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Abstract

The paper is based on a quantitative investigation of 678 interviews carried out in the two largest cities of Mozambique, Maputo and Beira, by a pre-coded questionnaire of about 200 variables. It was aimed at interviewing in each household household head and first wife; 457 households were interviewed in 13 selected peri-urban areas, the two fully urbanized areas of the respective cities and three villages. The results are representative for the peri-urban areas only, while urban and rural areas merely serve as control groups.

The main social indicators used to determine the quality of life in the three different areas and their influence on satisfaction respectively as far as this influence was analyzed by the Linear Structural Relation (LISREL) model were: income or the level of poverty, formal education, the housing situation including the infrastructure, the considering of housing as a problem, private personal social interaction and satisfaction or depression respectively.

The quality of housing includes apart from the house as such also water supply, sanitary situation, transport, waste removal, schools and health facilities. Private personal social interaction was measured only on the frequency of visits and assistance to relatives, friends and neighbours (The kind of assistance is dealt with only in the main research report.)

What was assumed in the three main hypotheses could be established in a manifold way through numerous cross tabs, through the chi2 significance and t-test significance values as well as via the LISREL model, namely that, firstly, the general socio-economic conditions of life and with it the objective quality of life decreases from the fully urbanized via the peri-urban to the rural areas. However what was not directly expected was the result of the much wider gap within the cities between the fully urbanized and the peri-urban areas. Were, so to speak two different 'worlds' live next to each other, while the gap is also clearly there between the peri-urban and the rural areas, it is considerably smaller.

Secondly, satisfaction decreases in the same direction from the fully urbanized via the peri-urban to the rural areas, because basic human needs such as food and housing are least fulfilled in the last mentioned areas, where more than three quarters of Mozambicans population live and poverty is the plight of the majority. Causes for it are complex and an attempt was made in the paper to analyze them at least in bypassing. The gap is also in this aspect much wider within the cities than between the other two areas. It was not expected here that there is hardly any difference between men and women as far as satisfaction is concerned.

Private personal social interaction, as we measured it here, increases considerably in the above mentioned direction, but is not able to make up for the lack of fulfillment of basic human needs. The economic structural adjustment programme imposed on Mozambique in 1987 by IMF and World Bank apparently even worsens the socio-economic situation for the majority. And if there is any possibility to improve the life satisfaction in Mozambique and many other Third World countries a start must probably be made here for the long and difficult road towards an improvement.
LIFE SATISFACTION IN A THIRD WORLD ENVIRONMENT

A *comparison of the conditions and the satisfaction between the peri-urban, urban and rural dwellers in Mozambique*

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Setting and brief historical overview

Mozambique, one of the most beautiful countries in Southern Africa is unfortunately at the same time the poorest country in the world. (see general information in appendix 1).

After about one hundred years of Portuguese colonial rule she became politically independent in 1975 through a successful liberation struggle by FRELIMO (Frente de Libertação de Moçambique) which lasted about thirteen years.

It was, of course, in no way an objective of the colonial power to develop the country and its people as a whole, but use the former and the later only for their interest. A deeply divided society was the outcome: a big gap between the urban and rural areas on one hand and on the other hand an equally serious gap within the cities between the small fully urbanized areas, mainly for the whites, and the large peri-urban areas for the poor, black population.

After their defeat most of the white settlers left, but before doing so, they destroyed a considerable part of their agricultural and industrial equipment. This exodus also left a serious lack of technical and administrative know-how.

However the new leadership of Mozambique had learned during the liberation struggle how to mobilize the people. After all, a Portuguese army of 30,000 soldiers supported by NATO was defeated by the Mozambican guerrilla movement (PINSKY 1985). Therefore it was the intention of the new Government to organized the participation of the people to find solutions to the enormous problems in the rural areas as well as in the poorer areas of the cities; solutions developed and carried out by the people. Priority was given to agricultural production, the second main focus was transport and communication and the third objective was the improvement of the housing conditions and the general living standard (PINSKY 1984, 48).

In the rural areas 1,350 communal villages were created for 1.8 million people (HANLON 1986, 151) and in the peri-urban areas of the cities great effort was made to improve the housing conditions including the infrastructure such as sanitation and water supply. In co-operation with UNDP a squatter upgrading programme in Maputo was launched around 1980 from which a large part of the peri-urban population benefited. (SAEVFORS 1986)

Great successes were also achieved in the field of education and health. The illiteracy rate was lowered from 93% at independence to 72% in 1980. Also
an excellent curative and preventive health care system was established within a few years and Mozambique had soon one of the highest vaccination rates amongst children in Africa. There was also hardly any corruption and there existed an extraordinary low crime rate until the late 1980s. The equality of women was incorporated into the constitution right at independence, which was unusual for Africa.

In spite of all these efforts it was neither possible to abolish poverty in such a short period of time nor to close the two gaps mentioned above within the urban areas and between urban areas and country side. However a lot more could have been achieved if there would not have started this devastating undeclared war launched by the then racist South Africa and the Secret Service of the also racist Smith Regime of South Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe. In fact, all throughout the years of successes from 1975 to 1980, when Zimbabwe became independent Mozambique was complying with international sanctions against Rhodesia as well as supporting the liberation struggle there and, for doing so, she suffered heavy losses on human lives and material goods, because of frequent bombardments by the Smith Regime.

The above mentioned war had started shortly after independence on a small scale, but around 1980 its devastating effects began to be felt country wide. With an additional drought in 1983 even the capital Maputo was experiencing severe famine. With the most brutal means supported by South Africa and other rightist groups of the West abusing many thousands of children as bandits Renamo (Resistência Nacional de Moçambique) managed to destroy the country until the peace accord in 1992 (see general information in the appendix). So from the beginning of the liberation struggle in 1962 up to 1992, during thirty years, Mozambique had never experienced a single day of peace.

In addition in 1991/92 large parts of Southern Africa were affected by the worst drought of the century which brought an enormous amount of additional sufferings for Mozambique. There was famine again and thousands of human lives were lost. Hardly any country in this world has gone through so much hardship for such a long period of time in recent history as Mozambique.

In 1987 an economic structural adjustment programme PRE (Programa de Rehabilitação Económica - Economic Rehabilitation Programme) was forced upon Mozambique by the IMF and the World Bank which again worsened the material situation for the majority.

So the recent history of struggle and sufferings of Mozambique with a short bright period, but even that not without war, could be summed up in the following way:
- The successful fight against colonial oppression from 1962 to 1975.

- The construction of a new society from 1975 to around 1980. But during all this time constant attacks by the Smith Regime of Rhodesia with heavy losses for Mozambique.

- From 1981 to 1987 the undeclared war by South Africa affects more and more the lives of all Mozambicans and an additional drought causes famine even in the capital Maputo around 1983.

- From 1987 to 1992 the war continues and in addition the structural adjustment programme is imposed by the IMF and the World Bank and in 1991/1992 the worst drought of the century hit Mozambique.

- In October 1992 a peace accord was signed in Rome between FRELIMO and Renamo and general elections are planned for October 1994.

2. The survey

The social survey the results of which we will use in this paper was carried out in Mozambique still during war time from July to October 1991. However the effects of the drought started to be felt only thereafter.

Satisfaction or depression respectively was only one part of the area of inquiry. The survey had its main emphasis on housing, but also gathered information on, in how far the different aspects of housing and infrastructure would be considered as problems, looked into social interaction or integration respectively and gathered general socio-economic data as, for instance, on income and education. The effects of all these variables on satisfaction or depression respectively we will analyse with LISREL (see p. 37).

The main areas of investigation, for which the results claim to be representative are the peri-urban areas of Maputo and Beira (the second largest city of Mozambique); 244 households were interviewed in these areas in Maputo in nine selected bairros (part of a city district - neighbourhood of several hundred families) and 86 households in four selected bairros in Beira. (see maps in the appendix). In both cities a small control group 25 households in Maputo and 32 in Beira from the fully urbanized areas - in Mozambique called cement cities - were selected. However they included only flats in run down buildings in both cities which were selected by a World Bank programme for rehabilitation. So any difference regarding the general conditions as well as the degree of satisfaction or depression respectively between the peri-urban areas and a

---

1 Preliminary title of the research report in progress: The Twofold Gap - A Comparison between the Peri-urban, Urban and Rural Dwellers in Southern Africa - Mozambique as an Example
representative sample of the cement cities as a whole could only be greater not smaller.

To compare the results of the pen-urban areas with the other end of the spectrum, three villages were chosen: one in the province of Maputo, Massaca 1 and two in the province of Sofala, Nhangau and Mutua. Of course they can never be representative for the thousands of villages, but here, contrary to the disadvantaged, run down buildings of the cement cities where the first control group was selected, these villages rather belong to the privileged villages as two of them were either close to the capital Maputo (Massaca 1) or provincial capital Beira (Nhangau) and Mutua was situated in the Beira corridor protected by Zimbabwean troops (see maps in appendix 2). So also here, any difference concerning either the general conditions or the degree of depression and satisfaction respectively between the peri-urban areas and the villages as a whole could only be greater not smaller than the difference presented here between the peri-urban areas and the three villages selected as control group. Actually, Massaca 1 was too atypical and too privileged so that in the depression variables as well as in the LISREL model it will not be included.

