HCUSZHCLDS

Definition of "Household"

The term "household" employed in this analysis is taken to mean a group of people staying together in the same house and sharing the same bulget expenditure (or ricepot). Such a definition, therefore, would include visitors (friends or relatives), lodgers, employees living and eating in the same premises. The same definition would cover a person living all by himself, irrespective of whether he or she occupies one room or a whole house.

Distribution by Dislect Groups

Table 2.1 below shows the distribution of Houses and Households according to their layout and dialect groups.

TABLE 2.1

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSES AND HOUSEHOLDS BY LAYOUT AND DIALECT GROUPS

	SITE	•	SITE	C	TO	PAL	PERCE	ntage
DIALECT GROUP	NC. OF HOUSES	No. of H-Holds	nc. cf houses	NC. OF H-HCLDS		NO. OF H-HOLDS	No. CF Houses	NO. CF H-HCLDS
HOKKLEN			25	25	32	32	34.8	34.8
HAKKA	12	12	12	12	24	24	26.1	26.1
CANTONESE	B	13			17	17	18.5	18.5
TEOCHEW	9	9			9	9	9.8	9.8
OTHERS*	2	2	2	2	4		4.3	4.3
MIXED H-HOL	D S 5	3			6	6	6,5	6.5
TOTAL	48	4.5	44	44	92	92	100	100

* For greater detail of dialects found in this group, see Supplementary Table 1 in Appendix II(a)

Altogether, there are 92 households occupying the same number of houses. Therefore, each house is occupied by one household. Of the total 92 households 32 or 34.8% are Hokkien households, 24 or 26.1% are Hakka, 17 or 18.5% are Cantonese, 9 or 9.8% are Teochew, 4 or 4.3% are the group designated as "Others" with 6 or 6.5% belonging to the "Fixed" category. It is hardly surprising to note that Hokkien households have the highest

number since the two Sites on the whole is dominated by people of that dialect group. Yet, their percentage (44.9%) of the total population is not in proportion with their number of households. For the rest of the dialect groups leaving out the "Mixed" category, 19.8% of the Hakka people occupies 26.1% of the households, 18.3% of the Cantonese have 18.5% of the households, 12.3% of the Teochew have 9.8% of the households with 4.6% of the "Others" occupying 4.3% of the households. From this, we can conclude that there is a greater number of hokkien and Teochew people occupying their respective number of households than the Cantonese and the "Others" while much less Eakka people occupy the same proportion of houses.

The househeld group designated as "Nixed" may be interpreted in two ways. It may mean that the "lixed" household is an entirely Chinese household though in that household, the occupants may be of two or more dialect groups. This has to be differentiated from a "lixed" house which means that the house'is occupied by two or more distinct households whose dialect groups are different from each other. Here the term "Nixed" is used in the first sense since all the houses allocated are occupied by one household each. In this group, occupants having two or more dialect groups are the result of a person belonging to a particular dialect group marrying into a different dialect group or having relatives of different dialect groups living in the household. For example, a Hokkien man may have a Teochew wife or his household may contain his or his wife's relatives of another dialect group. This shows that there is a certain amount of integration among the dialect groups though the normal trend would be for marriages to take place among members of the same dialect group.

Coming to inter-site comparisons, it is obvious that no Teochew households are to be found in Site C. Although, as a whole, the 2 Sites are dominated by Hokkien households, it is only in Site C that they are very much the dominant group. In fact, nearly 66% of the households in Site C belong to the Hokkien. The 2 main groups of households in Site C are the Hokkien and the Hakka with nearly 66% and about 27% of the Site total respectively. The remaining 2 categories of "Cthers" and "Mixed" households form a very small proportion of the Site total with about 5% and 2.5% respectively.

The dominant groups in Site B are the Cantonese and the Hakka with the former having a alight edge over the latter. In percentage terms, they make up about 27% and 25% of the site total respectively. Hokkien and Teachew households form 18.7% and 12.5% respectively of the Site total. In actual numbers, there is not much variation in the distribution of households among these four dialect groups in this Site.

