

Costa, Ana Bénard da e Adriano Biza 2013. “Maputo Home Spaces. Working for a home, working at home”. In Engels, Ulf e Ramos, Manuel João. African Dynamics in a Multipolar World. Leiden: Brill (no prelo)

Maputo Home Spaces

Working for a Home, Working at Home

Ana Bénard da Costa

Adriano Biza

Introduction

In 2010, a team of three anthropologists (the authors and Judite Chipenembe) assisted by anthropology students carried out a fieldwork with 19 families living in eight different urban *bairros* of the metropolitan area of Maputo (Polana Caniço A, 3 de Fevereiro, Mahotas, Mavalane B, Hulene B, Magoanine B, Ferroviário, Albasine). This ethnographic study was one of the three components of the “*Home Space in African Cities*” programme¹ and took place in the part of Maputo that was known as *Bairros de*

¹ This chapter draws on Costa and Biza (2012) and is part of the research programme “Home Space in African Cities”, funded by the Danish Research Council for Innovation 2009-2011, under the management of Prof. Jorgen Eskemose Andersen of the School of Architecture, Copenhagen. The programme was based on a conception and research design by Prof. Paul Jenkins of the School of the Built Environment, Heriot-Watt University / Edinburgh School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture. It was implemented in partnership between the above institutions (led by Professors Andersen and Jenkins), the Centre of African Studies at the ISCTE- Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (represented by Dr. Ana Bénard da Costa) the centre for Development of Habitat Studies in the Faculdade de Arquitectura e Planeamento Físico, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane, Mozambique (represented by Prof. Luís Lage, Prof. Julio Carrilho and Dr. Carlos Trindade) and the Faculdade de Letras e Ciências Sociais da Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (represented by Dr. Adriano Biza). The fieldwork was undertaken with participation of students of architecture and anthropology from Universidade Eduardo Mondlane, and had key involvement from architect Silje Erøy Sollien and the academic Judite Chipenembe. Generous support from the Mozambican institutions and time

Caníço (reed) but as nowadays most houses are not made of *caníço* is called simple *the Bairros*.

Based on participative observation, non-directive interviews, life stories and family stories we sought to understand the meaning and importance of *home space* in the organization of families, and in the perpetuation or transformation of family structures and relations.

This concept *home space* – developed in a speculative sense by the research team of the programme “*Home Space in African Cities*” – “refers to the spaces within which the majority of African urban residents ‘dwell’ – ‘dwelling’ being both a place and a process. Creating ‘home spaces’ thus involves spatial and social practices, but conceptually ‘home’ is above all else a culturally defined concept” (Jenkins 2012, 12).

With this innovative concept that inter relates physical, social, economic, cultural and temporal aspects of urban change, the research team of the programme “*Home Space in African Cities*” besides offering, as Bourdieu ([1970]1992) and Moore (1984) taught long ago, an insight into the ways Maputo families position and project themselves within their social environment, merge in a single study unit the act of dwelling and the physical space of dwelling. Through this *home space* programme disciplinary boundaries (architecture, urban planning, economics and anthropology) were cut across and the micro-level understanding of the house as living space was related to wider urban development.

Currently the urban African development is taking place in an “arguably uniquely weak political and economic context...(that is)...leading to new forms of urbanism which challenge conventional values of what is ‘urban’ ... This new urbanism, dominated by households’ use of space for living” (Jenkins 2012, 5–6), needs to be studied with the

donated by Edinburgh and Lisbon institutions for their academics’ inputs have been a key aspect of the programme’s success.

above mentioned new academic approaches within African Studies and following current trends in urban anthropology that besides qualifying understandings of governmentality (Nielsen 2011, Simone 2004) are revisiting aesthetics in the production of material life (Taussig 2012).

In this chapter we focus on the economic aspects in which these “urban spatially mobile populations” (Jenkins 2012, 5) are involved and that are directly related with their *home spaces*. Exploring the economic resources families and their members can draw upon to acquire, construct, modify and maintain their *home spaces* we aim to understand the way economic production and social reproduction are linked creating unique urban spaces and urban lives².

