

Review

Bridging the disciplinary divide between history and sociology in studying social change in Swaziland

Agostino M. Zamberia

Department of Sociology, University of Swaziland, Kwaluseni M201, Swaziland.

Accepted 20 June, 2012

Historians and sociologists have consistently demonstrated a concern about the nature and dynamics of social change in society. However, despite their shared interest in documenting and elucidating the dynamics of change, disciplinary compartmentalization (especially in African academic institutions) has stifled the development of interdisciplinary research and theoretical debates in sociology and history. This paper examines a number of methodological and theoretical issues that highlight the need to analyse the processes of social and economic transformation from an interdisciplinary perspective. The paper argues that such a perspective would facilitate refinements of theoretical formulations and methodological approaches in sociology and other social sciences through the integration of theory with historical evidence. The process of social transformation over time during the colonial and post-colonial periods in Swaziland is examined to demonstrate the benefits of utilizing the research and theoretical tools of historians and sociologists jointly in exploring social change in Swaziland, in particular, and Africa, in general. The paper calls for collaborative work among sociologists and historians in order to build and strengthen an interdisciplinary approach to the study of social change and development in Africa.

Key words: Social change, Swaziland, proletarianization, capitalist penetration, social stratification.

INTRODUCTION

The study of social change has elicited considerable interest among scholars in the humanities and social sciences. This interest is a reflection of the scholars' concern about documenting and explaining social change with a view to settling unresolved debates pertaining to its nature and dynamics in the context of diverse settings and historical periods. What is glaringly evident with regard to scholarship in Africa is the apparent lack of interdisciplinary collaboration in the social sciences and humanities. This disciplinary compartmentalization has engendered an academic culture that encourages scholars to pursue research endeavours framed solely in terms of their disciplinary orientations, both theoretically and methodologically. Given that social change embraces the different spheres of human experience¹, disciplinary-specific approaches to its analysis may not provide a comprehensive picture of its nature and dynamics in a rapidly changing world. In light of this

argument, this paper suggests an approach to studying social change through interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary endeavours that would benefit from the joint application of the different theoretical orientations and research practices to unveil the underlying elements of the processes of change that cannot be understood from a single perspective.

To demonstrate the utility of this approach for the study of social change in Swaziland, this analysis specifically focuses on the potential for collaborative research between sociologists and historians. The analysis relies on empirical and theoretical works on Swaziland covering a wide range of spheres of social change, and tries to show how these studies provide a basis for further interdisciplinary analysis that could, if thoughtfully applied, enhance our understanding of change and development in Swaziland. Throughout the analysis, theoretical and empirical studies conducted in other

countries are used to highlight how scholars in Swaziland and the rest of Africa can proceed in an interdisciplinary fashion to develop both the empirical and theoretical tools in their disciplines by taking into consideration the commonalities between these disciplines that form the basis for fruitful research ventures and academic debates. The paper begins by outlining the basic orientations of both history and sociology, and then proceeds to explain why, for a long time, African scholars have been averse to collaboration across disciplinary lines. In an attempt to propose a way of bridging the disciplinary divide, the paper focuses on a number of spheres of social change, including the general process of social transformation, and society and technological change in both colonial and post-colonial periods in Swaziland. These spheres of change are not exhaustive and are only intended to be illustrative of the kind of analysis that would enrich constituent disciplines in this inter-disciplinary endeavour, and thus enhance their repertoire of theoretical and methodological tools in the study of social change in the country. In a number of instances, studies by scholars in other disciplines are cited to clarify key arguments and anchor the viewpoints in the existing corpus of empirical and theoretical works on Swaziland.