Thirty interviews were conducted in Massaca 1 and 40 in the two villages of the province of Sofala. As a whole in 457 households interviews were carried out with a structured precoded questionnaire of about 200 variables. Wherever possible in each household household head and first wife were interviewed and a total of 678 interviews carried out. Including the pilot study and one bairro which had to be eliminated because of lack of representatives and including the two initial interview phases with two different structured, but open ended questionnaires for responsibles for urban planning and urban renewal on one hand and for the responsibles of the selected bairros on the other hand, then more than 800 interviews were carried out as a whole.

3. The hypotheses

From all the different kinds of suffering indicated in the brief historical overview the rural areas were apparently hit hardest and the fully urbanized areas the least with the peri-urban areas normally taking on a middle position. However it should be stressed that war and drought as tragic as they were for too many million of people are still not essential for the formulation of the following hypotheses, but that they are based on much broader theories which we will mention in brief in the following paragraph. We hypothesized that:

a) the general living conditions are the best in the small fully urbanized areas, of Mozambique, they are worse in the vast peri-urban areas and worst for the even much greater majority, the people in the huge rural areas.
b) satisfaction with the different aspects of life and even happiness is highest in
the cement cities, lower in the peri-urban areas and lowest in the villages.
c) the frequency of private social interaction (here meaning the frequency of
visits and mutual assistance between relatives, friends and neighbours)
decreases with urbanization and the degree of urbanization.

4. The theoretical framework

The hypothesis concerning the existing better general living conditions in
the pen-urban areas in comparison to the villages was based on the personal
Africa experience of the author, particularly on a five years teaching and research
experience in neighbouring Zambia, but also on the works of numerous other
researchers, particularly on rural-urban migration: KUPER 1965, MABOGUNJE
just to mention a few. In the flood of research basically all authors come to the
same conclusion, namely that people vote with their feet for better living
conditions when they move from the villages to the pen-urban areas. As
GUGLER (1982, 174) puts it:

"Most rural urban migrants correctly assess that they are improving their life chances. A paradox
arises between the rationality of the individual and small group decisions to migrate and the
irrationality of the migratory movement when considered at the level of the national economy.
This micro/macro paradoxon is resolved when the migratory movement is seen as a mechanism
that allows some of the disadvantaged rural population to partake in a small measure of resources
disproportionately concentrated in urban areas. In absence of effective policies to redistribute
productive resources and/or income across the rural-urban divide, rural-urban migration can be
argued to contribute to economic development, defined to include the distributional aspect."

In the light of all these evidence one could be inclined to consider the
setting up of such an hypothesis as superfluous, because it is actually already a
well founded theory. However the existence of the opposite belief is in spite of
all the research still incredibly widespread and persistent amongst scientists and
non-scientists involved or not involved in development aid, namely that the
poorest in most Third World countries would live in the pen-urban areas which
are most unjustly subsumed under the term 'slum'. 2 Apparently there is still more
enlightment needed concerning this question. In addition, according to my
knowledge, little research exists in comparing fully urbanized and peri-urban
areas. 3

The hypothesis, that the frequency of private social interaction (in our
study measured on the frequency of visiting relatives, friends and neighbours
only) is decreasing with the process of urbanization has nearly all the classics,
but also modern literature on urbanization as basis. Again just to mention a few:

2 Even an official of Habitat wrote in a statement to the proposal of this research that it could not
possibly be the case what the Central Statistical Office found out, that houses in the rural areas in
Zambia are more overcrowded than houses in the poorer areas of the cities. (see footnote 8 on p.15.)
3 It was dealt with indirectly in an integrated housing study in Zambia (KNAUER 1982)

However ABU-LUGHOD (1969) has put into question this aspect on the theory of urbanization of the here mentioned classics (namely that with the process of urbanization impersonal relations increase and personal ones decrease) as valid only for European and not for African cities. Yet she did not distinguish between fully urbanized and pen-urban areas.

MUSLOW’s hierarchy of the fulfilment of human needs of 1954 has apparently still its validity. The highest percentage of depressed household heads must be assumed to be in the villages because their basic human needs of food, clothing and housing are not fulfilled. The lack of fulfilment of these needs cannot be substituted by even the most wonderful social integration.

Finally the concept of the relative deprivation can also be considered as theoretical framework for this paper or at least as a basis for discussion. Following HARVEY (1973) we mean here by relative deprivation the feeling that arises if somebody sees needs fulfilled for other people which she or he wants to be fulfilled for herself or himself as well. We will encounter this phenomenon when comparing the three areas under the aspect of considering housing as a problem and when discussing the satisfaction variables.

II. THE CONDITIONS IN THE PERI-URBAN, URBAN AND RURAL AREAS

1. The income situation

As mentioned in the introduction Mozambique being the poorest country in the world, poverty is the lot for about half the population even in the cities and, still worse, it is the lot for the vast majority in the countryside.

If we put the poverty line at 100 contos household income per month, (no official poverty line exists for the time being in Mozambique, however according to oral information it was very difficult to live with less than 100 contos per month for an average seized family; to achieve this income at least three people must work in each family if they receive the minimum wage or they must get involved in other activities;) we are confronted with the very sad fact, namely that according to the results of our study 40% of the population in the peri-urban areas of Maputo live under the poverty line and 8% belong to this very poor in the run down buildings of the cement city. The population in the peri-urban areas of Beira is still poorer than the one of the peri-urban areas of Maputo.

---

1 conto = 1.000 Meticais (singular: Metical = Mt is the Mozambican currency) The official exchange rate during the time of interviewing, mid 1991, was 1 US$ = 1.600 Mt.. However exchanging on the black market was already then very common, where the US Dollar traded for 2 contos or more. Inflation is extremely high (see appendix I)

The official monthly minimum wage for workers was 32.175.00 Mt (≈ about 20 US$) for agricultural workers 24.310.00 Mt (≈ about 15 US$), Notícias, (daily newspaper) 30th January, 1991
In view of these facts it is not surprising that more than half of the urban population of Maputo can only acquire half of the biologically necessary food and that one third of the children of Mozambique is undernourished. (MINISTÉRIO DE COMÉRCIO 1988)

In the following we will present two tables on the monthly income of the households. The first one shows the results of our survey which have two shortcomings. Firstly, they show the income from employment mainly but hardly the income from family production, trading and remittances (mainly from family members in South Africa.). It was the merit of a very comprehensive, methodologically sound and sophisticated study of the Central Statistical Office, in the following called IAF (Inquérito às Famílias: family inquiry; at that time for Maputo only DIREÇÃO NACIONAL DE ESTATISTICA, 1992) to find out that these types of income make up for almost half of a household’s budget. These findings justify the doubling of our categories in table 1b, since the responses to our questions on the household income obviously reflect mainly the income from employment. Doubling our categories means that those who indicated a household income of, for instance, 50 to 100 contos in reality have an income of about 100 to 200 contos.

Secondly, only 70% gave an answer to this question in Massaca 1 and even only 20% in the villages of Sofala (in the table in parenthesis). So to use this information on income is very questionable. However we had at our disposal a study carried out by an entire research team in 24 districts in five provinces interviewing 1,166 families (6,224 persons) whose results on income were surprisingly enough close to the 20% answers in our villages of Sofala. (DIREÇÃO NACIONAL DE ESTATISTICA et al. 1990)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INCOME</th>
<th>MONTHLY INCOME (M) PER HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>PER CAPITA</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income from employment</td>
<td>94.967</td>
<td>14.164</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from family production</td>
<td>16.266</td>
<td>2.426</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from trading</td>
<td>37.115</td>
<td>5.535</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from occasional work</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from property</td>
<td>2.211</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCOME</td>
<td>151.210</td>
<td>22.522</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittances</td>
<td>19.413</td>
<td>2.895</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCOME</td>
<td>171.597</td>
<td>25.593</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IAF of the CSO. Inquérito às Famílias, p.16

---
Table 1a: Monthly income of households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>cem.cities</th>
<th>pen-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(---) 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 24 contos</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.0 (62.5)</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 50</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>38.1 (25.0)</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 100</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>36.9 (12.5)</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 200</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>16.7 (---)</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 - 500</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2.8 (---)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 500</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.8 (---)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=48        n=252    (n=8) n=31

Table 1b: household income of the cement city and the peri-urban areas of Maputo and entire Maputo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.city</th>
<th>peri-urban</th>
<th>IAF6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 100 contos</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 200</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 400</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 +</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=25        n=189    n=1472

Graph 1: household income in the cement city, the peri-urban areas of Maputo and entire Maputo

IAF made no distinction between the first district, which is the cement city, and all the others. However our distribution of the pen-urban areas would also not change much if the cement city would be included since only 25 household heads have been interviewed there. This means the results of our

IAF of the CSO. calculations from table on p.18
survey are not identical with IAF, but surprisingly similar. Since even in industrialized countries it is extremely difficult to find out household incomes one can be extraordinarily satisfied with these two very similar results, but at the same time the level of poverty is shocking and brings extreme suffering to adults and particularly to the children.

