."

A good indication of the social readaptation of lone-parents is the frequency of their going out and patterns of friendships, be they new or old. Whether they retained their old friends or not is of interest. While this may be an indication of societal prejudice, a change of friends may also be because friends held in common by two people may be difficult to retain when they separate.

The following tables are presented as cross-tabulations from which various correlations are sought. With the breakdown into cells required by the computer system (CROSTAB2 1.4.6.4 and Appendix E) it was necessary for presentational reasons to table the male divorced, and divorcées and separated (female), in different tables. As the widowed sample is small, these findings will be summarized.

TABLE 28
FRIENDS OF DIVORCED AND SEPARATED FEMALE RESPONDENTS
BY FREQUENCY OF GOING OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle of friends</th>
<th>Frequency of going out</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared with before lone-parent status</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT with same friends (new friends)</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITH same friends (former friends)</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The term 'circle of friends' has been used to indicate a group of friends as opposed to odd, individual new or old friends retained or acquired.

There was one non-response.

These tables show considerable activity which could be interpreted as a craving by single-parents for friendship in their loneliness. Most reported the frequency of their going out with friends as being more than during their pre lone-parent status.

Of the 40 women in the sample, there were responses from 39 (38 divorcées and the one separated) which lent themselves to the cross-tabulations produced in the first of the two tables. Two-thirds (26) changed their circle of friends. Of these 26, six went out less frequently with their new friends and almost three-quarters (19) went out with these new friends more often than they had gone out with the circle of friends they had before they became single-parents.

Among the 26 women with new friends, the one divorcée who 'seldom' went out, was as equally disinclined to socialize as before. It is interesting to note that 13 of the 26 were going out more than once a week and seven others once a week. With 18 of them (13 + 5) this represented an increase in the frequency of going out.

Only one-third (13) had retained their pre-lone-parent status circle of friends. Of these, too, four were going out more than once a week and four -- once a week. They too were going out more frequently than before single-parent status, although with the old circle.

Adding these eight to the previous 18 mentioned (13 + 5), there were 26 women (two-thirds of the 39 divorced and separated in Table 28) who had increased the frequency of their going-out to once a week and more. Yet, according to Tables 31 and 32, only 13 said they no longer experienced loneliness. This tends to indicate that the going-out with friends may be but a help in curing loneliness or a defence against it and is not an indication per se of its absence. It could be postulated that feeling comfortable on one's own, there would be no need to go out frequently.
Like the table for the divorced and separated women, the above table for the male divorced also shows considerable activity in the going-out-with-friends patterns. This holds good for both the seeking out of new circles of friends and the increased frequency of going out with them.

Thirteen of the 18 were moving in new circles. Ten of those with new friends and three of those with old friends were going out more frequently than before. Fifteen of the 18 were going out once a week or more often. Of the 15, 12 fell into the more than once a week category.

Only four reported that they were going out less often with friends than before their lone-parent status, but even this less-than-before frequency, referred to once a week and more.

The reason for the men going out slightly more often than the women may partly be due to fewer of them having custody of the children, thus having more time in the evenings and feeling more alone.

Both for men and women, the increased patterns of their going out, in new circles particularly (according to anecdotal data, these drawn largely from their single-parent organization), strongly indicates their search for potential marriage partners, judging from the statistics in the overview of literature which mentions figures as high as 90% for the remarriage rate of the divorced, with lower remarriage rates for the widowed.
Amongst the widowed (not tabled) there were two non-responses. Two of the three widowers and four of the seven widows were going out more frequently than before the death of the spouse. Only one widow from the total sample of widowed went out less than once a week. Contrary to the overview of the literature (Schlesinger 1975), which shows less societal prejudice against widowed than divorced, and who would therefore be expected to have retained their old friends, most of them had made new friends. Perhaps societal stigma is more subjective amongst the widowed. On the other hand, as pointed out earlier, the possibility exists that with the widowed, as with the divorced and separated, friendships held in common by both spouses before marital dissolution may be difficult to maintain.

The widowed, particularly, comprise a small segment of a but limited universe. Further studies may be of interest.

Regarding the post-divorce contact with their relatives, it appears from the interviews that the women in the population were in more frequent contact with their relatives than the men, probably because they were dating less. The overview of the literature also suggests that divorcing males seek social networks outside the family during their post-divorce adjustment (see 3.2.3).

Figures 1 and 2 on the following page present the dating patterns of the divorced and separated in the population.

Of the 40 divorced and separated women in the universe, 42.5% (17) were dating. Included in these were seven who had 'weekending' or 'living-together' arrangements. Some correlation appears to exist between age of subjects and dating. Of the women 34 years old and under, 60% were dating as against only 30% of the 35 - 49 year olds.

Twelve (or almost 67%) of the 18 divorcées were dating, including the male over 60. In the two largest age cohorts the proportion is 75% of those aged 34 years and under and 60% of those aged 35 to 49 years. Compared with the divorced and separated females, a greater percentage (67% as compared to 42.5%) were dating. The 12 divorcées dating included four who had weekending or living-together arrangements.

While this male aggregate, when broken down into age groups, is too small to draw definite conclusions from, the findings certainly cannot be dismissed.

There were only 12 widowed in the universe. The numbers are rather small for breakdown and, at most, indicative trends only may be noted.

Of the eight widows, only one (12.5%), who had weekending arrangements, was dating, although three-quarters fell into the 35-49 years age cohort. Amongst the divorcées in this cohort, (as shown above), there was a 50% dating score. This discrepancy may be due to
FIGURE 1
DATING OF DIVORCED AND SEPARATED BY SEX AND AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>DATING</th>
<th>NOT DATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34 AND UNDER</td>
<td>75% (3)</td>
<td>25% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 49</td>
<td>60% (6)</td>
<td>40% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 AND OVER</td>
<td>50% (1)</td>
<td>50% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FIGURE 2
DATING OF DIVORCED AND SEPARATED BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION BY SEX OF 58 DIVORCED AND SEPARATED MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIVERSE</th>
<th>DATING</th>
<th>NOT DATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 MEN</td>
<td>67% (12)</td>
<td>33% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 WOMEN</td>
<td>42% (17)</td>
<td>58% (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
several factors. One such factor may be the fear of being labelled a 'merry widow' by a prejudiced society. Another may be the persisting emotional attachment to the departed spouse. Yet a third may be the intensified bond with the children, which lessens the loneliness and the need for new ties. All these are mentioned in the overview of the literature.

Of the four widowers, three were dating. Of these, two had week-ending arrangements. The one not dating was also the only widower who was over 60 years old.

**TABLE 30**
REMARRIAGE ASPIRATIONS BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do NOT wish remarry</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish remarry</td>
<td>15 34</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 39</td>
<td>1 4 8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish remarry now</td>
<td>6 10</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish remarry later</td>
<td>8 24</td>
<td>1 2 5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain when, but wish to remarry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>15 34</td>
<td>1 4 8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See. 05, YOU REMARRY (S31).)

An overwhelming majority of 87.2% of the universe expressed a desire to remarry. Only two respondents (2.9%) who had living-together arrangements were uncertain.

There are no significant differences in the marital aspirations of the men and the women in the population.

Interestingly, the separated mother in the universe also wished to remarry, even though, in the course of the interview, she expressed a lingering hope for marital reconciliation. Though but a single case, it happens to fall in with Marsden's (1969) findings that, in the case of men deserting, there remains an emotional attachment by the woman who did not even seek a divorce and may very likely remain separated.
The widowed, with but one exception, also aspired to remarriage.

Relating the numbers from this table to those in Figures 1 and 2 on dating, it shows that the percentage of those dating does not coincide with the percentage of those aspiring to remarry, but perhaps opportunity does not match wishes. This is particularly true of the women as they are more restricted by society in their social contacts. Amongst the widows only one was tabulated as dating, whereas almost 90% aspired to remarriage. Whereas only 42% of the divorced and separated females were dating, over 86% aspired to remarriage.

In the case of the males, dating figures were closer to their marital aspirations -- a 66% dating average, compared to 83%, wishing to remarry. All the non-custodial parents declared themselves to be in the marriage market. Remarriage aspirations are probably a reflection of the main reason for membership of the single-parent club (see Appendix F). The percentages shown are in keeping with the high figures for remarriage mentioned in the overview of literature, amongst lone-parents in general and particularly amongst the divorced (Goode 1956; Glick and Norton 1976; see 2.7.1 and 3.1.4 and 3.2.5). The redressing of the maternal or paternal deprivation suffered by their children was not the reason or the only reason for the lone-parents' wish to remarry. The great majority of the respondents in the sample hopefully looked upon single-parenthood as a transient state (Hunt 1968; Hart 1976). There was almost a universal desire for companionship and return to a 'couples' society.

From the interviews

Upon being asked their views on remarriage, respondents, although aspiring to remarry, advised a cautious approach, no doubt based on their own experience. Comparing the position and attitude of widows and divorces, a younger divorcee, a mother of two said: "A widower with children needs a wife and probably finds it easier to get remarried, because of no hangups as in the case of divorces. Age also has a lot to do with it, in advocating remarriage or not. Generally, the older lone-parent is more set in his ways and it is advisable for him to remain single," was this respondent's opinion.

A divorcee, mother of three grown-up daughters, felt one should "never jump into marriage." She advised that one must "first experiment by living together, but not get married because of the children." She explained her conclusion with: "The kids are growing up and when they want to leave home, it's goodbye mom and they are gone!"

A widow was concerned about the problems brought about through stepparenting. She said: "Stepparents can be terrible to kids. Also sometimes the other side has to financially support and keep in touch with their own kids too. It can become a real mix-up."

The separated woman said she could not so easily give an opinion about others as she was bogged under in an attempt to appraise her own position. "I don't feel free and I don't feel married. At the moment I don't really know what I am."
Figures were extracted from computerized cross-tabulated data to examine the possible correlation between feelings of guilt about the divorce and the experience and persistence of loneliness. As the breakdown reduces the cells, data were tabled for the two dominant groups, the 39 divorced women and 18 divorced men.

### TABLE 31

**DIVORCED FEMALE RESPONDENTS WANTING TO REMARRY: FEELINGS OF LONELINESS BY THEIR FEELINGS OF GUILT ABOUT THE DIVORCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>You did not feel guilty before or now*</th>
<th>You did feel guilty but not now</th>
<th>You did not feel guilty but do now</th>
<th>You did and still do feel guilty</th>
<th>Uncertain about feeling guilty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>You experienced loneliness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For about 6 mth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 yrs.+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You ARE STILL experiencing loneliness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Seq.04, GUILT (S8).)*

*'now' is at the time of interview with respondent.

**One woman divorced for under six months gave no reply to wanting to remarry or not. She was the only respondent who had been a lone-parent for this short period.*

Of the 34 women who aspired to remarriage, 47% (16) had not felt guilty about the divorce. Of these 16, 37.5% (six) had never felt loneliness, and one was uncertain; with 31.2% (five) the loneliness had lasted for about six months and with the remaining 25% (four) the loneliness had persisted for about a year with two respondents, and over two years with another two.
Of the 50% (17) who had felt guilty at the time of the divorce, only 23.5% (four) stated they had never felt loneliness, and one was 'uncertain.' With 17.6% (three) the loneliness had lasted for about six months and of the remaining 52.9% (nine) the loneliness continued for about a year with one divorcee and for over two years with the other eight.

There therefore appears to be less tendency for feelings of loneliness and the loneliness tends to be of shorter duration amongst those who did not feel guilty about the divorce compared with those who did feel guilty. Although the numbers involved are comparatively small, the findings suggest that this aspect deserves further study. Regarding the correlation between guilt feelings and the experience of loneliness at the time of interview, the Table shows that of the 12 who still experienced feelings of guilt about the divorce at the time of interview, only three (25%) were 'not experiencing feelings of loneliness now,' (two were uncertain), compared with nine (42.9%) of the 21 who did not feel guilt now. This again points to some positive correlation between guilt and the experience of loneliness. Almost 65% (22 of the 34 respondents) experienced loneliness while 29.4% (ten) did not and two were uncertain. Amongst 20 of the 32, feelings of loneliness still existed at the time of interview.

**TABLE 32**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVORCED FEMALE RESPONDENTS NOT WANTING TO REMARRY: FEELINGS OF LONELINESS BY THEIR FEELINGS OF GUILT ABOUT THE DIVORCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You did feel guilty, but not now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You experienced loneliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You ARE STILL experiencing loneliness now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Seq. 04, LONENESS(S7).)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amongst the four divorcees who did not wish to remarry, there was none who had never experienced guilt about the divorce, and all four experienced loneliness which persisted for at least a year. The two who 'felt and still do feel guilty about the divorce' still experienced feelings of loneliness at the time of the interview.
While the population is obviously too small to draw conclusions from, the findings may be of some interest. There is a suggestion that those who have guilt feelings about their divorce are less likely to seek remarriage than those who do not have feelings of guilt. While all those not wishing to remarry had experienced guilt, (Table 32) almost 40% of those wishing to remarry (see Table 31) had not felt any guilt. Regarding the relationship between feelings of guilt and loneliness, this Table (32) supports the findings in the previous Table, that there was a positive correlation between the two emotions.

The one separated subject (not included in this Table) felt guilty before and still felt guilty (at the time of interview) about the separation. She did not respond to the question about loneliness. She questioned her adequacy as a wife.

**TABLE 33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVORCED MALE RESPONDENTS WANTING TO REMARRY: FEELINGS OF LONELINESS BY THEIR FEELINGS OF GUILT ABOUT THE DIVORCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>You experienced loneliness for about 6 months</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 yrs+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **You are still experiencing loneliness**                      | You did not feel guilty before or now | You did feel guilty but not now | You did not feel guilty before but do now | You did and still do feel guilty | Uncertain about feeling guilty | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| No                                                             | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | 6 |
| Yes                                                            | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 9 |

(Seq. 04, GUILT (58).)
Fifteen of the 18 divorced men in the universe aspired to remarriage. Of the 15, 40% (six) had not felt guilty before about the divorce (although one of them expressed feelings of guilt at the time of the interview). Of these six, two had never felt loneliness; with three the loneliness had lasted for about six months and with the remaining respondent for over two years. Of the 53.3% (eight) who had felt guilty at the time of the divorce, only 12% (one) said he had never felt loneliness; with 25% (two) the loneliness had lasted for about six months and with the remaining 62.5% (five) the loneliness had persisted for about a year in two cases, and over two years in the other three.

The above findings for the divorced men wanting to remarry, therefore are in keeping with the findings in the Tables for the divorced women (see Tables 31, 32) -- that there is a tendency for those feeling guilty about their divorce to experience loneliness and for a longer period, than those not feeling guilty.

Of the 15 respondents in Table 33, 80% (12) had experienced loneliness, compared to 65% of the parallel divorced women's cohort in Table 31. However, the divorced men's loneliness appeared to be less persistent than that of the divorcées. With 25% (three) of the 12 men, loneliness was no longer experienced at the time of interview. This compares with under ten percent (two out of 22) in the case of the divorcées in Table 31. Hetherington et al. (1977) found a similar tendency amongst the men as compared to the women in their sample with regard to identity problems and changes in self-concept of the divorced parent.

Many of the respondents' feelings of guilt about the divorce was guilt at their depriving their children of their second parent.

All the four widowers (all wanted to remarry) felt loneliness for a year and longer and in the case of three of them, this loneliness was still felt at the time of the interview. Three of the four widowers felt some guilt about the death of their wives. The one who did not, was aware of the possible terminal nature of his late spouse's illness. Of the eight widows, seven of whom wished to remarry, all but one felt loneliness for a year or longer, a feeling which persisted with all. Seven of the widows had no feelings of guilt at the time of their spouses' death, but of these, six felt guilty 'now.'

From the interviews

The following extracts from interviews reflect some of the guilt and loneliness so many felt.

"It's a new kind of existence -- it's very difficult to explain. The hardest part is knowing that you must decide on everything alone."

Asked about feelings of guilt, the respondent said she did not feel easy about her children. "Perhaps for their sake" she should have
"Humbled and kept the marriage together." From the children's viewpoint she felt guilty that she had "not done enough to keep the marriage together."

She had spurts of loneliness after breaking up with a boy-friend. Respondent has had about three or four relationships, but has "also been treated like trash, to be slept with and cast off." Since the divorce she feels "terrific," but when she does not have a relationship ("love affair going on") she feels "remorseful and alone."

Other respondents denied feeling lonely. One man, shaking his head quite emphatically said: "I am not a person to feel lonely. The biggest thing is feeling sorry for oneself. That is worse."

Other divorced men and women felt no guilt but did feel loneliness, yet relief that a turbulent marriage had come to an end.

"No! Heil! I felt I did try and save that marriage. I would have done anything to save it!" She had felt lonely from very early in the marriage; when her child was born, she was already separated.

Perhaps the difficulty of the situation was best summed up by an Afrikaans speaking female -- "Jy is in 'n ander wereld dan -- 'n mens voel uitgesluit omdat jy alleen staan, met die gevolg dat jy nie uitgaan nie."

Perhaps the strongest reason for most of the respondents having joined the lone-parent clubs, from which the universe for this research was drawn, was summed up by the above quotation (in Afrikaans) from the interviewee. Translated this would read: 'You are in another world -- a person feels shut out because you are alone, with the result that you do not go out.'

TABLE 34

REASONS FOR JOINING LONE-PARENT CLUB BY SEX OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for joining club</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You were lonely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You felt 'unwanted' in a couples' society</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You wanted to get away from your 'two-parent' responsibilities which you as a lone-parent have to cope with</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You wished to discuss your problems with other single-parents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You wanted to make new friends</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You wanted to meet widowers/widows</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You wanted to meet the divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 03, MEMBERSHIP REASONS (S2).)

Basing the questions for this Table on the overview of literature and the information gathered during the preliminary enquiries, the
writer placed emphasis on the social reasons for joining the club, but, as usual, included an 'other' category in this question, for noting unexplored reasons. The responses bear out what Hunt (1968) terms as the 'latent' functions of such clubs (see Appendix F).

Sixty-seven of the 70 respondents gave as their reason for joining the search for new friends, while almost two-thirds cited 'loneliness' as a cause.

The repeated statement in the overview of the literature, of society being a 'Noah's Ark world' is reflected in the responses of over 52% of the sample who felt 'unwanted in a couples' society.' There were no startling reasons for joining the clubs offered in the 'other' category, which tends to bear out the largely purely social basis for club membership. Among these 'other' reasons were to avoid the ex-husband's Saturday night visits; to escape the efforts of relatives to pity them by inviting them over to "profitless couples' family entertainment" and to introduce their children to other members of the club.

The importance attached by the parents to the last-mentioned reason was brought out by the respondents' assessment of the objectives of the single-parents' associations. This information was obtained by the researcher from the replies and discussion around question (S3) in sequence 03 in the questionnaire (see Appendix A). Thirty-nine of the 70 (28 women and 11 men) considered the objectives to include providing opportunities for children of lone-parents to meet and go out together; and over 40% of the 70 (29 -- 19 women and ten men) thought the club in fact helped lone-parents cope with the social needs and demands of their children. Although several respondents expressed some reservations, as illustrated in 'From the interviews,' the lone-parent clubs, in varying degrees, to most of their members, filled some vacuum in their lives.

From the interviews

A widower reported "One day, feeling lonely and depressed, I looked in the newspaper and phoned. I scotched myself up and went to the first house-party. It was my first in two years. I imagined my late wife was giggling at me all the time and more scotch produced more giggles. The club's fine for a cuddle and a booze."

A widow said, 'My mom had seen the advert in the paper. She pulled it out and phoned for me. I felt lost at the first meeting. There were so many females and they all seemed to be mistrusting and worrying about either catching or losing a man. I felt an absolute 'wallflower,' and this was a terrible feeling. I've stopped going to meetings and house parties, but I take the children to family outings. No one makes real friends there, but the children love it."

A divorced male summed up his view with "I expect very little of the club. I just wanted to belong to something, to feel and know there was somewhere I could go to. It's not important at this stage whether I make friends or not. I have not yet fixed up my home to invite people over."
Another divorcé opined: "I was lonely and guilty at the beginning, after the divorce. Ours had been a stormy marriage. My wife complained and nagged a lot. I had to force myself, after the divorce, to go and meet people and go out. So I joined, aware that I had to go somewhere organized and easy at the beginning. Another reason was I wanted, through contact with others like myself, to learn how to cope with my situation. I wanted hints on how to bring up the children. Listening to their problems I could compare my situation. I needed assurance that others were coping."

A divorced woman, an attractive middle-aged professional, who had stopped going regularly to club functions, remarked cynically: "It's not my scene. The men are really a lot of 'relics' and 'has beens.' It's all a big act -- the women sparkling, while meantime back at the ranch..."

6.5 The children

The overview of the literature (Chapter 4) showed that children were affected in varying manner and degree because of turbulent home conditions before, during and after marital breakdown, and/or other difficulties related to lone-parenthood, including problems caused by the lack of an ongoing relationship between lone-parent and child.

The findings in this section are introduced by two Figures which give a composite picture of the structure of the families (and their relationships) of the dominant marital cohort (the divorced) in the universe of the study. The one separated mother is included with the divorced in Figure 4. The Figures illustrate graphically the relationship between the 58 respondents, whether custodial or non-custodial, and their children and between both parents; with which parent, if at all, the child is living and whether the non-respondent spouse has remarried and, through this remarriage, brought half and/or stepsiblings to the respondent's children.

The above relationships are all interlinked and affect and reflect parental roles and adaptation to their new familial situation.

For the purposes of Figures 3 and 4, the researcher analysed responses to the question about the children's contact with the non-custodial parent in the questionnaire, and drew upon the anecdotal data accompanying this to categorize degrees of relationship. While division could not be rigid as patterns of visitation varied greatly, the researcher decided upon the undermentioned situational guidelines for categorizing into the following five classifications the degree of non-custodial parent-child relationship:

1) A full ongoing relationship is indicated by four shaded squares in the figures and applies to situations such as:
   a) where the child sees the non-custodial parent on a regular and frequent basis such as at least one day a week or such as weekends or alternate weekends.
   b) where the child is at a distant boarding school and does not come home for weekends, if the child spends at least part of
each end-term holiday with the non-custodial parent.
Of the four parents in the universe who had children at
boarding school, all fell into this category.

2) A steady ongoing relationship is indicated by three shaded
squares and describes patterns of contact between the child and the
non-custodial parent such as visits once a fortnight, including
an occasional weekend.

3) A medium ongoing relationship is indicated by two shaded squares.
This describes situations such as visits once a month, where the
child spending at least several hours of the day with the non-
custodial parent; or, where the non-custodial parent resided
overseas, a letter at least once a month and a visit by or to
the non-custodial parent once a year. One child living with
her mother overseas fell into this category.

4) A weak ongoing relationship is indicated by one shaded square.
This describes situations such as visits at least every two months;
or, where the non-custodial parent resided in another province or
overseas, a letter or telephone call once in two months.

5) No relationship is represented by four blank squares and indicates
that all contact between the non-custodial parent and the family
has ceased.

The degree of interparental ongoing relationship, which, more often
than not, appeared to affect child-non-custodial parent relationship, is
similarly represented according to the proportion of the squares shaded
of the four allotted to each case, and here too the classification was by
the researcher from anecdotal data. The classification, representation
and the guidelines used are as follows:-

1) A close ongoing relationship: by four shaded squares and
describes personal contact (or, if geographically distant,
telephonic or postal contact) at least once a fortnight.

2) A steady ongoing relationship -- three shaded squares and
describes communication as above once in three weeks.