HISTORY AND SOCIOLOGY

Although many scholars have for a long time recognized the disciplinary affinity between history and sociology (Santoro, 2011; Steinmetz, 2011; Wallerstein, 2004), few academics in Africa have endeavoured to pursue academic ventures that would promote enhanced collaboration in research and theorizing to explore the dynamics of change in Africa.² In Swaziland, historians and sociologists have explored diverse aspects of the same key themes over the years, but there is little evidence of actual collaborative work between these scholars across the disciplinary divide. For instance, in conferences sponsored by academic and professional organizations, similar issues have been debated and the need for closer collaboration emphasized³. However, only a few of these scholars have made concerted attempts to realize this grand scheme⁴.

A major reason for the failure to realize this potential goal has been the belief among many sociologists and historians that their disciplines are, in certain respects, different and thus cannot be easily reconciled particularly with regard to their theoretical orientations and methodological approaches. As Volti (2003:459) has argued:

The traditional division of scholarship into separate disciplinary domains can be justified in terms of distinctive subject matters, theoretical orientations, and methodological approaches, but much of it is simply a matter of administrative convenience – a way of

apportioning faculty positions, making budgetary allocations, and organizing college catalogues.

With regard to the issue of subject matter, sociologists focus mainly on the study of ongoing social processes and institutional forms. This approach has tended to limit some sociologists to the use of contemporary data. As Calhoun (1997) argues, contemporary data gathered specifically to address an analytical problem are better suited for many sociological purposes. He asserts that, to the extent that sociologists seek generalizable, law like statements about specific aspects of social life, contemporary data will usually be better. In line with this argument, Volti (2003) states that many sociologists have confined their inquiries to topics amenable to positivistic methodologies, utilizing mainly quantitative analysis that relies on survey responses, census tabulations, and other sources of hard data. Calhoun (1997: 311), however, points out the key limitations of this approach:

This tells us nothing, however, about how adequate a knowledge of social life we can in fact construct from such more or less generalizable statements about several of its specific aspects. It tells us nothing about where the categories of our sociological inquiries come from and how they remain shaped by their empirical and practical origins.

The disadvantages arising from reliance on contemporary data and the focus on ongoing social processes have been acknowledged by some sociologists. These sociologists note that the present cannot be adequately comprehended without reference to the past. As Grosby (1995: 142) states:

For many of the complexes of meanings constitutive of society, the past is a referent in the present. This means that the image of the current society contains within it images of the past. It is not merely that the past influences the present, but that the past is a part of the present. Clearly to achieve a proper understanding of the nature of the stability of meaning necessary for social action to occur and for society to exist is to achieve a proper understanding of this “temporal depth” of social action and society.

Some scholars, like Griffin (1995) see a very close affinity between the two disciplines and argue that the use of history by contemporary sociologists in their research is the most telling evidence of the interpenetration of history and sociology. He asserts that, by taking history more seriously, sociologists also take “time” more seriously. Additionally, “it is difficult to identify any ontologically compelling borders between sociology and anthropology or history” (Steinmetz, 2007: 50).

Analysis of the changing structural trends by historians and sociologists has also been heavily influenced by their

disciplinary orientations that preclude the use of historical models of analysis. What is interesting is that, as argued by Neuman (2003), the founders of sociology, such as Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, and Max Weber, used a historical and comparative method that was essentially a blend of sociology, history, political science, and economics. The need to incorporate historical approaches into sociological studies has been encouraged by the disenchantment with some of the dominant grand theories in sociology. Neuman points out that the static view of society espoused by structural functionalism and the economic determinism of orthodox Marxism were not sensitive to historical and cultural contexts. He further notes that many researchers saw the limitations of relying exclusively on a strict positivist approach and felt that quantitative techniques alone were inadequate. Calhoun (1997) identifies some social phenomena that, he contends, cannot be dealt with adequately through purely contemporaneous data sources. These include some important sociological phenomena like revolutions; some phenomena that simply happen over an extended period of time for example, industrialization, state formation, the creation of the modern form of the family; and the fact that, for some phenomena, changing historical context is a major set of explanatory variables. He surmises that "it is for these reasons that *all* sociologists need to be historical, at least in some part" (Calhoun, 1997: 314).