However in the countryside, the situation is much much worse. In the above mentioned research in five provinces it was found that 38% of the population near the district centres lived at high risk (near starvation) in 1990 with a household income of only 7 contos per month on average (about 4 US$ the value of their own production was included in the calculations)

31% lived at risk with 31 contos per month (less than 20 US$) and only another 31% did not live under risk concerning their nutrition with 88 contos per month (a little more than 50 US$).

We did not give the average of our groups, but those five household heads (63%) of the villages of Sofala (although the number is ridiculously small) who indicated that their monthly family income would be less than 24 contos per month correspond with the first and a large part of the second group of the study in the five provinces. With this horrifying degree of poverty it is in addition no longer relevant whether there are a few percent more or less in this group or that group or one or two contos more or less, it is just absolute inhumane misery.

However it should be mentioned here that it is not only the war situation which had caused these terrible conditions, but also the structural adjustment programmes of World Bank and IMF, as we shall see later, and in addition, rural poverty goes back to the colonial destruction of indigenous agriculture. In Zambia, for example, were there was never any war in recent history, 79% were considered as poor and very poor in rural areas in 1980, but 'only' 26% in the peri-urban areas (squatters, Site & Service Schemes and low cost housing areas) (ILO/JASPA 1981, xxiii). In addition even in countries which had hardly ever been a colony, like China, the city population is privileged compared to the rural areas.

2. The level of education of household heads

The educational level of the population in a given area depends amongst other factors of income and of infrastructures. As these are inferior in the peri-urban areas than even in the worst parts of the cement cities also the level of education is worse. But it is still higher in the peri-urban areas than in the villages, where income and infrastructures are very low and worse than in the peri-urban areas.
### Table 2: Educational level of household heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>cem. cities</th>
<th>peri-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>without formal education</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between first and third class</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary school 1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary school 2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary school</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre university college</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elem. techn. school</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium level technical school</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher education</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first two and the fourth category of educational levels place the peri-urban areas once more between the rural areas and the cement cities:

- 2 < 20 < 54 per cent do not have any formal education
- 7 < 26 < 30 per cent have completed 1st, 2nd or 3rd class; 
- 24 > 33 <10 per cent reached the first level of primary school (EP1=4 classes); 
  - but in the following category the percentages decrease in contrary to the first two categories
- 22 > 15 < 6 per cent completed primary school (EP2=6 classes)

Secondary schools are completely lacking in the peri-urban areas as well as in the villages; only 5% of the household heads in the peri-urban areas completed secondary school but nobody in the villages, whereas secondary school level of education have reached 24% in the worst parts of the cement cities. Some courses or some training on the job have had:

- 57% in the cement cities
- 32% in the peri-urban areas
- 12% in the villages.

3. The occupation of household heads

The mode of occupation of household heads is employment with the government. The rates are almost the same in the cement cities as well as in the peri-urban areas: 40 and 38% respectively. In the villages however only 5% work for the government.

Although the mode in the villages is still with agricultural work, namely 44%, it is actually surprising that already the majority of household heads no longer works in agriculture but in other occupations. However also in the already mentioned study of the five provinces (DIReçãO naciOnal de eStatística et al. 1990, viii)
46% peasants were found.\textsuperscript{7}

Table 3: The occupation of household heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cement cities</th>
<th>pen-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private sector</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-operative</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house servant</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trader</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business woman/man</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainly in the field</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informal sector</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployment</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retired</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housewife</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=57          n=324          n=63

The private sector employs a quarter of the household heads of the cement cities and 18% of the household heads of the peri-urban areas. Here 7% work almost all day long in the fields. Most likely these are the female household heads. This fact shows once again the transitional character of the pen-urban areas which could also be called the ruralization of cities.

Only 3% work in the informal sector.\textsuperscript{8} The 19% household heads of the peri-urban areas whose occupation is "housewife" are probably the widows, the divorced or separated ones, those whose husbands work in South Africa or Swaziland and also those - as mentioned in the introduction - whose husbands could not have been interviewed because they were travelling or for any other reason could never be met at home. Only 3% are unemployed, but an additional 5% work only occasionally. For a co-operative, as a domestic worker, or as a business man work only 1% each; 3% are already retired.

The rate of unemployed is of course much higher amongst all adults than amongst household heads, We calculated it only for the pen-urban areas and found 22% unemployed there.

\textsuperscript{7}In this study were found: 45.6% peasants 

26.3% officials 

3.4% traders 

21.2% others 

3.5% unemployed. (compare ow table 3)

\textsuperscript{8} In 1979 in the urban areas of Zambia between 14 and 23% of household heads worked in the informal sector and between 3 and 8% were unemployed in Lusaka. (ILO/IASPA, 1981 p.xxi) while in a study of Nici Nelson in Mathare Valley in Nairobi 80% of the male household heads and 90% of the female household heads worked in the informal sector. (NELSON in GUGLER 1988) Maybe these increase from 3% via around 20% to 80% reflects the differences from a at one time socialist society via a mixed economy to a purely capitalist one.
4. The housing situation

Amongst the basic human needs, necessary to be fulfilled for a satisfactory life is right after food, housing. Unfortunately it is unlike food or clothing by far the most expensive one and even industrialized countries are far from having satisfied this need.

The concept of housing or habitation means more than just a shelter against climatic factors, a place of intimacy, a place for resting during the night and for the preparation of meals. It also means the existence of local infrastructure like water supply, sanitation and transport as well as social facilities like schools and medical centres. All these factors together are indicators for the quality of a habitation. This quality again is determined by economic and cultural factors. The pen-urban areas constitute a link - not only in Mozambique but in the majority of developing countries - between a traditional and a modern culture. In our opinion both of this types of cultures have their own value. Unfortunately, large parts of the traditional African culture of housing were destroyed by European aggression during the times of slavery and colonialism and also in recent times by neo-colonialism. In our control group of villages we did not find an intact culture of African traditional housing, only remaining parts of it.

In the same way run down buildings in the cement city which were chosen as the other control group do also only in part represent modern housing. Nevertheless it was possible to study the big differences between these three areas and some of the variables will be presented here in brief. (For an illustration of the big differences see photographs in appendix 4.)

The construction material of the walls

One of the determinants of the quality of a house in developing countries is the construction material of the walls, the floor and the roof and here particularly whether this material is permanent or precarious. This is of course a European judgement. However the indigenous population has long since joined in in this view and desires strongly permanent houses. Even traditionally in the city of Beira where apparently the surrounding forests still allow it, a more permanent way of construction is preferred. Because of this considerable difference between Maputo and Beira the following table and graph will present the two cities separately and leave out the cement cities, where the walls of the buildings, as the name indicates, consist, of course, of permanent material like European cities.

However in the peri-urban areas of Maputo 40% of the walls of the houses consist of a bamboo-like reed called caniço, 36% are constructed of concrete blocks, 12% of corrugated iron sheets and 11% of sun dried bricks.
In the pen-urban areas of Beira 51% of the houses are built with the "pau-a-pique" method, a wooden structure filled with stones and mud, the walls of 39% of the houses consist of cement blocks, only 5% of reed, 4% of corrugated iron and 2% of sun-dried bricks.

In the villages of both provinces the overwhelming majority of the houses are made from grass or reed (87% and 78% respectively). In the villages of Sofala for 17% of the houses clay was used to construct the walls. The remaining few per cent of the houses are built with any of the other materials.

**The floor**

In the majority of the peri-urban houses in Maputo (80%) and in Beira (86%) the floor consists of cement; but the floors of 17% of the pen-urban houses in Maputo and 12% of those in Beira still consist of soil only. In Massaca 1 one finds 47% soil floors and in Sofala this proportion is 76. The rest has clay or cement.

---

9Wooden sticks are fixed vertically and horizontally in about 10 to 15 cm distance and the process is repeated parallelly also in about 15cm distance. The space in between is filled with clay and small stones. These walls are very resistant. (see photograph in appendix 4)
The roof

The roofs of about three quarters of the houses in both pen-urban areas consist of corrugated iron sheets, but increasingly fibre cement sheeting is used too: 14% in Maputo and in Beira even 21%. As can be expected most of the houses in the villages use grass for their roofs, but also social change brings increased use of corrugated iron; in Massaca 1 already 28% of the houses are covered with this material.

The number of rooms

Another indicator for the quality of a house is its number of rooms. Surprising is the fact, that the majority of houses in the villages have one room only, where space would be there in abundance and also local material.\(^{10}\) A detailed anthropological analysis is probably necessary to shed more light on this phenomenon. On one hand one could suggest that the need for more rooms is not yet felt, because houses have been built this way for centuries on the other hand it is a big status symbol if a family in a village manages to build a house with permanent material and several rooms. This desire is there undoubtedly, however for this the financial recourses as well as the building material is lacking.

Table 5: The number of rooms per house

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.cit.</th>
<th>peri-urb</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) In Zambia 16% of all the urban dwellings consist of one room only, but in the rural areas this proportion is 31. In urban areas only 4% of households with 7 or more persons live in one room only, but 15% of these large households do so in the rural areas. "The problem of an adequate number of rooms for a household appears to be more acute in rural than in urban areas". (CSO 1980)
The most common means for illumination in the peri-urban areas are petroleum lamps which are used by 62%; 20% use a candle in a glass (called "xipefo") and 18% have already electricity (23% in Maputo and 4% in Beira). In the cement cities 100% use electricity. In the villages 64% use "xipefo", 32% a petroleum lamp and 4% have no possibility to illuminate their house.