3) A medium ongoing relationship -- two shaded squares and
describes communication as above, once a month.

4) A weak ongoing relationship -- one square and describes
communication once in two months.

5) No relationship is represented by four blank squares.
**Figure 3**

Families of Divorced Fathers: Ongoing Relationship Custodial and Non-Custodial Parents, Parents and Children • Sex and Home of Children
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WITH X-SPouse</th>
<th>ON OWN SINGLE OR MARRIED</th>
<th>WITH WHOM CHILDREN LIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.C. (Non-Custodian)</td>
<td>S.C. (Shared Custody)</td>
<td>O (Overseas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 = Second Divorce; Or Mother And/Or Child Of First Marriage
3 = Third Divorce
There were 18 divorced fathers in the universe, the parents of 37 children, of whom four were living on their own, married or single. Of the 18 fathers, 39% (seven) had the custody of children. Of these seven custodial fathers, three had split custody. It is interesting to note that, in the one instance, the father had the custody of the opposite sex child, a daughter of 12, while the mother had that of the son of nine. In another case, the father had the son of eight, with the mother having custody of the nine year old son and 12 year old daughter. Included in the divorced fathers' custody were two sons of eight and one daughter of five. The ex-wives of the 18 divorced men in Figure 3 had, in their custody, 23 (70%) of the 33 children. These 23 children were made up almost equally of boys and girls, with the sons ranging from seven to 17 and the daughters from four to 20. It is therefore difficult to discern in Figure 3 any strict application of either the tender age or same-sex considerations which the overview of literature cites as being the basis for the best interest of the child principle for granting custody.

In two thirds of the cases in Figure 3 there is a full ongoing relationship between the children and their non-custodial parents, including three of the four non-custodial mothers; the fourth resided overseas. The links between the spouses themselves were less close but with 39% (seven) of the total, these could still be categorized as close. Whereas there was no ongoing relationship in 11% (two) of the cases between non-custodial parent and children, in 33.3% (six of the 18) there was no such interparental relationship.

The figure also shows that four of the ex-spouses of the 11 non-custodial fathers had remarried (as shown, one non-custodial mother had also remarried), and in two of these cases children had been born of these remarriages. Although in the one case the links with the non-custodial parent had been severed completely, in the other case the non-custodial father's child had gained a stepfather and a half-brother, while retaining 'medium' links with his natural father.

According to the definition of the one-parent family, as appears in the overview of literature, of the 18 divorced males, 11 are not heads of such families. They are included in the survey for reasons explained in the methodology (see 1.4.5.3). The same applies to three of the divorced females in Figure 4.
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Figure 4 illustrates the extent of the relationships between the 39 divorced (and the one separated) mothers in the universe of the study with their children and ex-spouses. The 40 mothers (57% of the population) were parents of 92 children, 48 sons and 44 daughters. These children constituted 59% of the 156 children of the parents in the universe. There were three non-custodial mothers and two other mothers had shared custody. The children varied in ages. The youngest child was two years old, the eldest were in their twenties and married. The breakdown of children by age and sex, by parental marital status, is detailed in Table 35.

Figure 4 shows that 30% (12) of the 40 women have a close ongoing relationship with their ex-husbands and in these 12 cases, which include two non-custodial mothers, there is also a full ongoing relationship between the children and the non-custodial parent. Ten percent (four), although having no communication with their ex-spouses, do have a full ongoing relationship with the children. In only 15% (six) of the 40 cases comprising Figure 4, is there no ongoing relationship whatsoever between the children and the non-custodial parent compared with 32% (13) where there was no such interparental relationship.

All three non-custodial mothers included in Figure 4 sustained their relationship with their children who remained with the ex-spouse. Any severing of ties with the children was with non-custodial fathers. It appears therefore from Figures 3 and 4 that mothers who do not have custody tend to keep in touch with the children more than fathers who do not have custody.

The Figures show that almost all the non-custodial parents, separated as they were from their children by marital dissolution, still wished, in varying degrees, to continue to be parents. This non-custodial parent-child bond exceeded somewhat the bond between the ex-spouses themselves. But there usually remains, both with the ex-spouse and, especially, with the children, an ongoing relationship. The findings in this population are in keeping with information from the overview of literature. In Rosen's (1977) study, 90% of the children in her sample had maintained an ongoing relationship with the non-custodial parent. Hetherington et al. (1977) mentions a similar trend. Both Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) and Rosen (1977) found instances where a closer relationship developed between non-custodial parents and the children after divorce.

It is shown (in Figure 4) that 11 of the ex-husbands have remarried, ten have step or natural children from their new partner, step (or half) brothers or sisters (in addition to the stepfather) to the children involved in the universe. The relationship with this new extended kin is
not in the scope of this research, although included in the overview of the literature. It is an interesting aspect for further study.

From both Figures 3 and 4 it appears that remarriage of the non-custodial parent does not necessarily break the relationship between this parent and the children of the ex-spouse. There is a slight hint in Figure 4 that when the non-custodial father has remarried and has step or natural children from his 'new' wife, this apparently does not affect his relationship with his children of the former spouse, though it does reduce his contact with his ex-spouse. On the other hand, in Figure 3, and here it must be borne in mind that only two cases are involved, there is a suggestion that when the custodial mother has step or natural children from her 'new' husband, the contact with the non-custodial father ceases or is reduced.

It is interesting to compare the information concerning the children in Figures 3 and 4. It is seen that the respondent mothers in Figure 4 had in their custody 78 (almost 92%) of the 85 children (excluding the seven living on their own), and only three (75%) of the mothers were non-custodians. The proportion of custodial divorced fathers and the children in their care, did not complement the above figures. These non-custodial fathers formed not 90% but only 61% of the divorcés and the children in the custody of seven of the 18 males constituted 30%, not eight percent of the divorced men's children.

It would therefore appear that divorced males having custody of their children, are more prone to join single-parent associations. It is uncertain whether they do so to get guidance for their roles as parents or in search of future mothers for their children. To a lesser extent there appears to be a suggestion that custodial mothers tend more to join lone-parent organizations than non-custodial mothers. Rosen (1977:258) in her South African study, mentions proportions of 25.8% children being in father custody and 74.2% in mother custody. This is a much higher father-custody figure than found in the United States (see 4.3).

Of the universe, 20% (14) of the respondents had living-together or weekending arrangements; seven divorced women (four living-together and three weekending arrangements), four divorced men (two living-together arrangements and two weekending arrangements) and two widowers and one widow with weekending arrangements. All the living-together arrangement couples had already been cohabiting for at least one year. For reasons of anonymity, the 14 respondents are not identified.

In four of the cases where there were living-together arrangements, both parties to the arrangement had children who shared the home with them. Household expenses were shared, with the accepted intact-home division of role functions. In one case the home was purchased jointly by the man and woman.
Some of the possible social and legal implications of living-together arrangements households have been reviewed in the overview of literature (see 2.6).

From the interviews

The following is but one example of the tenseness, tension, intensity and concern in many an ongoing relationship between a non-custodial parent and his child.

The respondent, divorced on the grounds of desertion, his wife having left him, is the non-custodial father of an adolescent boy. The respondent has a room and boards with his parents-in-law in an old, but well maintained house in a lower-class suburb. He and his ex-wife were both heavy drinkers and at one stage, before the divorce, his son was placed with his parents-in-law by the social worker. His son visits him at his parents-in-law regularly every weekend. His mother-in-law cleans his room, does his laundry, cooks his food. He pays her monthly board and lodge. Towards the end of the interview this respondent again repeated "I'm worried as hell about the kid. He's all I have. What more can be done?"

A custodial mother, whose two sons and daughter spent every school holiday with their father, living in another province, summed up the effect the visits had on the children with: "They have divided loyalties when they come back from their holiday with their father. I see them fighting back many tears. I let them phone him, even if the bills shoot up. The novelty wears off, and they settle down. Then the problem starts all over again with the next holiday."

A non-custodial father said: "I never run his mother down. He lives with her. I guess he loves us both. She can't really handle the boy and she expects me to punish him, once in a fortnight for things past."

A father who had no contact with his child at all, said sadly: "We're still mommy and daddy."

A custodial mother expressed her dissatisfaction at her ex-husband's irregular pattern of visiting with: "It's called reasonable access, but he pitches up at all odd times."

A non-custodial mother said: "He kept the house. It was important for his ego and shattered reputation to get the custody of the children. There was a lot of gossip about this man I was living with at the time. The children come here to my place every second Saturday or Sunday. Their father drops them at my place and pops in to have a drink. I drive them back to his place, but don't go in."

A custodial mother summed up her situation very bitterly with: "I would like their father to be out of their life completely. When they hear from him or see him, their guilt, their necessity to decide who's really to blame starts all over again, and so does mine."
TABLE 35
CHIL DREN ACCORDING TO AGE AND SEX BY RESPONDENTS' MARITAL STATUS AND SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>With which spouse children live</th>
<th>0 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 12</th>
<th>13 and over at home</th>
<th>Married or on own</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>with self</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and separated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with ex-husband</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>with self</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with ex-wife</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widows</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total child ren</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seq.01 (AGE (12.)

The researcher has classified children in the tabled age brackets in view of the following:

(i) 0 - 5 years: In South Africa, six is school-going age, and children five and under, are therefore pre-schoolers.

(ii) 6 - 12 years: In this age group children cannot, generally, be left on their own for any length of time. The movement and activities of children of this age are therefore often restricted.

(iii) 13 years and over: Children over thirteen are, by and large, already more mature and more independent and can generally be left alone during the day. These children are often more involved in peer-group activities, and can usually commute to schools, friends and activities, particularly in the daytime without adult escort, although some parents still feel that their 13 to 15 year old daughters do still require escorting.

Of the 156 children whose parents formed the universe, there was only one under two years of age. Tapp et al. (1963) had in their universe (by coincidence) also 156 children with only two children under two years.
of age. Only 23 children, under 15% of the total, were five years and younger. In the six to 12 years' cohort, there were 30% of the children, and 44% (excluding the 11% married or living on their own) were 13 years and over. Of those living at home in this age group, just over 30% were over 17 including four (5.8%) older than 20.

The relatively low percentage of children five years and under, is, judging from the overview of the literature, not indicative of the percentage of pre-school children in lone-parent families, as most divorces occur in the earlier years of marriage, while the children are still young. This low percentage may, however, be a reflection of membership of single-parent organizations, with parents of younger children tending not to join such associations, possibly because these pre-schoolers need parental care more than older children.

There were nearly twice as many girls as boys in the age range 0 - 5 years, with the position reversed in the 6 - 12 age range. This may have been merely incidental. Of the children over 13, the girls and boys were equal in number. Bearing in mind that most of the respondents in the universe had been divorced or separated for under three years, it would appear that, overall, while there is an indication of the tender age doctrine having been applied in the granting of custody (18 of the 21 children five years old and under were with their mothers) there is no apparent evidence of the same sex principle having been used as a guideline in the granting of custody.

In the tables which follow a) rearing difficulties experienced by lone-parents; b) children's choice of substitute for the missing parent; c) change of school and its effects, are analysed.

### TABLE 36
**REARING DIFFICULTIES BY RESPONDENTS* MARITAL STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had NO particular rearing difficulties</td>
<td>11  17</td>
<td>4  32</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAD specific rearing difficulties</td>
<td>3  17</td>
<td>1  4  3  28</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14  34</td>
<td>1  4  7  60</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-response</td>
<td>4  5  1  4  10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18  39</td>
<td>1  4  8  70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 03, REAR DIFF'S (C2).)

* Difficulties such as sex education or discipline.
Of the 70 respondents in the universe, ten are tabled under non-response. These include four of the non-custodial fathers of whom two had no ongoing relationship with their children; one had a daughter living on her own and one whose daughter was overseas with her mother; five divorced females of whom one was non-custodial with a son of 24 (on his own) and a daughter of 21 (with the ex-spouse), mothers of children three years old and under, and the fifth had a son of 23 at home; and there was one widow, all of whose four children were living on their own, single or married. It is interesting that none of the non-custodial parents who had ongoing relationships with their children, failed to respond. They apparently considered themselves as involved in the parenting of their children. Of the 60 who responded, 28 (seven men and 21 women) or 46.7%, considered that they had rearing difficulties with their children. The fathers claimed to have coped better than the mothers, with seven (under 39%) of the 18 having rearing difficulties, as compared with 21 (50%) of the 42 women. The divorced males particularly claimed success, with only three (21.4%) of 14 having rearing difficulties with their children. This may be accounted for to a degree by the fact that there was a high proportion of non-custodial parents amongst these divorced fathers, and they did not have to cope with the day-to-day problems of the children.

From the overview of the literature, it is also learnt that many non-custodial parents tend to be over-indulgent with their children and overlook misdemeanours to influence their loyalty.

All the four widowers in the universe had rearing difficulties with their children. While this number is too small to draw conclusions from, it may be opined that one of the reasons was that a greater proportion of the children were teen-agers. Another possible reason was that there was no second parent with whom the children could have an ongoing relationship, and the overview of the literature shows that such an ongoing relationship is a positive factor in a child's development (Kelly and Wallerstein 1977(a); Rosen 1977). However, amongst the widows, the percentage of those having rearing difficulties is close to the overall percentage with this problem. It may be interesting to study a more representative sample of the widowed to further investigate this apparent difference in rearing difficulties.

The rearing difficulties mentioned were, in the case of 80% of the women, of a disciplinary nature. Two of the three men and four of the women expressed difficulties in the sex education of children of the opposite sex. Arsenau et al. (1971), in their research on female-led one-parent families, found that 17 of the 40 mothers in their universe expressed problems in disciplining, decision-making and sex education.
**TABLE 37**

**REARING DIFFICULTIES OF CUSTODIAL AND WIDOWED PARENTS**

**BY CATEGORIES OF AFTER-SCHOOL DAY CARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who takes care of child after school</th>
<th>HAVE rearing difficulties</th>
<th>Have NO rearing difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced and separated</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (1)**</td>
<td>F (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep-in maid</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At relative's home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time maid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creche for Sub A &amp; Sub.B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other categories of after-school care*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Teenagers looking after themselves and/or looking after young siblings; children at boarding school.

**( ) Numbers in brackets indicate numbers of respondents.**

Table 37 represents 51 of the 70 respondents in the universe. The 19 excluded are the 14 non-custodial parents in the population and five of the ten listed under non-response in the previous table. The other five non-responses in Table 37 were, as explained, non-custodial parents. The Table therefore correlates rearing or no-rearing difficulties with arrangements for after-school care of the children of these 51 respondents (widowed and custodial parents).

There were five non-responses. These consisted of one divorced father of a five year old daughter, three divorced mothers and one widower with children not yet at school.

It must be pointed out that in some cases two categories of after
school-care were used by respondents. This was particularly true for the divorced mothers, having, or not having rearing difficulties, who had sleep-in or part-time maids, although they had teen-aged children, who are tabled as being able to look after themselves. The availability of comparatively low-paid domestic help in South Africa, no doubt was a factor in many of the lone-parents being able to take up full-time employment.

Only eight, all divorced mothers, looked after the children themselves. Of these, four had and four did not have rearing difficulties. It appears that the direct involvement of the mother in the day care of the child is not a guarantee that there will not be rearing difficulties. There is a slight suggestion in the Table, however, that the employment of a maid, full or part-time, may have had a negative effect. Almost 53% (nine) of the 17 divorced mothers who had rearing difficulties, employed domestic help in caring for their children, whereas 38% (six) of the 16 having no rearing difficulties, employed such help.

Only two children were left with relatives (after school daily) outside their home. This is not in keeping with some of the findings in the overview of the literature, where more relatives, particularly grandparents (Ferri 1976(a)) were involved in looking after the children. This may possibly be explained by the domestic help situation specific to South Africa. Also the universe of this research was middle class, whereas most of the studies referred to in the overview of the literature concerned themselves largely with lower-income groups (see 3.1.2 and 4.4).

Generally, this cross-tabulation does not indicate any obvious correlation between having rearing difficulties and the category of the person caring for the child after school. Rutter (1972); Orthner et al. (1976); Rosen (1977) among others, questioned whether only a mother can mother.

To what extent, if any, the length of lone-parent status had influenced rearing difficulties, is not reflected in these Tables (34, 35).
TABLE 38
CUSTODIAL PARENTS' SATISFACTION WITH PATTERN OF CHILD/REN'S CONTACT* WITH EX-SPOUSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of contact and satisfaction of respondent about contact</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No contact; dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact; satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular contact; dissatisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular contact; satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular contact; dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular contact; satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 04, KID'S CONTACT (S15).)

* For the purposes of this Table 'contact' refers to physical meetings between ex-spouse and child/ren; 'regular contact' refers only to what is termed a 'full ongoing relationship' in the classifications preceding Figures 3 and 4.

Table 38 deals only with the 44 custodial parents in the universe. As the satisfaction expressed by these parents relates to any possible physical contact between the children and the ex-spouse, the four respondents, three women and one man, whose ex-husbands and ex-wife resided overseas, are shown in the Table, while not included in the totals. The numbers involved after splitting into cells, are rather limited. In only 12\% (five) of the 40 respondents making up the total of the Table, was there no contact between the child and the ex-spouse. As pointed out, in the explanations to Figures 3 and 4, it is interesting that in all five cases, the severance was between the non-custodial father and the child. There was only a slight difference between mothers satisfied (three) and mothers dissatisfied (two) with this total lack of contact with the father.

Of the 15 (14 mothers and one father) whose contact with the children is categorized as irregular, and, who constituted 37.5% of the respondents
in Table 38, 60% were dissatisfied with the existing pattern of contact and expressed a wish for more regular contact between the children and their non-custodial parent. The children of almost 50% (19) of the 40 custodial parents were recorded as having regular contact with the other parent. These 19 respondents were almost equally divided as to satisfaction of the contacts, nine being dissatisfied and ten being satisfied. In the interviews, the nine dissatisfied parents, two fathers and seven mothers, wished their children to have less frequent contact, and two of these mothers would have preferred even no contact. The dissatisfied parents accused the other spouses of undermining their authority. Several mothers expressed concern about the undesirable influence of a father’s girl-friend on their children.

In the case of the custodial divorced males who appear in the totals of this Table, the five whose children have ‘regular’ contact comprise 83.3%, whereas the 14 custodial divorced females make up 42.4% of these categories. As shown in this Table, as previously pointed out in Figures 3 and 4 and as learnt from the overview of the literature, contact between the child and the non-custodial mother is stronger than that with the non-custodial father.

Although not listed separately, but included in the Table, all five of the respondents who had split custody were satisfied with the access patterns. Of these five split-custody respondents (three male and two female), only the contact of the one male respondent has been classified as ‘irregular,’ and here too, although ‘irregular,’ this contact was steady (see Figures 3 and 4, three squares shaded).

Overall, from this Table, there appears to be almost no numerical difference between those custodial parents satisfied and those dissatisfied with present access patterns, 20 parents being dissatisfied, 19 satisfied and one uncertain. Only amongst the respondents whose children had irregular contact, was there a suggestion that a great proportion of them would have wished for greater contact.

How the child of the lone-parent relates to his parent’s friend or friends of the opposite sex is presented as reported by the respondents, in Figure 5. The word ‘response’ in the caption of the Figure refers to how the child relates to his parent’s friends of the opposite sex. The parent referred to is the parent interviewed by the researcher (whether custodial or non-custodial). The parents include all the divorced, separated and widowed who responded and the inclusion of the widowed made almost no difference to the picture presented from that of the divorced and separated only. Five of the non-custodial respondents not having a full ongoing relationship with their children did not respond to this question and their children are amongst those not included in this figure. Non-responses listed reflect the number of respondents who did not reply and not the number of children. (See following page for Figure 5).
FIGURE 5

POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE RESPONSE OF CHILD TO PARENT'S FRIEND'S OF OPPOSITE SEX.

CHILDREN OF 16 SEPARATED AND 33 DIVORCED MOTHERS 6 YRS & UNDER 13 AND OVER MARRIED/OWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOYS</th>
<th>GIRLS</th>
<th>B. G.</th>
<th>B. G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0%

6 NON-RESPONSES

CHILDREN OF 12 DIVORCED MOTHERS 12 TO 15 & UNDER 15 AND OVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. G.</th>
<th>B. G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0%

6 NON-RESPONSES

CHILDREN OF 46 MARRIED & 50 UNMARRIED MOTHERS 16 AND OVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. G.</th>
<th>B. G.</th>
<th>B. G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0%

12 NON-RESPONSES

IN ADDITION THERE WAS NON-RESPONSE FROM 3 WIDOWS — 15 NON-RESPONSES IN ALL

ALL THE CHILDREN OF 55 PARENTS (16 SEPARATED AND 33 DIVORCED MOTHERS, 12 DIVORCED FATHERS, 5 WIDOWS, 4 WIDowers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BREAKDOWN BY AGE OF CHILD</th>
<th>12 yrs &amp; Under</th>
<th>15 yrs &amp; Over</th>
<th>MARRIED/OWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOYS</td>
<td>GIRLS</td>
<td>BOYS</td>
<td>GIRLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0%

KEY

NEGATIVE BOYS
NEGATIVE GIRLS

POSITIVE BOYS
POSITIVE GIRLS

NUMBER OF CHILDREN
There was almost no difference in the reported reaction of children to the friends of non-custodial and custodial parents, although not differentiated in Figure 5. In both cases there appears to be an overwhelming (approximately 80%) positive reaction by the children to their parents's friends of the opposite sex. Of the 112 children belonging to 55 parents, whose responses are reflected in the lower half-page of the Figure, 80% (90) of the children are recorded as being positive in their attitude to their parent's friend/s of the opposite sex.

Of the 40 children of the 34 separated and divorced mothers' children in the 12 years and under cohort, 75% were reported to be positive in their responses. Of the 29 children of the divorced and separated mothers in the 13 and over cohort, almost 83% were reported to be positive. The children living on their own and/or remarried, reacted 100% positively, although it must be stressed that only three were involved and the result may be purely incidental.

Of the 22 children of the 12 divorced male respondents, 15 were in the age group 0 - 12 years and two-thirds were reported to be positive in their responses; seven were in the age group over 13 years and all responded positively.

Broken down by the sex of the children, there appear to be but slight differences in the reactions of boys and girls. In the case of the children of divorced and separated mothers, the girls in the 13 and over cohort reacted proportionately more positively (90%) than the boys (79%). There was a similar difference of 11% between the girls and boys of the divorced fathers' children in the 12 years and under cohort.

The high percentage of positive reactions shown in Figure 5 bears out the interest of the child in his parent's remarriage, particularly in the case of adolescent children. It must be stressed that all these figures reflect the children's reactions as reported by the parents interviewed. The overall picture may therefore be rosier than in fact it is, as parents may wish their children to react favourably to their friends of the opposite sex.

From the interviews

One mother said "I was called by the school principal. She said my teen-age daughter told her I disappeared with my boy-friend every weekend. I suppose it is the principal's business, but I can't force my boy-friend to marry me. She (her daughter) is always so happy when he's around. She had trouble menstruating when I broke up with the last one. I doubt if anything will come of this affair, either. I can't push things, you know."

Another mother said "in her composition on a 'project on myself' my daughter wrote all about her father and my boy-friend. She wrote I should marry this guy, but she'd always put her father first and if there were any trouble she'd go to live with her father."
A widow said sadly "My sons are starved for male company."

A widower (bereaved just over a year), a father of a 17 year old daughter, said: "My daughter wants to go to varsity next year. She's doing most of the running of the home now. If I remarried, my kid would have more time for herself. But she's my only daughter, and she knows she's important to me. She's very nice to my girl-friend on the telephone. I haven't introduced them as yet to each other. I'm a bit uncertain, all round."