A number of limitations have been pointed out with regard to the use of secondary sources by sociologists. According to Neuman (2003), sociologists usually draw on four types of historical evidence or data: primary sources, secondary sources, running records, and recollections. Citing Bendix (1978: 16), Neuman notes the distinction made between the *judgments* of historians and the *selections* of sociologists. He argues that sociologists are restricted to selecting illustrative materials, deferring to expert historians who, despite their different purposes, possess far greater knowledge of specific historical materials. As Skocpol (1984: 382) remarked, the use of such materials is not systematized, and "comparative historical sociologists have not so far worked out clear, consensual rules and procedures for the valid use of secondary sources as evidence." Other shortcomings of the use of secondary sources include problems of inaccurate historical accounts and a lack of studies in areas of interest, the lack of transparency in the historian's selection procedure, and problems relating to the organization of the evidence with regard to undefined concepts and the selection of evidence (Neuman, 2003).⁵ Despite the limitations of the use of historical evidence as outlined in the foregoing, sociologists (particularly historical sociologists), have continued to rely on historical data in their various analyses of change in society.⁶ What sociologists in some African academic and research institutions have done is to use historical data merely as a basis for the introductory sections of their analyses. They then proceed to analyse current trends without drawing clear

links between the past and the present.

The historians too have concentrated more on their traditional approaches in the discipline without any particular overtures towards other disciplines in the analysis of diverse aspects of change. A review of recent studies published in the University of Swaziland (UNISWA) *Research Journal* and other journals published in Swaziland. (Zamberia, 2009) reveals that very few of the articles were co-authored by scholars from different departments. While it may be difficult to point out exactly what has nurtured this practice, few would dispute the view that lack of collaborative ventures across disciplines undermines the prospects of interdisciplinary work in the country. Studies conducted in other settings have shown the fruitful outcomes of interdisciplinary research between history and other disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, political science and economics. These examples of fruitful collaboration demonstrate the need for scholars in Swaziland, in particular, and Africa, in general, to shift their focus and explore possibilities of enhanced collaboration across disciplinary boundaries. The following areas will explicate how this can be done by focusing on some of the spheres of social change specified earlier, and then examining these with reference to specific works on Swaziland. The goal is to demonstrate the plausibility of such endeavours and highlight the benefits to be gained from adopting such approaches.

SOCIAL CHANGE IN SWAZILAND: SOME POTENTIAL AREAS OF DISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION

Several scholars from a multiplicity of disciplines have examined the pre-colonial and post-colonial social, political, and economic developments in Swaziland. These scholars have explored a wide range of issues which point to the common areas of concern in terms of the impact of these changes on the country's social and economic landscape over the years. In an interdisciplinary effort to provide a coherent analysis of social change in Swaziland, an edited volume on social transformation in Swaziland was published in 1995 (Simelane, 1995). The preface to the volume states that the project was an interdisciplinary effort intended to spur a process of analysing the various aspects of the Swazi society. The contributors were drawn from the departments of history, political science, and geography. This was an examination of the 'new social forces' that underpin the changing trends from an interdisciplinary perspective, and the scholars examined the nature of social transformation in a number of domains. In this regard, the project examined a range of issues, including proletarianization, migrant labour, contract farming and small scale irrigation. To highlight the benefits of interdisciplinary work, some of the chapters in the volume will be briefly reviewed, and specific areas where collaborative work would enhance similar analysis will be

pointed out.