As for the smaller groups designated as "Others" and "Mixed", nothing much can be said about them. The category of "Cthers" appears quite evenly distributed each having 4% of the Site total in each site. But, a greater proportion of the "Mixed" households are found in Site B (85% of the total number of Mixed households found in both Sites). They (85% of the total number of Mixed households found in both Sites). They form about 10% and 2% of their respective Site totals. From this, we form about 10% and 2% of their respective Site totals. Site 3 than in Site C. may say that there is greater dialect integration in Site 3 than in Site C.

^{1.} See analysis of Table 1.1, page 7.

Types of Households

rember concerning its relationship to the head of the household were taken. 2 On the basis of the information collected, the majority of the households were classified into 7 main types while arrangements other than these were lumped together under a group termed as "Others". This system of classification was employed in an attempt to differentiate the family type of household from the others.

The 8 categories of households are listed in greater detail below:

- a) Family. This consists of the man, his wife and their children which may be their own children or adopted ones. No other persons are to be found in this group. The household ceases to be a Family type if children, other than that of the married couple, are among its members. Numerically, this group is the most important.
- b) Couple without children. Childless couples make up this group which also include those practicing bigamy or polygamy.
- c) Counte with parents. The couple may or may not have children of their own. Included in the term "Parents" are the "inlaws."
- d) Comple with miscellaneous relatives. "Relatives" here would range from brothers, sister-in-law, grand-children to kinsman.
- e) Widows/Widowers with or without children which is taken to mean own children only as in (a).
- f) Single Person. An individual with his/her own domestic arrangements; need not necessary be married.
- g) Non-resident head. This group is made up of those house-holds where the head does not live with the other members of the family for one reason or another. This category was designated to distinguish it from types (a) (d).
- h) Cthers. This group includes all kinds of arrangements which do not fall under those types enumerated so far. Examples of such arrangements are employer and employee, backstor and miscellaneous relatives or even a non-resident head with miscellaneous relatives. But the bulk of this group is provided cellaneous relatives arrangement of a widow/widower having miscellaneous relatives living with her/him.

^{2.} Head: The head of the household is the person under whose name the house is registered. He or she may or may not reside there nor be the main income earner.

TABLE 2.2

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPES

TYPES OF HOUSEHOLDS	HCI	JSCHCLD	Po	RSCN
	NU:Z:R	PERCENTAGE	i.U/SDR	PERCE.TLAG
FALILY (CCUPLE WITH CHILDREN)	41	44.6	270	44.9
CCUPLE WITHOUT CHILDREN	2	2.2	4	0.7
CCUPLE WITH PARENTS	2	2.2	24	23
CCUPLE WITH NISCELLATECUS RELATIVES	19	20.6	171	28.4
ndo::3/indoi.ars And Children	12	13.0	45	7.5
SI.:GLE PERSON		1.1		0.2
NCN-RESIDENT HEAD			6	1.0
CPHE rs	14	15.2	90	15.0
TOTAL	92	100	601	100

Table 2.2 above gives an idea of the distribution of the 92 households and the 601 persons in the 2 Sites according to the types of households listed.

As expected, the most important type of household is the Family, i.e. a couple with their own children. It accounts for nearly 45% of the total households. Coupling it with the second group (i.e. Couple without children), we can call them the "Familial" categories. The "familial" group then comprises about 47% of the total households. And in these households live about 45% of the total population. That such a group is the most important of all is hardly surprising considering the marrying and productive tendencies of the Chinese (who, traditionally gets married scretimes at the age of 15 or below).

Another substantial type (or types) is where the couples have either their parents and/or their relatives living with them. The main bulk of this type comes from couples who have married children living with them. These groups constitute nearly 23% of the total households with them. These groups constitute nearly 23% of the total households with carry 31, of the total population living in them.