TABLE 39

POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE 'RESPONSE' OF CHILDREN TO PARENTS' LIVING-TOGETHER OR WEEKENDING ARRANGEMENT PARTNERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of child</th>
<th>Positive response</th>
<th>Negative response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boys</td>
<td>girls</td>
<td>boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 and under</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As in Figure 5, 'response' refers to how the child relates to parents' living-together or weekending arrangement partner.

It is again pointed out that the information for Table 39, as in the other Tables, was obtained from the respondent parent and not the children. The data were recorded during interviews on 'specify' sheets. The Table drawn up reflects positive or negative attitudes of children of ten parents (five divorced women, three divorced men, one widow and one widower) who had living-together or weekending arrangements.

The children of two such divorcées, one such divorcé and one widower are not included due to non-response of the parents.

Of the 23 children whose parents were the respondents in this Table, almost 75% (17) related positively to the person with whom their parent had weekending or living-together arrangements. There was almost no difference between the attitudes of the boys and the girls.

Nine of the 12 sons and seven of the 12 daughters, were reported as reacting positively to the parent's opposite sex partner. Although the numbers involved are small, there appear to be some differences in attitude when broken down by age. All six of the over 13 age cohort reacted positively, compared with 11 of the 17 children in the 12 and under age cohort.
Overall, the child's positive or negative attitude was hardly affected by the type of relationship between the parent and friend of the opposite sex. In six cases where there were living-together arrangements, a situation resulted where there were, de facto, quasi parents and in four cases, quasi siblings.

TABLE 40
CHILDREN'S CHOICE OF SUBSTITUTE FOR OTHER PARENT BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substitute for other parent</th>
<th>Divorced M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sep. M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Widowed M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No substitute found</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under same roof</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside of home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of parent after breakdown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other substitute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 04, SUBST IDN FN (S18).)

Four divorced women did not respond to this question: one non-custodian, one who had a three year old daughter and two who 'did not know.'

Sixty-six of the total sample of 70 responded to the questions in the above Table. Numbers do not refer to each of the 156 children of the parents in the universe, as was the case in Figure 5, but to the respondent parents.

There is some discrepancy between the percentages of respondents who reported that their children sought substitute identification for the missing parent (Table 40) and the children's overwhelming positive reactions to their parent's friend/s of the opposite sex as reflected in Figure 5 where the respondents reported 80% of the children involved related positively to their friend/s of the opposite sex; while not strictly comparable because Table 40 lists respondents, yet only 9% (six of 66) of the parents...
in this Table reported their children had found a substitute in a parent's opposite sex friend. Apparently most children, while relating positively to their parent's opposite sex friend/s, did not consider them surrogates for the absent parents.

A majority of over 70% (47) of the lone-parents stated that there was no, or no need for a surrogate for the other spouse for the children. Most of the divorced respondents claimed this was mainly because there was an ongoing relationship of varying degrees of closeness between the children and the other parent. This rationalization appears to be negated by the fact that all the widowed considered their children also had not found substitute identification. A possible explanation may be drawn from the replies of three widows, as expressed by one of them, "We live in a family set up. We don't need a substitute." The relationship between the widowed and their children appeared to be a very close one, possibly brought nearer to each other by their shared grief.

There were two other factors which may have had a bearing on the search by the children of the divorced (as compared to the children of the widowed) for a surrogate for the other parent. Most of the children of the widowed were 13 years old and over, while, amongst the divorced, the majority of children were under 13 (see Table 35). As shown in the overview of literature, these older children may have had more peer group associations and their need for a surrogate parent was thus weakened. Over half of the widowed in the universe had been lone-parents for six years and over, compared with under a quarter of the divorced and separated respondents. These factors were not applied as variables in the Table. The five respondents in the category 'other' who did not fall into the categories mentioned, claimed their children had other substitutes -- an oldest daughter's boyfriend, a family doctor, a scoutmaster, school-teacher, judo instructor. Of the 19 respondents whose children had found substitutes, only one considered a grandparent to be a substitute, although most of these children still had grandparents. Nor do other relatives figure as surrogates to any extent. Of the seven relatives who were regarded as substitutes, two were living outside the home. From Tables 14, 37 and 40 and from Questionnaire Seq.04 questions (S16), and (S17), (YOU AND RELVS, KIDS AND RELVS; see Appendices A and B) it appears that any continuing relationship with relatives was rather weak. This is contrary to the findings of Marsden (1969), whose population was drawn from the lower income group, and Ferri's sample (1976) where consanguinal kin particularly provided considerable support systems for the one-parent family. Gongla and Wales (1977 (see 2.8)) found that consanguinal relationships are strengthened and affinal bonds weakened when the nuclear family is split.
From the interviews

A divorcée reported her (adolescent) son's reactions to the men who dated her: "My boy looks at all the guys I go out with as if I must marry one of them. He says to me, after each date "he would make a nice father," though of course he means a stepfather, and he says this of any casual caller!"

Another divorcée said "My oldest daughter's boyfriend was probably like their dad to them. Now the girl's married and out of the house. The other children miss them both."

A divorcée, speaking about her boyfriend and possible substitute identification, concluded: "Their father will always come first, but the children accept my boyfriend and are always happy with him."

Another divorcée philosophized in Afrikaans about the unlikelihood of a likely substitute. She simply said: "Daar kan nie so een wees nie, 'n pa's 'n pa en ek is die ma!"

TABLE 41
CHANGE OF SCHOOL BECAUSE OF LONE-PARENTHOOD
BY MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed at same school for reasons connected*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed school for reasons connected*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed at same school for reasons NOT connected*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed school for reasons NOT connected*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* connected with their lone-parent status.

The figures in Table 41 refer to respondent parents who had moved their child/ren from one school to another since lone-parenthood and not their children. The 14 of the universe of 70 not recorded were lone-parents with children who had completed their schooling or had either just started school or were yet too young.
Table 41 records the change or non-change of schools by one-parent families in the sample. As in the other sections of the questionnaire, the parent and not the child supplied the information recorded as responses (see Methodology, Chapter 1).

Of the 56 lone-parents, more than half (29) had changed or not changed the child's (children's) schools for reasons connected with the change in marital status.

Of the 56 respondents concerned, 25 had actually moved their children to other schools for reasons connected with the change in marital status as against only nine who changed schools for reasons not connected with the breakdown.

Several respondents explained their reasons for moving the children from one school to another. They were aware of the difficulties entailed and the possible effects on the children. Sometimes schools were changed as the family had moved from one province to another. Sometimes the mother removed the child from a private school, which she could not afford financially and placed the child in a government school.

In one case a mother had moved her children to a school within walking distance of their home as she wanted to stop the children travelling by bus both for financial reasons and because they came home later. She wanted them to have friends from school in their geographic area. Another mother wanted her boys to go to an all boys' school, even if this involved travelling, as she felt that boys without a resident father were better off in a male orientated environment.

There were parents who felt that the whole change in the situation was traumatic enough for the children without still changing their home environment or their schooling; their lives were upset through 'losing a parent' without any other changes.

While there was no controlling sample of intact families, the figures of school changes for reasons associated with marital breakdown show a definite association between single-parenthood and school changes. This is in keeping with the findings of others. Ferri (1976) (see 4.4.6) found that one in ten of the children of divorce or separation in their sample had been to four or more schools in six years.

From the interviews it was clear that, in the researcher's universe, many of the changes in schools, as in employment and housing, were made largely within the first two years after marital dissolution.

From the overview of the literature it had been found that mothers in many cases move away with the children from geographic proximity to the non-custodial father. Some of the movement in schools must no doubt be attributed to change of residence following a breakdown. As found from the
overview of literature (2.3.2 and 3.1.3.1), one-parent families tend to move more than two-parent families. Arsenau et al. (1971) reported that 62% of their respondents had moved after the breakdown.

TABLE 42

SCHOOL FAILURES OF CHILDREN WHOSE SCHOOLS WERE CHANGED BECAUSE OF MARITAL BREAKDOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children per family who failed</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One child</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two children</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three children</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals of children</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To obtain an indication of a possible correlation between changes in schooling with the failures of the children at school, the figures in the above Table were extracted from computerized cross-tabulation. Of the 12 divorcées who changed their children's schools because of reasons connected with the marital breakdown (see Table 41), in five of these families there were school failures (ten children) and the same situation occurred amongst four of the nine divorcées. All four of the widowed who had changed schools because of the breakdown had some of their children failing at school. (Ferri (1976) (see 4.4.7) analysed children's reading and arithmetic scores). The writer's sample is limited and it could be interpreted that failures were due more to family breakdown rather than the changing of schools. The cross-tabulation from which the Table was extracted shows, however, that there were school failures in only three of the 13 families where there were no changes in schools; also the proportion of failures is higher amongst those who changed schools for reasons connected with breakdown than for those who changed for unconnected reasons. There appears to be some measure of substance to respondents ascribing their children's school failures, where they had not failed previously, to their lone-parent status mainly.

Almost two-thirds of the 156 children of the 70 lone-parents who formed the universe of this study were at school (97) or at university (four). There were 21 pre-schoolers and the balance of 34 sons and daughters were 18 years old or over. Twelve were not living with either parent. Single or married, they had set up their own homes.
A large portion of a child's day is spent at school and as such it probably vies with the home in the child's social and psychological development. It can be presumed that the home environment affects the child's behaviour and performance at school and vice versa.

This is an exploratory study limited in scope (see Chapter 1, Methodology). No controlling sample has been used and the effects of the lone-parent status on the children's school performance are tabled according to the scholastic records and school failures of the children from the subjective reports of the respondents (the parents).

The following Table 43, deals only with children of school-going age whose parents in the universe were custodians or, in the case of split custody, only the custodial child of that parent is included.

### TABLE 43

**EFFECTS OF LONE-PARENT STATUS ON BOYS' AND GIRLS' SCHOOL PERFORMANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of lone-parent status on school performance</th>
<th>Sex of child</th>
<th>Divorced &amp; Sep.*</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men (6)**</td>
<td>Women (30)</td>
<td>Men (3)</td>
<td>Women (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have NOT been affected adversely</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE been affected adversely</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed because of one-parent status</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed NOT because of one-parent status</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children who failed</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 03, CHILDREN's EDUCATION)  
(manual table; see Appendices C and D)

* Only custodial parents and the children in their custody.  
** ( ) Number in brackets indicates number of respondent parents.

The 79 children tabled include three who were at university. These 79 children were from 44 parents in the sample: six divorced men
and 30 divorced women, two widowers and five widows. The one separated female has, for the purpose of this table, been included amongst the divorced. Seventy-two percent of the children were, according to the parent interviewed, not affected in their school performance because of the parent's lone-parent status. Of the 27.8% who have been affected, there may have been contributory direct and indirect causes such as change of schools (see Tables 41 and 42). The overall percentages given above are not however, sustained, with breakdown into categories of marital status of parents and sex of children.

Of the 62 children of the divorced and separated females, 14 (22.6%) made up of eight boys and six girls, were adversely affected in their school performance by the lone-parent status. Three (42.9%) of the seven children of the divorced males were affected adversely. In comparing children of the divorced males and females, the smaller number of custodial fathers in the universe must be borne in mind. Only trends are therefore noted. The children (of either male or female divorced parent) affected in their school performance were not restricted to any particular age and there appears to be no direct correlation between age of child and effect of parent's marital status on the child with regard to school performance.

Almost twice as many proportionately of the children of the divorced men than of the divorced women were affected in their school performance by lone-parent status. Amongst the widowed too, three of the four children of the widowers as compared with only two of the six children of the widows were adversely affected. The financial position of the males in the population was, in keeping with the overview of the literature, better than that of the females and yet more of the motherless children were affected. The difference therefore cannot mainly be attributed to economic variables which were not controlled. The economically advantaged position of the males did not prevent their children being affected adversely. It is possible that the aspirations of the male custodians were higher than those of the females. Of the 79 children studying, 44 (55.7%) were boys and 35 (44.3%) were girls. Of the boys, ten (22.7%) had been affected in their schooling (by parents' reports), whereas the school performance of 12 (34.3%) of the girls had been affected. This would suggest that girls are more sensitive to the situation than boys. This is not in keeping with the findings of Hetherington et al. and others (see 4.7.2) who found boys in post-divorce situations more affected than girls.

However, the school performance of more of the children appeared to be affected adversely in motherless than in fatherless homes. Fourteen (23%) of the 62 children attending school or university in the divorced and separated mothers' custody, as compared with three (43%) of seven such children in the divorced fathers' custody, were adversely affected in their
school performance. Douglas (1970) (see 4.5.2) found that in lone-parent families, the school performance of children brought up by a father, was poorer than that of children brought up by a mother. From the researcher's universe, very small when broken up into cells, it appears that particularly adversely affected were girls cared for by male parents. This effect may be worth further investigation, with controls employed, in larger studies.

It was found that most of the women in the population were working a full day. The time available to the male or female custodian was not therefore a variable in the present study. Did the male parent devote less time to assisting in monitoring the child's schooling? This aspect could be pursued further.

In Ferri's sample (see 4.4.7) in the overview of the literature, the children of divorced or separated full-time working mothers read less well than children of such mothers working part-time or not at all.

The lower half of the Table records failures of school children in relation to the one-parent status of the custodial and widowed mother or father. Seventeen failures were involved. By marital status, 12 (17.4%) of the 69 children of the divorced and separated, and five (50%) of the ten widowed's children failed once or more at school, after the breakdown. All except two of the failures were (according to the respondents) because of the lone-parent status. As the number of children of the widowed in the Table is so small, conclusions could not be drawn. However, it must be noted that although there were more boys than girls in Table 42, of those who failed because of the lone-parent status, ten were girls as compared with five boys.

It must be stressed again that the numbers involved are small, no controlling variables have been applied, and there was no controlled comparative sample of children from intact homes.

From the interviews

A divorcée reported: "My daughter failed Sub B. Of course she was upset by the divorce, but we'd also moved to another part and I changed her school. What else could I do?"

A divorced male, talking about his 15 year old son, explained "My boy is very withdrawn since the divorce. His grades are down. He's just not interested in any of the swotting subjects. I've seen the school psychologist. He is satisfied that there's no learning problem. I think things are getting better now. The wife was, in any case, never home to take an interest. I still keep a lot of things from him. He always felt for his mother. Perhaps he still broods instead of concentrating."

A divorced woman, an educationalist herself, was far more optimistic: "My kids have improved. The youngest boy is top of his class. During the marriage the children suffered because of all the terrible tension; definitely not after the divorce at all. Everyone, all round, seems to be doing better. My middle boy is head boy of the school. My oldest does well at varsity. His father pays and has just bought him a car. The boys help each other and stick together."
A mother of four sons, aged 13, ten, and a twin of six, the two former placed in the same boarding school and the two little ones moved to a day school just near their new home, feels that in their new set-up, away from marital strife and tension, the children’s school performance, in spite of change of school, has improved. This mother changed her employment, earning less, living nearer home in an inferior area, but coming home each day for lunch to be with the two boys. Her two older boys are at a boarding school with many children from broken, affluent homes. 'He does not want,' she claimed, 'to come home for weekends as he is ashamed of the area we live in'(she said of her 13 year old boy).

A custodial father, whose son of 18 was out of school, remarked sadly about the boy having left school at 17: 'I think the divorce hit him badly. He wanted to leave school earlier and go out and earn a living. It doesn't bother me that much, but he had a good head. He should have done matric. He'll learn a trade.'

A custodial mother said: 'My little boy failed Sub A, but it was just as well. The move down from ——— to ——— was not easy. He's good at school and very happy. The teacher is kind to him. She's divorced herself.'

6.6 Divorce laws, social services and suggestions for reform

At the time of conducting the study, there was considerable discussion in the public media of the Report being prepared by the 1975 Commission to 'report on the Law of Divorce and Matters incidental thereto,' which was to be tabled in the South African parliament as a proposed act to be called 'The Divorce Act, 1978' (see 5.6). There was thus more than usual interest in the existing South African laws of divorce.

| TABLE 44 |
| RESPONDENTS' FAMILIARITY WITH SOUTH AFRICAN DIVORCE LAWS BY MARITAL STATUS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you familiar with South African divorce laws?</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 28 1 3 8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13 11 1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 39 1 4 8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 05, S.A. DIV LAWS (S41).)

Almost two-thirds (45) of the universe admitted to being unfamiliar with South African divorce laws, with the women being disproportionately
well-represented. Twenty-eight (almost 72%) of the divorcées, and all the widows fell into this category. On the other hand, amongst the 25 who claimed familiarity with the laws, 14 (56%) were men although they represented only 31.4% of the sample. These included 13 of the 18 (over 72%) of the divorcées. Although only 25 respondents expressed themselves as having a knowledge of South African divorce laws, according to Table 44, many more respondents answered in the affirmative to a question 'do you think improvements should be specifically by changes in the South African Law of Husband and Wife?' which is suggestive of a negative attitude to the justice and efficacy of the South African divorce laws. Amongst the divorced females, especially, the gap between familiarity and desire for change is striking, only 11 familiar with, but 21 favouring changes in the existing laws. This negative attitude referred to, is further expressed by the responses in Table 45.

**TABLE 45**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are the South African divorce laws good?</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See. 05, S.A. DIV LAWS (S41).)

Over one-third of the universe refrained from voicing an opinion. Six of the widowed were not interested and twenty of the divorced having been 'through it' preferred 'to forget about it.' Particularly the women avoided answering. To the question 'are the South African divorce laws good?' 54% (38) of the population of 70, but 86% of the 44 expressing an opinion, answered 'no.' Laws which are so overwhelmingly considered 'poor' should be regarded in the light of the comment in the South African Report 1978m reviewed in the literature (see 5.6) that realistic rules should be laid down, which 'do not lose sight of society's conception of what is reasonable and just (South African Law Commission Report, 1978: 3-4).

When respondents were asked 'what changes' they would like to see brought about in the existing divorce laws, 15 of the men and 15 of the women volunteered the following suggestions, which are listed by sex
of the respondent. The respondents included two widowers and one widow, all three of whom favoured making divorce more difficult.

Some of the suggestions proffered by respondents and the number who made them are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divorce 'should be made more difficult'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a compulsory reconciliation period</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce should be based on incompatibility and not proof of guilt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce actions should be in camera, no publication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory counselling before the divorce</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers should not receive preference in the granting of custody</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free legal aid</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home (house or flat) should remain with the parent who has custody</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The man should on no account be able to evade his responsibility of paying maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers should have 'less power and control' and there should be a 'lower maximum fee'</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women should not so easily be able to give up custody of the children</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody should be subject to regular review</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody to parent 'best equipped to care for child'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make subsequent reduction of maintenance pay more difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women married by ante nuptial contract should get equal share of accretion in assets during marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be incumbent on both parties to attend divorce court hearings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All maintenance should be paid through the Department of Social Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance should be tied to a realistic cost of living index and to the living standard accustomed to during marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the number of respondents was limited, several suggestions were in keeping with recent American and other court decisions cited in the overview of literature (see 5.4.2.1). These include equal division of assets accrued during the marriage, awarding of custody in the best interests of the child rather than automatically granting mothers custody of tender age children, or granting custody on the same sex principle (see 4.7.3 and 5.7) and that irretrievable breakdown should replace guilt as the basis for divorce. The changes proposed generally do not indicate particularly

*All four of these women said they were not familiar with the law.*
objective suggestions, but seem to relate rather to the respondents' own situations.

From the interviews

One divorcée said: "Our position is terrible; we suffer degradation because it's far too easy to get a divorce, because of the whole set up of the law and its misuse. (She had admitted to not being familiar with the laws regarding divorce).

A male respondent said: "This whole business of divorce through desertion is a lot of crap. My wife left me and went to a lawyer and the next thing I knew was that there I was in the lawyer's office and discussing the divorce settlement, and if you don't mind she got the kids and the house!"

And another male reflected that "the law does not really consider the children. Custody is given to the parent who asks first and who has the better lawyer."

An immigrant female reflected "it's madness to get divorced in this country. You're left with nothing and the kids while their dad has a ball!"

**TABLE 46**

**RESPONDENTS' FEELINGS ABOUT NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL POSITION OF LONE-PARENTS, BY FEELINGS OF DISCRIMINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The social psychological position of the lone-parent needs improvement</th>
<th>Did NOT feel discrimination</th>
<th>FELT discrimination</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>Divorced and Sep.</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the five respondents in Table 46 who expressed no opinion about the need for improvement of the social-psychological position of lone-parents, were women; four of them divorcées, who did not feel discrimination and therefore were probably not particularly interested in the problem.

Although half (35) of the respondents had not felt discrimination, (44) almost two-thirds, felt the position of the lone-parent needed
improvement. Of the 50% (35) who felt discrimination, 83% (29) thought that improvement was required, with only 14% (five) thinking differently. The percentage in favour of improvement, amongst the 65 respondents who expressed an opinion, was considerably higher amongst the women than the men; 74% (32 of 43) women as compared with 54% (12 of 22) men. By marital status, particularly amongst the divorced and separated in the universe, there appears to be an implicit correlation between the feeling of discrimination and their wish for improvement. Of the 23 who did not feel discrimination, 43% (ten) wished for improvements, as compared to 84% (26 of 31) of divorced and separated respondents who felt discrimination.

There was little difference between the widowed respondents and the divorced and separated in the percentage wishing for improvement in the social psychological position of the lone-parent, 62% as compared with 67%, although considerably less discrimination was experienced by the widowed (see Table 25).

The majority of the respondents gave as reasons for the need for the improvement of the social psychological position, the stigma attached to their marital status and the lack of special facilities, social and economic, to help lone-parents with child rearing. Three of the women respondents, while wishing for improvements, foresaw no possibility of a change for the better and simply resigned themselves to the existing unsatisfactory situation both as regards the continued prevalence of stigma and lack of compensatory provisions. Although they were not asked to do so at this stage of the questionnaire, almost all of these respondents volunteered suggestions for improvements. The most popular was the use of television, radio and press to change the prevailing negative image of lone-parents.

From the interviews

One female respondent said "You're obviously different because you're not a complete family. If people want to think of me as different it's up to them, but it would be nice if they would not and if they would treat me like everyone. T.V. and articles in magazines and newspapers will all help very much to open people's eyes about our lousy position, lousy because we're different."

A widower, widowed just over a year, said: "I find the whole situation embarrassing. It's humiliating to be pitied as a widower at first, then to be forgotten about."

A widow summed up her position with: "All the neighbours are kind and helpful, but it's not the same attitude as when my husband was alive. I cannot afford to give the children the same expensive treats their children have, like putt-putt or the skating-rink, or even birthday parties."

One widower's assessment of the social psychological position of lone-parents was: "pretty average on whole -- not especially worse than that of married."

A divorced female who had felt discrimination, resigned herself to her disadvantaged position with "should be changed, but never will be, so will always remain second grade."
Another divorcée blamed the unfavourable position of the divorced on the ease with which marriages may be dissolved and the consequent public indifference. She reasoned: "When it's easier to get a divorce, there are lower morals. If you don't care, why should the society care. No one then bothers. The children suffer."

**TABLE 47**

**AWARENESS AND USE OF SOCIAL SERVICES BY MARITAL STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are NOT aware and do NOT use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You ARE aware but do NOT use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You ARE aware and DO use</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 05, COMM SERV (S45).)