Nsibande (1995), a political scientist, examines the proletarianization process in Swaziland from a historical perspective. His analysis focuses on the process of initiating capitalist relations of production in agriculture, with the consequent undermining of the pre-conquest social relations of production by colonialism and the associated reconstitution of the political power of the colonial state in the post-partition period. He then explores the nature of Swaziland's dependent economy and the effects of labour migration. Drawing on evidence from historical sources, Nsibande explores the process of the transformation of the peasant society in Swaziland following the implementation of the Partition Proclamation of 1907 which led to the crisis of peasant reproduction and the creation of peasant migrant labour. Along similar lines as Nsibande (1995), Simelane (1995) examines migrant labour in Swaziland focusing on the links between capitalist penetration of the region and the subsequent uneven development. Arguing that Swaziland was deliberately and systematically created as a labour reserve for the benefit of capital within the region, Simelane (1995) asserts that this form of integration into the capitalist system meant that the country changed from being self-sufficient in food production at the turn of the century to being highly dependent on food imports from South Africa. She details the process of colonial capitalist penetration and the mechanisms of creating labour, as well as the character of the dependent Swazi economy. She notes that, owing to the nature of the colonial economy, there was little economic development with the consequent labour migration into South Africa. She then highlights the adverse effects of migration especially on families when men migrate to South Africa and to the urban areas of Swaziland. This view has been previously articulated by Booth (1982: 329) who states that the "homestead was preserved by the delegation of one or two sons to this task, leaving the family predominantly agricultural (though less productive)."

The process of proletarianization on the peasantry has been a subject of numerous sociological analyses (Bernstein, 1977; Bernstein, 1996; Cohen, 1991). Some of these analyses place specific historical events and arguments within a broader theoretical context. A similar approach to the analysis of proletarianization and migrant labour in Swaziland would shed light on some explanatory dimensions that are inaccessible without such conceptual tools. Cohen (1991) has explored the transformation of peasants to workers in Africa, detailing the emergence of wage labour which he argues is a product of white settlement and the establishment of European colonial administrations. He also analyses the major theoretical debates surrounding the question of peasants as proletarians. Such debates could open up avenues for empirical investigations and analyses to test the relevance of their basic arguments to the Swaziland experience. For this reason, collaborative works across

disciplines would broaden the focus of studies on proletarianization of the peasantry in Swaziland, placing the process within the broader framework of similar and, sometimes, interconnected processes in the southern African region and elsewhere.

In a similar manner as the commentary on proletarianization, the general process of capitalist penetration and the ramifications for the economies being integrated into the system have been explored from an array of sociological perspectives. Cohen (1991) has argued that the chains of proletarianization and peasantization are rooted in colonial policies, and even Africans who remained on the land gradually became incorporated into the mercantilist system and, later, into more complex international division of labour. Such analysis sufficiently demonstrates the commonalities in these areas of focus to warrant the launch of joint academic ventures. As Steinmetz (2007: 5) argues, "from the standpoint of the underlying ontological and epistemological issues, the distinction between history and sociology makes little sense." Moreover, significant works have been published in the sociological literature whose integration within historical debates would add depth to the analysis and further expand the focus from detailed historical cases to embrace issues of how current developments mirror processes of social transformation that began with the advent of colonialism. This is illustrated by Ngwisha's (2006) sociological analysis of the process of urbanization in Swaziland in which he provides a historical background that includes an examination of proletarianization.

Ngwisha's (2006) approach is radically different from the treatment of the same subject by historians since his discussion is geared only towards providing some background material for analysing what he refers to as the rural-urban process. Although this analysis lacks the depth evident in historical analyses, it points to a fertile area of collaboration between the disciplines. He proceeds to examine the process of the growth of towns and what differentiates rural from urban social relations. Clearly, these are issues that would interest historians, and sociological research analysis would greatly benefit from the insights of historians. In a similar light, Zamberia's (2006) overview of the process of urbanization in Swaziland draws heavily on historical data, but the main goal of the analysis is to highlight how Swaziland is progressively experiencing the crisis of rapid urban growth. In this regard, the material only provides a background, and any further sociological analysis that could yield insights pertaining to the social structure of the city during the colonial period and immediately after independence is only tangential and thus not given sufficient attention. Again, although proletarianization is central to a lot of theorizing in sociological studies of change and development, no detailed discussion of the subject is provided. Such discussion requires detail and historical depth that collaborative efforts with historians

would make possible.