The sanitary situation

There exists a big difference between Maputo and Beira in comparison to the sanitary situation in the peri-urban areas, as well as between the villages of the province of Maputo and Sofala. Apparently, this difference is caused by the fact that the city of Beira is situated below the sea level. To build sanitary installations, i.e., latrines, in many places, is very difficult and dangerous, because the underground water level is very near the surface and latrines would pollute the drinking water. Therefore, the majority of the families in the peri-urban areas of Beira, use only the bush for their sanitary needs, (67%), 7% use a latrine with one or more families, 22% have their own latrine, 2% have a flushing toilet and 2% a septic tank. In the following table we can see a big difference between Maputo and Beira.

Table 6: The sanitary situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi² sign. = .0000</th>
<th>cem. cit.</th>
<th>peri-urb.</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no latrine/bushes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 latrine with 2 or more fam.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 latrine with 1 more fam.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our own latrine</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved latrine</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flushing toilet</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>septic tank</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to Beira, in the peri-urban areas of Maputo, only 2% use the bush for their sanitary needs but like in Beira 7% use a latrine with one or more families and also 2% have a septic tank, but 61% have their own toilet, and in addition 25% already have an improved latrine, which is stable and hygienic. However the programme of improved latrines has started already also in Beira and by now an equally high percentage of families as in Maputo might have an improved latrine also in Beira. In the villages of the Sofala province, the majority of the families also only use the bush for their sanitary needs, however only in Nhangau the level of underground water is near the surface and not in Mutua. Here, the reasons for not having latrines may apparently be different ones. In Massacal nearly all families have their own latrine.
**The water supply.**

The mode of the water supply in the pen-urban areas, are public water outlets followed by wells. But, in Beira the mode is public water outlets that are far away (39%), followed by the far away wells (19%) while in Maputo the mode is public water outlets that are near (37%) and wells nearby (25%).

Table 7: The water supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem. cit.</th>
<th>peri-urb.</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rivers or lakes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant well</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearby well</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant public water outlet</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public water outlet close by</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water tap in our yard</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piped water in our house</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: The consideration of housing as a problem;

|                      |           |           |           |           |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                      | M         | B         | M         | B         |
| the house is$^{11}$  | 1 a serious problem | 15 £ 43 < 68 | 30 £ 34 £ 20 | 55 > 23 £ 12 |
| chi$^2$ sign. = .0000 | 2 a problem, but not a serious one | 3 no problem |           |
|                      | n=53; n=316; n=41 | t-test sign.: .000 .007 |           |

11 Here the codes: from the answers: "I suffer a lot because I do not have a good house, I suffer but not too much and I do not suffer. have been used, because their meaning is the same.
sanitation is 1 a serious problem 23 « 42 « 63
chi² sign. = .0043 2 a problem 25 ~ 27 ~ 23
3 no problem 52 » 31 » 15

means: 2.2982 > 1.8780 > 1.5250
t-test sign.: .001 ,012

n=57; n=329; n=40

to get water is 1 a serious problem 16 « 48 » 18
chi² sign. = .0000 2 a problem 14 « 24 » 10
3 no problem 70 » 28 » 73

means: 2.5357 > 1.8025 < 2.5500
t-test sign.: .000 .00012

n=56; n=325; n=40

transport is 1 a serious problem 23 « 52 « 55
chi² sign. = .0000 2 a problem 26 « 30 = 32
3 no problem 51 » 18 ~ 13

means: 2.2807 > 1.6646 > 1.5789
t-test sign.: .000 .514

n=57; n=326; n=38

waste removal is 1 a serious problem 25 « 30 » 05
chi² sign. = .0002 2 a problem 23 « 29 » 23
3 no problem 53 » 41 « 72

means: 2.2807 > 2.1153 < 2.6750
t-test sign.: .169 .426

n=57; n=322; n=40

the primary schools are 1 a serious problem 11 « 36 « 52
chi² sign. = .0000 2 a problem 28 « 39 » 24
3 no problem 61 » 25 = 24

means: 2.5106 > 1.8802 > 1.7200
t-test sign.: .000 .395

n=47; n=192; n=25

the health facilities are 1 serious problem 41 ~ 43 « 52
chi² sign. = .1583 2 a problem 29 « 38 = 31
3 no problem 30 » 19 » 17

means: 1.8929 > 1.7642 > 1.6571
t-test sign.: .247 .426

n=56; n=319; n=35

In all these aspects of housing, concerning the house as such, the infrastructure and from the social facilities as far as the primary schools are

12 It is considered as a less serious problem in the villages
11 It is considered as a less serious problem in the villages
concerned, the difference of evaluation between the three areas only the chi2 test shows a highly significant difference between the areas. As far as the health facilities are concerned not even the chi2 test shows a difference between the areas, although there is a difference in the last category: for 30\textgreater{}19\textgreater{}16 per cent of the household heads the health facilities are no problem. Apparently, as far as the health facilities are concerned only a minority of the household heads of the cement cities are satisfied with them, whereas all the other variables are no problem always for a majority of the household heads of the cement cities.

However the t-test shows that the difference between the peri-urban areas and the villages is highly problematic. Two important results become apparent from this subjective evaluation of the people: firstly it corresponds to the reality, as far as the difference of the cement cities with the peri-urban areas is concerned. However, bearing in mind the empirical results of this chapter, the difference between the peri-urban areas and the villages is considerably greater in reality than in the subjective evaluation of the household heads. This is so at least if we compare the reality with the appreciation of the houses the transport system, the schools and the medical facilities.

The houses are much worse in the villages, but, the percentage of those that consider the house as a serious problem, is only 13\% per cent greater in the villages compared to the peri-urban areas. An interpretation via the concept of relative deprivation seems to be justified. The people in the villages are not always confronted with better, more comfortable and bigger houses, however the household heads of the pen-urban areas are: a large portion of them work in the cement city or go there much more frequently than those from the villages.

The transport system is in reality, of course, also much worse in the rural areas than in the peri-urban areas, but has been judged almost equally. Here apparently it is not only the relative deprivation which plays an important role, but also the need. The need for transport might not be felt so desperately in the rural areas, as going to the fields does normally not require transport and most other occupations are normally concentrated in or nearby the village.

The schools have also been evaluated with not much difference between the pen-urban areas and the villages, but in reality the difference is considerable: in the villages of Sofala less than half of the children go to school. It is probably dangerous to interpret this result as if the household heads in the villages would be more or less indifferent to the fact of a child going to school or not. Three quarters of the household heads actually do the primary schools consider as a problem also in the villages, although they are not constantly confronted with the families where nearly all children go to a school. Such is the case for the household heads in the peri-urban areas.
However the theory of relative deprivation only would help us to explain why the difference in the judgement of housing infrastructure and facilities is not bigger as it is between peri-urban areas and villages. Table 9 shows that the difference in the evaluation between the cement cities and the peri-urban areas is much bigger than the difference between the peri-urban areas and the villages and that the problems of water and waste are considered as much less serious ones in the villages than in the peri-urban areas, while transport and primary schools have been judged more or less equally. We can also see that the difference between the first two areas is sometimes two or three times bigger than between the last two areas.

**Water, transport and waste, seems to be a more serious problem in the peri-urban areas than in the villages.**

In the category: "no problem", the pen-urban areas take on a middle position only in the three variables: house?sanitation and health. These areas take on a medium position, in the category: "it is a serious problem", also in the three variables: house, sanitation and schools (and only slightly in health facilities.

If we sum up the two categories: "it is a serious problem", and" it is a problem", we can see more clearly that the difference in this subjective evaluation between the cement cities and the peri-urban areas on one hand and the much smaller difference between the peri-urban areas and the villages on the other hand.

Table 9: **The percentages of the evaluation of housing as a serious problem or a problem, with the differences between the areas.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>difference between</th>
<th>cement cities &amp;</th>
<th>peri-urban &amp;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>45 &amp; 77 &amp; 89</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanitation</td>
<td>48 &amp; 69 &amp; 75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>30 &amp; 72 &amp; 54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(- 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transport</td>
<td>49 &amp; 82 &amp; 80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste</td>
<td>48 &amp; 59 &amp; 29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td>39 &amp; 75 &amp; 74</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health facilities</td>
<td>70 &amp; 81 &amp; 87</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It does not come as a surprise that, only 29% of the household heads in the villages have problems with the waste, because on one hand not many consumer goods exist there apart from food and the problem of packing material does not arise, on the other hand the consciousness does not yet exist that burning the waste is harmful for the environment.

However it is surprising that, 70% of the household heads in the cement cities do have problems with the health centres and the central hospital. The reason could be that even in this big quite well equipped hospital, normally
people have to wait very long to be treated and to visit a specialist, they have to wait for months. Nevertheless the health facilities in the cement cities are incomparably better than in the pen-urban areas and here they are incomparably better than in the rural areas.