The empirical data at our disposal shows that the economic resources available to each family varied according to the diversity of sources and the ways these resources are mobilized. Research on work and economic strategies of peri-urban Maputo families (Costa 2007, 2008) explain this diversity in terms of the characteristics of the families themselves (size, composition, type, stage of domestic cycle) and other characteristics related with the resources available (within the family and external to it) and with the ability to mobilize, defend, maintain and transform these resources into income, dignity, power and sustainability (Bebbington 1999, 2022 and 2028–29). This process is strictly related with family linkages – and these can only be understood by extending the scope of analysis to encompass the different dimensions which structure the families (on the material, affective, symbolic, identity and value levels) – and with the different

² This ethnographic study was preceded by a built environment dwelling and household socio-economic study conducted in 2009-2010 (109 cases) and some of findings and data collected there is also used here (Andersen, Sollien and Ouis 2012; Andersen 2012)

trajectories and consequently the different frames of reference within which the families mobilize their resources (Costa 2007, 123).

Economic conditions are acknowledged as structural factors in the options followed by families in their economic strategies. As Loforte noted, families are permanently attempting to adjust to an uncertain social and economic context, and constantly recasting their life strategies in an attempt to respond in an articulated manner to changes in the socio-economic context. These changes are visible in the broader sphere of the national economy and employment market (exogenous factors); and in transformations within the family (endogenous factors). Both exogenous and endogenous factors have implications for the potential of families to generate resources enabling their survival and reproduction (Loforte 2000, 137–138).

The empirical study observed a wide diversity of situations allowing families to generate economic resources that enable their social reproduction and allow them to materialize their ideas and plans for the construction, transformation, organization and use of their *home space*. These practices involve and articulate many dimensions (social, economic and symbolic) and many types of resources (human, social, cultural and natural) (Costa 2007, 123).

Working for a Home

Generally speaking, strategies and practices for achievement access to economic resources are activated at the interface between the so-called formal and informal economies.³ The families we studied, and their members, structure their *home space*

³ The bibliography on the informal economy and its relations with the formal economy is extensive (AlSayaad and Roy 2004; Chen 2003; Grassi 2003; Hansen and Vaa 2004; Hugon 1999; Lopes 2008, Maldonado 1995; Roberts 1994; Yusuff 2011), and illustrates the diversity of ways of economic

economies by participating in an articulated manner in economic activities and occupations which span both sectors, although it is the informal sector which tends to predominate.⁴

In the formal economy, there are different occupational trajectories that determine different ways of obtaining resources, saving and investing, and family reproduction strategies. Of the 19 families we studied, six heads of family work in the formal sector of the economy, although one of these is not a permanent resident of his *bairro* as he works as a miner in South Africa. The occupations of the other five heads of family (one female and the others male) are: clerk; contracted building worker; senior clerk at Eduardo Mondlane University (the female head of family); civil servant with the Ministry of the Interior; and administrator in a state bureau.

The remaining families obtain the income and produce they need from a wide range of “informal” economic activities. These activities range from services (lease of

organization encompassed by the term, as well as the many ways formal and informal can interact (Hansen and Vaa 2004; Lopes 2008). Some authors argue that this concept “remains inadequate to explain the dynamism of the informal economy in developing countries from its origin, causes and persistence” (Yusuff 2011, 634) and that its complexity eludes the various theoretical approaches (modernization, dependency, neo-liberal and structuralist) that attempt to define it (Yusuff 2011). In the absence of an alternative definition and acknowledging the difficulties in avoiding this term (and its corollary, formal), and since an in-depth examination of the meaning(s) of the concept of the informal economy lies outside the scope of the present study, we use the term “informal economy” in the awareness that none of the proposed definitions fully encompasses the diversity of the economic situations they aim to address.