Class analysis has always formed the bedrock of sociological analyses, particularly those relating to the social transformation of work. Beginning with the works of Karl Marx and other classical scholars, a compelling and cumulative body of literature has grown around the subject, projecting diverse strands of thinking about the nature of class and class relations in capitalist societies. Opportunities for research and collaborative work aimed at producing systematic works on Swaziland in this area are limitless. Such works would essentially be based on historical materials, and the theoretical lenses of the social sciences would provide interpretive frameworks to discern the character and dynamics of the changes in class systems in the country. An interesting feature would be an analysis of the role of culture in the processes of change in this respect. Sociological analysis would provide theoretically informed accounts of stability and as they relate to the component elements of Swazi culture.

Social stratification is a central sociological concept and an area of continued interest in sociology, in particular, and the social sciences, in general. Sikhondze's (1995) historical analysis of social differentiation with respect to Swazi cotton cultivating entrepreneurs ties in neatly with an enduring interest by scholars in the discipline of sociology. Sikhondze (1995) examines Swazi cotton cultivating entrepreneurs and social differentiation between 1955 and 1985. He notes that Swazi growers originally began to produce cotton around 1909, persuaded to do so by those settlers who could not produce enough themselves for the market. Sikhondze provides a historical background and notes that Swazi cotton growers were generally pastors of religion and ex-migrant workers who had returned from Natal in South Africa where they had worked on settler and company farms growing cotton and other commodities. An investigation into the process of social differentiation from a sociological perspective would provide an explanation of how such social differentiation was a product of specific social contexts, and how these contexts conform to or deviate from the general character of stratification systems under colonialism in other settings. This task calls for a combination of skills in historical and sociological analyses, and would best be accomplished through combined efforts of historians and sociologists interested in the subject.

In his discussion of social differentiation, Sikhondze (1995) touches on the question of the effect of the adoption of new technology on social differentiation. He notes the impact of the use of tractors in farming as a key factor in the process of social differentiation in southeast Swaziland. This is an important area of research given the dearth of studies on the subject in Swaziland. Booth (1982) argues that the history of technological change and productivity improvement prior to 1970 is largely unresearched. An examination of existing literature shows that scholars have increasingly begun to show an interest

in the history of the application of technology in agricultural production in Swaziland. An excellent attempt to examine technological change in Swaziland has been provided by Simelane (2002). Citing Dube and Dlamini (1992), Simelane (2002) notes that, significant changes during the colonial and postcolonial periods led increased use of the tractor amongst peasant producers. His analysis is a reaction to earlier arguments by scholars such as Sikhondze (1997) who argued that the use of the tractor amongst Swazi peasant producers had been limited because most cultivators could not afford to purchase individual tractors, nor afford even to hire them because the prices lay beyond their means. He argues that Sikhondze's argument is a generalization that treats Swazi rural economic relations as a monolithic entity and fails to capture divergences with the Swazi rural periphery (Simelane, 2002: 28). He thus asserts that, contrary to conventional assumptions, peasant families whose members participate in labour migration possess the necessary financial resources to hire tractors for agricultural purposes. He supports this viewpoint by noting that, from the 1970s, tractors began to play an important role in the process of agricultural production in peasant homesteads in Southern Swaziland.