The other two main groups are the "Midows/widowers with or thout children" living with them and the type designated as "Others". They form 13.0, and 15.2 respectively of the total households and having 7.9, and 15.0% respectively of the total population living in them. The former category of "Widows/widowers and children" would even be more substantial if it had been broadened to "Midows/widowers with miscellaneous relatives". As has been remarked earlier, this arrangement forms the bulk of the category "Cthers".

The remaining two groups of "Single Person" and "Non-resident head" are very negligible as there are only 2 in both types together, each forming about 25 in percentage terms with only 15 of the total population living in them.

The relation between the percentage of households and that of the population living in them is fairly even in all the types except in 2 cases. In the category designated "Couple with miscellaneous relatives," we find that the percentage of population living in this type of households is greater than that of the households themselves (about 28: 21%). This can be explained by the fact that it is a Chinese custom for the sons of the families to stay with their parents even after marriage. Thus daughtersin-law and grandchildren help to swell up the population.

On the other hand, for the group classified as "Widows/wittowers and children", the respective percentages are the other way round, i.e., although the number of households make up about 13%, the number of people counted as living in these houses is about only 7% (slightly less than half). From experience on the field, it has been discovered that the number of children is much less in such households than in those where both man and wife are still living. The reason is fairly obvious.

Tables 2.3 and 2.4 following attempts to separate the distribution of the different types of households in each of the dialect groups and how they are affected in each of the 2 Sites. Table 2.3 gives the distribution of such a nature in Site B while Table 2.4 does the same for Site 0.

The two Tables reveal that the typical household unit is the Family type and the general trend is for houses to cluster round the "familial" type. Nearly 43% of the households in Site B and 44% in Site C belong to this category. Regarding the category of "Mixed" dialect group, belong to this category. Regarding the category of "Mixed" dialect group, belong to the households in Site B and all in Site C (in this case 1 out of 1) 80% of the households in Site B and all in Site C (in this case 1 out of 1) come under this group. (The remaining 10% of the "Mixed" dialect group come under this group. (The remaining 10% of the "Mixed" dialect group store as a conclusions apply in the case of the remaining dialect groups. The same conclusions apply in the case of the dialect group "Others" in Site C The only exception is the case of the dialect group "Others" in Site C where none of the two households found here belong to the "Familial" group. Where none of the two households found here belong to the "Familial" group while 2 and 44.4% of their households respectively in the family group while 2 and 44.4% of their households respectively in the family group termed as out of the 2 households belonging to the dialect category termed as out of the 2 households belonging to the dialect category termed as out of the 2 households belonging to the dialect category termed as

As for the other types of households, the same inferences that were drawn for the 2 Sites as a whole can be said to pervade in each Site.

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEKILD TYPES BY DIALKOT CHUDS 11 31 TH.

		•	ı o	4	ч	ы	ပ		ч ಅ	о ш	.	on i		
		H O H	E B	H				A	N H	න ප	'단 '로	.e.	<u> </u>	
			Ħ	8	自	8	일 보공		À	ğ	ls,	1	5	발충
PANTIX (COUPLE WITH CHITDREN)	≏∾	=	27	Mvo	m	N CV	7		42.9		, .		. 8	
COLPLE METHOUR CHILDREN	4		ī	1	rd.		`` . •I					ä	j.	
COUPLE WITH PARENTS	N			. ~	. i	ř		%			15.4			
COUPLIS WITH VISCIALANDOUS RELATIVES	9.0	A	R	74	m	Į	, E	<u> </u>	ů	. ० %		<i>"</i>	1	<u>ဝ</u> လွ
WIDOW/WIDOW:R AND CHILDREN	5	۲.	17	ત્ય		L		<u>এই</u> ই	ů	16.7	15.2			·
SINGLE PURSON		•		1	1						*			
NON-RESIDENT (IEAD)				•	1			<u> </u>						
		*	~ ~	N			3	16.7	8.6 1.6	5 9	Ä	Ņ		
7 7 4 0 4	837	16	2	ង	10	70	A w	<u>21</u> 20 20 20	T T S	1001	180	10 % 100	8	8