⁴ As mentioned in the previous footnote, this distinction (formal/informal) does not reveal the structural logic of the mechanisms used for obtaining economic resources. In most of discourses and in the practices we observed, the reality that emerged was a complex one, characterized by a set of inter-related situations which occasionally reflected profound contradictions and which allowed families and their members to obtain economic resources for the satisfaction of their needs.

rooms, traditional healer, treatment of “traditional” illnesses, domestic employees, hairdresser, guards) to commerce (carried out in or outside the home, or as street vendors) and agriculture (cultivation of small vegetable patches on home premises, or on larger plots at a nearer or greater remove from the *bairro*), minor industry and carpentry / metal workshops manufacturing the goods, raw materials and technology necessary for the growing construction market in the *bairros* (doors, windows, frames, grilles) and basic domestic utensils (cookers, pots and pans) and the hire of construction materials (timber, shuttering) and, finally, income obtained via membership of a savings group or *xitique*.⁵

Economic activities pursued on personal initiative and without involving any kind of contract, occasionally practised on a non-permanent basis (the so-called *biscates*) are predominant (these activities constitute the principal source of income for 11 families). In nearly all the families (15), economic income and/or available produce (for consumption and/or sale) derive from a combination of different activities exercised by various family members. The same family member may exercise more than one activity (in eight families there is at least one person involved in more than one economic activity).⁶ These sources of income may also be complemented by the lease of rooms (3),

⁵ The local term in Maputo for a rotating savings groups.

⁶ Recourse to economic activities which combine complementarity of activities with pluriactivity, and in many instances entail the geographic dispersion of the family’s members, has been observed in other studies in the same or similar contexts (Andrade 1998; Costa 2007; Loforte 2000). However, the articulation of diversified sources of income is not a strategy exclusive to the peri-urban Maputo families, nor even of families living in urban and rural milieu in sub-Saharan Africa, or other “developing” regions (Creed 2000). It also occurs in the “developed” world (Barlett 1993, Lima 1992). Creed relates the emergence of this strategy not only with situations of economic crisis but also with the flexibility of the global economy (2000, 9).

remissions from family members living in South Africa (2) or (in one family only) a pension. Some family members (7) mentioned that they received assistance in the form of money or produce from family members living elsewhere. In some cases these contributions are regular, and considered as their principal source of income; in other cases they are occasional, and are considered merely as “a bit of help”.

As explained below in this chapter the social value attributed to these income- and produce-generating activities varies enormously, and this value does not stand in direct proportion to the resources gained by them. Different values are attributed to activities depending on whether they are performed by men or women, adults or children, and on the nature of the activity itself. Some activities are not considered as work; others are.

The importance of agriculture in the economic activities pursued by Maputo families (Sheldon 1999, 2002, 2003) is borne out by the fact that it is mentioned in most (12) cases. And the fact that everyone who practises some form of agriculture emphasizes its importance to the domestic economy (regardless of quantity, variety, regularity or value) attests to the continuing preponderance of rural activities in the economies of urban families, in this study at least. Even those who no longer practise agriculture have practised it in the recent past, citing various reasons for giving it up. Some, for instance, sold their *machamba* to get what they needed to build the house they now live in; others left agriculture because they only practised it when young, when living in their parents' house; for others, the *machamba* was a long way from their home and they lacked the money to get there.

In cases where the resources obtained from agricultural work are mentioned, the cultivation plots are located in the yards of the family's *home spaces* and are small vegetable patches, or agricultural plots in the *bairro* of residence or in other areas or more rural *bairros* (normally low-lying land), in locations outside the city or even

outside the province of Maputo. In the latter cases, family members either go there regularly to work the land (or live there permanently). Then there are some families who have loaned or leased their *machambas*. There are still cases where work on the *machambas* is by specially contracted labour. The *machambas* are often located well outside the city (20 to 40/50 kilometers distance from their houses), but as we shall explain below they are still associated with the *home space*, for not only are they a relatively important resource for the survival of the family, they also have performative effects on the organization of domestic life.

Different members of the same family, not necessarily living in the same *home space* or belonging to the same household, often perform work on the same *machamba*. This demonstrates the persistence and importance of family connections across diverse *nuclei* of the same family, and also reveals a series of social dynamics, which, though based on agriculture, are structured and maintained in the urban milieu. Agriculture is pursued not only for strictly economic reasons, but also, and perhaps essentially, because it perpetuates (albeit in combination with other factors) the family and social ties which are essential for the survival and reproduction of the family in the urban milieu.