What is important from a sociological standpoint is Simelane's (2002) argument that tractor ownership contributes to the process of social stratification, with owners of tractors being considered to be high achievers in the rural periphery of Southern Swaziland. He argues that the crucial limiting factor in the use of tractors has been the difficulty of getting tractors when needed and not financial constraints. His conclusion is that, from the colonial to the postcolonial era, the Swazi rural periphery has experienced a shift in technological adoption from the rudimentary to the more advanced forms of technology. Sociologists have also been fascinated with technology and its impact on society. The analyses by Sikhondze (1997) and Simelane (2002) are akin to sociological debates on technological determinism and the social construction of technology (Johnson, 1998). These debates suggest the need to re-examine the issue of tractor use in Swaziland to establish the extent to which its adoption was a product of socially constructed notions about the technology itself. The need for such analyses is critical given the argument that the interplay between "institutional decision making processes and the character of technology being adopted has not been adequately explicated in studies of the diffusion of agricultural technologies in sub-Saharan Africa" (Zamberia, 2004: 40). Zamberia argues that studies of adoption of agricultural technologies tend to depict farmers as voluntarily 'adopting' new technologies because of the benefits accruing from adopting these novel methods. He argues that a more sociological approach should focus on the processes through which technologies are sometimes imposed on farmers. As Volti (2003: 460) asserts, technological change is not simply a matter of

improvements in devices and techniques in response to new possibilities; it is a process shaped by social and political structures, cultural patterns, and economic interests. Scholars therefore need to establish how these mechanisms played out in the case of Swaziland.

In his analysis of priorities and opportunities for research in Swaziland, Booth (1982) outlines and discusses a number of research topics which he considers both important and viable in terms of available resources. The topics include agricultural history, capital penetration, labour history, social history and what he refers to as, 'other history'. With regard to labour and class consciousness, Booth argues that Swazi response to capital penetration belies the traditional image of the pliable and compliant "native" labour force. Scholars exploring the character of the peasantry have also been interested in class consciousness and labour resistance. After noting that previous literature on African labour protest has for the most part been confined to those indices of worker dissent that are easily observed, or accessible to measurement, Cohen (1991) examines resistance and hidden forms of consciousness among African workers. Some of these workers' responses to the labour process include desertion, community withdrawal or revolt, and target working. In the case of Swaziland, Booth (1982) sees this as a promising area for further research in Swaziland.

A major research gap concerns the interrelatedness of the social history of Swaziland with labour history according to Booth (1982). After stating that this interrelatedness has not been investigated, he argues that the growth of the labour market, internal and external, has profoundly affected family and homestead history as well as the history of women. He points out that, thus far, research has been limited to studies of the homestead and of women by economists and sociologists over the recent past. He sees these studies as constituting an excellent beginning on which may be built on studies of social change. This is, therefore, a potential area for collaborative research between sociologists and historians.

Research interest on women and formal employment in Swaziland, as rightly hinted by Booth (1982), has not attracted a lot of interest from historians in the country. Most of the available analyses focus on women's present-day circumstances and examine their situations with regard to issues of pay, entry into paid employment, and their positions in the workplace relative to the positions of men. Russell (1986), for instance, examines the employment of women in Swaziland with regard to their status and pay structure. In her discussion of the Swazi workforce, she cites the 1982 estimates from the Swaziland's Central Statistical Office pointing out that almost a third of the population (and two thirds of the labour force) were 'unpaid traditional sector workers', most of whom were women. Exploration of women's participation in formal sector employment also focuses on the utility of sociological theories in explaining the