* Actual figures do not add up to 100 because of the rounding of mumbers

HKN = Hokkten, HKA = Hakka, CA = Cantonese, TE = Teochew, CT = Others, MI. CP = Nixed Group

TABLE 2.4

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSIEHOLD TYPES BY DIALECT OROUPS IN SITE C

			H	•	1	123	U	F•	•	0	5	8		
TYPES OF HOUSEHOLDS	*	74 5	B B	œ						ы 0 6		E C		
	FOTAE	B	I S	ੋਰੋ₋	胃	চ	보용	TOTAL		Š	8	\$	Ë	보용
PANTLY (COUPLE WITH CHILDREN)	8	A		9		1.1	H	6.07		% .o	9 2			8
COUPLE WITHOUT CHITLDREN		1				1		n N		8.3				
COUPLE WITH PARENTS				ı	. 1	. 1								
COUPLE WITH MISCRILANEOUS RELATIVES	Я	•	N	Н			1	8.7	о. 8	16.8	.0 .0			
WIDCW/WIDOWER AND CHILDREN		0	•		•	H		٠. ۲	12.0	୍ %	1	50.0		
SINGE PERSON	A.		H	1			1	رب س		<u>ن</u> ش		•		
NON-RESTDEAT HEAD		VI.			100	нI	1			8				
OTHERS	9				•			13.6	16.0	8.3		.0 0		i
TOTAL		33	2	*		ભ	H	8 7.	8	87	8	ဒ္ဓ		ន្ត

TE = Teochew, OT = Others, M. GP = Mixed Group HKN = Hokkien, HKA e Hakka, CA = Cantonese, Taking the type Couple with parents or miscellaneous relatives and comparing the two Sites, we find that there is not very much variation between the same dialect groups where the Hakka and Cantonese are concerned in both Site B and C, (Hakka - 41.6% in Site B and 41.7% in Site C; Cantonese - 23% in Site B and 25% in Site C). But for the Hokkiens, more of this type of household are found in Site C than in Site B; 40% against 28.5%. Inter-site comparisons of such nature is not possible at all for the Teachews and the dialect group termed "Others", since there are no Teochew in Site C and no households of such type in both Sites for the latter dialect group.

As for the household group termed as "Others", it varies greatly for each dialect group in both Sites. Finally the two remaining types of "Single Person" and "Non-Resident Head" households are only found in Site C.

Household Size

This sub-sections deals with the size of the different types of households. Table 2.5 below shows the distribution of households according to the number of persons found in each household in each layout.

TABLE 2.5

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY NUMBER OF PERSONS AND LAYOUT

Number of Persons	SITE B NO. OF H-HOLDS	XAGE	SITE C NO. OF H-HOLDS	%acæ	ALL SIT NO. OF H-HOLDS	Account to the contract of the
				2.3		1.1
	3	6.2		4.5		5.4
3	5	10.4	•	20.4		15.2
		6.2		6.8	6	6.5
5		14.6		15.9		15.2
6	6	12.5		2.3		7.6
	6	12.5		9.1	10	10.9
	7	14.6		9.1	1	12.0
9		10.4	5	11.3	10	10.9
10	3	6.2		9.1		4.3
ı		2.1	4	9.1	.	5.4
12 & ABCV	2	4.2	3	6.8	5	5.4
TOTAL	48	100*	<u>u</u>	100×	92	100*