In the life stories related to we observed that many of the strategic options in the search for economic resources are shaped and influenced by past experiences and skills, both personal and occupational. These are present-moment situations that take shape in a constantly ambiguous and contradictory dialogue between the ideal and the possible. A significant proportion of the families members whom we studied (most of them with irregular incomes) made reference to the growing discrepancy between their everyday reality and their socio-economic aspirations and expectations.

One of the characteristics of family economies is the exchange of goods and services between members of the same extended family, who may or may not share the

same *home space*. These exchanges – “a bit of help” in their words – are part of the mutual rights and obligations established via practices of reciprocity rooted in traditional kinship rules. However, observance of these practices is now limited to a narrower group of relatives (and even then they are not always observed) with closer ties of kinship (fathers, sons, brothers, nephews). This family network of exchange, mutual assistance, duties and responsibilities is one of the most important ways of facing up to the economic constraints to which the families are subjected. This system – whereby a family member feels *obliged* to provide assistance, or to which he or she resorts when necessary –, helps each family secure the financial means and/or consumer goods necessary for meeting their basic requirements, while it may also make additional resources available.

Working at Home

In only a few of the families we studied (5) was the *home space* merely a place of residence and social reproduction. Most (14) also pursue economic activity in their *home space*; in some cases this activity is complementary to other activities pursued outside the *home space*, while in others it actually constitutes the principal source of income and involves one or more family members, working part- or full-time.⁷ In addition to requiring changes to the spatial configuration of the house, these activities provide monetary resources and/or foodstuffs that are considered important for the domestic economy, although just how important varies according to the type of activity and the volume of production.

⁷ The Built Environment Study (Andersen, Sollienen and Ouis 2012) observed that economic activities were pursued in the *home space* in almost 60 per cent of cases.

In addition to growing vegetables on small patches in their yards, some families have modified parts of their *home spaces* to accommodate other types of income-generating activity. These include vending (7 cases), craft industry (2 cases) and services (5 cases). To facilitate their vending activities, families build *barracas* in or at the front of their plots,⁸ small takeaways or groceries where they mainly sell food and drinks, and *bancas* – stalls set out on the street adjacent to their plots – where household members, mainly women and children, sell small kits of various basic products.

In the cases of a blacksmith, a carpenter and a traditional healer, their places of work are within the *home space*, which they have built and/or modified to serve their purposes: and this implies the separation of work and living zones, with common areas in which both customers and family members can circulate: the yard or patio. In other cases, where the income-generating activity is sporadic (an example is a woman who treats children with traditional remedies) or the *home space* is used for storing products that are sold outside economic activity does not entail structural modifications: but it does nevertheless interfere with the domestic space (clients coming and going, products stacked in bedrooms etc.).

Lease of rooms in the main house or annexes/outhouses, called “dependências” (3 cases) is another activity which provides the families with income,⁹ and which also entails some reorganization of the domestic space.

⁸ The part of the yard beyond its perimeter but running immediately alongside it is considered to belong to the *home space*, as other research in the same context has verified (Costa 2007).

⁹ In the 109 cases addressed by the socio-economic and physical survey (Andersen 2012, Andersen, Sollinen and Ouis 2012), only seven cases of leased living space were recorded. The survey did however suggest the emergence of a important market for room rental.

Analysis of the facts reveals not only a symbiosis between domestic activities and the generation of income which erodes the traditional spatial distinctions between reproduction (non-economic activities) and production (economic activities); it also, and above all, shows that the balance in the use of space between residence and workplace varies according to income, aspirations of the household, the nature of the economic activities pursued, and the alternative income-generation opportunities which emerge, among other variables. It was also shown that the performance of the different activities in the *home space* entails multiple and complex combinations of human, material, symbolic and spatial resources, which are not always managed in harmonious fashion by the different family members. Economic activities pursued in the *home space* – observed in 14 of the cases we studied – were mainly the responsibility of women (11), who occasionally mentioned the assistance of other family members (7) and some are considered to be the family's principal source of sustenance (6), but only three of these activities were unequivocally considered to be *work* (a man who has a metal workshop at home, a couple in which the wife does *mukera*,¹⁰ and a traditional healer).