changes taking place in formal sector employment. Little attention is paid to historically relevant data that could inform the current trends which the author attempts to explain in light of extant socio-logical theories of change in labour force dynamics. Such critical research could be made possible through studies that take into account historical data and accounts provided by historians that documented the development of the working class historically such as Simelane's (1995) analysis.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing analysis has demonstrated that major areas of concern in both history and sociology can be more comprehensively investigated through a combination of sociological and historical approaches. Many sociological studies, for instance, have endeavoured to explain the contemporary nature and dynamics of a multiplicity of social phenomena, leaving out details on the historical roots of such phenomena that largely account for their present-day character. Historical studies, on the other hand, are lacking in critical theoretical insights that link different phenomena. This is a pertinent issue since these insights constitute the logic of explanation in any comprehensive analysis of social phenomena. The gaps identified with respect to both disciplines thus portray the need to use the research tools of both disciplines to capture elusive facets of the issues being investigated. Many sociologists' reliance on theories such as modernization are clearly brought into question by the facts about the structural changes in Swaziland that do not fall within the explanatory frames of these sociological theories. The works reviewed in this analysis have demonstrated that there is fertile ground for interdisciplinary research given the gaps in theoretical and empirical areas of knowledge that cannot be filled through studies conducted by specialists from only one discipline. As Steinmetz (2007: 50) has argued, "disciplinary structures tend to be too cumbersome and inertia-bound to keep up with changes in the external objects of analysis." Importantly, a reanalysis of works done by specialist historians through the lens of sociological frameworks would yield powerful insights into structural changes and trends over time. In this regard, joint efforts by sociologists and historians could lead to reinterpretation of these works and fruitful co-production of knowledge. In sum, such collaborative endeavours would build and strengthen an interdisciplinary approach to the study of social change that would provide compelling accounts of the processes of change and development in Swaziland, in particular, and Africa, in general.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The initial version of this paper was presented at the

International Interdisciplinary Conference on 'Swaziland since 1968: Historical and Contemporary Meanings of Independence' held at the University of Swaziland, Kwaluseni Campus – Main Conference Room, January 12-14, 2009. The conference was organized by the Department of History, University of Swaziland.

REFERENCES

- Abrams P (1982). *Historical Sociology*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Bernstein H (1977). Notes on capital and the peasantry. *Rev. Afr. Polit. Econ.* 10:60-73.
- Bernstein H (1996). The political economy of the maize filière. *J. Peasant Stud.*, 23(2/3):120-146.
- Booth AR (1982). Priorities and opportunities for research in Swaziland. *Hist. Afr.* 9:325-335.
- Calhoun C (1997). The rise and domestication of historical sociology. In MacDonald T (Ed.), *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences: Essays on Transformations in the Disciplines*. Ann. Arbor: Univ. Michigan Press pp.305-337.
- Cohen R (1991). Peasants to workers and peasant-workers in Africa. In Cohen R. *Contested Domains: Debates in International Labour Studies*. London & New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd. pp.73-90.
- Cohen R (1991). Resistance and hidden forms of consciousness amongst African workers. In Cohen R *Contested Domains: Debates in International Labour Studies*. London & New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd. pp.91-110.
- Grosby S (1995). Introduction: The tasks of historical sociology. *Qual. Sociol.* 18(2):139-145.
- Harper CL (1998). *Exploring Social Change: America and the World*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Johnson RR (1998). *User-Centered Technology: A Rhetorical Theory for Computers and Other Mundane Artifacts*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Neuman WL (2003). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ngwisha JK (2006). The urban-rural process in Swaziland: Towards an explanation. In Muzvidziwa VN, Zamberia AM (Eds.). *Urbanization and Development in Swaziland*. Manzini: JAN Publishing Centre pp.27-63.
- Nsibandze BJ (1995). Historical perspectives on the proletarianisation process in Swaziland. In Simelane N (Ed.), *Social Transformation: The Swaziland Case*. Dakar: CODESRIA pp.1-14.
- Russell M (1986). High status, low pay: Anomalies in the position of women in Swaziland. *J. S. Afr. Stud.* 12:293-307.
- Sadovnik AR, Semel SF (2010). Education and inequality: Historical and sociological approaches to schooling and social stratification. *Paedagog. Hist.* 46(1/2):1-13.
- Santoro M (2011). From Bourdieu to cultural sociology. *Cult. Sociol.* 5(1):3-23.
- Sikhondze BAB (1997). The impact of mechanical and chemical technology on the rural Swazi. Paper presented at the History Seminar Series, University of Swaziland.
- Sikhondze BAB (1995). Swazi cotton cultivating entrepreneurs and social differentiation 1955-85. In Simelane N (Ed.), *Social Transformation: The Swaziland Case*. Dakar: CODESRIA pp.73-97.
- Simelane HS (1995). Capitalism and the development of the Swazi working class, 1947-62. In Simelane, Nomtheto (Ed.), *Social Transformation: The Swaziland Case*. Dakar: CODESRIA pp.38-72.
- Simelane HS (2002). Peasant producers and tractor-hire in post-colonial Swaziland. *UNISWA Res. J.*, 15: 27-41.
- Simelane N (1995). A historical discussion of migrant labour in Swaziland. In Simelane, Nomtheto (Ed.), *Social Transformation: The Swaziland Case*. Dakar: CODESRIA pp.15-35.
- Skocpol T (Ed.) (1984). *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Steinmetz G (2007). Transdisciplinarity as a nonimperial encounter: For an open sociology. *Thesis Eleven* 91:48-65.
- Steinmetz G (2011). Bourdieu, historicity, and historical sociology. *Cult. Sociol.* 5(1):45-66.
- Tilly C (1981). *As Sociology Meets History*. New York: Academic Press.
- Vago S (1990). *Social Change*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Volti R (2003). Reuniting history and sociology through research on technological change. *B. Sci. Tech. Soc.* 23(6):459-464.
- Wallerstein I (2004). *The Uncertainties of Knowledge*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Zamberia AM (2009). Some methodological dilemmas in social science research: compelling evidence, sense and nonsense. In Vilakati JN, Nkosi JH, Mathew R (Eds.), *Social and Political Identity in Swaziland in the 4th Decade of Independence & Social Science Research in Swaziland*. Proceedings of the 2008 OSSREA National Conference. Kwaluseni: OSSREA pp.79-87.
- Zamberia AM (2006). A historical overview of the process of urbanization in Swaziland. In Muzvidziwa VN, Zamberia AM (Eds.). *Urbanization and Development in Swaziland*. Manzini: JAN Publishing Centre pp.10-26.
- Zamberia AM (2004). Socio-cultural contexts and the AIDS epidemic in Africa: A comparative multidisciplinary approach. Paper presented at the 2004 OSSREA National Workshop and Research Fair on 'Critical Issues in Multidisciplinary Research for National and Regional Human Development in the 21st Century Africa', held in Matsapha, Swaziland on 27-28 October, 2004.
- Zhaowu H (2005). Some reflections on historical studies. *Chin. Stud. Hist.* 38(3-4):69-87.