* Actual figures do not total 100 because of rounding of numbers

In general, the distribution of household size tends to centre round the size range of 3-9. Although, the range may seem rather wide; no other definite pattern can be observed. The number of households tend to "tail" off above and below this range. This size range of 3-9 accounts for 78.3% of the households in the 2 Sites. The number of households found in this range for each size numbery 10 and above with 2 exceptions as in the cases of household size 4 and 6 where each has 6 and 7 households respectively. The same can be said of in percentage terms, i.e., each household size in the range has more than 10% of the total households except for the odd cases mentioned. The greater majority of all the households have up to 9 persons per household (84.8% of the total households). Of this, the highest number of households are found in the 2 households sizes of 3 and 5, each having 14 households respectively.

iverage Size

From Table 2.6 below we have the average size of households of different dialect groups in different sites. It tells us that the average number of persons per household for all dialect groups is 6.0. This is very close to the National average of 5. Apart from this, Table 2.6 also

TABLE 2.6

AVERAGE SIZE OF HOUSEHOLDS OF DIFFERENT DIALECT GROUPS
IN DIFFERENT SITES

DIALECT GROUPS	SITE B	SITE C	ALL SITES
. HORKIEN	6.0	6.5	6.3
HAKKA	5.4	3.7	4.5
CANTCHESE	6.5	3.5	5.0
TEOCHEM	7.0		7.0 5.5
OTHERS MIXED GROUP	8.0 8.6	3.0 7.0	
ALL GROUPS	5.2	4.7	6.0

reveals other interesting features. The overall average size of households in Site B is slightly higher than that of Site C though the former is closer to the Mational average than the latter. On the whole, the average size of households in Site B of the different dialect groups are much creater than that of Site C. The only exception is the case of Hokkien where the position is reversed.

Comparing the 2 Sites, substantial variation between them is found regarding the average household size of each dialect group. The exceptions are the liokkien and the "Fixed" dialect groups where the average size is quite even. Also note that the average household size of the Fixka, Cantonese and "Others" is very much lower than that of the Hokkien and "Fixed" dialect groups in Site C.

Household Size by Dialect Groups

Distribution of households by size in the different dialect groups is shown in greater detail in Table 2.7 below.

TABLE 2.7

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY DIALECT GROUPS

NO. OF	HCE	KIEN	HAK	KA	CANT	UNESE	TEX	OHEM	Cī	Highs	NI.	GP	ALI	, CP.
Parsons	110.	8	NC.	5.	NO.	5	NO.	7	NO.	7	730	9	100	
				4.2									1	1.1
2	-		3	12.5			1		1 1	25.0			5	5.4
3	4	12.5	5	20.8	5	29.4							14	15.2
	1	3.1	3	12.5	1	5.9				25.0			6	6.5
	4	12.5	4	16.7	3	17.6	3	33.3					ц	15.2
6	4	12.5	2	8.3	1	5.9							7	7.6
7	3	9.4			4	23.5	-		1	25.0	2	33.3	10	10.9
	3	9.4	3	12.	1	5.9	2	22.2			2	33.3	11	12.0
2	4	12.5	3	12.	1	5.9	1	11.1	1	25.0			10	10.9
10	1	3.1					1	11.1			2	33.3	4	4.3
1	4	12.5			-] 1	11.1					5	5.4
L2 & ABCVI	4	12.5	_	-	1	5.9	-	.		-		-	5	5.4
TOTAL	32	100	24	100	137	100	9	100*	4	100	6	100	92	100

^{*} Actual figures do not add up to 100 because of the rounding of numbers.

II. GP = lixed Group, ALL GP. = All Groups

From the Table, we find that no Hokkien household has 1 or 2 persons only and with the exception of household sizes of 4 and 10, the distribution of Hokkien households among the various household sizes is fairly even.

The concentration of Hakka households is found in the household size of 2-6 while no household is found in household sizes 7 and 10 onwards.

16 of the 17 or 94.17 of the total Cantonese households are within the size range of 3-9 with the remaining households in the size of 12 and above.

55% of the Teochew households centre around the 8-11 size group with the remaining in sizes of 5 (33%) and 1 (11%).