Except in the judgment of the health facilities there is hardly any difference between women and men in considering housing as a problem: for a higher percentage of women the health facilities do constitute a problem, but the almost significant chi2 value concerning transport indicates that for a higher percentage of women transport is considered as no problem most likely because the majority does not have to go to work every day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>chi2 sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>.6285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanitation</td>
<td>.1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>.5935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transport</td>
<td>.0754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste removal</td>
<td>.2588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td>.7019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health facilities</td>
<td>.0244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. SOCIAL INTERACTION

The third hypothesis was clearly verified. But instead of many tables, graphs and their interpretation we will only present here some of the characteristic results of the chapter on social interaction. However, we can now repeat with more certainty, that the frequency of mutual visits and mutual assistance declines with urbanization and the degree of urbanization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem. cit</th>
<th>peri-urb.</th>
<th>vill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of household heads who visit</td>
<td>38 &lt; 51</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their relatives daily or once or twice per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of household heads who gave three answers to the question: in which way do you assist your relatives</td>
<td>44 &lt; 66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of household heads who visit their friends daily or once or twice per week</td>
<td>37 &lt; 64</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of household heads who gave three answers to the question: in which way do you assist your friends</td>
<td>33 &lt; 55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of household heads who visit their neighbours frequently</td>
<td>23 &lt; 49</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of household heads who gave three answers to the question: in which way do you assist your neighbours

33 < 77 > 66

IV. SATISFACTION AND DEPRESSION, PROBLEMS AND LIKINGS

1. Dissatisfaction with income

In the villages 30% of the household heads are either very contented or at least contented with their income, but only 12% fall into these categories in the peri-urban areas and in the villages only 32% are very discontented or discontented, but 65% in the pen-urban areas. This is clearly another support for the theory of relative deprivation. The pen-urban areas are not in a middle position, but show a higher proportion of discontented than in the other two areas as well as a lower proportion of contented: 37 > 12 < 30 per cent of the household heads are satisfied or very satisfied with their income and 44 < 65 > 32 per cent are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their income, the rest: 19 < 23 < 38 per cent are indifferent.

Table 10: Dissatisfaction with income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.cities</th>
<th>peri-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very contented</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contented</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither contented nor discontented</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discontented</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very discontented</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=52  n=260  n=50

The high percentage of indifferents in the village could be due to the fact that a large proportion did not know their income. (see table 1a)

2 Dissatisfaction with the level of education

It is actually surprising that the majority of the household heads in all areas 58 < 66 < 74 per cent is either very discontented or at least discontented with their level of education. Particularly in the villages one might expect that people do either not care so much about education and in addition do not need so much education. However this is obviously not the case. The pen-urban areas occupy once more a middle position, but not as far as the proportion of satisfied is concerned. Here we find no difference between the peri-urban areas and the villages: 32 > 22 = 22 per cent are either satisfied or even very satisfied with their level of education. The rest is indifferent. The percentage of dissatisfied correspond insofar with reality as amongst the least educated, the villagers the percentage of discontented is highest. However, it does not correspond with
reality, in the categories of the contented and could be interpreted as another hint for relative deprivation.

Table 11: Dissatisfaction with the level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.cities</th>
<th>pen-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very contented</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contented</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither contented nor discontented</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discontented</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very discontented</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Satisfaction with one's occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem cit.</th>
<th>peri-urb</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very contented</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contented</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither contented nor discontented</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discontented</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very discontented</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Satisfaction with one's profession, occupation or job situation respectively

As far as satisfaction with one's profession, occupation or job situation respectively are concerned we find just the opposite results compared to the satisfaction with the level of education: A large majority is very satisfied or at least satisfied with their occupation: \(88 > 70 < 78\) per cent. In this case the peri-urban areas do not take on a middle position: a smaller percentage of household heads is satisfied with their occupation than is the case in the villages. Only if we would consider the very contented separately the peri-urban areas would be in a middle position again: \(48 > 25 > 19\) per cent are very contented. However the proportion of contented grows in the opposite direction: \(40 < 46 < 59\) per cent are contented with their occupation. In this case the combination of these two categories apparently reflects the real situation better.

Table 12: Satisfaction with one's occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem cit.</th>
<th>peri-urb</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very contented</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contented</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither contented nor discontented</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discontented</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very discontented</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight per cent more contented or very contented household heads in the villages is interesting. Apparently, in spite of all the hardship the peasants like to be peasants and those with other occupations like their occupations in the rural areas. Here the theory of relative deprivation could serve once more as an additional explanation. The people in the rural areas have less opportunity to compare themselves with the people in the cement cities than the people in the peri-urban areas. However the 18% per cent more very satisfied or at least satisfied household heads in the cement cities do correspond with the reality,
because it is certain that those in the cement cities do have better professions than the household heads in the peri-urban areas.

Also the vast majority in all areas is either very satisfied or at least satisfied with their job conditions.

Table 13: Satisfaction with job conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.</th>
<th>cit.</th>
<th>peri-urb</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very contented</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contented</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither contented nor discontented</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discontented</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very discontented</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=52  n=254  n=64

4. Satisfaction with one's house

There seems to be a big contradiction between the answers to the question: "Are you satisfied with your house?" and the answers to the question: "Do you suffer a lot, because you do not have a good house?" (see first part of table 8 and footnote) While, for instance, in the peri-urban areas 57% are satisfied or even very satisfied with their house only 23% said that they do not suffer, because they do not have a good house. It is apparently easier for people to reply: "I suffer, but not a lot (which could also mean: I suffer a little or I suffer only sometimes) Than to say: "I am discontented or even very discontented with my house. One could also say: I am contented with my health even at times I do have some problems, I suffer a little. And the percentage of those who said that they would suffer a lot because of not having a good house, is at least the same as the sum of the percentages of the last three categories of the following table including the indifferent ones. However choosing the statement: "I am neither satisfied nor dissatisfied could also mean I do not want to answer this question.

Table 14: Satisfaction with one's house

|                      | cem. | cit. | peri-urb | villages |
|----------------------|------|------|==========|----------|
| very contented       | 28.1 | 14.2 | 8.6      |          |
| contented            | 63.2 | 43.0 | 34.3     |          |
| neither contented nor discontented | 3.5 | 18.9 | 28.6   |          |
| discontented         | 5.3  | 20.4 | 18.6     |          |
| very discontented    | --   | 3.4  | 10.0     |          |

n=52  n=254  n=64

In all these five satisfaction variables there is no statistical difference between women and men, although the chi² sign. value is almost significant
concerning the satisfaction with income: it is \(0.0943\) meaning that a higher percentage of women is dissatisfied with the household income.

5. Degree of suffering and depression as well as that of happiness and cheerfulness

A scale from very unhappy to very happy was presented to the interviewees. The results show the household heads of the villages as being the most unhappy and those of the peri-urban areas in a middle position: \(23 < 48 < 69\) per cent said that they feel very unhappy or unhappy, a little more than a third is neither happy nor unhappy over all three areas and \(41 > 14 > 5\) per cent stated that they are happy or very happy.

Table 15: Scale from very unhappy to very happy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cement cities</th>
<th>pen-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I am very unhappy</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I am unhappy</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I am neither happy nor unhappy</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I am happy</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I am very happy</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means are: \(3.1607 > 2.4308 > 2.1053\). Although the t-test sign. value is only close to being statistically significant (which would be \(0.050\)) we can still conclude that the degree of happiness is also a different one between the peri-urban areas and the villages, namely that it is considerably lower in the villages.

Graph 3: Scale from very unhappy to very happy

The difference between the cement cities and the peri-urban areas is greater than between the peri-urban areas and the villages. As a whole it is a very tragic result that only such a small percentage in the villages is happy and nobody very happy, particularly when we bear in mind that 77% of the total
population of Mozambique still live in rural areas. As mentioned above the village in the province Maputo, Massaca 1, was a very atypical one, even more privileged than the other two and for that reason excluded from the depression variables.

In the second statement which was supposed to measure satisfaction and depression respectively the overall picture of the results is slightly more positive. Apparently it is easier for people to state that they are cheerful than that they are happy which is actually logical, because cheerfulness can be a more temporary state and be a little more superficial than happiness.

One quarter indicated in the cement cities that they are cheerful almost every day as against 6% and 3% in the pmi-urban areas and the villages. Cheerful frequently are \(28 > 19 > 8\) per cent and the statement "it is already a long time that I was last cheerful" chose \(4 < 15 < 39\) per cent. There is no doubt that people in the villages are less cheerful than the people in the peri-urban areas and particularly less cheerful than those in the cement cities.

Table 16: Scale of being cheerful from very rarely to almost every day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cement cities</th>
<th>peri-urban areas</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I have not been cheerful for a long time</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I am rarely cheerful</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I am sometimes cheerful</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I am frequently cheerful</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I am cheerful almost every day</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean are: \(3.6140 > 2.7438 > 2.0789\).

The mode in the table, illustrated by the graph is with the statement "I am cheerful sometimes", but only in the cement cities and in the pmi-urban areas. In these two areas it was chosen by more than one third and corresponds with the indifferent in the previous table and graph. However the mode in the villages is sadly enough with the statement 'I have not been cheerful for a long time'.
Graph 4: Scale of being cheerful from very rarely to almost every day

![Graph 4](image)

The responses to the question: "at this time do you suffer very much, you suffer but not too much, you do not suffer at all?" show again less difference between the peri-urban areas and the villages. The 2-Tail Prob. of the t-value is not significant anymore between these two areas, but the difference is still highly significant between area 1 and 2.