Table 47 shows that over 80% (57) of the sample were aware of some of the various social (community) services available to them. Over 77% (44) of these (almost two-thirds of the total universe) used such services. The services available included: church counselling services, counselling crisis telephone and call in services of the state department of social welfare and of 'Lifeline,' a voluntary 24 hours service; psychological and guidance services for testing school children; alcoholics anonymous organizations; financial help and counselling by social workers of the state, and family and child welfare agencies; day hospitals and out-patients' hospital clinics; including out and in-patient services of a children's hospital; baby clinic services, municipal health services of the City's Health Department; private, sectarian and government creches and day nurseries; municipal and Provincial Hospital dental clinics; welfare and related services for the mentally handicapped by state institutions and a recognized* mental health society; residential day care centres for the mentally handicapped; a sports association for paraplegics; a Child and Family Unit of the local children's hospital with social work and other community services; special schools and services for the deaf.

The term 'educational' in the questionnaire did not refer to normal primary and secondary education which obviously everyone is aware of

* Recognized officially and subsidized by the State Department of Social Welfare.
and is enjoyed almost universally by the children of the White middle class in South Africa. Although the Table was not reproduced, answers to question C3*, seq. No. 03 in the schedule (see Appendix A) showed that all respondents had aspirations for their children to matriculate or achieve an equivalent educational level. The term 'educational' in this question covered any extra-curricular activities made use of by the children. Most of the parents in the sample worked and, as can be expected, most of them apparently encouraged their children to use all extra-curricular educational services as this performed a triple purpose of furthering their education, helping in their socialization and taking a child off a working parent's hands. It must be pointed out that the questions were directed at all the respondents and therefore covered the use of services for children of the non-custodial as well as the custodial parents.

Of the 57 (81.4%) in the sample who were aware of community services available, 39 (68.4%) availed themselves of these special educational services. Only just over a third (24) used medical services available. Eleven (15.7%) utilized mental hygiene and psychiatric services offered by the community.

The recipients (nine men and one woman) of social assistance (see Tables 13 and 14) all availed themselves of child welfare services. In addition, one divorced male also used the advisory service of a child welfare organization.

The five responses listed as 'other' included mention of the use of the services of Life-line and pastoral counselling.

The percentage of respondents satisfied or dissatisfied with the existing social services is shown in the following Table.

* Question C3 (see Appendix A) of the questionnaire is 'Have you any idea about what you would like each of your children to do?'
TABLE 48
SATISFACTION WITH EXISTING SOCIAL SERVICES BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separ.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-response as unaware and/or did not use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 05, SATIS'N (S46).)

Of the 54 respondents, 51.8% expressed themselves as being NOT satisfied. The under 40% who were satisfied, included two of the four widowers, the other two not having responded to this question. The five listed as 'uncertain' in Table 48 were uncertain in their assessment of satisfaction: for instance, one divorced stated that he had used both a 'government' and private psychologist to help his child who had a learning difficulty.

The divorced males in this universe were as aware and unaware, satisfied and not satisfied and used available services to the same degree as the divorced females. This conclusion may be too superficial as the universe includes the non-custodial parent.

To initiate and draw forth broad ideas for improved or additional social services and legal reforms, the section of the questionnaire listing improvements suggested by the researcher was administered to all the respondents. Of the 70, four chose not to express an opinion. The responses to these specified improvements are listed in Table 49. This section of the questionnaire concluded with provision for the respondents to add other suggestions to those specified by the researcher.
TABLE 49
RESPONSES TO SUGGESTED SPECIFIED IMPROVEMENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think improvements should be specifically by:</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in community social services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family allowances based on a means test</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family allowances NOT based on a means test</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in the South African Law of husband and wife</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 05, IMPROVE (R2).)

Although a middle-class sample and mainly referring to themselves as such (in spite of the fact that 24 of the 70 in the sample considered their incomes insufficient), 83.3% (55) of the 66 who responded expressed themselves in favour of a system of family allowances being instituted. The responses of the widowed were similar to those of the divorced to this question although their economic position was better than that of the divorced. Opinions were divided as to whether such an allowance should be based on a means test or not, 56.4% considering a means test to be more just.

Of the 70 respondents, 57% (40; 35 or 61.4% of the 57 divorced and 5 or 41.7% of the 12 widowed), wished to see changes in South African divorce laws. This is interesting, as almost 72% of the divorced and all the widowed were unfamiliar with the law (see Table 44). Twenty-four (34%) of the respondents wished for improvements in community social services. Amongst the divorced the proportion of women desiring such improvements was almost three times that of the men, although this proportionate preponderance may be exaggerated. Allowance should perhaps be made for the inclusion of a much larger proportion of male non-custodial parents.

The suggestions for 'other improvements' made by three of the respondents (all women) were not of a broad nature and are included in the list of suggestions for special services and reform following the explanation of Table 50.
TABLE 50

NEED FOR SPECIAL COMMUNITY SERVICES BY MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should there be special community services to assist in the adjustment of single-parent families</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Sep.</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seq. 05, SPEC SERV (R1).)

This Table was extracted as a follow-up to Tables 44 to 49.

Seventy percent (42 of the 60 respondents who expressed an opinion on the question) considered there should be special community services to assist lone-parent families in their adjustment, with only 30% considering such special services unnecessary. The high percentage favouring special services, indicates a subjective feeling that the requirements of single-parent families differ from those of intact families. It is clear from the list of suggestions of the lone-parents in the sample for special services and reforms that their desires for special services are not due entirely to the economic disadvantaged position of single parents.

Amongst the suggestions for special services and reforms made by the respondents were the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number suggesting this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) More social clubs like their lone-parent club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Educating the community in acceptance of the one-parent and his children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) More professional services and advice (psychiatrists, lawyers, social workers) at the clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) State aid to single-parent clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) A panel of health, psychiatric, legal and financial experts, financed by the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Medical aid for middle-class should not be tied to ex-husband and should be subsidized by state.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Free further education for children of lone parents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In South Africa many middle-class families belong to private medical aid schemes with membership registered in the name of the head of the family, who, in intact families, is considered to be the husband. In the case of marital dissolution, continued receipt of benefits depends on arrangements in the divorce settlement and adherence to these arrangements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Suggesting this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>viii)</td>
<td>Public media to educate lone-parents of their rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix)</td>
<td>Teachers and schools to consciously assist children of single-parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x)</td>
<td>Baby-sitting bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi)</td>
<td>Tax rebates for the lone-parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii)</td>
<td>Educating children about divorce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii)</td>
<td>More creches for the children of single parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv)</td>
<td>Home-makers service for emergency situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv)</td>
<td>Longer school hours and provision of school lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi)</td>
<td>Job retraining for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii)</td>
<td>Alimony laws for the remarried: alimony should not fall away immediately after remarriage as remarriages are experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii)</td>
<td>Educating children to wish to continue seeing both parents after a divorce or separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix)</td>
<td>Special section of Marriage Guidance Council for single-parents (after break-up)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note the prominence the lone-parent club enjoys in these special services and reforms suggested by these single-parents who are all members of such clubs.

**From the interviews**

One widow, talking of the help she had received, said "I had a complete breakdown after my husband's death. I was treated wonderfully at the — hospital. The shock treatment was not terrible. It helped me to pull through and come right."

Another woman, a divorcée said, "There is nowhere I can go, because the services are all for the lower class and although I'm divorced, I'm not lower class. The kids are on my ex-husband's medical aid. The big girl needs a brace. I don't know if she's covered for that and we can't go to — hospital. I'm middle class, you know."

A widow said "When my late husband was in hospital, a social worker saw me. She was feelingless. Never again, thank you!"

A professional man, divorced, weighed up the position with "We're pretty average on the whole. Our position is not especially worse than that of the married. We're taxpayers and that's what taxes are for. We're all in the same boat if we're well and making a living and our children are not handicapped. When we need them, the community services are there. I'm a Rotarian myself. I help others. I perform a community service. So each one should find a group to make him happy and avoid self-pity. It's humiliating to be pitied. If we especially help the divorced, all humbugs will get divorced!"

A widower said "They should set up a strong co-ordinating body from ourselves and we should be listened to and tell Government and municipalities our needs."

One female sighingly said "I'm separated. I'm new to this country. I really don't know what I'm entitled to."
7.1 Summary and conclusions
7.2 Closing statement

Is it not time we stopped thinking of women in general and one-parent families in particular as a supported group but as supporters doing a worthwhile job, which requires an adequate income and social services as of rights.

(Streather 1975:7)
While the overview and the schedule were far-ranging, the emphasis of the research, particularly the findings, has been on certain aspects of lone-parenthood, encompassing the situation of the subjects themselves (which may or may not affect their functioning as parents), their parental roles, and the children involved. These aspects fell under the following headings:

1. Economic
2. Adaptation
3. The children
4. Divorce laws, social services and suggestions for reform.

Each chapter in the overview of the literature has been concluded with a summary and some broad social implications. To avoid unnecessary repetition, mainly those facets immediately relevant to, or associated with particular aspects dealt with in the Findings are restated in this summary and conclusions. This final chapter also includes social implications, hypotheses and suggestions for further research and reforms, largely generated from the overview of the literature and the findings and interviews of the researcher.

The universe from which the findings were drawn, was made up of 70 respondents, 22 men and 48 women, their median ages being 43.5 years and 38.4 years respectively. By marital status, 57 were divorced, one was separated and 12 were widowed. Of the divorced, proportionately many less women than men did not have custody of the children, three of the 40 mothers as against 11 of the 18 fathers. The majority of the population were aged 45 and under, were of Christian, non-Catholic denominations, were English speaking and had a high-school education. Nine had university degrees. Most of them had been lone-parents for less than three years.

For 12 of the universe, it was not their first experience as single-parents, having been widowed or divorced, remarried and redivorced; for three of the universe it was the 'third time round.'

All the males, except one, and most of the women, were working full-time, the women mainly in clerical positions. Almost all the respondents considered themselves middle class. Close to 50% lived in houses and 40% in flats (all rented), mostly in middle and lower middle-class suburbs. The median number of children for the 70 respondents was 2.23. More than half of the children were 13 years and older, with a preponderance of boys.
Some of the findings presented concerning this population are summarized and evaluated against the broad spectrum of theoretical and empirical studies of one-parent families reviewed in the literature.

From the overview of the literature there appears to be a consensus that the economic situation constitutes perhaps the severest problem common to most one-parent families. Difficulties flowing from insufficient income are often incorrectly ascribed to the one-parent status. Mother-headed families, who form the majority, are usually more disadvantaged than father-headed families. In the researcher's sample, which was essentially middle class (as assessed by the respondents themselves) the economic stresses were, by and large, not as severe. The relative weighting would compare with middle-class findings of other researchers (Tapp 1963) where there was often diminished (and sometimes inadequate) income, particularly among the women. The economic and social position of the widowed (they had higher incomes and felt less discrimination) was, on the whole better than that of the divorced. This is in accord with the overview (Marsden 1969; Ferri 1976) where there is a consensus that the widowed fared better socially and economically than the divorced. The divorced is more accepted societally than the separated, with the unwed mother the most vulnerable.

The overview of the literature associates this grading of societal acceptance of the one-parent family forms largely with moral stigma. There is however, some basis, judging from the data in the overview and the results of the findings on this aspect, though limited, to suggest that societal degree of prejudice is more related to the level of the material deprivation of the various one-parent family forms. Compensatory support systems should be geared accordingly. Specialized services are required to reach out and cater for the solution of problems specific to the different categories of single-parents. While, overall, automatic State allowances to single-parents having to raise minor children would make these families economically viable, and thereby possibly reduce stigma, on the micro level, for instance, the organisation of the single-parent club as a mutual-aid society, providing credit guaranty cards to its credit-worthy members, would make facilities in banks and large departmental stores more accessible to the middle-class female single-parent particularly. Such separate services, or for that matter any services extended separately to the one-parent family, would, however, focus attention on them and isolate them at a time when it is critical they be accepted and integrated into the majority. This contradiction will have to be resolved in practice.

The usually diminished financial means available to the single-
The researcher's universe included a higher proportion of university graduates amongst the divorced women than amongst the divorced men. An implication of this may be that the economic independence university education often brings, makes these women more prone to divorce. As women's incomes move closer to those of their male peers, these women are free to opt for divorce in unhappy marriages.

It can be hypothesised that, since women obtained legal equality in divorce courts and irretrievable breakdown has become the main ground for divorce:

*The increase in the incidence of divorce is related to the degree of increase of women's economic equality.*

(Hypothesis 1).

Some scale (and manner of practical application of it) will however have to be evolved by society for assessing economic compensation for the biological and nurturant roles performed by the mother. Additional research in this direction could be rewarding for pragmatic application.

The overview of the literature shows that separation, by death or divorce (in the latter sometimes its turbulent prelude), is generally a traumatic experience and regarded as a crisis in the lives of those involved. With the divorced, who form the bulk of the one-parent population (as also in the writer's universe), Goode (1956:18) found that it was rare that parties separated coolly and pragmatically without experiencing rancour, accusations, misunderstandings or guilt. 'Emotional' divorce, turbulence and its deleterious effects is a recurring theme in the overview of literature. Some of the tension is
communicated to the children and reflects in and affects the social and psychological adaptation of the broken familial triad.

All the widowed, and the majority by far of the divorced, considered their separation as having been a crisis in their lives. An interesting finding hardly touched upon by the researcher in her overview (Kelly and Wallerstein 1977 (a)), and emerging from her use of non-custodial parents in her universe, was the definite indication that non-custodial parents considered parting with their children a greater trauma than parting with the spouse. It may be rationalised that the fact that twice as many divorced women as men regarded the separation as not having been a crisis in their lives, was due to the majority of these mothers having custody of the children. Counselling which could accompany the calmer atmosphere of separation foreseen with the introduction of The Divorce Act 1979 in South Africa could considerably alleviate this trauma by encouraging amicable ongoing relationships between the triad. The contact of the non-custodial parent with the child was maintained more often and more intensely than with the ex-spouse.

The comparatively high incidence of divorce in South Africa and the comparative simplification of the legal means and grounds for its obtainment (even more so with the passage of the Divorce Act, 1979, enacted subsequent to completion of the investigation of this research), while reducing the stigma of marital dissolution, has not removed it. Slightly over half the respondents in the population experienced discrimination, with more women than men sensing it. This may have been due to the women's reduced incomes. In the words of Ogg (1976:3) 'For a woman to divorce is to drop two economic and three social notches.'

Those who considered their divorce as having been a crisis were more prone to feelings of being discriminated against. In the case of the women, the source of such discrimination was mainly their neighbours, whereas with the men it came chiefly from their co-workers. The widowed had experienced less discrimination than the divorced. Some of the respondents, while admitting to discrimination, opined that this may be subjective rather than objective and referred to it as "a chip on the shoulder." A few parents felt that this discrimination extended to their children both at school and out. Respondents who felt discrimination, by and large, supported (the women more so than the men) the notion that the social and psychological position of lone-parents must be improved. They felt that the strong prevailing stigma attached to their marital status accounted for the poor social and psychological position of lone-parents and their families. They stressed the lack of special economic and social facilities to help lone-parents with child rearing. Slightly more women than men considered the social and
psychological position of lone-parents needed improvement. Negative societal attitudes to lone-parenthood not only engendered feelings of discrimination, but also feelings of guilt and loneliness. Respondents felt guilty not only about the divorce or death of a spouse, but also about depriving the children of a parent.

About two-thirds of the universe researched had experienced loneliness and with most of them this persisted still at the time of interview, though less so amongst the divorced males. Guilt feelings were slightly less prevalent than loneliness and those who had or felt guilty appeared to be more prone to feelings of loneliness and for longer periods and were less eager for remarriage. Goode (1956) and La Grange (1970) pointed out that the feelings of loneliness and guilt in particular were compounded by the absence of institutionalised norms, mores and behaviour patterns, laying down role support for the single-parent. Society's attitudes towards the divorced and separated instead of being supportive and sympathetic, are often judgemental and suspicious.

From the findings on 'guilt' and 'remarriage', the following hypothesis is put forward:

The degree of aspiration to remarriage is related to the degree of guilt felt by the parent about the loss of the spouse. (Hypothesis 2).

The examination of this hypothesis will involve a retrospective study of parents who had remarried, either after the death of the spouse, or parents who had remarried after divorce.

By substituting the phrase 'loss of spouse' with 'loss of children', the above hypothesis would be applicable to the non-custodial parent. This, in view of the intensity of trauma felt by some of the non-custodial respondents at the 'loss' of their children and the feelings of guilt at 'depriving' them of the second parent.

Flowing from Hypothesis 2, may be an investigation of the effects of guilt on the success of the remarriage and whether the guilt feelings of the parent affected the child's adaptation to parental remarriage. It may also be investigated whether, where there is no remarriage, if, and how, a feeling of guilt affects the parental role and the child's adaptation.

Feelings of loneliness, shock, guilt, depression, and discrimination, frequently affect lone-parents' sense of well-being. Unable to cope with the complex and varied demands their position as lone-parent heads of families requires, and the position frequently aggravated by limited financial and depleted emotional, and often poorer physical resources at their disposal, single-parents and their families may experience generalised functioning difficulties. Although generally the one-parent family is economically, socially and emotionally more vulnerable than the two-parent family, there is also a correlation
between socioeconomic class and degree of vulnerability. Middle class populations, including that of the researcher whose population appeared to cope reasonably well being materially less deprived, did not, by and large, experience generalized functioning difficulties and fared better than lower class samples reviewed in the literature. It can be deduced from this that it is not the one-parent situation per se which is responsible for the difficulties experienced, but rather, amongst the other factors external to the situation, the lowering of the living standards experienced by most on becoming single-parents.

Lone-parenthood is in most of the literature referred to as a transient state. Legitimate remarriage, (or marriage, as in the case of the never-married mother) as Hart (1976:227) found in her research was, largely due to societal pressure to conform, almost the universal goal of her respondents. It was therefore not surprising that 90% of the researcher's sample wished to remarry and actively engaged in pursuits which increased their likelihood of meeting potential marriage partners, for their own sakes or for that of their children (or both). Non-custodial parents aspired to remarriage, no less than the custodial parents. Remarriage was sought as a solution to their problems and was reflected in their club membership, in an increased frequency of going out and in seeking new circles of friends, the latter often due to considerable disappointment by many of the respondents at the reactions of their old friends after their separation through the death of divorce of the partner.

This cultivation of new friends, as Goode (1956) pointed out, may well be an active or passive part of a search for dating partners. He regarded the divorcee's friendship patterns as an index of social adjustment and dating, and maintenance or entrance into new circles of friends as one of the social activities that precedes marriage. In the researcher's universe the percentage of those dating fell considerably short of the percentage of those aspiring to remarry. This was particularly true of the women, who may be more restricted in their social activities by societal norms of behaviour and therefore opportunity in dating did not match wishes. The single-parent organisations they joined was central in this search for potential partners for themselves, and 'father or mother' for the children. It was a primary source for meeting dating partners and attempts to curb their loneliness and escape societal stigma, partly subjective, in this subculture.

The high incidence of divorce and remarriage, found in the overview of literature, poses the question whether either marriage or divorce, though traditionally regarded as final states, are in fact so. It appears that they are both status passages and that marriage is firmly entrenched as the norm to aspire to, rather than being on the way out.
It can however be opined that couples may increasingly tend to enter into marriage, knowing from the first that the relationship is not necessarily permanent, with societal acceptance of this. The dissolution of such marriages should, theoretically at least, reduce the degree of unenvisaged difficulties of one-parenthood, which is such a factor in adjustment, and the breakup should be less acrimonious and less likely to be preceded by acrimony and interparental denigration, which is one of the most damaging aspects to the social and psychological development of children of divorce and separation.

This is a new direction for research and merits testing by the following hypothesis:

*Couples who enter into a marriage, understanding that it may be temporary, and divorce after becoming parents, experience less turbulence in their relationship with each other and dissolve the marriage more amicably.*

(Hypothesis 3).

To test hypothesis 3, a retrospective study will have to be conducted, sorting out two comparative groups; one cohort of parents who had viewed their marriages as not necessarily permanent, and another group of parents who contracted marriages with life-long monogamy in mind.

Flowing from this, another study may be conducted on whether couples viewing marriage as not necessarily permanent, are less likely to embark on parenthood and more likely to divorce.

In the transience of marriage is implicit the transience of divorce and the social services must constantly bear this in mind. Although appearing contradictory, by assisting in their adaptation to their lone-parent status and their acceptance by the mainstream, the problem of lone-parenthood would be resolved through earlier remarriage. The pressure of the two-parent society and the almost universal basic urge for this, is too strong for comfortable adaptation to keep them in their one-parent status. Adaptation to their lone-parent status is hopefully viewed by the single-parents themselves as being a temporary necessity.

This does not imply that the lone-parent does not feel a real need for assistance and reforms and the respondents themselves proffered numerous suggestions. Excepting for the minority who do not wish to, and will not, remarry, 'temporary' can be a long time for a lone-parent to fulfil the threefold function of parent, socialiser and provider. This is made more difficult by the fact that, expected to and expecting to remarry, the lone-parent experiences a lack of security and feelings of impermanence.

In South Africa (1976) almost 30% of White marriages involved a formerly married party. In the universe of the writer, for 17% it was
not their first experience as lone-parents. The number of children who will have personally experienced divorce will continue to rise and peer stigma will, it can be inferred, lessen. The negative popular connotation associated with stepparenting will be weakened with the increase of the reconstituted family; supportive systems, particularly counselling services, will have to concern themselves with this phenomenon. As marriage proves itself less and less permanent, there is a search for other 'family' lifestyles which are often more temporary. Cohabitation, not only amongst the pre-married, but also amongst lone-parents, is no more as frowned upon and is openly entered into. In fact, legislation for easing divorce has been influenced to a considerable extent by the fear that, unless a dead marriage can be buried without difficulty and honourably, society, with its new attitudes and aspirations for individual happiness, will resort to cohabitation and spurn marriage.

This greater tolerance towards extra-marital relationships, resulting from changing social attitudes, traced also in the overview of the literature, made it possible for over 20% of the universe to maintain relationships (L.T.A. and weekending) other than marriage with a partner of the opposite sex, all but one drawn from their single-parent organisation. No doubt, in some of the cases in the writer's population these L.T.A. relationships were but a step to remarriage, cohabitation serving as a trial marriage. This new life-style, may in South Africa too, be indicative of a trend towards increased other, perhaps more temporary, life-styles, complementing traditional ever-forever monogamy.

Obviously these new life-styles affect parental roles, the parents involved and their children. In the writer's universe all but one of the cohabiting parents had custody, with the children ranging in ages from three years to 15 years old. These children were de facto, if not de jure, as in the case of remarriage, no longer parentally deprived, had 'stepparents' and 'stepsiblings'. De facto, though possibly in more of a transitory nature than that which would have been provided by remarriage, there was again, in most respects, an 'intact' (or quasi-intact) family.

Remarriage, to which most of the respondents aspired, and were statistically most likely to attain, is the usual resolution of the one-parent status, but at the same time introduces the advantages and disadvantages concomitant with stepparenthood.

It creates a new type of extended family beyond the nuclear family which engenders possibilities for new or additional affections and loyalties. At the same time, however, the loyalties and affections demanded of them can be confusing, though less so than in the case of cohabitation, to the stepparents who are often put in a quasi-parental position, to the other relatives involved and, particularly to the
children who now have two complete sets of families -- the family of origin and the family of accretion; and all this without societal norms of behaviour as to what is expected of all the parties concerned in their relationships with each other. With sequential monogamy the problems become more complex and are more untouched as yet by research.