The 4 households found in the dialect category termed "Others" are scattered, one in each of the following household sizes 2, 4, 7 and 9 while those in the Mixed dialect group are equally distributed in 3 household sizes of 7, 8 and 10.

This table also enable us to see why there is an overall concentration around the size range of 3-9 persons. The greater majority of the households (70-94%) of all the dialect groups are concentrated in this range.

Average Size Household by Types

In order to reveal any variation in the household size that may have been concealed by the overall average, the average size of each type of household is computed as shown in Table 2.8.

TABLE 2.8

AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY DIALECT GROUPS AND TYPES OF HOUSEHOLDS

		Н (US	E H O	L D !	l A b	E S	
DIALECT	FAMILY	CHILD IN MITHOUT COUPLE	COUPLE WITH PARENTS	CCUPLE WITH MIS R'ATIVES	WIDCW/ WIDCWER & CHILD'N	SINGLE PERSON	non Resident Head	OTHERS
HOKKTEN	7.1			10.4	4.7			8.0
HAKKA	4.7	2		8.6	2.6	1	6	4.7
Cantonese	6.1		1 7	5.0	4.5	•		5.5
TEOCHEW	7.0	2	-	8.3				7.5
others	8.0				4.0	•		2.0
MIXED GROUP	8.0			10.0		<u> </u>		
ALL GROUPS	6.8	2	7	8.5	3.9	1	6	5.5

The Table reflects quite considerable variations in household sizes and we can relate these variations to the different types of house-clis enumerated.

For example, as expected, the Family type or Couple with Miscollaneous relatives is bound to have a much higher average household size
that of, say, Couple without children or Single Person type. It
would also be obvious that the average household size of the type Couple
with miscellaneous relatives would be greater than that of the Family type.
This is because, as the former type consists mainly of couples having
-normed children living with them, the number in each such household is
tound to be greater since there may be two or more families in that category.

The types of households termed as "Couple with Children", "Single Person" and "Non-resident head" are only found in the Hakka dialect group except for the first named which is also found in the Teochew dialect group.

From the Table, it would also appear that it is only among the Cantonese that parents live with their children or children-in-law. From the forms, it has been discovered that such parents were mainly in-laws.

Finally, we find that with the few minor exceptions, variations in the average size between the different dialect groups of the 3 main types of households (i.e. Family, Couple with Miscellaneous relatives and widow/widower and children) are quite negligible.

Housing Situation

So far, we have discussed the size of households. As a conclusion to Chapter IV, we shall try, in general terms, to assess the overall housing situation. Owing to the lack of information in this field, we shall only touch lightly on the subject.

There are several certain criteria, generally accepted, to determine what the overall housing situation is like. Here, we shall only use the measure of house density as a guide.

From Table 2.1, we find that each household occupies 1 house as there are 92 houses for 92 households. From Table 2.6, we have seen that the average number of persons living in 1 house is 6.0.4 According to these house density figures, it appears that the housing condition is fairly tolerable. However, these figures may belie the actual situation. The figure of 6.0 is only an average and the one extreme of more than 6 persons in a house may have been compensated by a greater number of houses having less than the other extreme. In fact, this is the case from field experience and from a closer scrutiny of Table 2.6.4

^{3.} See Table 2.1, page 15.

^{4.} See Table 2.6, page 23.

Moreover, we have to bear in mind too that though the above sinces may be useful in gauging the housing situation, they have their litations. In the first place there is the difficulty of defining saidly what a "house" is. Usually there is extension to the main struction time to time as the population of the household increases. Then a figures do not take into consideration the size of the house nor the labor of rooms in each house. Finally, variations in household size have also not been given sufficient and due consideration.

Thus, these household density figures may under-estimate the extent of the housing situation, as from Table 2.75 we find nearly 50% of the total households in the 2 Sites have more than 6 persons.

Where tenancy and the rent of houses are concerned, nothing such can be said as no information in this area is available.

5. See Table 2.7, page 24.