Table 17: Degree of suffering at this time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem. cit</th>
<th>peri-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I suffer a lot at this time</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I suffer, but not too much</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I do not suffer at all</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| t-test sign. = .000; t-test sign. = .274 |

Mean of area 1 = 1.7719 > 1.4451 > 1.3421.

Graph 5: Degree of suffering at this time
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In the responses to the scale whether the interviewee was very depressed to not at all depressed on the day of the interview the pattern remains the same as in the previous variables: the highest percentage of very depressed household heads we found in the villages. The peri-urban areas take on a middle position; however the difference between the peri-urban areas and the villages is again somewhat smaller than between the peri-urban areas and the cement cities with the t-test sign. statistically only being almost significant.
### Table 18: Degree of depression on the day of the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.cities</th>
<th>peri-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 very depressed</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 depressed</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 a little depressed</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 not depressed</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.0360 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n=50</th>
<th>n=321</th>
<th>n=39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t-test sign.</td>
<td>= .001</td>
<td>= .089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means are: 3.5517 > 3.0903 > 2.7895;

**Graph 6: Degree of depression on the day of the interview**

The middle position of the *peri-urban areas* becomes apparent in the codes 'very depressed': 3 < 10 < 21 per cent stated that they were very depressed on that day, in the code 'a little depressed': 21 < 26 < 35 per cent felt a little depressed and in the 'not at all depressed' code: 69 > 46 > 31 per cent were not at all depressed on the day of the interview. However a higher percentage of the household heads of the *peri-urban areas* chose the statement: *I am depressed* in the pen-urban areas than in the villages: 7 > 17 > 13.

There is again no difference between men and women in all these four satisfaction-depression variables.

**The factor analysis of the variables measuring depression and satisfaction**

The factor analysis shows that the four variables presented above are determined by one factor only, in other words, they all do measure depression and that the scales 'very unhappy to very happy' and 'very rarely cheerful until almost every day cheerful' show a higher loading, which means they measure depression better than the other two scales: 'I suffer a lot, I suffer or I don't suffer' and 'very depressed to not depressed on the day of the interview'. But even the last two scales show considerable high loading.
factor loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Commonalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of suffering</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of happiness</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of cheerfulness</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of depression on the day of the interview</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Eight iterations were necessary. The four variables explain 51% of the variance of the different responses.)

6 The effects of the structural adjustment programme - PRE

As it was the case with many other developing countries in the last two decades, so also Mozambique had to agree to the introduction of the structural adjustment programme (Programa de Rehabilitação Económica = PRE) in 1987.

These programme is more or less the same for most developing countries. It never takes in account external factors for the devastated economy of the particular country, such as the unfavourable terms of trade the low prices for the raw material a.s.o. It includes in essence measures as:

- the devaluation of the currency
- the introduction of a free market system
- privatization of state enterprises
- reduction of the budget deficit by introducing school fees and fees for health care (see general information in appendix 1)
- a wage and salaries freeze a.s.o
- creation of a climate friendly to foreign investors
- creation of an export oriented economy.

just to mention the most important ones. (compare BRAUNMUEHL, 1988)

All these Mozambique has introduced slowly by slowly from 1987 onwards. But how did these measures affect the lives of the majority?

Although the headline to this chapter is, effects of the structural adjustment programme, we did not use the term 'PRE' in the question to this variable. The abbreviation 'PRE' is commonly used in the cities of Mozambique amongst the educated ones, those who read the newspaper. Yet it is not possible that those who do not have access to a newspaper and do not have a radio can know about it: 28 < 56 < 76 per cent of the household heads did not know what PRE is all about.

So we simply wanted to know if and in what direction life changed in the last three years. It is justified to attribute improvements anyway but also changes for the worse during this time period more to PRE than to the continuation of the war as the war was going on for so many years before and did not particularly intensify in the last three years (meaning from 1987 to 1990 when the survey was
On the other hand there is hardly any country where this adjustment programme was imposed on in a situation of war. Life became more difficult or a lot more difficult for $45 < 63 < 72$ percent in the last three years. The effects of PRE were apparently felt most negatively in the villages but also in the pmi-urban areas. However in the cement cities the percentage of those who benefited from PRE and those who suffer even more through it are almost equal.

Table 19: Scale from great improvement of life to life becoming very difficult in the last three years;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.cities</th>
<th>peri-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 life improved in many aspects</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 life improved in some aspects</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 did not change much after 1987</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 life became difficult</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 life became very difficult</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean of cem.cities= 2.9828 peri-urban=3.5714 2 Tail Prob. between cem.cities and peri-urban=.003 villages = 4.0000 2 Tail Prob. between peri-urban and villages =.058, a value which is again only almost significant.

Graph 7: Scale from great improvement of life to life becoming very difficult in the last three years

As we already mentioned only about one fifth of the inhabitants of the two largest cities live in the cement cities and only 23% of the population of Mozambique are urban. Yet only for 15% of our investigated village population life improved since the introduction of PRE and only for 30% of the pmi-urban population. So the proportion of the nation as a whole for which life improved through PRE is really small. We cannot generalize from our small village control group for the entire rural population, but the already mentioned large investigation by an entire research team of the Central Statistical Office and a Department of the Ministry of Commerce dealing with the nutritional situation of
Mozambique which was carried out in 24 districts in five provinces (DIRECAO
NACIONAL DE ESTATISTICA et al., 1990) speaks a much louder language: the
esential results should be mentioned here once more: 38% of the rural
population near the district centres live at high risk not to get enough food and
31% live at least at risk. Only 31% are able to get an appropriate nutrition, but
poverty is their lot in so many other aspects of life. Those at risk and those at
high risk match exactly the 69% of our tiny control group who said that life
became difficult or very difficult in the last three years.

Changes in the condition of the house

In this economically extremely difficult time it is not surprising that the
conditions of the house worsened in the last three years for $21 < 29 < 62$ per
cent, and improved for $36 > 18 = 18$ per cent only. For the rest the house
remained the same.

Table 20: Changes in the conditions of the house in the last three years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.cities</th>
<th>peri-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the conditions of the house worsened</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they remained the same</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the house improved</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean of area 1 = 2.1429
area 2 = 1.8769  2 Tail Prob. between area 1 and area 2 = .008
area 3 = 1.5641  2 Tail Prob. between area 2 and area 3 = .008

Graph 8: Changes in the conditions of the house in the last three years

7. The main problems

The severe hardships caused by the war as well as by the policy of IMF
and World Bank is also reflected in the variable dealing with the main problems
of the household heads. In another section of the survey we found out that
helping out with food is the most frequent kind of mutual assistance amongst
relatives in the villages and the second most frequent kind in the peri-urban
areas. In this variable food was named most frequently (by 35%) in the first reply
as main problem at this time in the peri-urban areas. The second most frequently named problem in the peri-urban areas was the low salary. Food was mentioned as main problem in the first reply by 28% in the villages. There the mode of the problems named was the war (37%), food takes on the second position and, - with only a fourth of the proportion of the answers by the household heads in comparison to the food problem, - the condition of the house takes on the third position. However also in the cement cities which are least affected by the war, war is the mode (32%) followed by the low salary and even there food was named as the third main problem in the first reply.

So, what makes people suffer most in the three different areas is:

cement cities: peri-urban areas: villages:

1. war not enough food war
2. low wage low wage not enough food
3. not enough food war condition of the house
4. condition of the house condition of the house low wage

Table 21a: The main problems of the household heads at present (first reply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.cities</th>
<th>pen-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low wage</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crime</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banditry</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployment</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>war</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having no family field</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water supply</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transport</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough vacancies in schools</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=57 n=329 n=67

The house is so to speak only problem number four in the first reply in the peri-urban areas (the fourth most frequently named, by 10%, amongst the long list of problems that was presented to the people and which was named by the people in the pilot study)

Surprisingly enough the sequence of the most frequently named problems remains the same in the peri-urban areas in the second reply: food, low salary, war and house. Only in the third reply the house becomes the second most frequently named problem with 15%.