Whatever the degree of success in their performing of parental roles and the children's and parents' apparent successful adaptation, the urge to return to a two-parent situation is expressed both in the parent's search for a new partner and the children's approval of their parent's friendships which may lead to remarriage. This can be concluded also from the writer's findings from her limited universe.

While all statistics prove the high incidence of remarriage, not much research has been found by the author on the correlation between remarriage aspirations, remarriage and successful adaptation to the lone-parent situation. This researcher's limited findings on this aspect need substantiating by testing of an hypothesis, such as:

Remarriage of single-parents is not related to their success in adapting to their changed marital situation.

(Hypothesis 4).

The high incidence of remarriage and aspirations for remarriage has been borne out by both the overview of the literature and the findings in this study. Whether, and to what degree, remarriage is aspired to as a solution to one or more lone-parent-related problems; whether it results from societal pressure to conform to the two-parent society or whether it is an instinctive reaction for the perpetuation of society, remains to be assessed.

The great majority of the 156 children in the population reacted positively (in keeping with the findings of others) with only slight differences by age and sex, to their parent's friend/s of the opposite sex, whether the parent had a living-together arrangement or not. In spite of the apparent eager anticipation of their parent's remarriage, perhaps the reason for so few of the children finding substitute identification for the 'missing' parent in their parent's friend was due to the large extent of ongoing relationships with their 'absent' natural father or mother.

For over 80% of the respondents in this study there was some continued relationship with the other, mainly non-custodial parent. Rosen (1977:271), whose sample was also middle class, found 90% of the children in her study enjoying such a relationship, whether the parents had remarried or not. Remarriage of parents in the universe did not appear to affect the ongoing relationship with the children.

In the researcher's population, the attitude of most of the children to their parent's friend/s of the opposite
sex was positive in spite of a strong ongoing relationship with the non-custodial parent. Not only this apparent contradiction, but the entire aspect merits further research and the following hypothesis is put forward as a possible starting point:

Children differ in their attitude to their parent's friend of the opposite sex. Their positive or negative attitude is inversely related to the strength of their relationship with the non-custodial parent. (Hypothesis 5).

Comparative variables in the above hypothesis would be the age and sex of the child.

Recent studies have shown that most children need, for their emotional development and social adaptation, to maintain contact with both the parents of divorce. The researcher's universe supports other studies that the non-custodial parent, though separated legally, remains a parent factually and this is to be encouraged by suitable legislation and counselling.

An interesting aspect for further investigation is the relationship between the triad of custodial parent, non-custodial parent and child; also to what extent, with remarriage being as frequent as it is, the addition of a stepparent affects ongoing relationships, can in itself be the subject of more than one study.

As indicated from comparisons of some of the researcher's findings with some studies in the overview of the literature, socio-economic class appears to affect attitudes, relationships and adaptation, with the middle-class non-custodial parent possibly maintaining a stronger ongoing relationship with his children than his lower-class peers.

The validity of the above rationale, based as it is on limited findings in the researcher's small universe, could perhaps be established by research into the following hypothesis:

The higher the socio-economic class of the 'absent' parent, the greater this parent's involvement in the child of the marital dissolution. (Hypothesis 6).

This hypothesis could be adapted to extend to the putative fathers of unwed mothers' children.

It would be interesting with this variable, to establish whether in a correlation between socio-economic class and parental-child and interparental relationships, it is the financial or the educational level of the parents which is the dominant factor.

Further research in this direction may point to the need for evolving differential support systems.

While the findings show a high degree of continued contact between the respondents, their children and the non-custodial parent,
there is little evidence of any significant relationship between the respondents and their children and grandparents or other relatives. This is contrary to the findings of Marsden (1969) and Ferri (1976 (a)) where relatives provided considerable support.

The researcher's findings show her middle-class population received little financial assistance from relatives, relatives did not help to any extent in child care, and but few children regarded a relative as a substitute parent. Furthermore, contrary to the findings of Gongla and Wales (1977) the researcher found several cases where affinal ties were closer than consanguineal ties after marital breakdown.

There appears room for testing the hypothesis:

The relationships of the parent with consanguineal kin become closer, whereas the parent's relationship with affinal kin distance, after marital dissolution.

(Hypothesis 7).

This hypothesis can be applied in situations of both divorce and death.

Cross variables for such a hypothesis could be the age and sex of the children of the parent involved, and the duration of marriage prior to the dissolution. Related to the hypothesis is the effect of the passage of time on the relationship of the child with kin. This would entail a longitudinal study.

Another hypothesis suggested, also flowing from the contradictions, is:

The degree of the lone-parent family relationship with kin is in inverse proportion to the socio-economic class of the one-parent family; The higher the class, the weaker the relationship.

(Hypothesis 8).

In the situations of divorce and separation where children are involved, it is the issue of custody and access which is the most controversial and the most bitterly contested. Perhaps second only to custody, access arrangements are most crucial to the lives of children and may substantially affect the wellbeing and adaptation of the child. But the understanding as to the child's best interests on which court decisions are predominantly based, are open to varying interpretations of concepts based on continuing developments in the fields of sociology and child psychiatry and shifting societal values.

The custody pattern of the 156 children in the sample did not particularly reflect an application of either the tender-age or same-sex principles cited in the overview of the literature as being the basis for the legal guidelines in the granting of custody for the best interests of the child. This was hardly adhered to even in the five cases of split-custody in the researcher's universe. Rosen (1977:97, 99) found that children's adjustments were not affected by their sex or age.
at the time of the divorce, in relation to the sex of the parent
granted custody. It appears therefore that either lone-parent can by
and large fulfil parental roles and their doing so has already generally
been accepted by society, and more custody is being granted to divorced
fathers. Fain (1977:40) suggested that the overriding consideration in
custody decisions should be the emotional tie which exists between the
child and the intended custodian. Rosen (1977) distinguished, as did
Fain (1977), between biological and psychological parents. These
opinions are in accordance with Rutter (1972) who contended that the
quality of the relationship is more important than the sex of the
bonding figure.

Parental roles and functions in the two-parent family have been
merging and changing, stemming largely from the increased participation
of women in industry, business, science and politics. In addition, the
taking over or complementing, of many familial, socializing and nur-
turing tasks by external support systems, combined with a lessening of
stigma, has not only made it easier for the one-parent family to
function and made it more viable, in a two parent society, but has also
made it feasible, both in theory and in practice for both parents to
lay equal claim to custody. This movement away from traditional
custody principles increases the number of fathers gaining custody, a
trend already found in South Africa (including the writer's population).
In planning support systems this growing trend should be considered.
Outreach activities should encompass male-oriented social systems.

Rosen (1977) suggested that an important consideration in the
granting of custody should be the child's express preference. In the
researcher's study, adolescents, having experienced friction with a
stepparent or their mother's male companions, showed their preference
for the non-custodial fathers by moving in with them in spite of the
court having granted the legal custody to the mothers. Similar preference
in defiance of court custody decisions were mentioned by La Grange (1970).

Contention about access mentioned in the literature, is reflected
in the findings of this research where half of the custodial parents
expressed themselves as dissatisfied with the access pattern.

In the overview of the literature, the legal and psychological
aspects of access were looked into. There are differing opinions as to
the pros and cons of various types of access. Reasonable access, which
is the accepted practice, is, largely, an ambiguous term and is open
to abuse in practice. The child often becomes the shuttlecock between
warring parents, is torn in his loyalties, and is manipulated or
becomes manipulative. There is a growing recognition, springing from
the increased importance attached to a continued ongoing relationship
with the non-custodial parent, that reasonable access should be supplanted by other forms such as free access.

Both Rosen (1977) and Kelly and Wallerstein (1974-1977) found the greatest satisfaction and feelings of self-esteem amongst those children whose contact with the non-custodial parent was not prescribed or proscribed. Joint custody is also a form of not only custody by both parents, but access by both parents. Both in free access and joint custody, is implicit a continued co-operative instead of competitive interparental relationship, or at least agreement against mutual denigration and use of the child as a weapon. In the researcher's study, in the five cases of split custody, where access happened to be virtually free, both the parents expressed satisfaction which infers the children too were happy about the visitation arrangements.

For further investigation on these aspects to which recent research is being directed, the following hypotheses are suggested:

The greater the opportunity given to the non-custodial parent, through access, to act as parent, the more involved the parent feels, the more the parent becomes involved and the more satisfied the parent feels. (Hypothesis 10).

On the other hand, it can be investigated whether the relationship, positive or negative, between parents, has a more significant effect on children's development than specific custody or access arrangements.

Complementing this would be the following:

A co-operative relationship between divorcing parents has a more positive effect on children than a competitive relationship wherein the children may benefit more materially. (Hypothesis 11).

While Hypothesis 10 can be applied to all access arrangements short of joint custody, Hypothesis 11 extends to joint custody arrangements which are likely to increase in South Africa with the passage of the new divorce act following which, as previously noted, custody and access arrangements are more likely to be pragmatically and amicably arrived at.

To what extent the high incidence, found in the researcher's universe, of ongoing relationships between the non-custodial parent and child contributed to the relative success of familial adjustment, is in itself a subject worthy of further exploration.

Of particular concern to society is the child. While problems of a child's social and emotional development are not confined to the one-parent family, it is in such familial situations that the child is often most 'at risk'. Extreme examples of this are maternal or paternal deprivation (though its adverse effects are being questioned by researchers such as Gettleman and Markowitz (1974)) in all one-parent families and problems related to custody and access, already dealt with,
in the case of the children of divorce and separation.

With almost 75% of the 156 children in the sample being over six years old, it is reasonable to expect that, amongst these children, there should be incidence of rearing difficulties and problems connected with their schooling. There was no cohort of children from intact homes to serve as a comparison.

Most of the men in the universe claimed not to have had rearing difficulties. It must, however, be borne in mind that this sample included 11 non-custodial fathers. Of the 50% of the women who had rearing difficulties, it was, with the majority, of a disciplinary nature. There were but a few cases of difficulties in sex education of the children of the opposite sex, unlike in the findings of Arsenau et al. (1971:69).

There appeared to be little or no correlation between rearing difficulties and the category of the person caring for the child after school. This is in keeping with other findings in the overview. In the researcher's universe there was a slight suggestion that the use of part or full-time domestic help ('maids'), which in South Africa, unlike in most Western countries, is quite often within reach of even the lower middle class, was but a minimal factor in whether parents had or did not have rearing difficulties with their children.

From the above it would appear that:

- Direct involvement of the 'custodial' parent (widowed, divorced or unmarried) in the daycare of the child does not affect the adjustment of the child.

(Hypothesis 12).

The quality of the bonding relationship with the parent is of importance. From this hypothesis it could be deduced that mothers can take up employment without feelings of guilt, and this in itself would remove stress, which is transferred to the children, affecting them adversely.

According to the overview of the literature there is little change in children's school performance (with most difficulties abating and disappearing within a year or two), but in the researcher's population many parents ascribed their children's schooling difficulties to their one-parent home. This may have been due to the large number of children who changed the schools they attended (a variable which existed and was considered in the Ferri study). Indirectly, this could be attributed to the parent's marital status as almost half of such school changes was ascribed by the parents to their own lone-parent status. The girls appeared to have suffered more than the boys, contrary to findings in the overview (Hetherington et al. 1978(a)), but their school
performance was less affected when they were in their mother's custody as compared to their father's custody. The three widoweds' children who had failed a class at school were all girls. Failures at school amongst the children of the divorced was not related to the sex of the parent.

By and large children of one-parent families have been found to be remarkably resilient and no different to the child in the intact family after the initial shock of parental loss has worn off. In the case of death of a parent, after the initial shock, the child accepts its finality and comes to terms with this parent's loss. Bonds with the widowed parent are strengthened. Most of the children involved are, however, (as in the author's universe), from 'broken homes.' Stress, according to the literature, was often due to interparental turbulence before and after the divorce and normally disappeared within a year or two of the parents' separation. The writer found that of the 156 children of the respondents in her universe, the problem of the only child under psychiatric treatment had predated the dissolution of an unhappy marriage. Some of the discrepancies noted between the findings of researchers in the overview and that of the author, require further study. But there is a consensus that there are school-related problems, even if only of a temporary nature, and dealing with them, may well lie within the scope of a school social worker and psychologist. This could be within the framework of a larger, more embracing programme.

As most children spend a considerable portion of their day-span at school, research may be conducted on how the school could be more involved in providing supportive services, including after school care, holiday facilities, psychiatric services, children's counselling, education about divorce, death and reconstituted families. Ideally, schools could become community centres where single and two-parent families, including parents, will meet, muse and fuse. The school could constitute the operative base for the social worker without the stigma attached to a welfare agency address. Assessing and delineating objectives and instruments and finding the organizational structure for setting up such centres, is a tremendous challenge in itself.

The rationale for the provision of support systems, for repairing the distortions caused by the one-parent situation, is the hypothesis:

The major contributing factors to poorer development in one-parent children are factors external to the family situation. These factors can be changed through social practice. (Hypothesis 13).

This hypothesis is more of a guideline for a number of hypotheses to be postulated with separate, or groups of
contributing factors as variables against specific support or counselling services provided. It is difficult to test as an entity.

While mindful of the comparative and more favourable socio-economic position of her population, the writer can summarise the overview as well as her own findings regarding rearing difficulties of children in the one-parent situation with the words of Ferri:

*Given the hardship and deprivation that such families were experiencing, the lone-parents in our study were doing a pretty good job bringing up the children single-handed.*

(Terri 1974).

The researcher ponders whether the lack of familiarity with existing South African divorce laws expressed by 80% of the women and one third of the men in the universe, is not a reflection of poor legal practice in South Africa, and points to a lack of adequate explanation of the law to the clients. It would have been expected that the researcher's educated, middle-class universe, most of them being so personally legally involved through divorce, would have had considerable knowledge of and displayed particular interest in the laws pertaining thereto; especially so at the time when there was considerable debate about a new divorce law being prepared in South Africa. This law, in keeping with legislation already in force in most countries of the Western industrialised world, proposed that irretrievable breakdown be the main or only ground for divorce. In spite of the widespread ignorance of the law, 80% of the universe felt the existing laws were unsuitable, and most of them considered changes were required. The proposed new South African divorce law (in force since July 1979) was perhaps an example of belated recognition of changed societal attitudes as reflected in the deep-rooted dissatisfaction expressed by the universe with the existing laws relating to marital dissolution.

The former legal concept of divorce being granted almost only on proof of guilt by one party encouraged and intensified acrimony and hatred in a situation normally already strained by a long history of interparental turbulence. There are numerous implications besides the obvious one of the initial spate of divorces which accompanies the introduction of a divorce law based essentially on incompatibility. Accusations and counter accusations being now unnecessary, the chances of amicable agreement on divorce-related problems, including interparental relationships and particularly custody and access arrangements will increase, with the parties more open to professional counselling. It will, hopefully, even affect the pre-divorce atmosphere. Matrimonial lawyers will be freer, and should be trained to have a broader perspective of divorce, play more of a counselling role and concentrate more on the economic aspects of divorce, such as property division. Both the
behavioural sciences and the law can and should co-operate in post-divorce counselling to ensure a continuing, healthy, co-operative, ongoing relationship between custodial and non-custodial parents and children.

La Grange (1970:239) warns that it must be borne in mind that individual undesirable human behaviour cannot necessarily and easily be changed through academic enlightenment, professional help, legislation and positive societal attitudes.

Flowing from the above, the following hypotheses for further study are suggested:

The amount of turbulence surrounding divorce is the most important factor influencing maladjustment or adjustment of children of divorce. Divorce based on irretrievable breakdown will lessen the incidence and intensity of such turbulence. (Hypothesis 14)

Divorce based on irretrievable breakdown enables the parents to explain their parting from each other to their children. This will positively affect their roles as custodial or non-custodial parents. (Hypothesis 15)

Arising from these it may be researched whether, in cases where the divorce was amicable, agreement on custody and access of the child is arrived at to the satisfaction of both parties and to the best interest of the child, based upon the degree of bonding, rather than popularly accepted guidelines (such as tender age and same sex principles).

Research on the emotional adaptation and attitude of the child to whom the divorce has been explained, as compared to the child to whom the divorce was not explained or was explained at the expense of the other parent, could be of value to guide counsellors. Such pre-divorce and post-divorce counselling could assist parents to be able to communicate better with their children.

The overview of the literature has shown that the gap between divorce in the lower and middle classes has narrowed. The question arises whether, with the simplification of the law and resulting lowering of legal tariffs, more of the lower classes will not join the ranks of the divorced and the gap will reappear.

Various reforms in and suggestions for legislation and services to further the social and psychological wellbeing and adaptation of one-parent families, were proffered by almost half the respondents. Among the suggestions were: divorce should be based on incompatibility and not proof of guilt; there should be a compulsory reconciliation period; lawyers should have 'less power of control, with a lower maximum fee' (all these points raised by men); the home should remain with the parent who has custody; women should get equal share of accretion in assets since marriage; stricter enforcement of maintenance payment; (all the
latter suggestions from the women). In addition it was suggested that custody be granted to the parent best equipped to care for the child; that custody be subject to regular review and that maintenance should be paid through the Department of Social Welfare. These suggestions echo many aspects raised in the overview of the literature; particularly in the chapter on divorce (Chapter 5).

The researcher, when conducting this study, visited the better known, larger social welfare agencies in the city in which she conducted the research, and found that in none was there a special worker/s to deal with specific problems or cater for the needs (in any different or special way) of lone-parents and of one-parent families. In the initial interview enquiry sheets of the Department of Social Welfare, particulars about stepparents are sought. This is the only specific allusion to any circumstance relating to single-parenthood. In the diagnosis sheet of a child welfare agency, children from one-parent families are included in the 'at risk' categories of the population. Overall there was, comparative to its dimensions, sparse recognition of the problems related to lone-parenthood and a shortfall in the resources, both human and technical, to deal with its specific aspects. There is much to be said for La Grange's (1970) suggestion that undergraduate courses on divorce be introduced in all academic departments of social work and that at least one university should offer a postgraduate course on problems related to marriage and divorce, particularly for qualified social workers who could, in practice, contribute most.

Stemming from the expressed need for changes in the (then) existing divorce laws and the social and psychological position of lone-parents, the question arises as to whether the lone-parents in the universe were or were not aware of existing community social services and whether and which of such community services they used. An overwhelming majority claimed they were aware of these services. Almost 70% availed themselves of the extramural educational services available; close to 30% used the medical services (a high percentage for a middle-class sample if one takes into account that use of community medical services is based on a means test) and 15% used mental hygiene and psychiatric services. As the researcher did not have a control sample, any conclusions could be erroneous.

Advisory legal aid services on their divorce situation was not available in this city. Having been inundated with requests for such assistance, the local legal aid bureau terminated this service. Free assistance could only be obtained through a court appointed lawyer in cases of 'in pauperis.'

Just over half the sample were satisfied with the social
(community) services they used, but one-third of the sample (particularly the women) wanted them improved and called for special services to assist single-parents in their adjustment to their new situation. Close to 80% favoured state family allowances, with the majority of these preferring that such assistance be based on a means test, as they felt that the single-parent, being generally economically deprived, would benefit more that way.

The respondents' answers to the concluding question in the schedule, gave some credence to their claims of middle-class status. Their suggestions for 'other' forms of aid were not for financial or housing assistance, but centred mainly on educating the teachers, the public and the children on lone-parenthood; setting up panels of health, psychiatric and legal experts financed by the government, and subsidising more social clubs like the single-parents' organizations they belonged to. In fact the single-parent club could, besides its socializing function, become the operative core for disseminating knowledge to sensitize the public through the media to the problems and to the acceptance of the one-parent family. It could be the base for organizing parliamentary, provincial and city pressure groups to further favourable legislation at all levels. This task has probably been considerably eased by the fact that there has been a cumulative increase in the proportion of people on whom first-hand experience of divorce has impinged, resulting in more tolerance and reduction in stigma.

With increased recognition and acceptance of the one-parent family and, should the trend of statistical stabilization through the levelling off of divorce and natal mortality rates continue, the long-term planning and provision of support systems for the one-parent family probably will become more feasible.

In addition to the suggestions for social and legal provisions and reforms contained in the overview and those related to the findings embodied in the summary and conclusions, the following suggestions, generated by insights and extensions from the overview, as well as some interesting ones reviewed therein, are proffered:

**Research and education**

1. There should be continuous evaluation and ongoing research of existing and new projects and community developments. There should be ongoing research in custody, particularly male custody and joint custody because of their emerging importance.

As La Grange (1970) points out, more studies will lead to planning, implementation and evaluation of community and professional services for the divorced and one-parent families.
2. Teachers' training should include courses in problems relating to the one-parent child.

3. Crash courses on the one-parent family for teachers, ministers of religion, youth leaders, and members of the legal profession should be conducted.

4. All those working with single-parent families should be sensitized to the importance of promoting non-custodial parent-child relationships. The non-custodial parent has largely been neglected hitherto.

Community services

Pragmatically, it is suggested that the concentration should be on the provision of neighbourhood primary group networks offering the following community service based, operationally, largely from the school and the single parent organization.

1. As already mentioned these should, as far as possible, be based from the school. Multi-faceted problems of lone-parenthood will not be solved by a multiplicity of geographically and aspect-isolated agencies. There must be interaction and co-operation. In addition, the school does not overtly isolate lone-parent members as it is used by intact families as well.

2. After-school day-care should be provided and could best and most economically be located in the school. The child of the working two-parent family would also participate and again the single-parent child not be isolated.

3. Community agencies and counselling services should operate at such hours as to make them available to working parents; they should be professionally staffed, including psychiatrists, social workers, members of the legal profession, and trained supervisors in the dynamics of human relations to refer lone-parents to the proper channels for ongoing casework. The community agencies should reach out to the one-parent family, and the services should be widely advertised.

4. School authorities should be instructed to send school reports also to the non-custodial parent. This would deepen his involvement. Both parents should be encouraged to attend parents' teachers' association meetings. The above two simple suggestions are from La Grange (1970).

5. Lone-parent organizations should be assisted not only financially, but organizationally. They should be encouraged to widen their scope of operations to attract all socio-economic classes and become the base for co-operative state-assisted self-help systems. These could include:

a. Operating centres, properly staffed for single-parents and their children. Against a monthly payment, lone-parents and/or their children could move in for a maximum period (say four months) in case of crises such as housing, illness of a parent or child. A children's crèche and after school care service would be part of the facilities.

b. The centre would also be the base for a 24 hour hour homemaker service for emergency cases.
c. Big-Brother and Big-Sister organizations should be set up by the lone-parent organizations, professionally advised and assisted by psychiatrists, social workers and teachers.

**Economics**

1. Tax provisions should take into consideration that the one-parent home has greater per capita expenses than the two-parent home. Tax rebates should be granted accordingly.

2. Single-parents should, in larger organizations particularly, be permitted to work flexitime.

3. Large employers (including the defence services) should by law be required to provide support systems such as crèches, and medical aid schemes. Leave should be granted to single-parents concurrent with their children's school holidays.

**Legal**

1. Family courts should have on their panels, not only lawyers, but also social workers, psychiatrists and marriage counsellors to be able to bring to the judge the human angle.

2. These family courts should counsel for conciliation, reconciliation and adjustment to lone-parenthood for both custodial and non-custodial parents and their children. They should particularly encourage post-divorce parental co-operation, in the best interests of the child.

3. Counselling of these courts should include explanations to the child, according to his age, of the pertinent aspects of the situation.