In addition to the relatively diverse range of economic activities pursued in the *home space*, another income-generating activity is of a financial nature, and rotates around the homes of its members: *xitique*. In most cases only women take part in a *xitique* scheme, although one case involving a couple was observed.

In all the cases we studied where the head of the family was a man, when questioned on all the decisions relating to the obtaining and allocating of the material resources necessary for the acquisition, construction, upkeep and transformation of the *home space*, the responses of family members – including the head of household himself

¹⁰ This refers to the process of buying products in neighboring South Africa and re-selling in the south of Mozambique - a well-established economic activity. Someone who does this is called a Mukerista.

– suggested that the decisions had been taken by men. These decisions often involved complex choices, given the limited resources. Deciding whether to channel investments and savings into home improvements (and what kind), or the education of the children, or even to formalize the conjugal union, involves choices that attend to the different needs and priorities of the various male and female members of the family. Normally, the man's will prevails and his power of decision is not (openly, at least) contested, for this power lies with him *naturally*.

It is no easy task to analyse this assistance in terms of the power relations it embodies, or to determine whether it is given on a regular basis, whether it is freely given or imposed upon the weaker by the stronger, whether failure to give it entails punishment, what kind of management underlies it, or who exercises it and in relation to what kind of expenditure. It would also require more fieldwork than we were able to conduct. Nevertheless, in several cases we obtained information from different family members on the way individual contributions to the common family revenue are processed, and these allow us to make some tentative guesses on the management of income in the *home space*.

Gender and power relations in the *home space*

The first factor to consider is that the person seen as in charge of the *home space* is always the head of the family, whether male or female. Everyone else who contributes funds, regardless of amount or frequency, are seen as *helpers*. Although in practice they are also responsible for the upkeep of the family, the women who were the partners of the heads of family also saw themselves, in most cases, as “helpers”.

All the other activities which women may pursue (vending,¹¹ agriculture) and from which they derive income or produce are not seen as *work*, regardless of the importance of the resources thereby obtained for the upkeep of the family. “My husband doesn't let me work. The only thing he permits is [me] selling from the booth here in the house” (female aged 36, 3 de Fevereiro).

The men on the contrary, even when unemployed or doing sporadic work (*biscates*) and earning wages insufficient to sustain their families, are always seen as the ones in charge, even where they recognize that they are unable fully to exercise this function due to lack of resources. At the same time, in all the cases observed, the women pursue some kind of activity (on a more or less regular basis) that generates income and/or produce.

However, the fact that women are involved in income-generating activity does not of itself qualify them for an improvement in their status. For as we have seen, such activities are not seen as *work*, and to pursue them women need the authorization of their husbands – which is not always given. In one case, for example, the husband declared:

“The one who pays all the expenses of my family is me, I'm the one who works ...I have a machamba in Guijá but it's my wife who works it, not me.” His wife adds: “I don't work, my husband doesn't let me work, I don't sell anything either. At home, in Guijá, I started selling but my husband doesn't like it. ...”

¹¹ As observed in an earlier study (Costa 2007), vending activities are not seen as work.

The fact that women often pursue income-generating activities inside the *home space* or in family-owned *machambas*¹² which, regardless of how close they are to the houses they live in, they have always considered as part of their family space has important implications. On the one hand these activities *belong* to the domestic space, where the woman has always exercised a degree of control and power. Therefore it is socially acceptable for them to pursue these activities: but by the same token, such activities are not considered to be *work*. Yet many of them involve contact with the outside world (clients) and as such require the authorization of the husband. Where economic activity in the home is pursued at the initiative of the man, however,¹³ it is considered to be work.

Economic activities pursued by women and associated, in practice or symbolically, with the domestic sphere do not, for this reason, entail changes to their status, which continues to be related to the family and to their roles as wives and mothers. And while their access to the financial resources, which their activity procures, is something new relative to the old practices in the rural milieu, this does not of itself bring about any change in gender relations, in terms of or increased autonomy and power, or less inequality, with regard to men. The roles traditionally assigned to women remain the same. They are the ones who are responsible for the domestic chores but the boys or the men can perform this work, where there is no woman in the house. And in many of the

¹² The importance of agriculture was also verified in the Built Environment Study (Andersen, Sollienen and Ouis 2012), which found that 36 per cent of the households included in the sample had a *machamba* in the green areas or another location remote from the plot of land they lived on. In most cases (75%), the *machamba* yielded only enough for consumption by the family. Only one *machamba* in four produced a surplus for market, thereby contributing to the family income.