The most frequently named four problems mentioned above remain almost the same if we combine all three responses.
**Table 21b: The main problems of the household heads (all three answers combined)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>cement cities</th>
<th>peri-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low wage</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crime</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banditry</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployment</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>war</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having no family field</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water supply</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transport</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough vacancies in schools</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the *cement cities* two and a half answers were given by one interviewee in average while almost all respondents named three problems in the *other two areas* (2.8 in average), which can be seen as another indication that people in these two areas do have more problems than people even in the most disadvantaged buildings in the cement cities. The four most frequently named problems after combining all three answers are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cement cities</th>
<th>peri-urban areas</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. war</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. low wages</td>
<td>war</td>
<td>food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. food</td>
<td>low wages</td>
<td>cond. of the house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. crime</td>
<td>conditions of the house</td>
<td>banditry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the *pmi-urban areas* the codes remain the same compared to the first answer only that war and low wages change position. In the *cement cities* crime becomes the fourth most frequently named problem instead of the condition of the house and in the villages *banditry* instead of low wages. Banditry was, of course, related to the war, but it is not exactly the same. It was not always organized attacks people feared and suffered from, but often single bandits broke into the houses during the night and took the little people had. Crime in the cities of Mozambique is an absolutely new phenomenon. As mentioned in the introduction there was hardly any crime and hardly any corruption after independence. That crime is now a problem for people in the privileged *cement cities* can not so much be attributed to the relative poverty there and even not only to the poverty in the peri-urban areas, (there is little crime in the rural areas...
not only of Mozambique but in Africa in general were poverty is worse) but it must rather be attributed to the change in the value system and norms as well as the change in the social structure, caused by the introduction of capitalism in general and the policies of IMF and World Bank in particular. Actually all modern theories on the causes of crime confirm this point of view. (For a comparison with critical criminology see TAYLOR WALTON, YOUNG eds. 1975). However also already the structural functionalist approach more than half a century ago, with MERTON as main exponent (1938) came in essence to the same conclusion in the explanation of the causes of crime. (For a summary of theories see KNAUDER 1994, p.35 - 49)\(^\text{13}\)

8. Aspects of life liked and loved most

Although the situation was grim in Mozambique during the time of this research the reader would have been misled if she or he imagines now that we must have met only crying, sad and desperate people. If one reads about the situation one really does get this impression. At least such was the case during the reading period with the author. However, when moving out into the bairros to conduct the interviews, one got very surprised how much kindness even cheerfulness, openness and warm welcome one could encounter. The table and graph on the depression variable in this paper give the empirical proof for this subjective impression, namely that almost half of the household heads in the peri-urban areas stated that they were not depressed on the day of the interview and those who said that they were a little depressed, one could probably hardly notice it, because kindness might have covered their sadness. A substantial proportion of depressed or very depressed household heads we could only find in the villages of Sofala were one could feel the tension. But even there and in all the other areas it was justified to ask people not only about there sufferings and problems but also about their liking. Most of the codes were named by the household heads themselves during the pilot study.

Forty per cent of the household heads of the cement cities like to live in the city and 53% of those in the villages like to live there according to their first response. The peri-urban areas are once more typical areas of transition, the people are divided. Thirty percent of the household heads would prefer to live in the rural areas, - maybe it is nostalgia for what they had lost for gaining economic advantages -, but 22% already prefer the city.

\(^{13}\) In 1980 one could walk freely after midnight through the streets of the cement city of Maputo, while this was already extremely dangerous in Lusaka, the capital of Zambia, as the author has experienced and studied herself. (KNAUDER, 1994) Mozambique was introducing socialism in many aspects of life, while Zambia had already a capitalist class society, even when the official state philosophy was Humanism and one tried here and there to put some socialist elements into practice. With the advent of capitalism in Mozambique high criminality is one of the negative byproducts.
A considerably high proportion does like their occupation most, particularly in the cities, but after the second and third answer is included, also in the villages which corresponds with the satisfaction variables, were satisfaction with ones occupation ranges highest.

Table 22a: Aspects of life most liked and loved (first response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.cities</th>
<th>peri-urb</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>life in the city</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my occupation</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my church</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>music</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one of the new parties</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frelimo</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life in the rural areas</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most percentages change in the following table with the three answers combined. The church ranges in the third position. Music, a new party, sports and Frelimo gain percentages in most areas, but do not reach 10%, except for the music in the cement cities.

Table 22b: Aspects of life liked and loved most (the three answers combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem.cities</th>
<th>peri-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>life in the city</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my occupation</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my church</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>music</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one of the new parties</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frelimo</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life in the rural areas</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the number of designations is concerned we have here just the opposite situation to the variable of the main problems: the household heads of the cement cities named almost three aspects of life they like most (2.8), the household heads of the peri-urban areas and the villages mentioned less than two and a half only (2.4 and 2.3 respectively).
9. Prospects for the future

As last question people were asked: "For the next five years do you think life in general will improve, not change much or deteriorate?" A considerable proportion has not lost hope, in spite of all the difficulties, (or should we say, because the situation was so bad, one could only hope for the better\textsuperscript{14}), although these optimists are less than half in the peri-urban areas and in the villages but more than two thirds in the cement cities: 68 > 47 > 40 per cent hope for the better, but 4 < 8 < 17 per cent fear for the worst. More than a third is uncertain in the peri-urban areas, 20% don't know in the cement cities and 23% in the villages.

Table 23: prospects for the future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cem. cities</th>
<th>peri-urban</th>
<th>villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will improve</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will not change much</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will deteriorate</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14} In a survey in Zambia carried out in 1977 60% of the low income people expected their standard of living to be worse or much worse in five years' time, only 17% hoped it will be better or much better, 14% expected the future to remain the same and only 9% did not know. Unfortunately for Zambia the pessimists were right. As in many other developing countries the situation did deteriorate since. Three development decades are lost (KNAUDER 1982, p. 119).
VI. THE LINEAR STRUCTURAL RELATIONS

Although we have dealt with all along in this paper with the many differences of the area of living and we have verified the hypotheses in a manyfold way. With the LISREL-model we can now show the intensity of the influence of the area of living as independent variable on the dependent ones: income, which we could also translate with level of poverty, formal education, the housing situation or quality of housing, social interaction (here measured only as frequency of visiting relatives, friends and neighbours), considering housing as a problem and finally satisfaction. It is on one hand surprising that the influence of the area of living on the housing situation is so dominant over all the other influences with a gamma value of .76. On the other hand, if we remember all the big differences in the chapter on the housing situation, this high value might well be justified.

The other surprise at first glance is the relatively low influence of the area of living on the level of poverty: gamma = .40. As mentioned earlier, we do not have very valuable and reliable data on the level of poverty in the villages, but had to rely on other more comprehensive sources in this aspect. However these other mentioned sources can not infiltrate the Lisrel model. On the other hand as low wage and food take on second and third place even in the cement cities (as the underprivileged buildings were selected there) as main problems of the household heads, poverty is not yet overcome even there and the relatively low gamma value might also here reflect reality.

One's formal level of education also depends very much on the area of living, gamma = .47, but the considering of housing as a problem the least, gamma = .21. As we have sew in that respective chapter, many elements which constuite the quality of housing are either not a problem, like water supply and waste removal or are not considered as a problem, because the specific need is not es yet felt so much in the villages.

Personal social interaction as it decreases with the process of urbanization is influenced negatively by the area of living, gamma = -.30 and the gamma value for the influence of the area on satisfaction is also not extraordinarily high with only .31.

What we did not deal with throughout the paper was the influence of the dependent variables on the other dependent variables. And we can see that the frequency of personal social interaction is not only influenced negatively by the area but also by the level of formal education, beta = -.13 and the housing situation, beta = -.25. The only already mentioned light influence of the area on the considering of housing as a problem is made up for by a much greater
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR ALL HOUSEHOLD HEADS. MODEL WITH ONE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE AND SELECTED OR COMBINED DEPENDENT VARIABLES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Formal Educ.</th>
<th>Quality of Housing</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Considering Housing as Problem</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Educ.</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of H.</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider. H.</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selected and combined variables

Household Income = v036
Formal Education = v012
Quality of Housing = v063 + v064 + v065 + v067 + v069 + v076 + v088 + v090
Interaction = v188 + v197 + v210
Considering Housing as a Problem = v080 + v089 + v094 + v099 + v103
Satisfaction = v013 + v037 + v220 + v221 + v226 + v227
Area = v003

LINEAR STRUCTURAL RELATIONS

MODELL I: ALL HOUSEHOLD HEADS (one independent variable)
(only the total effects equal or greater than .10 are shown)
influence of the quality of housing on this consideration, $\beta = .48$ and an additional light influence by the income, $\beta = .14$. The degree of satisfaction is apart from the area also influenced by the level of poverty, $\beta = .30$ the considering of housing as a problem, $\beta = .30$ and the frequency of personal social interaction, $\beta = .20$, but surprisingly enough not by the quality of housing as such.

MODEL 2: ALL HOUSEHOLD HEADS (2 independent variables) (only the total effects are shown)

The beta values remain the same if we consider apart from the area of living also the level of poverty as independent variable. From the gamma values the influence of the area of living becomes weaker on formal education, considering housing as a problem and on satisfaction.