Endnotes

¹ In his discussion of the different spheres of social change, Vago (1990) highlights the main areas of social change to include the economy, power relations, social movements, stratification and family. Harper (1998) examines issues of change with regard to structural trends (for example, growth in scale of society and bureaucratization) and changing cultural themes, such as growing cultural complexity and decreasing trust in national leaders and social institutions. These diverse areas are of interest to a wide range of disciplines, and it is this interest that makes disciplinary compartmentalization in their investigation untenable.

² Scholars based in Western institutions, such as Sadovnik and Semel (2010), have fruitfully integrated historical and sociological approaches to understand critical problems relating to education and inequality.

³ At a national workshop sponsored by the Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) held in 2004 in Swaziland, scholars emphasized the need for collaborative work to create policy-relevant research (Zamberia (2004)). Another conference sponsored by the same organization in 2008 explored the themes of social and political identity in Swaziland, as well as social science research in the country. The paper presentations drawn from various disciplines in the social sciences and humanities, included some that explicitly called for interdisciplinary research.

⁴ With the exception of disparate papers published as conference proceedings focusing on interrelated themes, concrete cases of joint academic undertakings among scholars in Swaziland are lacking.

⁵ In this regard, Zhaowu (2005: 76) has argued that historical materials themselves do not change, but the historian's understanding of the materials is always changing, because his or her thought and knowledge are always changing.

⁶ Key works in this respect include Tilly (1981), Abrams (1982) and Skocpol (1984).