4. La Grange (1970) suggested that:

   *Parties intending to divorce should inform the magistrate of this intention. He would be recognised as a commissioner of divorce and would be advised by a senior social worker and a psychotherapist. This panel would decide whether divorce is actually unavoidable. Reasonable access and custody would be discussed with all the parties concerned (including the children) and a report would be sent to the Supreme Court.*

5. Maintenance should be paid by the state who would, through its income tax channels, be instrumental in collecting the sums from the non-custodial parent.

The researcher wishes to end this chapter with a point raised in the Methodology (1.4.3.1). The writer found the use of so many different terms to describe the one-parent situation confusing. The researcher suggests, with some hesitation, in view of the warning by Goode and Hatt (1952) against developing 'his own terminology peculiar to himself', that the existing terms be used more restrictively and each term be confined in its meaning to one specific concept only. The following terminology is proffered in an effort in this direction.
One parent -- the parent who has de facto custody of the child/ren and, not necessarily, de jure custody. Where there is split or joint custody, the term applies to each of the two parents individually.

Lone-parent -- the parent who has not the de facto custody of the child. This term is introduced also because of the aloneness and loneliness inferred. (The word lone-parent must not be confused with this term as used in the title of the study.)

Widowed-parent -- a male or female parent whose spouse is deceased.

Single-parent -- the never-married female who has given birth to or adopted a child and the never-married male who has adopted a child and rears the child without a spouse.

In addition, it is suggested that the term 'uni-parent' be used to cover any or all of the above four situations.

Thus, for example, an organization catering for parents in the above categories could be referred to as a 'uni-parent' association.

The writer feels that the use of the above will help to clarify, simplify and codify the usage of terminology in future studies on the subject.

7.2 Closing statement

In spite of lessening stigma, as evidenced from the overview, against one-parent families, the findings of this study have shown that attitudes, both subjective and objective, are as yet not conducive to their re-integration into the mainstream of society. The comparative centrality in the activities of most of the respondents of single-parent organizations from which the researcher's universe was drawn, suggests both negative societal positions and negative self-appraisal which tend to isolate the one-parent family.

Although made more difficult by material disadvantage, and emotional stresses (such as feelings of crisis, guilt and loneliness) flowing from the one-parent situation, the respondents were somehow coping in maintaining family life including rearing the children. This in itself is an achievement and a positive contribution to society and merits recognition.

Lone-parents look to society for acceptance and assistance and it is in society's interest to extend these. Information and education can shape understanding and unprejudiced social attitudes which are so crucial to the osmosis of the family. The development and provision of the necessary social networks will furnish the counselling, reassurance, and moral and material assistance. Public assistance and public acceptance must be treated as being complementary of each other.

It is hoped that some directions will have been provided by this study which will contribute to the solution of problems flowing from some of the implications of lone-parenthood.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

IDENTIFYING DATA (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ.No.</th>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX 11</td>
<td>Sex: 1. Masculine 2. feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE 12</td>
<td>*Age: 1. 20 and under 2. 20 - 24 3. 25 - 34 4. 35 - 49 5. 50 - 59 6. 60 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR.ST 13</td>
<td>Marital Status: 1. divorced 2. separated 3. widowed 4. other Specify 5. other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG 15</td>
<td>Home Language: 1. Afrikaans 2. English 3. Other Specify 4. other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR.HIS 17</td>
<td>History of Marriages: 1. Have you been married once and are now widowed? 2. Have you been married once and are now separated? 3. Have you been married once and are now divorced? 4. Are you an unmarried parent? 5. Have you been married twice, was the second marriage after widowhood, and now you are divorced? 6. Have you been married twice, was the second marriage after widowhood, and now you are divorced? 7. Have you been married twice, was the second marriage after divorce, and now you are divorced? 8. Have you been married twice, was the second marriage after divorce, and now you are widowed? 9. Have you been married twice, was the second marriage after divorce, and now you are separated? 10. Have you been married twice, was the second marriage after divorce, and now you are widowed? 11. Other Specify 12. other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Each respondent's age (at last birthday) is recorded on the 'specify sheet' to enable extraction of mean average age etc.
IDENTIFYING DATA (I)

SEQ. NO. 01  RESPONDENT

LENGTH (18) How long is it now that you are a lone parent? (Where there was a second marriage account is only taken of the time span since the second marriage)
LP ST
Lone Parent Status:
1. 6 months or less  2. 7 months-35 months
3. 3 - 5 years  4. 6 - 10 years
5. 10 years

Specify.

EDUC (19) Education: Have you a:
1. primary  2. high school -
3. technical college minimum std.8
   after std.8 high  4. university education (B.A.degree or
   or some other higher)

Specify.

OCCUP (110) Occupation: (N.B. For the purposes of this study working shall be working for remuneration and working continuously for not less than three months, for as recently as three months before interviewed. I shall ask you in more detail about your work during the course of this interview.
Are you working?
1. no  2. yes
Have you worked since you became a parent? (For the purposes of this study, where there have been two marriages, account is taken of the second only).
3. no  4. yes
5. other

Specify.

EMP CAT (111) From the type of work you do: of employment hence within 'specify' I have constructed a schedule of categories
   work you do: of employment hence within 'specify' I record respondent's exact present occupation).
1. unskilled  2. trade
3. typist/clerk  4. semi-professional
5. professional  6. other

Specify.

LP CLUB (112) Lone Parents' Club Membership:
1. You do not belong to a One-Parent Club
2. You belong to Club B
3. You belong to Club A
4. other

Specify.

CONJ FAM (113) Conjugal Family: Are your parents alive?
1. not alive  2. alive
   Who?
3. mother  4. father

Specify.

RELSH H/H (114) Relationship to Household Head: Are you the daughter of the household head.
1. You are the daughter of the household head.
2. You are the son of the household head.
3. You are the brother of the household head.
4. You are the sister of the household head.
5. You are another relative of the household head.
6. You are the household head.
7. other

Specify.
# Identifying Date (1)

**Seq. No. 01**

**Respondent**

**Other Members of the Household** - for the purposes of this study all persons who live under the same roof, shall be deemed 'other members'.

**Relation (II5) - Relationship**

(each household member's data is coded in chronological order, with the exception of servants living in who are coded last)

1. mother
2. father
3. grandfather
4. grandmother
5. father-in-law
6. mother-in-law
7. brother
8. sister
9. brother-in-law
10. sister-in-law
11. cousin
12. uncle
13. aunt
14. son
15. daughter
16. other

Specify...

**Age (116) - Age:**

1. 0 - 5 years
2. 6 - 12
3. 13 - 17
4. 18 - 20
5. 21 - 24
6. 25 - 34
7. 35 - 49
8. 50 - 59
9. 60+ years

**Sex (117) - Sex:**

What is the sex of each member?

1. M
2. F

**Marital Status (118) - Marital Status:**

What is the marital status of each household member?

1. widowed
2. divorced
3. separated
4. single
5. married

Specify...

**Education (119) - Education:**

What is his/her education?

1. primary
2. high school
3. technical college
4. university education
5. other

Specify...

**Occupation (120) - Occupation:**

What is the occupation of each member of the household?

1. unskilled
2. trade
3. typist/clerk
4. semiprofessional
5. professional
6. other

Specify...

**Employment Length (121) - Employment Length:**

How long is each working member of the household in his/her (now) employment?

1. under 6 months
2. 6 months - 1 yr
3. 3.2 - 4 years 11 mths
4. 5 - 9 yrs 11 mths
5. 10 years and over
6. other

Specify...

**Religion (122) - Religion:**

What is the religion of the members of the household?

1. Catholic
2. Non-Catholic excluding 3. Jewish
3. Dutch Reformed
4. Anglican
5. Other non-Catholic

Specify...

**Language (123) - Language:**

What is his/her home language?

1. Afrikaans
2. English
3. other

Specify...

**Length of Residence (124) - Length of Residence:**

How long is he/she living in the informant's household?

1. since marriage of respondent
2. before respondent's lone parent status
3. after
4. other

Specify...
IDENTIFYING DATA (I)

CHILDREN LIVING AWAY FROM HOME

(For the purposes of this study we are concerned with children under 18, direct descendants (by birth) of the respondent, or legally adopted by the respondent and having lived away from home for a period of six months or longer, prior to this interview date. Children in institutions who come home for school holidays also fall into this category provided they have been in such an institution for six months or longer at time of interview).

(A code no. will be allotted for each child living away from home).

(In all of the following questions a separate response will be obtained and codified for each child living away from home -- information being recorded in chronological order).

WHERE LIVE (I25) They Whom - Where do each of these children live? 6

live 1. the other spouse 2. a grandparent with: 3. another relative
4. a special institution for the mentally handicapped
5. a special institution for the physically handicapped
6. a boarding school 7. a university residence
8. other

Specify.............................................................................

SEX (I26) What is 1. male 2. female 7

the sex of each of the children:

AGE (I27) What are 1. 0-5 years 11 months 2. 6-12 years 11 months 8

the ages 3. 13-18 years of each of these children:

Specify.............................................................................

SUPP EX (I28) Are the 1. no 2. yes 9

children 3. other supported by the ex-spouse (i.e. Not respondent):

Specify.............................................................................

PAY B/L (I29) Do you 1. you do not pay 2. you do pay 10

pay 3. you pay full for maintenance for the their children board 4. other and lodging:

Specify.............................................................................

EDUC (I30) What is 1. primary 2. high school 11

the education 3. trade school/tech- 4. university of the children living away from home:

Specify.............................................................................

STUDY (I31) Do these 1. no 2. yes 12

children study:
IDENTIFYING DATA (I)

SEQUENCE NUMBER: 02

CHILDREN LIVING AWAY FROM HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK (I32)</th>
<th>Do these</th>
<th>1. no</th>
<th>2. yes</th>
<th>3. other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDY + (I33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>Do these</th>
<th>1. no</th>
<th>2. yes</th>
<th>3. other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOME VAC (I34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME VAC</th>
<th>Children are school/university vacations i.e. when children come home the institution is shut for several days during the or longer -- e.g. at the end of a term/ vacation: semester etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECONOMIC POSITION (E)

Your economic position may or may not, for various reasons, have been affected by the change in your marital status -- may we talk about some of the effects and causes?

INC COM (E1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INC COM</th>
<th>Would you</th>
<th>1. less</th>
<th>2. the same</th>
<th>3. more</th>
<th>4. other than it was</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INC ADEQ (E2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INC ADEQ</th>
<th>Your pre-</th>
<th>1. insufficient</th>
<th>2. sufficient</th>
<th>3. other - for your household needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCES (E3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>Your house-</th>
<th>1. alimony</th>
<th>2. child maintenance</th>
<th>3. income from shares</th>
<th>4. your employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources from various other members, possibly:

1. Alimony
2. Child maintenance
3. Income from shares
4. Employment
5. The employment of other members
6. Support from relatives not living under your roof (being for the purposes of this study, regular financial assistance) or from friends
7. Social assistance
8. Other

WORK HIST (E4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK HIST</th>
<th>1. You were not (in employment) working?</th>
<th>2. You were working before becoming a lone-parent?</th>
<th>3. Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. (For the purposes of this study, the terms 'employment/working' are defined as working continuously for not less than three months, for as recently as at least three months before being a long-parent and for financial remuneration).
SEQ. NO.02

EMP NOW (E5) 1. not (in employment) working 57
2. you work inside your home (not house-
hold duties) half a day
3. inside the home a full day
4. outside your home half a day
5. outside your home a full day
6. other

Specify

T A I M S (E6) What time 1. before 7 a.m. 2. 7 - 7.30 a.m. 59
do you 3. 7.30 - 8.30 a.m. 4. 8.30 - 9 a.m. 60
leave from5. other
home for
work:
And at 6. 1 - 2 p.m. 7. 2 - 3 p.m. 61
what time 8. 3. - 4.30 p.m. 9. 4.30 - 5.30 p.m.
have you 10. 5.30 - 6 p.m. 11. 6 - 7 p.m. 62
returned 12. other
home from
work:

Specify

* (N.B. For the purposes of this study 'for reasons'
are subjective reasons -- as felt and decided upon
by respondent, whether rational or otherwise -- and
are not evaluated or questioned during the interview)

NOT WORK (E7) REAS If you 1. your *reasons for not working are not 62
do not
connected with your present one-parent
status,
2. are connected with your present one-
parent status,
3. but -- if you are working half day
your reasons for working half-day are
not connected with your present one-
parent status,
4. are connected with your present one-
parent status;
5. if you are working a full day, your
reasons for working a full day are not
connected with your present one-parent
status,
6. are connected with your present one-
parent status,
7. other.

Specify

JOB (E8) HAVE YOU 1. You have not changed jobs for reasons 63
changed
jobs since
becoming a2. lone-
parent: 3. You have changed jobs since becoming a
one-parent for reasons not connected with your lone-parent status.
4. for reasons connected with your one-
parent status.
5. other.

Specify

(For the purpose of this study *future is no further
away in time than twelve months from date of interview).

TRAINING (E9) RETRAINING 1. You have not undertaken a training 64 65
retraining, vocational guidance course
since envisaging and/or becoming a lone-
parent.
2. You have undertaken such a course.
3. You are undergoing a course now.
4. You plan to undertake a course in the
*future.
5. other.

Specify
(I will at a later stage consider the social biases or possible biases affecting lone-parents in employment. Now I ask you to consider the physical difficulties etc. handicapping you -- a single parent who works -- e.g. you have chosen or 'stuck to' less remunerative work, etc.

INTERFERENCE (E10)
1. Would you say that being a lone-parent has not interfered with your work
2. Has interfered with your work
3. other.

Specify

TRANSPORT (E11) Transport: (vehicle ownership)
1. You did not own a motor vehicle before becoming a lone-parent, and you do not own one now.
2. You did own a motor vehicle before becoming a lone-parent, and you do not own one now.
3. You did not own a motor vehicle before becoming a lone-parent, and you do own one now.
4. You did own a motor vehicle before becoming a lone-parent, and you do own one now.
5. other

Specify

OTHER H/ls (E12) VEHICLES
1. other members of the household do not have
2. do have - motor vehicle/s
3. other

Specify

CHILD CARE (E13) Child (while away at work) only where Respondent works
1. You have not Made arrangements for child care while you are at work
2. You have arrangements made, before you became a lone-parent.
3. You have arrangements made, since you became a lone-parent.
4. other

Specify

DUTIES (E14) Assessment of employment duties of lone-parent by Respondent
1. You think that a lone-mother with pre-school children should not go out to work
2. should go out to work
3. should not work at home
4. should work at home
5. other

Specify

DUTIES (E15) DAD
1. You think a lone-father with pre-school children should not go out to work
2. should go out to work
3. should not work at home
4. should work at home
5. other

Specify

TELEV (E16) Television set in home
1. No.
2. Yes, which is black and white, which was paid for cash
3. Yes, which is black and white, and was bought on hire purchase.
4. Yes, which is black and white, and is on monthly hire.
5. Yes, which is coloured, which was paid for cash.
## ECONOMIC POSITION (E)

6. Yes, which is coloured, and was bought on hire purchase.
7. Yes, which is coloured, and is on monthly hire.
8. other.

### TELEPH (E17)

1. You do not have a telephone (in your home).
2. You do have a telephone and you had a telephone since before your lone-parent status.
3. You have a telephone which you acquired after becoming a lone-parent.
4. other.

## ACCOMMODATION (A)

### FLAT/ (A1) HOUSE

- **OWN/RENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type</th>
<th>You live in a flat which is owned in your name, in the exspouse's name, and in someone else's name and on which there is -- no mortgage; on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; you do pay.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>You live in a flat which is owned in your name, in the exspouse's name, and in someone else's name and on which there is -- no mortgage; on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>owned in your name, in the exspouse's name, and in someone else's name and on which there is -- no mortgage; on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>in someone else's name and on which there is -- no mortgage; on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>in someone else's name and on which there is -- no mortgage; on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>no mortgage; on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>you do not pay; you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>You live in a house which is owned in your name -- in the exspouse's name; in someone else's name, and on which there is -- no mortgage; on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; which you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>in the exspouse's name;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>in someone else's name, and on which there is -- no mortgage; on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; which you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>no mortgage; on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; which you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>on which there is a mortgage, which -- you do not pay; which you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>you do not pay -- which you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>which you do pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>You live in a flat for which you pay rent, You life in a house for which you pay rent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>You live in a house for which you pay rent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>You have other accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ................................................................. .

### STD ACCOM (A2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of housing:</th>
<th>Do you think your present housing is worse the same better than that you had before becoming a single parent or other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>better than that you had before becoming a single parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ................................................................. .

### MOVEMENT (A3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement:</th>
<th>You have not moved, since becoming a lone-parent, and you do not connect your not moving to another house/flat with the change in your marital status or you do connect not having moved with your marital change. You have moved once -- for reasons not connected with the change in marital status, for reasons connected with the change in marital status You have moved two - four times -- for reasons not connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>You have not moved, since becoming a lone-parent, and you do not connect your not moving to another house/flat with the change in your marital status or -- you do connect not having moved with your marital change. You have moved once -- for reasons not connected with the change in marital status, for reasons connected with the change in marital status You have moved two - four times -- for reasons not connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>You have not moved, since becoming a lone-parent, and you do not connect your not moving to another house/flat with the change in your marital status or you do connect not having moved with your marital change. You have moved once -- for reasons not connected with the change in marital status, for reasons connected with the change in marital status You have moved two - four times -- for reasons not connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>You have not moved, since becoming a lone-parent, and you do not connect your not moving to another house/flat with the change in your marital status or you do connect not having moved with your marital change. You have moved once -- for reasons not connected with the change in marital status, for reasons connected with the change in marital status You have moved two - four times -- for reasons not connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>You have not moved, since becoming a lone-parent, and you do not connect your not moving to another house/flat with the change in your marital status or you do connect not having moved with your marital change. You have moved once -- for reasons not connected with the change in marital status, for reasons connected with the change in marital status You have moved two - four times -- for reasons not connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>You have not moved, since becoming a lone-parent, and you do not connect your not moving to another house/flat with the change in your marital status or you do connect not having moved with your marital change. You have moved once -- for reasons not connected with the change in marital status, for reasons connected with the change in marital status You have moved two - four times -- for reasons not connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>You have not moved, since becoming a lone-parent, and you do not connect your not moving to another house/flat with the change in your marital status or you do connect not having moved with your marital change. You have moved once -- for reasons not connected with the change in marital status, for reasons connected with the change in marital status You have moved two - four times -- for reasons not connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>You have not moved, since becoming a lone-parent, and you do not connect your not moving to another house/flat with the change in your marital status or you do connect not having moved with your marital change. You have moved once -- for reasons not connected with the change in marital status, for reasons connected with the change in marital status You have moved two - four times -- for reasons not connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, for reasons connected with change in marital status, other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ................................................................. .
**HOME MANAGEMENT (M)**

You as a member of a 'functioning society' have probably inherited, may have formulated opinions on the duties of family members. May I ask you --

| 1. | Male members of a two parent household should not assist in household functions |
| 2. | Male members of a two parent household should assist in household functions |
| 3. | Female members of a two parent household should not assist in household functions |
| 4. | Female members of a two parent household should assist in household functions |

**L.P. (M2) MOTHERLESS**

What are your views on division of duties in lone-parent (single) family households:

| 1. | Male members of the household in a motherless household should not assist in household functions |
| 2. | Male members of the household in a motherless household should assist in household functions |
| 3. | Female members of the household in a motherless household should not assist in household functions |
| 4. | Female members of the household in a motherless household should assist in household functions |

**L.P. (M3) FATHERLESS**

| 5. | Male members of the household in a fatherless household should not assist in household functions |
| 6. | Male members of the household in a fatherless household should assist in household functions |
| 7. | Female members of the household in a fatherless household should not assist in household functions |
| 8. | Female members of the household in a fatherless household should assist in household functions |

**FEMALE (M4) HEADS L.P. (M3)**

When you lived as a two-parent household:

Before you became a lone-parent -- did your late husband/ex-husband assist with household functions:

| 1. | When the household lived as a two-parent family unit, the late husband/ - the divorced husband did not assist with household functions* |
| 2. | When the household lived as a two-parent family unit, the late husband/ - the divorced husband assisted you with household functions* |

*or where respondent is male -- you assisted with household functions.

**PAID (M5) OUTHELP**

What about paid outside help -- assistance which is rendered at least once weekly or more and is paid for:

| 1. | Paid outside help was not used before the breakdown. |
| 2. | Paid outside help was used before the breakdown. |
| 3. | Paid outside help is not used now. |
| 4. | Paid outside help is used now. |
HOME MANAGEMENT (M)

SEQ. NO. 03
RELATIVES (M6)
What about relatives: (extended family member, conjugal relatives) living away from home -- their help in your household duties before you became a lone-parent:--
1. They did not help with household functions. 15
2. They did help with household functions. 16
3. They do not help with household functions (now). 17
4. They do help with household functions (now). 18

What about your school-going children (N.B. for purposes of this study -- 'share in household functions' -- is to perform any household task/s e.g. shopping, cooking, baby-sitting, cleaning regularly -- at least once a week):

SCHOOL KIDS (M7)
Since you have been a (single) lone-parent family unit:
1. Children do not share in household functions 19
2. Children do share in household functions and their schooling is not affected by the additional responsibilities. 20
3. Children do share in household functions and their schooling is affected by the additional responsibilities. 21

OTHER MALES (M8)
(School-going children) -- their participation before and now -- in household functions:
What about other members of the household: 22
1. Other male members of the household did not assist with household functions before the breakdown. 23
2. Other male members of the household assisted with household functions before the breakdown. 24
3. Other female members of the household did not assist with household functions before the breakdown. 25
4. Other female members of the household assisted with household functions before the breakdown. 26
5. Other male members of the household do not assist with household functions now. 27
6. Other male members of the household assist with household functions (now). 28
7. Other female members of the household do not assist with household functions (now). 29
8. Other female members of the household assist with household functions (now). 30

OTHER MALES (M9)
NOW AND OTHER FEMALES NOW

(ii) LOOKING AFTER CHILDREN: DISCIPLINE, CONTROL AND EDUCATION

PRESCHOOL KIDS' CARE (M10)
Where there are pre-school children in the household--how are they looked after during the day (by whom are they cared for):
1. by you -- you do not work 22
2. by you -- you work half a day 23
3. Your child, children are in a full day creche. 24
4. Your child, children are in a half day creche. 25
5. Your child, children are in a play-group. 26
HOME MANAGEMENT (M)

6. Your child, children are in a nursery school.
7. Your child, children are looked after by another member of the household.
8. Your child, children are taken care of by another relative in the relative's home.
9. Your child, children are looked after by a paid outsider (not a member of the household) in your home.
10. Your child, children are looked after by a paid outsider (not a member of your household) outside your home.

Specify other

SCHOOL (M1) The school children in your household -- what happens to them after normal school hours

KIDS' DAY CARE

1. You look after your children yourself after they return from school.
2. A fulltime maid looks after them.
3. They are taken care of by another relative in his/her home (not your home).
4. They are taken care of by another relative in your home.
5. They are in a creche taking sub A and sub B children as exceptions.
6. other

*For the purpose of this study a fulltime maid is a domestic who works full time for respondent and sleeps on the premises.

Specify

EVENINGS (M12) And in the evenings -- when you go out -- who looks after the children:

1. Another member of the household
2. a full time maid
3. a paid outsider
4. other

Specify

LEAVE (M13) Do you feel you can leave your child/children alone at home at night

ALONE NIGHT

1. no
2. yes

Do you leave him/her/them alone at night

1. no
2. yes

Specify

CHILDREN'S EDUCATION (C)

SCHOOL (C1) Have your children changed school since you became a lone parent:

1. A child/children have not changed schools since the breakdown, for reasons not connected with the change in your marital status.
2. A child/children have not changed schools since the breakdown, for reasons connected with the change in your marital status.
3. A child/children have changed schools since the breakdown for reasons not connected with the change in your marital status.
4. A child/children have changed schools since the breakdown, for reasons connected with the change in your marital status.