¹³ This ethnographic study records only one such instance, but data from the socio-economic study (and from other studies too) carried out as part of the same project confirm this observation.

cases we studied, the males did perform certain tasks: they washed their clothes, swept the floor, sometimes cooked. This distribution of tasks by gender depends on the relative proportions of males and females in the house, and their ages; but the mother, whenever she is present, is the one who is ultimately responsible for them.

Thus, and as this study¹⁴ shows, the fact that women exercise activities which bring them monetary income does not necessarily signify – as some authors (Tripp 1989; Loforte 2000) suggest – that they have access to certain positions of power, or can achieve a certain visibility at *bairro* level which can positively influence their status inside and outside their families. These activities do not of themselves contribute to an increase in their self-esteem, to greater control over their own lives or to more bargaining power vis-à-vis men. In fact, they may even end up penalizing women more than benefitting them (Caplan 1995; Campbell 1995; Rocha and Grinspun 2001), for they entail a greater workload than in the rural milieu.

Children and young people often contribute to the family budget too. The form of these contributions, and the extent to which they are made freely or coercively, largely depend on the type and structure of the family to which they belong (number of resident members, age distribution, the economic situation of the family and the types of income-generating activities on which it depends), the social representations of the different family members with regard to the duties and responsibilities allocated to different generations, and the different places and social roles played by each member of the family. These social representations are not uniform across age groups, in each particular age group, or even at individual level. There are always different ways of interpreting the norms embodied in the cultural models which co-exist in the context we are examining,

¹⁴ Confirmed in other studies: see Costa (2007, 2005); Caplan (1995); Campbell (1995); Rocha and Grinspun (2001).

and this can generate conflict between family members – conflict that tends to become more acute the tighter the economic straits the family finds itself in.

The economic contributions of children and young people to their family budgets can be either direct or indirect. Direct contributions derive from activities which yield income or produce. The monetary gains resulting from these activities are totally or partially incorporated in the family budget, while in other cases the activities may be pursued as part of family businesses or ventures (helping out at vending stalls, in family-based industry, working on the *machamba*), with the income from these activities managed by the family member(s) responsible. Indirect contributions occur in instances where children and young people perform all kinds of domestic tasks (cooking, looking after younger children, cleaning the house, washing clothes, fetching water) which release the older family members from these responsibilities and enable them to exercise income-generating activities.

Direct contributions are more frequent among older children (sons and daughters) and those who are no longer in education. In some cases, older sons already have children of their own and live with their wives in their parents' home. They feel – or *are* – obliged to make some kind of contribution. This obligation to help may extend to children who have already left home, and in four cases mention was made of non-resident children who contribute to the upkeep of their parents' *home space*. And as we saw, in another three cases other non-resident relatives (brother and sisters) provide help too.

In similar fashion to what occurs with activities that yield income and/or produce and are exercised by the women of the family, however, receiving “a bit of help” (regardless of how much, and with what frequency) does not call into question the supremacy of the head of the family over the other members of the household. Where

there is a couple in the household, it is the man who is in charge, for he *works* while the others do *biscates*; and in the case of the women and younger members of the family, the activities they pursue are only considered to be *work* if they are regular, and remunerated in the form of a salary which presupposes some kind of employment contract.¹⁵

Conclusions

In their efforts to obtain resources and to reproduce, family members resort to a plurality of activities which generate income and products. These activities span all sectors of the economy (formal, informal, primary, secondary and tertiary); they take place in different geographic contexts (urban, rural and even other countries); and in most cases no single activity generates income sufficient to meet the needs of the families. Situations like this necessitate constant exchanges and sharing, structured around family relations which extend beyond the nucleus of residents of any individual home space. The social value attributed to the different activities depends not only on the type of activity pursued or the income or products which are the outcome of the activity; essentially, it depends on the status enjoyed by the individual pursuing the activity. We observed that the economic activities pursued by men have a different social value from the activities pursued by children, youths and women. Only where the activities of the latter are pursued as part of formal employment contracts are they actually seen as work