In both models the explained variances are not very impressive except the one of the housing situation of which 61 per cent of the variance are explained. Of the main theme of this paper, satisfaction, only 28 per cent of the variance can be explained as we measured it in this research by the independent and all the dependent variables together meaning that a lot of other variables must be responsible for peoples' satisfaction and depression which are not included in these models. Some might not even have been dealt with in this research, some have at least been brought to light in the questions about the main problems and likings.
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Map of Mozambique

Area: \(799.380 \text{ km}^2\)

Total population (mid 1989 estimate): \(15,166,000\); prop. of urban pop. 23% of tot. pop.: 1,200,000

refugees abroad: 1,200,000

internally displaced: 1,690,000

affected by war: 2,875,000

Population growth (1987 estimate): 2.6%; urban population growth: 5.3%

Population density: 18.2 per \(\text{km}^2\)

Work force: 7,818,000;

Capital Maputo: 1,015,400 inhabitants (1987);

second largest city: Beira 360,000 inhabitants, (1990 estimate)
second largest city: Beira 360,000 inhabitants. (1990 estimate)
Political Independence 1975
PRE: Programa de Reabilitacao Economica = Programme for Economic Rehabilitation = Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) introduced in 1987
GDP per capita (1989 estimate) US$ 150
GDP 1980: 2,810 million US$
GDP 1984: 2,012 million US$
GDP 1991: 96 million US$
Total of Debts 1991 3,982 million US$ 41 times the GDP
1 US $ = 1985 43.18 meticais (singular metical = Mozambican currency)
1986 40.43 meticais
1987 286.00 meticais
1988 526.00 meticais
1989 710.00 meticais (Jan. - June)
Level of absolute poverty (1989 estimate): 62 - 66 per cent
Child mortality (per 1000) 250 below 1 year
350 below 5 years
Average life expectancy 46 years
Inhabitants per physician 44,400
Government expenditure for health per capita in 1980 4.00 US$
in 1988 0.05 US$
Literacy rate 1975 7%
1980 28%
1986 30%
Primary school enrolment rate 1987 47%
Undeclared war of South Africa against Mozambique intensified around 1980;
Renamo also supported by right wing groups of Western Europe and
ultra conservative groups in the USA;
1 million people died; many more mutilated:300,000 children severly traumatized
Primary schools closed / destroyed 1983 - 1987 2,600 (45%)
Health posts closed 1982 - 1987 820 (31%)
Rural shops destroyed or looted 1981 - 1988 3,200 (50%)
Peace accord on 4th October 1992; Multi-party elections planned for October '94

Appendix 2

AREAS OF INVESTIGATION
Appendix 3
Selected questions from the questionnaire which were dealt with in this paper

4. Category
1 urbanized area
2 semi-urbanized area
   = peri-urban areas
3 non-urbanized area
4 village

2. What is your level of education?
1 without formal education
2 between first and third class
3 primary school 1 (4th class)
4 primary school 2 (6th class)
5 secondary school (9th class)
6 pre university college
7 elementary technical school
8 basic technical school
9 medium level technical school
10 higher education

13. Are you satisfied with your level of education?
1 very satisfied
2 satisfied
3 neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4 dissatisfied
5 very dissatisfied

23. What kind of job do you have presently?
1 working for the government
2 working in the private sector
3 working for a co-operative
4 house servant
5 trader
6 business woman/man
7 working mainly in the field
8 working in the informal sector (very small enterprises without license e.g. selling on the black market, repairing shoes etc.)
9 working occasionally
10 unemployed
11 retired
12 housewife

24. Are you content with the atmosphere on your workplace?
1 very content
2 content
3 neither content nor discontent
4 discontent
5 very discontent

25. Are you content with your job conditions?
1 very content
2 content
3 neither content nor discontent
4 discontent
5 very discontent

27. What is your monthly income?
1 nothing
2 less than 24 contos
3 25 - 50
4 51 - 100
5 101 - 200
6 201 - 500
7 more than 500

36. What is the total income of your household per month?
(use codes of question 27)

37. Are you content with the income of your household?
1 very content
2 content
3 neither content nor discontent
4 discontent
5 very discontent

63. Material used for the walls of your house
1 reed
2 corrugated iron sheets
3 pau-a-pique
4 mud
5 concrete blocks
6 bricks
7 other
64. Material used for the floor
1 soil
2 mud
3 tiles
4 cement
5 wood
6 stone / granulit

65. Material of the roof
1 grass
2 corrugated iron sheets
3 tiles
4 fibre cement (lusalite)
5 plastic sheets

67. How many rooms (not counting the kitchen) does your house have?

76. For illumination, what do you use?
1 candle
2 petroleum lamp
3 petromax
4 electricity

79. Are you pleased with your house?
1 very satisfied
2 satisfied
3 neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4 dissatisfied
5 very dissatisfied

80. Do you suffer a lot because you don't have a good house?
1 yes, a lot
2 I suffer, but not a lot
3 I don't suffer

88. What is your situation in terms of sanitation, the situation of the toilet or the latrine?
1 we have no latrine, we go to the bushes
2 we use one latrine with two or more other families
3 we use one latrine together with one other family
4 we have our own latrine
5 our latrine is an improved one / we bought the lid in the workshop
6 we have a toilet within our house
7 we have a sewer
8 we have septic tanks

89. Is the sanitary situation a problem for you?
1 a serious problem
2 a problem, but not a very serious one
3 no problem

90. What do you use for your water supply:
1 we use rivers or Lakes
2 we have to carry the water from a distant well
3 we use a well nearby our house
4 we have to carry water from a distant public water outlet
5 we use a public water outlet close by
6 we have a water tap in out yard
7 we have piped water within our house

94. Is the supply of water a problem for you?
1 a serious problem
2 a problem but not a very serious one
3 no problem

95. Which means of transport do you use normally when going to work?
1 I walk
2 chapa (private minibus)
3 bus service
4 the train
5 hitch hiking
6 my bicycle
7 my motorbike
8 my own car
9 transport is supplied by the workplace
10 other
99. Transport is
   1 a serious problem for you
   2 a problem but not a very serious one
   3 no problem

102. What do you do with waste?
   1 we bury it
   3 we burn it
   3 we throw it in a public place
   4 it is collected by the City Council
   5 other

103. The waste is:
   1 a serious problem for you
   2 a problem, but not a very serious one
   3 no problem

188. How often do you visit one or some of your relatives?
   1 every day
   2 two or three times per week
   3 once a week
   4 once each month
   5 hardly ever
   6 never

If interviewee does have relatives in the bairro
190. In which way do your relatives in this bairro I village help you most frequently:
   1 they help us with food
   2 they bring food stuff for us from the province
   3 they help us with money
   4 we exchange what each of us can spare
   5 they help us whenever someone is ill
   6 they help us whenever we have a ceremony
   7 they do not help us, because they do not have anything
   8 there is mutual help
   9 other

191. Use the above codes for the second answer

192. Use the above codes for the third answer

1%. Do you have friends in this bairro I village?
   1 many
   2 a few
   3 none

If answer is 1 or 2: 197. How many times do you visit one or more of your friends?
   1 everyday
   2 two or three times per week
   3 once a week
   4 once each month
   5 very rarely
   6 never

199. In which way do your friends help you?
  1 they lend me whatever I need
  2 they lend me money
  3 we exchange whatever we can spare
  4 they help me with some work
  5 they give me moral support
  6 they cannot help me, because they do not have anything
  7 there is no mutual help
  8 other

200. Use the above codes for the second answer

201. Use the above codes for the third answer
210. Do you visit the neighbours with whom you have contact?
   1 frequently
   2 sometimes
   3 we always meet outside

212. In which way do your neighbours help you?
   1 they lend me whatever I need
   2 they lend me money
   3 we exchange whatever we can spare
   4 they help me with some work
   5 they give me moral support
   6 they cannot help me, because they do not have anything
   7 there is no mutual help
   8 other

213. Use the above codes for the second answer

214. Use the above codes for the third answer

220. Right now:
   1 I suffer a lot
   2 I suffer, but not a lot
   3 I do not suffer

221. With which of the following statements can you identify best?
   1 I am very unhappy - very miserable
   2 I am unhappy - miserable
   3 I am neither happy nor unhappy
   4 I am happy - I am fine
   5 I am very happy - very fine

222. What is your main problem right now
   1 food
   2 my house
   3 the low wage
   4 I am afraid of criminals
   5 afraid of the armed bandits
   6 unemployment
   7 the war situation
   8 the lack of a field
   9 water supply
   10 transport
   11 lack of places in schools
   12 other problems

223. Which is the second most difficult problem you have?
   codes as above

224. Which is the third most difficult problem?
   codes as above

225. When has life been most difficult for you:
   1 before independence
   2 right after independence until app. 1981
   3 between app. 1981 till app. 1987
   4 after 1987
   5 now

226. With which of the following statements can you identify best?
   1 I have not been cheerful for a long time
   2 I am rarely cheerful
   3 I am cheerful sometimes
   4 I am cheerful not every day, but frequently
   5 I am cheerful almost every day
227. Today you feel:
   1. very depressed, very sad
   2. depressed, sad
   3. somewhat depressed, a little sad
   4. not depressed; not sad

230. During the last 3 years:
   1. life improved in many ways
   2. life improved in some ways
   3. for me life did not change much after 1987
   4. life has become more difficult
   5. life has become much more difficult

231. The state of your house during the last 3 years:
   1. has become worse
   2. has not changed
   3. has improved

232. Of the following aspects of your life, which do you like most?
   1. the life in town
   2. your work
   3. your church
   4. music
   5. one of the new parities
   6. sports
   7. Frelimo
   8. life in the rural areas

233. Which of these aspects do you like in the second place?
   codes as above

234. Which of these aspects do you like in the third place?
   codes as above

236. How do you think life will change in the next five years?
   1. it will improve
   2. it will not change much
   3. it will become worse
The cement city of Maputo
A pant-a-pique house in construction in the peri-urban areas of Beira.

A typical reed house in the peri-urban areas of Maputo with the interviewers and the interviewee.

Pau-a-pique house with corrugated iron sheets as roof.
Houses of the village Mutua with the female interviewers of Beira.

One of the few brick houses in the village Massaca 1 in the province of Maputo.

The village Mutua with inhabitants.

Typical reed houses in the village Massaca 1 with grass as roof.