Specify
CHILDREN'S EDUCATION (C)

REARING (C2)
Is there a particular area of child rearing you find most difficult:
1. no  2. yes

DIFF'S (C)
(e.g. sex education to child of opposite sex of lone-parent; children's discipline)

Specify.........................................................

KIDS' FUTURE (C3)
Have you any ideas about what you would like each of your children to do:
1. no  2. yes

3. You want him/her/them to leave school before matriculating
4. You want him/her/them to matriculate
5. You want him/her/them to work.
6. You want him/her/them to learn a trade.
7. You want him/her/them to go to business college.
8. You want him/her/them to go to University.
9. other

Specify.........................................................

FAIL SCHOOL (C4)
Have children-
1. (None of) the children failed a class at school since the divorce/death of other parent.
2. One child failed.
3. Two children failed.
4. Three or more children failed.
5. other

Specify.........................................................

-- This subsection is not for computer programming at all --

And Specify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child No.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Class Failed</th>
<th>Living at home</th>
<th>Living away</th>
<th>Reasons for failing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child No.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Has not been affected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HEALTH (H)
(the state of health we are in affects our functioning and our social life -- may we discuss aspects of health, health problems affecting you -- the loneparent?)

How would you specify your own health:
1. poor  2. fair
3. good  4. other

and can you give us the reasons?

Specify.........................................................
**HEALTH (H)**

**BREAKDOWN (H2)**

Do you feel...

1. Your state of health has not been affected by the breakdown.
2. Your state of health has been affected by the breakdown.
3. The state of health of a child/children in the household has not been affected by the breakdown.
4. The state of health of a child/children in the household has been affected by the breakdown.
5. The state of health of other* adult members of the household has not been affected by the breakdown.
6. The state of health of other* members of the household has been affected by the breakdown.

**CHRONIC (H3)**

Is there a...

1. none
2. yes - one
3. more than one

chronically ill physically or mentally handicapped member living at home?

(I make provision for the possibility of three such persons in a household; see table after next question)

**BURDEN (H4)**

Do you find such a person an additional burden?

1. not a burden
2. is a burden

--- This table is not for computerizing ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Householder</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Handicap</th>
<th>With you since</th>
<th>(and indicate again if this is before/after change in marital status)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For the purpose of this questionnaire 'other members of the household' do not include children of the respondent, nor full time maids.

**WORK (H5)**

Have you or...

1. You have not stayed away from work for more than two days in the last six months to look after another member of the household who was ill.
2. You have stayed away from work for more than two days in the last six months to look after another member of the household who was ill.
3. *Another adult member of the household has not stayed away from work for more than two days in the last six months to look after another member of the household who was ill.*
4. *Another adult member of the household has stayed away from work for more than two days in the last six months to look after another member of the household who was ill.*
5. other (including grown-up children who stayed away from work)-specify.

(N.B.*For purposes of this questionnaire 'another member of the household' does not include children of the respondent).

Specify ..........................................................
HEALTH (H)

Has/have (any) of the child/children stayed away from school for more than two days in the last six months to look after a member of the household who was ill.

Your child/children have not stayed away from school for more than two days in the last six months to look after anyone else at home who was ill.

SOCIAL RE-ADAPTATION (S)

(i) ABOUT LONE-PARENTS CLUBS’ MEMBERSHIPS

Right at the beginning of our interview I asked you about your 'club membership.' I shall now appreciate further particulars:

CLUB MEMBERSHIP

1. You do not belong to a single parent's club.
2. You are a member of a singles club for not yet six months --
3. for more than six months but less than a year --
4. for more than a year but less than two years --
5. for longer than two years.
6. other

Specify ................................................

MEMBERSHIP REASONS

1. You were lonely.
2. You felt 'unwanted' in a couples' society.
3. You wanted to get away from your 'two parent' responsibilities which you as a single parent have to cope with.
4. You wished to discuss your problems with other (lone) single-parents.
5. You wanted to make new friends.
6. You wanted to meet widowers/widows.
7. You wanted to meet divorcees.
8. other

Specify ................................................

CLUBS AIMS

1. to give lone-parents (singles) an opportunity to discuss lone-parent status and its problems, with each other;
2. to help lone-parents get away from the world of married couples;
3. to provide lone-parents (singles) with an evening's entertainment away from home;
4. help singles, lone-parents overcome their loneliness;
5. help lone-parents (singles) meet each other;
6. help lone-parents cope with the social needs and demands of their children.
SOCIAL RE-ADAPTATION (S)

7. facilitate children of lone-parents the opportunities of meeting and going out together (e.g. picnics, etc.)
8. provide entertainment for lone-parent families (at prices they can afford) e.g. block bookings at cinemas, etc.

Specify

YOUR FRIENDS
1. not made friends with other members of this lone-parents association? 70
2. made friends with other members of this lone-parents association?
3. other

Specify

KIDS' FRIENDS
1. not made friends with other children of this lone-parents association? 71
2. made friends with other children of this lone-parents association?
3. other

(ii) ADJUSTMENT TO LONE-PARENT STATUS
May we now discuss the difficulties or ease (with which you were required to and) may or may not have succeeded in adjusting to your lone-parent status? (I already have information as to how long you have been a lone-parent, and of your marital status and your assessment of your economic position.) May I further ask you:

CRISIS
1. Do you think that the death of your late husband was not a crisis in your life? No --
2. Was a crisis
3. other

Specify

KIDS' FRIENDS
1. not made friends with other children of this lone-parents association? 71
2. made friends with other children of this lone-parents association?
3. other

Specify

FEELINGS OF LONELINESS
1. You did not experience loneliness after the breakdown
2. You experienced loneliness, which feeling persisted:
3. for about six months
4. for about a year
5. for almost two years
6. for longer than two years
You are still experiencing feelings of loneliness now?
7. no
8. yes
9. other

Specify

FEELINGS OF GUILT
1. You did not feel guilty about the death of your late husband/wife and you do not feel guilty about it now.
2. You did feel guilty about the death of your late husband/wife and you do not feel guilty now.
3. You did not feel guilty about the death of your late husband/wife and you do feel guilty about it now.
4. You did and do feel guilty about your
Specify Feelings of guilt (in cases of divorce) 5. late husband's/wife's death.
6. You did not feel guilty about the divorce and you do not feel guilty about it now.
7. You did feel guilty about the divorce and you do not feel guilty now.
8. You did not feel guilty about the divorce, and you do feel guilty about it now.
9. You did and do feel guilty about the divorce.
10. other

Specify
PREPARE (S9) Preparing the children for the new family situation

May we discuss this (and do please forgive me if I bring up painful memories)? Your information, which is so recorded that it remains strictly confidential, and you are anonymous, is of great relevance to this study.
The death/divorce of the spouse-- was it sudden-- and so the children were not prepared for the breakdown?
1. no
2. yes
The children were not prepared for the breakdown (death/divorce) for other reasons:
3. no
4. yes
5. other

Specify
WHO PREPARED (S10) The children were prepared for the breakdown (death/divorce) by:

(12)
1. respondent
2. another household member
3. exspouse
4. another relative living away from home
5. teacher
6. other

Specify
EFFECTS (S11) Effects on the children

1. You did not speak to the children about the new family situation and feel that it has not had any effect on their adjustment to the new situation (i.e. that of a lone-parent family);
2. that, not discussing the situation has had a negative effect on the children's adjustment to the new situation;
3. has had a positive effect on the children's adjustment to the new situation;
4. You have spoken to the children about the new family situation and feel that it has not had any effect on their adjustment to the new situation.
5. that having spoken to them and discussed the situation has had a negative effect on their adjustment;
6. has had a positive effect on their adjustment;
7. other

Specify
**SOCIAL RE-ADAPTATION (S)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ. NO.</th>
<th>04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLAME (S12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. You feel that the children do not blame you for the death/divorce of the other parent;</td>
<td>14 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. do blame you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You feel that the children do not blame the deceased spouse/the exspouse for the family's lone-parent situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You feel they do blame the deceased spouse/the exspouse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specify**

**OUTHELP (S13) Outside help:**

(N.B. Respondent is asked to assess and list in order of significance of role -- functioning five 'outside agencies of help' (or fewer, as used)

Did you not/did you use outside help, in your efforts at adjustment to the lone parent status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>You did not use outside help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>You did use outside help through:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>the family doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>your friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>a marriage guidance counsellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>a minister of religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>a social service - social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>another household member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>your solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>extended family members, living away from home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>a psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>school remedial teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specify**

**YOUR (S14) CONTACT WITH OTHERS**

(in the cases of divorce/separation):

May we while not discussing in depth, perhaps obtain the pattern of frequency of contact with the exspouse and again -- please note that information is strictly confidential and recorded so that no person/s are identified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>You do not meet the exspouse at all, and are dissatisfied with your relationship with your estranged/ex-/husband/wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>You do not meet the exspouse at all, and are satisfied with your relationship with your estranged/ex-/husband/wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>You meet your estranged/ex-/husband/wife irregularly and are dissatisfied with this relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>You meet your estranged/ex-/husband/wife irregularly and are satisfied with this relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>You meet your estranged/ex-/husband/wife regularly and are dissatisfied with this relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>You meet your estranged/ex-/husband/wife regularly and are satisfied with this relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>You do not ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>You do talk to your children about the meetings with their father/mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specify**
SOCIAL RE-ADAPTATION (S)

SEQ. NO. 04

KIDS' CONTACT May we, now, likewise talk about the contact of your child/children with their father/mother?*

1. Your children do not meet their father/mother at all, and you are dissatisfied with this relationship.
2. Your children do not meet their father/mother at all, and you are satisfied with this relationship.
3. Your children meet their father/mother irregularly and you are dissatisfied with this relationship.
4. Your children meet their father/mother irregularly and you are satisfied with this relationship.
5. Your children meet their father/mother regularly and you are dissatisfied with this relationship.
6. Your children meet their father/mother regularly, and you are satisfied with this relationship.
7. other
8. Your children do not talk to you about their meetings with their father/mother.
9. Your children talk to you about their meetings with their father/mother.
10. other

Specify in the cases of divorce/separation.

YOU AND RELVS May we now talk about your contact with *other relatives: who are not living under the same roof -- (conjugal and/or extended family members -- i.e. in-laws, brothers, sisters, cousins, etc) specify which* How often do you see them or if *(geographically) living more than an hour and a half travelling distance away, telephone them, or write to them?

1. No contact is kept;
2. You only see each other on important family and/or religious holidays.
3. Irregularly -- less than once a month.
4. Close contact is kept (this being defined as meeting and when *(geographically difficult -- telephoning and/or corresponding) -- twice a month or more.

Specify

KIDS' AND RELVS What contact do/does your child/children keep with these relatives?

5. none at all
6. only on important family occasions and/or religious holidays
7. irregularly
8. regularly
9. other

Specify

SUBST IDNFN Has/have your child/children sought out another person of the deceased/divorced parent's sex for substitute identification?

1. The child/children have not sought out another person.
2. The child/children have sought out a 'substitute father'
3. who is the grandfather;
4. who is another male relative living under the same roof;
5. who is another male relative not living under the same roof;
SOCIAL RE-ADAPTATION (S)

6. who is a male, who has been respondent's friend since before the breakdown;
7. who is a male friend acquired after the breakdown.
8. The child/children have sought out a 'substitute mother'
9. who is the grandmother;
10. who is another female relative living under the same roof;
11. who is another female relative not living under the same roof;
12. who is a female, who has been respondent's friend since before the breakdown;
13. who is a female friend acquired after the breakdown.
14. other

Specify ............................................................................................................................

(iv) LEISURE ACTIVITIES

YOUR (S19)

LEISURE

Where do you spend your leisure time:
1. church
2. synagogue
3. cinema
4. at friends
5. at home
6. at race track
7. at gymnasium/sports
8. at single-parents' club meetings and functions
9. with the exspouse
10. with conjugal -- extended family members
11. other

Specify ............................................................................................................................

LEISURE

KIDS' (S20) Where do your children spend their leisure time:
1. you do not know where
2. at extra-mural activities at school, including sports
3. at church, synagogue, clubs
4. at friends
5. at home
6. at the home of your exspouse
7. at relatives (not living under the same roof)
8. at the pin-ball machines
9. at scouts/guides/national youth movement gatherings
10. other

Specify ............................................................................................................................

(v) SOCIAL LIFE

May we discuss your children's social life -- I have asked questions about their leisure activities earlier --

EFFECT (S21) Do you think the breakdown -- the death of the spouse/ the divorce/ affected the children's social life?

SOC: KIDS'
1. The breakdown did not affect the children's social life.
2. The breakdown did effect the children's social life.

LIFE KIDS' (S22) FRIENDS
3. Your children do not associate with the same group of friends as before you became a lone-parent.
4. Your children do associate with the same group of friends as before you became a lone-parent.
5. other

Specify ............................................................................................................................
**SEQ. NO. 04**

--- THIS TABLE IS NOT FOR COMPUTERIZING ---

How do your child/children relate to your male (i.e. opposite sex) friends/female friends? i.e. do they relate negatively or positively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD IS</th>
<th>Relate</th>
<th>Relate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Your household is lone-parent) --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Motherless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fatherless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Negatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Positively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ...........................................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHEN GO OUT (S23)</th>
<th>Do you go out -- how often?</th>
<th>Relate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. seldom (for the purposes of this study being less than once a month)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. once a month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. once a fortnight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. once a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. more often than once a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ...........................................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARE (S24)</th>
<th>Since you have become a lone-parent:</th>
<th>Relate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. You go out less often (than you did before you became a lone-parent)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. You go out more often (than you did before you became a lone-parent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ...........................................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMB. OTHER ORG'S (S25)</th>
<th>Relate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You do not belong to other organizations (besides the lone-parents' one).</td>
<td>57 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You do belong to other organizations (besides the lone-parents' one -- which are):</td>
<td>59 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. recreational/and/social</td>
<td>61 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. professional/and/or/business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. political</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. voluntary welfare/charity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ...........................................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISIT FRIENDS (S26)</th>
<th>Relate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Friends never visit you</td>
<td>64 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Friends visit you less often than once a week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Friends visit you at least once a week like:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You never visit friends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You visit friends less often than once a week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You visit friends at least once a week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ...........................................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAME FRIENDS (S27)</th>
<th>Relate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You do not associate with the same group of friends -- you did -- before you became a lone-parent.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You do associate with the same group of friends -- you did -- before you became a lone-parent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ...........................................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAR.ST. FRIENDS (S28)</th>
<th>Relate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. married marital status of your friends?</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. one-parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ...........................................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATING (S29)</th>
<th>Relate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You are not dating.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You are dating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify ...........................................................................................................................................
SEQ. NO. 04

DIV REMAR (S30)
Do you think the divorced and widowed should remarry?

1. A divorced female without children should not remarry.
2. A divorced female without children should remarry.
3. A divorced female with children should not remarry.
4. A divorced male without children should not remarry.
5. A divorced male without children should remarry.
6. A divorced male with children should not remarry.
7. A divorced male with children should remarry.
8. A divorced male with children should remarry.
10. A widowed female without children should remarry.
11. A widowed female with children should not remarry.
12. A widowed female with children should remarry.
13. A widowed male with children should not remarry.
15. A widowed male with children should remarry.
16. A widowed male with children should remarry.

SEQ. NO. 05

(i) SOCIAL ATTITUDES

YOU REMARRY (S31)
Would you like to remarry?

1. no
2. yes
3. now
4. later
5. other

Specify PAR DIV (S32)
Were your parents separated or divorced?

1. They were not separated nor divorced
2. They were separated.
3. They were divorced
4. other

Specify FAM ATT (S33)
What do you feel is your family's attitude to the change in your marital status:

1. indifferent
2. unsympathetic
3. sympathetic
4. other

Specify FRIENDS (S34)
What do you feel are the attitudes of your friends to the change in your marital status:

1. indifferent
2. unsympathetic
3. sympathetic
4. other

Specify (ii) DISCRIMINATION

INTFRCE (S35)
Since becoming a lone-parent, have you experienced discrimination:

1. Would you say that being a lone-parent has not interfered with your advancement in that you have not been discriminated against, because of your status;
2. has interfered with your progress* in that you have been discriminated against because of your status.

DISCR (S36)

1. You have not -
2. You have experienced discrimination by:
3. employers
4. co-workers
5. neighbours
6. teachers
7. other

*Both social and economic advancement and not only economic.
Lone-parenthood through widowhood, divorce, separation, unmarried motherhood, is a universal phenomenon. Do you feel that specific community attitudes exist to these aspects of lone-parenthood?

1. You feel that community attitudes to the widowed are unsympathetic.
2. sympathetic
3. other

Community attitudes to divorcees are:
4. unsympathetic
5. sympathetic
6. other

You feel there is not a social prejudice against the unmarried mother.
7. You feel there is a social prejudice against the unmarried mother.
8. other

Are community attitudes important to you:
1. Community attitudes are not important to you.
2. Community attitudes are important to you.
3. other

Are you familiar with South African Divorce Laws:
1. no
2. yes
Are they good:
3. no
4. yes

Before you became a lone-parent, in which of the following categories did you feel your household belonged?
1. lower class not because of your exhusband's, late spouse's occupation,
2. lower class because of your exhusband's, late spouse's occupation,
3. middle class because of your occupation,
4. middle class because of your exhusband's, late spouse's occupation;
5. upper class because of your occupation;
6. upper class because of your exhusband's, late spouse's occupation;
7. other

Please may we assist this study, discuss why you feel you now belong to one of three social classes?
1. lower class not because of your occupation;
2. lower class because of your occupation;
3. lower class because of your divorced/deceased spouse's occupation;
4. middle class because of your occupation;
5. middle class because of your divorced/deceased spouse's occupation;
6. upper class because of your occupation;
7. upper class because of your divorced/deceased spouse's occupation;
8. other
SEQ. NO. 05

SOCIAL RE-ADAPTATION (S)

PSYCHO-SOCIAL (S44) Do you feel that the psycho-social* position of lone-parents should be improved:

1. The psycho-social position of lone-parents does not need improvement.
2. The psycho-social position of lone-parents does need improvement.

because -- (and I should like to record your reasons which will remain anonymous in detail)
-- AND THESE ARE NOT COMPUTERIZED --

* For the purpose of this study this term means a combination of both the social and psychological position.

COMM SERV(S45) In your city there are social (community) services available to the public. Are you aware and do you use any of the following services:

1. You are not aware of and you do not use
2. You are aware and you do not use
3. You use:
   *4. educational (excluding compulsory schooling)
   5. medical
   6. mental hygiene and psychiatric
   7. child welfare
   8. recreational
   9. other

* principally all extramural activities provided for by the school

Specify .............................................................

SATIS'N (S46) Are you satisfied with existing social services:

1. You are not satisfied with social services.
2. You are satisfied with social services
3. other

Specify .............................................................

REFORM (R)

SPEC SERV (R1) Do you think there should be special community services to assist single-parent families in their adjustment to their lone-parent status?

1. You think there should not be special community services, (special social services) -- to assist single-parent families in their adjustment to their lone-parent status.
2. You think there should be special community services, special social services, to assist single-parent families in their adjustment to their lone-parent status.

Please list and describe these social services

NOT TO BE COMPUTERIZED

LIST OF SPECIAL SERVICES

IMPROVE (R2) Do you think improvements should be specifically by:

1. Improvements in community (social) services.
2. By way of family allowances based on a means test.
3. By way of family allowances not based on a means test.
4. Through changes in the existing South African divorce laws.
5. other

Specify.............................................................
Can you suggest any other things which could be done to help people like you to bring up your family?

Specify .................................................................

I list details of suggestions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE NUMBER</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>SEQUENCE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B

**SPECIMEN SET OF CODING SHEETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX (11)</th>
<th>AGE (12)</th>
<th>MAR ST (13)</th>
<th>REL (14)</th>
<th>LANG (15)</th>
<th>RES AREA (16)</th>
<th>MAR HS (17)</th>
<th>LENGTH LP ST (18)</th>
<th>EDUC (19)</th>
<th>OCCUP (20)</th>
<th>OCCUP (21)</th>
<th>EMP CAT (22)</th>
<th>LP CLUB (23)</th>
<th>CONJ FAM (24)</th>
<th>RELISH H/H (25)</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP (26)</th>
<th>AGE (27)</th>
<th>REL (28)</th>
<th>LANG (29)</th>
<th>LENGTH RES (30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>5678</td>
<td>9012</td>
<td>3456</td>
<td>7890</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234</td>
<td>5678</td>
<td>0123</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>8901</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>6789012345</td>
<td>7890123456</td>
<td>8901234567</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2345</td>
<td>6789</td>
<td>0123</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>8901</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>6789012345</td>
<td>7890123456</td>
<td>8901234567</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3456</td>
<td>8901</td>
<td>0123</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>8901</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>6789012345</td>
<td>7890123456</td>
<td>8901234567</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td>9012345678</td>
<td>012345678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table continues with similar entries for the remaining columns.
APPENDIX C

SPECIMEN OF NON-COMPUTERISED DATA SHEETS

HEALTH

- This table is not for computerizing -

No. of Householder Age Handicap With you since (and indicate again if this is before/after change in marital status)

Specify

Refer questionnaire page 10

SOCIAL

- This table is not for computerizing -

How do your child/children relate to your male friends/female friends i.e. do they relate negatively or positively

HOUSEHOLD IS

Your household is lone-parent

Child's No. Relate Relate


Specify

Refer questionnaire page 29

SOCIAL

- This table is not for computerizing -

How do you want changes brought about in this act (divorce laws)

Specify

Refer questionnaire page 33

REFORM

- This table is not for computerizing -

LIST OF SPECIAL SERVICES

MORE I PROVE I list details of suggestions
**APPENDIX D**

**SPECIMEN OF NON-COMPUTERISED COLLATED ANECDOTAL DATA SHEETS**

---

### DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE NUMBER</th>
<th>C1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEQUENCE NUMBER</strong></td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page No</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when moved to K.R. old school too far.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C1)015</strong></td>
<td>As could not afford private school fees, respondent took daughter out of all girls' private school. Son has been recently made a day-boarder at ____________ School as mother comes towards evening (5, 30) and neither maid nor daughter (9) can manage him after normal school hours. He is the youngest boarder in the school (6 years old) and there by special arrangement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C1)037</strong></td>
<td>How Govt. School. She cannot afford private school. They are old enough and in any case 'latch key children' (two girls one 13, one 11). This school means more travelling. Luckily 'latch key' fares reasonable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C1)055</strong></td>
<td>Two boys boarding since one year after husband died. (13, 10); 2 (6) day school. Better harmony this way, easier for her control, and less expensive. No feels boarding school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C1)059</strong></td>
<td>Boys without resident father better off in male orientated environment. Also have friends in residential geographic area, and less travelling so moved to local district school. Before went in with father by car.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C1)062</strong></td>
<td>Put daughter in convent boarding school—one week there, and homesick, especially mother, so put back to —— —— school. Brother in law arranged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C1)066</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Did not intend changing their schooling; their home. Their lives were upset through losing their father, without any other changes.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CROSTAB2 is one of the Statjob suite of package programmes. It can be used to produce multidimensional tabulations (i.e., cross-tabulations) of the values of selected variables from a data set. Input data to CROSTAB2 is in the form of a standard rectangular data set. Each column of the data set contains the data values for one input variable; each row of the data set contains one data value for each of the input variables. For example, if the observations of a data set represent respondents in a survey, each row would contain the information of one interviewee; and one column might represent ages of the interviewees, another the sex etc. The input data thus consists of observations which correspond to rows of a rectangular data set and analysis variables which correspond to columns of that set. Analysis variables may be numeric or alphanumeric and may contain missing data.