The internal management of the income and products obtained by the different family members in the activities they pursue depends on numerous factors ranging from power relations to normative codes and individual/collective affects and

¹⁵ This was observed in only one instance in this study. The only exception was that of the traditional healer, for reasons already given.

interests. Another factor is that the income or products resulting from these activities are often unpredictable, and in most cases are not guaranteed in advance. Many such activities require a degree of wheeling and dealing, knowledge of demand and the ability to imagine and anticipate future developments if a minimum amount of success is to be achieved vis-à-vis the competition. Other activities depend on social relations, knowledge and exchanges of favors. Others, like farming, depend on the climate and are founded on ancestral knowledge which includes the awareness of risk and lack of security. Consequently, the unpredictability and lack of security that characterize the urban milieu the families currently inhabit are nothing new. If anything, in fact, the city offers a wider range of possibilities for “playing” on various fronts.

Yet this potential can only be realized by combining different activities and simultaneously cultivating the social relationships on which such activities depend. And in cultivating these social relationships, actors embody behaviors and values which, depending on interests and circumstances, can actually be mutually contradictory.

Therefore, as we have seen, it is these multiple articulations and inter-relations between different income- and produce-generating activities, different types and levels of social relations, and different behaviors governed by values which are sometimes contradictory, which define the modernity and urbanity of the families in the context under analysis.

The conjugation of these apparently dissimilar but inter-dependent attitudes generates contradictions in the discourse of social actors. These contradictions become apparent in the comparison of discourses in which representations of normative ideals from different cultural models are evident (the practices of the actors are often in contradiction with their discourse).

We conclude from this part of the study that the social and/or economic relations between actors are simultaneously a resource in themselves and a means to obtaining other resources. Some of these resources are given freely, as a means of creating or maintaining dependency, on the basis of which relationships of power and prestige are established within a given family, social group or network. Thus, doing business and the value of what is transacted frequently depend on pre-existing social relationships between the parties, or on relationships which the actors wish (or wish not) to establish.

References

AlSayaad, Nezar and Ananya Roy eds. 2004. Urban informality: transnational perspectives from the Middle East, Latin America and South Asia. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Andersen, Jorgen E. 2012. “Home Space Socio-Economic Report.” Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture, Department of Human Settlements.

http://www.homespace.dk/tl_files/uploads/publications/Full%20reports/HomeSpace_Socio-Economic_Study.pdf (accessed June 10, 2012).

Andersen, Jorgen E., Silje Sollienen and Khadidja M. Ouis. 2012 “Home Space Built Environment Study”. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture, Department of Human Settlements.

http://www.homespace.dk/tl_files/uploads/publications/Full%20reports/HomeSpace_Built_Environment_Study.pdf, (accessed June 10, 2012).

Andrade, Ximena et al. 1998. Famílias em contexto de mudanças em Moçambique. Maputo: WLSAMOZ/CEA.

Barlett, Peggy F. 1993. *American Dream, Rural Realities: Family Farms in Crises*.
Chapell Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Bebbington, Anthony. 1999. “Capitals and Capabilities: A Framework for
Analyzing Peasant Viability, Rural Livelihoods and Poverty”, *World Development*, 27
(12): 2021–2044.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1992 (1970). “The Kabyle house or the world reversed.” In *The
Logic of Practice*, Pierre Bourdieu, 271–283. Cambridge: Polity Press:.

Campbell, John. 1995. “Conceptualizing Gender Relations and the Household in
Urban Tanzania”, In *Gender, Family and Household in Tanzania*, edited by Colin
Creighton, 178-202. Aldershot: Avebury.

Caplan, Pat. 1995. “‘In My Office We Don’t Have Closing Hours’: Gendered
Household Relations in a Swahili Village in Northern Mafia Island”. In *Gender, Family
and Household in Tanzania*, edited by Colin Creighton, 118-138. Aldershot: Avebury.