For each tabulation to be performed, one or more of the analysis variables are treated as classification variables. If more than one classification variable is used in a tabulation, then a subset of observations is obtained corresponding to every combination of categories of the classification variables. For example, if variables sex and age are used as classification variables in a tabulation, then the observations of the data set are divided into six subsets, corresponding to the six cells of the following table:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>(21.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>(46.99)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each classification variable of a tabulation forms one dimension of the tabulation; a tabulation of K dimensions is called a K-way cross-tabulation.

The above example illustrates a two-way cross-tabulation. A number of cross-tabulations can be produced in any run of CROSTAB2.
APPENDIX F

SINGLE-PARENT ORGANIZATIONS

In 1957 'when divorce still carried something of a social stigma' (Epstein, 1975:244), Jim Egleson, a divorced father, and Jacqueline Bernard, a divorced mother, started 'Parents without Partners, easily the best known of the organizations in the United States for the divorced.' While widowed, separated and the unwed parent are among its members, by far the largest bulk are the divorced.

To canvas for the membership, the 13th February, 1957, issue of the New York Post carried the following advertisement:

PARENTS WITHOUT PARTNERS: whether you have your children full time or on visitation; wouldn't you like to know others in the same position -- talk over common problems to develop a fuller life for both yourselves and your children, to hold discussions with psychologists, lawyers, etc.? We'd like to hear from you.

Twenty-five people attended the first meeting in New York, but the organization PWP was registered in 1958 in the State of New York. By 1971, its membership in the United States and Canada was 70,000, who were parents of some 200,000 children in single-parent homes and in 1977 there were, in the United States only, some 150,000 members in 950 chapters.

The organization is nonsectarian and religious discrimination does not seem to exist. It is not segregational in policy, but de facto segregation exists. The majority of members are middle-class Whites, meeting in middle-class 'white' areas. 'Wilfully separated' are eligible for membership provided they have been separated for at least 30 days.

A young man who joined PWP summed up its purpose: "I met a lot of interesting people with something in common, without the hostility of coupled society and the phoniness of single society." (ex brochure, undated, from Ann Parks.*) Clayton (1971) wrote: 'Finding a new social life in which one is no longer a fifth wheel is a legitimate motivation for joining PWP and a natural function of the organization.' The organizers and members, in providing social outlets and meetings for its members, claim that the parents' fulfilment is important as 'the healthy growth of a child is often in direct proportion to the feelings of adequacy and fulfilment of the parent.' (Ann Parks, 1978:45).

Among the programme facilities, in addition to social outings for the parents and children, are:

(i) An emergency community programme (referred to as SOS) of talks and lectures by experts, aimed at people who are already experiencing marital separation, or considering it.

(ii) Seminars such as the one held in 1977, which was concerned with Children of Divorce.

* Ann Parks is the Public Relations officer of the PWP International Inc., Washington, D.C.
(iii) National single-parent congresses with liaison and communication as their aim to promote greater understanding of single-parent problems, through discussions.

(iv) Each year PWP recognizes a person or group whose contribution to the welfare of children from all over the world may be considered greatest.

(v) The International Youth Council, YIC, was organized in 1972. In 1978 it had over 1,000 youth members in nearly 60 PWP chapters.

(vi) PWP members are offered life insurance, medical and other benefits and income insurance, through their expanding insurance programme.

(vii) School personnel are provided by Parents Without Partners with insights regarding the single-parent family.

(viii) Contact for children in PWP through meetings, outings, cultural activities with other adults and children, to make them feel they form a family structure, that of the one-parent, which is the norm, rather than being deviant.

(ix) Many chapters have organized child therapy groups, library services, blood banks, swap shops, repairs, home-making and maintenance services for each other.

Gongla (1974) had pointed out from her study that non-family kinship networks, particularly, help in the socialization of children and the re-adaptation of the lone-parent. Parks, enlarging upon this (1977) claimed that 'it is likely that a sample of PWP members would score higher on a divorce adjustment scale than a corresponding group of non-PWP members.'

Clayton (1971), Hunt (1968), Parks (1977) found the average length of membership to have been about two years. It can therefore be estimated that over half a million adults (with about twice that number of children) have experienced some period of membership in PWP. PWP is a temporary haven to help its members in their adjustment. Some leave to remarry or to move into living together arrangements. Some return to study or develop careers.

In 1978 the majority of its United States members were 30-40 years old. Sixty-five percent were women. The majority had two children, one of whom was a teenager. At the time of their joining, they were at different stages in their process of separation. Most joined because they wanted help. Twenty percent of members were widowers or widows, and 20% were never married. The majority were divorced (Parks 1978, in a letter to the researcher). Many have a graduate school or college training; the majority have a high-school education. The majority are of the middle-class, middle-income bracket and are self-supporting.

The results of a survey conducted by Parks (1977) among members of three urban chapters of PWP, to find out the effects of PWP membership on youth and children's adjustment after divorce showed that most of the 75 respondents claimed that their meeting and mixing with other single-parents helped in their adjustment and in their children's adjustment. Sixty-three percent reported that the divorce had been an opportunity for growth for all parties. More than half of those who had indicated that life had become worse, were males.

Hunt (1968:86-88), writing of various organizations the formerly married joined to socialize, meet other singles, and date with the hope
to remarry, wrote of the 'manifest function' of the club which is stated
in its brochures, pamphlets, and formulated in its constitution, which
is to enable the single-parents and their children to learn better ways
to cope with life in a divided family; the 'latent function' however is
to provide members with a market place to shop around for dates. Nine­
tenths of its members look mainly for eligible partners. Hart (1976:
31) believed (like Hunt 1968, and others) that many joined one-parent
organizations, to meet others, in a hope of remarriage:—

Despite their unhappy experience of the status, most
members actively aspired to the goal of remarriage and
they clearly viewed the status of divorce as a dubious
and deviant category.

There are affiliated organizations of PWP in Australia, England,
New Zealand and PWP organizations have been set up in Israel, Netherlands,
Korea, Venezuela, South American countries, and South Africa, based on the
American model. The Cape Town PWP organization appears to be very
active with 100 paid-up members (1977/1978). Affiliation to the United
States organization was denied them, as non-white members are debarred
from joining the organization in South Africa.

In England an important single-parents' organization is the
Gingerbread group which was started in London in 1970, held its first
official meeting in 1971, and by 1975 had more than 12,000 members with
groups spread all over Britain. It is an organization that is run by
the one-parent families themselves, with aims:

(a) To help single-parents and their children who are in need
of companionship, are lonely or isolated, with advice or
information.

(b) To seek to improve the social and economic circumstances of
single-parent families, through education of the public and
agitation to influence government bodies to implement changes
particularly implementation of the recommendations of the
Finer Commission. (Gingerbread, THW/61076, July, 1974).

According to Hunt (1968:81) in England a

National Federation of Clubs for the Divorced and Separated
has recently been formed; its purpose including the co­
ordination of activities, the spawning of new clubs, the
applying of pressures to M.P.s to amend the law relating
to divorce, and the like.

La Grange (1970:229) wrote of the importance of single-parent
organizations in the readjustment of divorcees, after she had visited
one-parent clubs in Europe, and referred to them as a 'subculture':

In die lande waar sulke klubs nie alleen bestaan nie, maar
baie aktief en 'n wye verskynheid van dienste aan geskeide
persone bied, kan die begrip subkultur gebruik word: daar
bestaan in dye klubs 'n stelsel van norms waarop maatskaplike
interaksie gefatsoeneer is en dit beheer die geleentheid vir
nuwe vriendskap benut kan word en waardes en maatreels vir
die hantering van probleme voorgehou en geskittleer word.

Whether the functions performed by the single-parent organi­
zations are the 'latent' or the 'manifest' ones, there appears, from the
literature, to be a consensus that they do fill a void as a support
system of some importance.
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Act No. 70, 1979

DIVORCE ACT, 1979.

GENERAL EXPLANATORY NOTE:

Words underlined with solid line indicate insertions in existing enactments.


ACT

To amend the law relating to divorce and to provide for incidental matters.

(Afrikaans text signed by the Acting State President.)
(Asssented to 8 June 1979.)

BE IT ENACTED by the State President, the Senate and the House of Assembly of the Republic of South Africa, as follows:

Definitions.

1. (1) In this Act, unless inconsistent with the context—
   (i) "court" means the provincial or local division of the Supreme Court of South Africa, or a divorce court established under section 10 of the Black Administration Act, 1927, Amendment Act, 1929 (Act No. 9 of 1929), which has jurisdiction with respect to a divorce action;
   (ii) "divorce action" means an action by which a decree of divorce or other relief in connection therewith is applied for, and includes—
      (a) an application pendente lite for an interdict or for the interim custody of, or access to, a minor child of the marriage concerned or for the payment of maintenance; or
      (b) an application for a contribution towards the costs of such action or to institute such action, or make such application, in forma pauporis, or for the substituted service of process in, or the edictal citation of a party to, such action or such application.
   (2) For the purposes of this Act a divorce action shall be deemed to be instituted on the date on which the summons is issued or the notice of motion is filed or the notice is delivered in terms of the rules of court, as the case may be.

Jurisdiction.

2. (1) A court shall have jurisdiction in a divorce action if—
   (a) the parties to the action are domiciled in the area of jurisdiction of the court on the date on which the action is instituted; or
   (b) the wife is the plaintiff or applicant and she is ordinarily resident in the area of jurisdiction of that court on the date on which the action is instituted and has been ordinarily resident in the Republic for a period of one year immediately prior to the said date and—
      (i) is domiciled in the Republic; or
      (ii) was domiciled in the Republic immediately before cohabitation between her and her husband ceased; or
      (iii) was a South African citizen or was domiciled in the Republic immediately prior to her marriage.
Dissolution of marriage and grounds of divorce.

3. A marriage may be dissolved by a court by a decree of divorce and the only grounds on which such a decree may be granted are—

(a) the irretrievable break-down of the marriage as contemplated in section 4;
(b) the mental illness or the continuous unconsciousness, as contemplated in section 5, of a party to the marriage.

Irretrievable break-down of marriage as ground of divorce.

4. (1) A court may grant a decree of divorce on the ground of the irretrievable break-down of a marriage if it is satisfied that the marriage relationship between the parties to the marriage has reached such a state of disintegration that there is no reasonable prospect of the restoration of a normal marriage relationship between them.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (1), and without excluding any facts or circumstances which may be indicative of the irretrievable break-down of a marriage, the court may accept evidence—

(a) that the parties have not lived together as husband and wife for a continuous period of at least one year immediately prior to the date of the institution of the divorce action;
(b) that the defendant has committed adultery and that the plaintiff finds it irreconcilable with a continued marriage relationship; or
(c) that the defendant has in terms of a sentence of a court been declared an habitual criminal and is undergoing imprisonment as a result of such sentence, as proof of the irretrievable break-down of a marriage.

(3) If it appears to the court that there is a reasonable possibility that the parties may become reconciled through marriage counsel, treatment or reflection, the court may postpone the proceedings in order that the parties may attempt a reconciliation.

(4) Where a divorce action which is not defended is postponed in terms of subsection (3), the court may direct that the action be tried de novo, on the date of resumption thereof, by any other judge of the court concerned.

Mental illness or continuous unconsciousness as grounds of divorce.

5. (1) A court may grant a decree of divorce on the ground of the mental illness of the defendant if it is satisfied—

(a) that the defendant in terms of the Mental Health Act, 1973 (Act No. 18 of 1973)—
(i) has been admitted as a patient to an institution in terms of a reception order,
(ii) is being detained as a President's patient at an institution or other place specified by the Minister of Prisons; or
(iii) is being detained as a mentally ill convicted prisoner at an institution or hospital prison for psychopaths,

and that he has, for a continuous period of at least two years immediately prior to the institution of the divorce action, not been discharged unconditionally as such a patient, President's patient or mentally ill prisoner; and
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(b) after having heard the evidence of at least two psychiatrists, of whom one shall have been appointed by the court, that the defendant is mentally ill and that there is no reasonable prospect that he will be cured of his mental illness.

(2) A court may grant a decree of divorce on the ground that the defendant is by reason of a physical disorder in a state of continuous unconsciousness, if it is satisfied—
(a) that the defendant's unconsciousness has lasted for a continuous period of at least six months immediately prior to the institution of the divorce action; and
(b) after having heard the evidence of at least two medical practitioners, of whom one shall be a neurologist or a neurosurgeon appointed by the court, that there is no reasonable prospect that the defendant will regain consciousness.

(3) The court may appoint a legal practitioner to represent the defendant at proceedings under this section and order the plaintiff to pay the costs of such representation.

(4) The court may make any order it may deem fit with regard to the furnishing of security by the plaintiff in respect of any patrimonial benefits to which the defendant may be entitled by reason of the dissolution of the marriage.

(5) For the purposes of this section the expressions "institution", "mental illness", "patient", "President's patient" and "reception order" shall bear the meaning assigned to them in the Mental Health Act, 1973.

Safeguarding of interests of dependent and minor children.

6. (1) A decree of divorce shall not be granted until the court is satisfied that the provisions made or contemplated with regard to the welfare of any minor or dependent child of the marriage are satisfactory or are the best that can be effected in the circumstances.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1) the court may cause any investigation which it may deem necessary, to be carried out and may order any person to appear before it and may order the parties or any one of them to pay the costs of the investigation and appearance.

(3) A court granting a decree of divorce may, in regard to the maintenance of a dependent child of the marriage or the custody or guardianship of, or access to, a minor child of the marriage, make any order which it may deem fit, and may in particular, if in its opinion it would be in the interests of such minor child to do so, grant to either parent the sole guardianship (which shall include the power to consent to the marriage of the child) or the sole custody of the minor, and the court may order that, on the predecease of the parent to whom the sole guardianship of the minor is granted, a person other than the surviving parent shall be the guardian of the minor, either jointly with or to the exclusion of the surviving parent.

(4) For the purposes of this section the court may appoint a legal practitioner to represent a child at the proceedings and may order the parties or any one of them to pay the costs of the representation.

Division of assets and maintenance of parties.

7. (1) A court granting a decree of divorce may in accordance with a written agreement between the parties make an order with regard to the division of the assets of the parties or the payment of maintenance by the one party to the other.

(2) In the absence of an order made in terms of subsection (1) with regard to the payment of maintenance by the one party to the other, the court may, having regard to the existing or prospective means of each of the parties, their respective earning capacities, financial needs and obligations, the age of each of the parties, the duration of the marriage, the standard of living of the parties prior to the divorce, their conduct in so far as it may be relevant to the break-down of the marriage, and any other factor which in the 65
opinion of the court should be taken into account, make an order which the court finds just in respect of the payment of maintenance by the one party to the other for any period until the death or remarriage of the party in whose favour the order is given, whichever event may first occur.

8. (1) A maintenance order or an order in regard to the custody or guardianship of, or access to, a child, made in terms of this Act, may at any time be rescinded or varied or, in the case of a maintenance order or an order with regard to access to a child, be suspended by a court if the court finds that there is sufficient reason therefor.

(2) A court other than the court which made an order referred to in subsection (1) may rescind, vary or suspend such order if the parties are domiciled in the area of jurisdiction of such first-mentioned court or the applicant is domiciled in the area of jurisdiction of such first-mentioned court and the respondent consents to the jurisdiction of that court.

(3) The provisions of subsections (1) and (2) shall mutatis mutandis apply with reference to any order referred to in subsection (1) given by a court in a divorce action before the commencement of this Act.

9. (1) When a decree of divorce is granted on the ground of the irretrievable break-down of a marriage the court may make an order that the patrimonial benefits of the marriage be forfeited by one party in favour of the other, either wholly or in part, if the court, having regard to the duration of the marriage, the circumstances which gave rise to the break-down thereof and any substantial misconduct on the part of either of the parties, is satisfied that, if the order for forfeiture is not made, the one party will in relation to the other be unduly benefited.

(2) In the case of a decree of divorce granted on the ground of the mental illness or continuous unconsciousness of the defendant, no order for the forfeiture of any patrimonial benefits of the marriage shall be made against the defendant.

10. In a divorce action the court shall not be bound to make an order for costs in favour of the successful party, but the court may, having regard to the means of the parties, and their conduct in so far as it may be relevant, make such order as it considers just, and the court may order that the costs of the proceedings be apportioned between the parties.

11. The procedure applicable with reference to a divorce action shall be the procedure prescribed from time to time by rules of court.

12. (1) Except for making known or publishing the names of the parties to a divorce action, or that a divorce action between the parties is pending in a court of law, or the judgement or order of the court, no person shall make known in public or publish for the information of the public or any section of the public any particulars of a divorce action or any information which comes to light in the course of such an action.

(2) The provisions of subsection (1) shall not apply with reference to the publication of particulars or information—

(a) for the purposes of the administration of justice;

(b) in a bona fide law report which does not form part of any other publication than a series of reports of the proceedings in courts of law; or

(c) for the advancement of or use in a particular profession or science.

(3) The provisions of subsections (1) and (2) shall mutatis mutandis apply with reference to proceedings relating to the enforcement or variation of any order made in terms of this Act.
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(4) Any person who in contravention of this section publishes any particulars or information shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding one thousand rand or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one year or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

13. (1) The validity of a decree of divorce granted in a country or territory in which the husband was not domiciled at the time of the granting of the decree shall be recognized by a court in the Republic if that country or territory has been designated by the State President by proclamation in the Gazette for the purposes of the recognition of such decrees.

(2) The State President may designate a country or territory for the purposes of subsection (1) if he is satisfied that the law of that country or territory provides for the exercise of jurisdiction which substantially corresponds to the jurisdiction referred to in section 2 (1) (b) (ii) and (iii).

(3) No proclamation shall be issued in terms of this section unless the State President is satisfied that the law of the country or territory concerned makes sufficient provision for the recognition by the courts of that country or territory of a decree of divorce granted in the Republic in terms of a jurisdiction under section 2 (1) (b) (ii) or (iii).

(4) A proclamation issued in terms of this section may be withdrawn at any time.

Abolition of orders for restitution of conjugal rights and judicial separation.

14. It shall not be competent for a court to issue an order for the restitution of conjugal rights or for judicial separation.

Application of Act.

15. This Act shall not apply with reference to a divorce action or proceedings for the restitution of conjugal rights or for judicial separation instituted before the commencement of this Act.

Amendment of section 5 of Act 37 of 1953, as amended by section 2 of Act 13 of 1966.

16. Section 5 of the Matrimonial Affairs Act, 1953, is hereby amended—

(a) by the substitution for subsection (1) of the following subsection:

"(1) Any provincial or local division of the Supreme Court or any judge thereof may, on the application of either parent of a minor whose parents are divorced or are living apart, in regard to the custody or guardianship of, or access to, the minor, make any order which it may deem fit, and may in particular, if in its opinion it would be in the interests of such minor to do so, grant to either parent the sole guardianship (which shall include the power to consent to the marriage of the child) or the sole custody of the minor, and the court may order that, on the predecease of the parent to whom the sole guardianship of the minor is granted, a person other than the surviving parent shall be the guardian of the minor, either jointly with or to the exclusion of the surviving parent;"

(b) by the substitution for subsection (2) of the following subsection:

"(2) An order under subsection (1) in regard to a minor whose parents are living apart shall, if the parents become reconciled and live together again as husband and wife, lapse with effect from the date on which the parents commence to live together again;"

(c) by the substitution for subsection (3) of the following subsection:

"(3) Subject to any order of court—

(a) a parent to whom the sole guardianship or custody of a minor has been granted under subsection (1) or the Divorce Act, 1979, or a father or a mother upon
Amendment of section 72 of Act No. 6506, 1979.

where a children's court has under section 60 (1) of the Children's Act, 1960 (Act No. 33 of 1960), conferred the exclusive right to exercise any parental powers in regard to a minor, may by testamentary disposition appoint any person to be the sole guardian or to be vested with the sole custody of the minor, as the case may be, and

(b) the father of a minor to whom the sole guardianship of the minor has not been granted under subsection (1) of the Divorce Act, 1979, or upon whom a children's court has not conferred the exclusive right to exercise any parental powers in regard to the minor, shall not be entitled by testamentary disposition to appoint any person as the guardian of the minor in any other manner than to act jointly with the mother;"; and

(d) by the substitution for subsection (6) of the following subsection:

"(6) if an order under section 60 of the Children's Act, 1960, is rescinded, or if an order under subsection (1) of this section or under the Divorce Act, 1979, granting the sole guardianship or custody of a minor to a parent, lapses or is rescinded or is varied in such a manner that the parent is no longer the sole guardian or vested with the sole custody of the minor, any disposition under subsection (3) (a) shall lapse.".

17. Section 72 of the Administration of Estates Act, 1965, is hereby amended by the substitution for that part of subsection (1) which precedes paragraph (b) thereof, of the following:

"(1) The Master shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (3) and to any applicable provision of section 5 of the Matrimonial Affairs Act, 1953 (Act No. 37 of 1953), and section 4 of the Matrimonial Affairs Ordinance, 1955 (Ordinance No. 25 of 1955), of the territory, or any order of court made under any such provision or any provision of the Divorce Act, 1979, on the written application of any person—

(a) who has been nominated by will or written instrument—

(i) by the father of a legitimate minor, who has not been deprived, as a result of an order under subsection (1) of the said section 5 or subsection (1) of the said section 4 or the Divorce Act, 1979, of the guardianship of such minor, or under section 60 of the Children's Act, 1960 (Act No. 33 of 1960), or section 58 of the Children's Ordinance, 1961 (Ordinance No. 31 of 1961), of the territory, of his parental powers over him; or

(ii) by the mother of an illegitimate minor or of a legitimate minor whose father is dead, who has not been so deprived of the guardianship of such minor or of her parental powers over him; or

(iii) by the parent to whom the sole guardianship of a minor has been granted under subsection (1) of the said section 5 or under subsection (1) of the said section 4 or under the Divorce Act, 1979, or on whose behalf the exclusive right to exercise parental powers in regard to a minor has been conferred under the said section 60 or the said section 58, to administer the property of such minor and to take care of his person as tutor, or to take care of or administer his property as curator; or".
DIVORCE ACT, 1979.

18. The laws mentioned in the Schedule are hereby repealed to the extent set out in the third column of the Schedule.

19. This Act shall be called the Divorce Act, 1979, and shall come into operation on 1 July 1979.

**Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. and year of law</th>
<th>Short title</th>
<th>Extent of repeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act No. 32 of 1935</td>
<td>Divorce Laws Amendment Act, 1935</td>
<td>The whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act No. 22 of 1939</td>
<td>Matrimonial Causes Jurisdiction Act, 1939</td>
<td>The whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act No. 17 of 1943</td>
<td>Matrimonial Causes Jurisdiction Amendment Act, 1943</td>
<td>The whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act No. 35 of 1945</td>
<td>Matrimonial Causes Jurisdiction Act, 1945</td>
<td>The whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act No. 37 of 1953</td>
<td>Matrimonial Affairs Act, 1953</td>
<td>Sections 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act No. 35 of 1945</td>
<td>Matrimonial Causes Jurisdiction Act, 1945</td>
<td>Sections 21, 22 and 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act No. 42 of 1974</td>
<td>Publications Act, 1974</td>
<td>Section 47 (2) (f) (iii) and (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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