Chen, Martha. 2003. “Rethinking the informal economy: in an era of global
integration and labor market flexibility”. *New Delhi Seminar N°531*, November.

Costa, Ana B. 2005. “Género e poder nas famílias da periferia de Maputo”. *Lusotopie*
12 (1-2): 203–216.

Costa, Ana B. 2007. *O preço da sombra: sobrevivência e reprodução social entre
famílias de Maputo*. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte.

Costa, Ana B. 2008. “Trabalho e imaginação nas famílias da periferia de Maputo”.
Nova Africa 22: 31–50.

Costa, Ana B. and Adriano Biza. 2012. “Understanding ‘Home Space’ in the
African city: Ethnographic Report”. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Fine
Arts, School of Architecture, Department of Human Settlements,.

http://www.homespace.dk/tl_files/uploads/publications/Full%20reports/HomeSpace_Ethnographic_Report_text.pdf (accessed June 10, 2012).

Creed, Gerald W. 2000. "Family Values' and Domestic Economies". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29: 329–355.

Grassi, Marssi. 2003. *Rabidantes. Comércio espontâneo transnacional em Cabo Verde*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.

Hansen, Karen T. and Mariken Vaa, eds. 2004. *Reconsidering informality. Perspectives from Urban Africa*, Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.

Hugon, Philippe. 1999. *Economia de África*. Lisboa: Vulgata.

Jenkins, Paul. 2012. "Home Space Context Report". Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture, Department of Human Settlements.

http://www.homespace.dk/tl_files/uploads/publications/Full%20reports/HomeSpace_Context_Report.pdf (accessed June 10, 2012).

Lima, Antónia P. 1997. "Trabalho de campo com famílias da elite empresarial de Lisbon: um terreno para a análise e o exercício das relações de poder", *Ethnologia* 6/8: 105–122.

Loforte, Ana M. 2000. *Género e poder entre os Tsonga de Moçambique*. Maputo: Promédia.

Lopes, Carlos M. 2008. "Economia Informal e Processos de Organização". *Janus* 2008, *Anuário de Relações Exteriores*: 134–135. Lisbon: UAL/Público.

http://www.janusonline.pt/2008/2008_4_2_4.html (accessed April 7, 2009).

Maldonado, Carlos. 1995. "The informal sector: Legalization or laissez-faire?". *International Labour Review*. Vol. 134, No. 6, Geneva: ILO: 705–728.

Moore, Henrietta L. 1984. *Space, Text, and Gender. An Anthropological Study of the Marakwet of Kenya*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Nielsen, Morten. (2011). "Inverse governmentality: The paradoxical production of peri-urban planning in Maputo, Mozambique." *Critique of Anthropology*. 31(4): 329-358.

Roberts, Bryan. 1994. "Informal Economy and Family Strategies". *Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 18 (1): 6–23.

Rocha, Mercedes G. De La and Alejandro Grinspun. 2001. "Private Adjustments: Households, Crises and Work", *Choices for the Poor: Lessons from National Poverty Strategies*, UNDP, <http://www.undp.org/dpa/publications/choicesforpoor/ENGLISH/CHAP03.PDF>. (accessed May 15, 2002).

Simone, AbdouMaliq. 2004. *For the City yet to Come. Changing African Life in Four Cities*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Sheldon, Kathleen. 1999. *Machambas in the city. Urban women and agricultural work in Mozambique*. In *Lusotopie 1999: Dynamiques religieuses en lusophonie contemporaine*. L. M. Silva, ed. Paris: Éditions Karthala: (accessed June 10, 2012).

Sheldon, Kathleen. 2002. *Pounders of grain. A history of women, work and politics in Mozambique*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Sheldon, Kathleen. 2003. *Markets and gardens. Placing women in the urban history of Mozambique*. *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 37(2–3):358–395.

Taussig, Michael. 2012. *Beauty and the Beast*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Tripp, Aili M. 1989. "Women and the Changing Urban Household Economy in Tanzânia". *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 27:601–23.

Yusuff, Olabisi S. 2011. “A Theoretical Analysis of the Concept of Informal Economy and Informality in Developing Countries”. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, V. 20, N° 4: 624–636.